Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress. Appendix.

Contributors

Great Britain. Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress.

Publication/Creation

London : Printed for H.M. Stationery Office, 1909-1913.

Persistent URL

https://wellcomecollection.org/works/cf4x5ffs

License and attribution

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



22502708790

BOARD OF TRADE
Received
3 SEP. 1912
LABOUR DEPARTMENT LIBRARY


BOARD OF TRADE
Received
3 SEP. 1912
LABOUR DEPARTMENT LIBRARY
28 AUG

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE POOR LAWS AND RELIEF OF DISTRESS.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR
26 AUG 1922
LIBRARY

APPENDIX VOLUME I.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(1ST TO 34TH DAYS)

BEING MAINLY THE EVIDENCE

GIVEN BY THE

OFFICERS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD FOR ENGLAND AND WALES.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



LONDON:
PRINTED FOR HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, 109, FETTER LANE, E.C.

And to be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, 109, FETTER LANE, FLEET STREET, E.C.; and
32, ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.; or
OLIVER AND BOYD, TWEEDDALE COURT, EDINBURGH; or
E. PONSONBY, 116, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1909.

[Cd. 4625.]

339.1

A List of the Appendix Volumes to the Reports of the Commission will be found at the end of this Volume.

WELLCOME LIBRARY
General Collections
+M
304

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WITNESSES WHOSE EVIDENCE IS CONTAINED IN THIS VOLUME.

Name of Witness.	Official or other Qualification.	No. of Days of Evidence.	Nos. of Questions.	Page.
Adrian, A. D., C.B., K.C. -	Legal Adviser to the Local Government Board, England	1—4	1—1455	1
Bagenal, P. H. - - -	General Inspector under the Local Government Board, England	20, 21	6868—7849	327
Bircham, F. T. - - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	16	4886—5356	253
Burd, E. P. - - - -	Inspector of Audits under the Local Government Board, England	15	4620—4885	244
Court, E. D. - - -	General Inspector under the Local Government Board, England	19	6149--6690	304
Dansey, R. I. - - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	18	5913—6148	295
Davy, J. S., C.B. - -	Assistant Secretary and Chief General Inspector to the Local Government Board, England	5—12	1594—3538 3758—4051	97 206
Fleming, Baldwyn - -	General Inspector under the Local Government Board, England	24, 25	8846—9573	394
Fuller, Andrew - -	Medical Inspector for Poor Law purposes under the Local Government Board, England	27	10175—10793	461
Fust, H. Jenner - -	General Inspector under the Local Government Board, England	28, 29	10794—11561	480
Herbert, N. - - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	22	8064—8614	371
Hervey, G. A. F. - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	29	11562—12058	502
Kitchin, B. T. - - -	Architect to the Local Government Board, England	11	3539—3757	197
Lockwood, H. - - -	General Inspector under the Local Government Board, England	12, 31, 32, 33	4052—4157 12519—14225	215 531
Lowry, A. B. - - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	30	12059—12240	514
Lowry, J. - - - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	22	7850—8063	365
Mason, M. H. - - -	Inspector of Boarded-out Children under the Local Government Board, England	26	9574—10174	437
Monod, H. - - - -	Late Directeur de l'Assistance et l'Hygiène Publique	32	13624—13753	576
Mott, E. J. - - - -	Clerk to the Fulham Board of Guardians	34	14619—14814	615
Owen, Sir Hugh, G.C.B. -	Receiver of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund	34	14815—14880	622
Pitts, T., C.B. - - -	Assistant Secretary to the Local Government Board, England	5 and 13	1456—1593 4158--4280	89 222
Stansfeld, Ina - - -	Assistant Inspector (Metropolis) under the Local Government Board, England	33—34	14226—14618	601
Stoltz, Gerhard - -	Overseer of the Poor, Bergen, Norway	19	6091—6867	323
Thomas, H. Preston - -	General Inspector under the Local Government Board, England	14 and 30	4281—4619 12241—12518	227 519
Walsh, The Hon. G. - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	23	8615—8845	388
Wethered, E. B. - -	Ditto - - - - - - -	17, 18	5357—5912	275

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

POOR LAWS AND RELIEF OF DISTRESS.

FIRST DAY.

Monday, 8th January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., &c., &c., &c. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. ALFRED DOUGLAS ADRIAN,* C.B., K.C., called; and Examined.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

1. (*Chairman.*) Will you kindly state what your present post at the Local Government Board is?—I am at present legal adviser to the Local Government Board.

2. Previous to holding that appointment, what office did you fill?—I was an assistant secretary for many years.

3. You are, of course, aware of the purport of this Commission; and that we are anxious that you should give evidence to us as regards the existing Poor Laws applicable both to England and to Wales. Now, the evidence you will have to give will be very voluminous; how would you propose to divide it?—The range of subjects covered by the existing law relating to the relief of the poor in England and Wales is so wide as almost of necessity to make elimination a condition of any practical survey which is to take the form of oral evidence; and there are other reasons for elimination. Matters covered by the actual wording of the reference to this Royal Commission have been or are already in course of investigation by other Royal Commissions or by Departmental Committees. For example, taxation for local purposes, so far as those purposes are connected with the relief of the poor, would undoubtedly, at first sight, appear to form an important branch of the present inquiry; but local taxation, as a whole, has been investigated by the Commissioners appointed on the 15th August, 1896; their reports were published some years ago, and legislation and proposals for legislation have ensued upon those reports. The Valuation Bill which was introduced into Parliament in the session of 1904 may perhaps be cited as in itself a sufficient indication of the fact that the subject of local taxation is no longer within the province of inquiry. Hence, I propose to exclude altogether from my evidence any reference to that part of the Law which is concerned with the valuation and rating of property for Poor Law purposes. Again, it is to be noted that in 1904 a Royal Commission was appointed to consider the existing methods of dealing with idiots and epileptics and with imbecile, feeble-minded or defective persons not certified under the Lunacy Laws. An investigation of this sort must inevitably include much that touches the Poor Law. The fact that the investigation is still proceeding seems to justify the sparing treatment in evidence of matters which might otherwise be regarded as fully within the scope of the present inquiry. Accordingly, I propose, especially in relation to pauper imbeciles, to avoid any such detailed discussion of the law as might involve needless repetition of the same topics. Another matter as to which elimination appears to be desirable, includes certain educational aspects of the Poor Law. On the 18th September, 1894, the President of the Local Government Board appointed a Departmental Committee to inquire into the then existing systems for the maintenance and education of children under the charge of managers of district schools and boards of guardians in the Metropolis, and to advise as to any changes that might be desirable. The report of that Departmental Committee, and the action taken upon the report, will doubtless receive the consideration of the present Commission; but from the legal point of view, the fact of the previous inquiry serves as a justification for abstaining from the statement of many details which should otherwise be noticed. Lastly, the subject of vagrancy has engaged the attention for some time of a Departmental Committee; and in this case also there seem to be good grounds for considering the matter to be outside the range of my evidence. After applying the process of elimination in the way already indicated, I propose to group what I have to say concerning the Poor Law of England and Wales under the following heads:— (1) The Central Authority; (2) Local Authorities; (3) Poor Law Unions; (4) Combinations; (5) Relief in

Division of Subjects.

* N.B.—It should be borne in mind that, since the dates at which this witness appeared before the Royal Commission, various Statutory enactments and judicial decisions have, in several respects, affected the legal position as described in his evidence.

429. 2,000—Wt. T.L. 313. 5/09. Wy. & S. 4339r.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

General ; (6) In-door Relief ; (7) Out-door Relief ; (8) Finance ; (9) Pauper Lunatics ; (10) Settlement and Removal ; (11) Bastardy ; and (12) Miscellaneous. It is quite obvious that an exhaustive treatment of all the subjects suggested by each of these heads would be out of place in such a summary as I suppose to be required of me. Many of the subjects bristle with technicalities and as to most, a complete statement of the law must be gathered not only from statutes and judicial decisions, but also from codes of regulations which often vary in effect to meet the circumstances of particular localities. I am compelled, therefore, to attempt nothing more ambitious than an outline of the main features of the law under each head. I shall endeavour to exclude technicality where this is not of direct interest in its relation to principles ; and, so far as possible, I shall limit my use of the judgments of the Courts and of the rules and opinions of the Central Authority to the illustration of the law in its practical working with regard to particular classes of persons.

THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY.

4. Taking the first of the subjects with which you propose to deal, what do you wish to say to us concerning the central authority ?—In the Report of the Commission of Inquiry there was the following recommendation :—" We recommend, therefore, the appointment of a Central Board to control the administration of the Poor Laws, with such Assistant Commissioners as may be found requisite ; and that the Commissioners be empowered to frame and enforce regulations for the government of workhouses, and as to the nature and amount of the relief to be given, and the labour to be exacted in them ; and that such regulations shall, as far as may be practicable, be uniform throughout the country." The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 gave effect to this recommendation by authorising the appointment, by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual, of three fit persons to be Commissioners, with the style of the Poor Law Commissioners for England and Wales. The Commissioners were empowered to sit as a Board of Commissioners for carrying the Act into execution ; they were to have a seal ; they were to be incapable of being elected or sitting as Members of the House of Commons ; and they were to hold office for a limited period. The first appointments of Commissioners were made four days after the passing of the Act, that is to say, on the 18th August, 1834.

The Poor Law Commissioners.

The Poor Law Board.

5. These Poor Law Commissioners were subsequently superseded by the Poor Law Board, I believe ?—On the 23rd July, 1847, the Poor Law Board Act, 1847, was passed. That Act superseded the original body by a new set of Commissioners for administering the laws for relief of the poor in England. The new Commissioners were to be appointed by letters patent or Commission under the Great Seal ; and they were to comprise certain *ex officio* Commissioners, namely, the President of the Council, the Lord Privy Seal, the principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Commissioner first named in the letters patent or Commission was to be styled " President ; " and the President and one of the Secretaries, whom the new Commissioners were required to appoint, might sit in the House of Commons. This second body of Commissioners, by Section 21 of a subsequent Act (the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849, 12 and 13 Vic., c. 103), received express authority to use the name of the Poor Law Board. Under that name the Commission, which, like the early Commission, was temporary only, was continued by renewal until 1867, when the Poor Law Amendment Act of that year (30 and 31 Vic., c. 106, which was passed on the 20th August, 1867) by repealing the enactment limiting the duration of the second Commission, placed the Poor Law Board upon a permanent footing.

6. Then the difference between the original Poor Law Commissioners and the Poor Law Board in one sense was that the former were not represented in Parliament except through the Home Secretary and that the latter were directly represented ?—That is so.

7. The establishment of the Poor Law Board was followed by another change, was it not ?—Yes.

8. What was the nature of that change ?—The Poor Law Board continued on a permanent footing until the 19th of August, 1871, when the appointment of the first President of the Local Government Board, under the Local Government Board Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 70), had the effect of transferring to the Board thereby created the functions of the Poor Law Board and of other departments. To the Local Government Board there was nominally given a rather wider constitution than that of the Poor Law Board ; and its *ex officio* members include the Lord President of the Council, all the principal Secretaries of State, the Lord Privy Seal, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The Local Government Board.

Reports and General Orders of Local Government Board.

9. Are there any points which you would wish to note at this stage of your evidence in connection with the powers and duties of the central authority so established ?—What has to be said with regard to the powers and duties of the Central Authority will, for the most part, fall more conveniently under the various heads to which the particular subjects of administration will be referred. It may, however, be convenient to note here that in pursuance of sec. 13 of the Poor Law Board Act, 1847, the Local Government Board are required once in every year to submit to His Majesty a general report of their proceedings ; and that every such general report is to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within six weeks after the date thereof, if Parliament be then sitting, or, if Parliament be not then sitting, within six weeks after the next meeting of Parliament. Also, under section 1 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, the Local Government Board are required to cause a copy of every general rule, order, or regulation issued by them to be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as practicable after its publication.

Ex-officio members of Local Government Board.

10. I think you mentioned that there was a committee connected with the Local Government Board consisting of certain high officers of State ?—The Local Government Board includes the Lord President of the Council, the principal Secretaries of State, the Lord Privy Seal, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

11. I assume, however, that any order issued by the Local Government Board, if it has the approval of the President of the Board, is legal without the assent of the other members ?—Quite so. About thirty years ago there was, I believe, a temporary arrangement for obtaining the signatures to orders of some of the *ex officio* members ; I do not think that the arrangement lasted very long, but I have seen a practice of that character.

12. So that their functions really are consultative rather than executive in practice ?—Their functions are not executive in any other than a ministerial sense.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

13. If that finishes the evidence you wish to give as regards the central authority, will you now please give us an account of the local authorities and their connection with the Poor Law ?—Turning to the constitution of the Local Authorities for Poor Law administration, I have first to say a few words about the appointment of overseers of the poor ; of their powers and duties it will be better to speak under particular heads of administration. The Poor Relief Act, 1601, by sec. 1., as amended by the Poor Law (Overseers) Act, 1814 (54 Geo. III. c. 91), enacted that the churchwardens of every parish, and four, three, or two substantial householders, as should be thought meet (having respect to the proportion and greatness of the parish), to be nominated yearly on the 25th of March or within fourteen days after the 25th of March under the hand and seal of two or more justices of the peace in the same county, whereof one was to be of the quorum, dwelling in or near the same parish or division where the same parish lay, should be called overseers of the poor of the parish. The effect of later Acts, namely, the Poor Law (Overseers) Act, 1849 (12 and 13 Vict. c. 8,) the 12 and 13 Vict. c. 64, and the Justices Jurisdiction Act, 1852 (15 & 16 Vict. c. 38), was that overseers for a parish in a city or borough might be appointed by any justices having jurisdiction within the city or borough. It may be proper here to say something about an officer, who, in the past, often had important duties in connection with the relief of the poor. This officer is the assistant-overseer. The appointment of assistant-overseers was first authorised by Sturges Bourne's Act (59 Geo. III. c. 12, sec. 7). The vestry were thereby empowered to nominate and elect and the justices to appoint a discreet person with a salary. The vestry were to determine what duties were to be executed by the assistant-overseer ; and these duties very frequently included the duties of the overseer in the matter of relief. The Poor Law Commissioners also issued Orders authorising the guardians of various unions to appoint assistant-overseers.

Overseers.

Assistant Overseers.

nt slation ting rseers Assistant seers.

14. What has been the effect of more recent legislation with regard to the appointment of overseers?—Subsequent legislation has generally placed the appointment of overseers on a different footing. Under sec. 5 of the Local Government Act, 1894, in the case of a rural parish having a parish council the power and duty of appointing overseers have been transferred to and vested in the parish council. Sub-sec. 2 of the same section provides that the churchwardens of every rural parish shall cease to be overseers, and that an additional number of overseers may be appointed to replace the churchwardens. Also in the case of a rural parish not having a parish council the power and duty of appointing overseers were transferred under sec 19 (5) of the same Act to the parish meeting. Further, by sec. 33 of the Act of 1894, the Local Government Board are empowered, on the application of the council of a municipal borough (including a county borough) or of any other urban district, to make an order conferring on the council or some other representative body within the borough or district the appointment of overseers. Again, by section 11 (1) of the London Government Act, 1899, the council of each metropolitan borough became the overseers of every parish within the metropolitan borough. Lastly, many local Acts contain provisions which depart materially from the general law with respect to the appointment and functions of these officers. In the case of the assistant-overseer, also, somewhat similar changes have been brought about. By the Local Government Act, 1894, the power of appointing and revoking the appointment of assistant-overseers in rural parishes was transferred to and vested in the parish council, or in the parish meeting where there is no parish council (secs. 7 and 19). Section 81 (6) repealed so much of any enactment as authorised the appointment of assistant-overseers by a board of guardians. Sec. 33 of the same Act extended to assistant-overseers; and many local Acts have authorised exceptional arrangements with regard to the appointment and employment of these officers. Lastly, sec. 30 (1) of the London Government Act, 1899, provided for the transfer to the metropolitan borough council of assistant-overseers and other officers employed in the performance of the duties of overseers.

15. Are we to assume that the modern overseer has nothing to do with the allocation or distribution of the poor rate?—In exceptional cases he has authority to give relief; I shall come to those cases under the head of relief.

e Board of ardians.

16. Now we come to the boards of guardians, I think?—Yes. The next poor law authority to be referred to are the boards of guardians. Sections 38 and 39 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, gave powers for the constitution of boards of guardians of the existing type; but the Local Government Act, 1894, effected very extensive changes in the law relating to the qualification and election of guardians, and these matters are now the subject of a somewhat elaborate and voluminous series of enactments and rules.

e electors and quali- tions for ce of rdian.

17. Will you please describe the constitution of a board of guardians?—I do not propose to set out in all its details the scheme of the existing law with respect to the constitution of a board of guardians; but the following summary will, I think, show the more prominent features. The persons who elect guardians are the parochial electors, and if a parish is divided into wards the electors of the guardians for each ward are such of the parochial electors as are registered in respect of qualifications within the ward (Local Government Act, 1894, Section 20). With regard to the electors it is to be observed that every person whose name is on the register of parochial electors is entitled to vote unless prohibited by an Act of Parliament (Local Government Act, 1894, Section 44). The following are disqualified:—Any person who is in receipt of relief given to himself or his wife or child, or who has been in receipt of relief on any day during the year last preceding the election. In the case of a person objected to on this ground a certificate from the clerk to the guardians is sufficient evidence of the person having received relief; and his disqualification is not affected or removed by the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, 1885. Other disqualifications apply to any person convicted of treason or felony, or convicted or reported guilty of a corrupt practice at a Parliamentary election or at a municipal election, or convicted of corruption as or with respect to a member, officer or servant of a public body; and a person who is an alien is also disqualified. Guardians are elected only for parishes in urban districts; but parishes may be divided into wards for the purposes of election. The number of guardians assigned to each parish may be fixed by the Order constituting the union, or by an Order of a county council, or of a joint committee of county councils; and for fixing or altering the number of guardians to be elected for each parish, a county council or joint committee of county councils, may exercise powers of adding parishes and dividing parishes into wards (Local Government Act, 1894, Section 60). In the case of rural districts, the persons elected as rural district councillors act as guardians. A person is not qualified to be elected or to be a guardian unless he—(*a*) is a parochial elector, that is a person registered in the register of parochial electors, which register consists of the Local Government Register of Electors, and the Parliamentary Register of Electors (so far as relates to the parish), and the separate list of parochial electors printed at the end of the other lists (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 44 (6 and 8)); or (*b*) has during the whole of the twelve months preceding the election resided in the union, or (*c*) in the case of a parish wholly or partly within a borough, is qualified to be elected a councillor for the borough. With regard to the qualifications above detailed, it should be explained that the Local Government Register of Electors so far as it relates to a parish consists of men, unmarried women and widows registered in respect of the occupation as owner or tenant of—(1) a house, warehouse, counting house, shop or other building; (2) some land or tenement of the clear yearly value of not less than £10. The Parliamentary Register of Electors means a register of persons entitled to vote at any Parliamentary election (52 and 53 Vic. c., 63, Sec. 17, Sub-Sec. 2); and, so far as relates to a parish, it comprises men registered in respect of—(3) the ownership of freehold, copyhold or leasehold property of the requisite value; (4) the occupation, as tenant, of land or tenements of a yearly rent of not less than £50—a qualification which applies only to persons already on the register in 1884; (5) the occupation, as owner or tenant, of some land or tenement of the clear yearly value of not less than £10; (6) the occupation, as inhabitant occupier, of a dwelling house, or of some part of a house separately occupied as a dwelling; and (7) the occupation, as lodger, of lodgings of a clear yearly value if let unfurnished of £10 or upwards. The separate list of parochial electors comprises—(8) men and unmarried women entitled to vote as parochial electors, but who are not entitled to be registered for voting as County or Parliamentary electors; and (9) married women entitled to be registered and to vote as parochial electors. The enactments relating to the qualification of a councillor for a borough are those contained in Secs. 11 and 12 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882. They are as follows—(1) The councillors shall be fit persons elected by the burgesses. (2) A person shall not be qualified to be elected or to be a councillor unless he (*a*) is enrolled and entitled to be so enrolled as a burgess; or (*b*) being entitled to be so enrolled in all respects except that of residence, is resident beyond seven miles, but within fifteen miles of the borough, and is entered in the separate non-resident list directed by the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, to be made; and (*c*) in either of those cases is seised or possessed of real or personal property or both to the value or amount, in the case of a borough having four or more wards, of £1,000 and in the case of any other borough of £500, or is rated to the Poor Rate in the borough, in the case of a borough having four or more wards, on the annual value of £30 and in the case of any other borough of £15. (3) Provided that every person shall be qualified to be elected and to be a councillor who is at the time of election qualified to elect to the office of councillor; which last-mentioned qualification for being elected shall be alternative for and shall not repeal or take away any other qualification. (4) But if a person qualified under the last foregoing proviso ceases for six months to reside in the borough he shall cease to be qualified under that proviso, and his office shall become vacant, unless he was at the time of his election and continues to be qualified in some other manner. Lastly, it is enacted that a person shall not be entitled to be enrolled as a burgess unless he is qualified as follows—(*a*) is of full age; and (*b*) is on the 15th of July in any year, and has been during the whole of the then last preceding twelve months in occupation, joint or several, of any house, warehouse, counting-house, shop or other building in the borough; and (*c*) has during

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

the whole of those twelve-months resided in the borough or within seven miles thereof; and (*d*) has been rated in respect of the qualifying property to all Poor Rates made during those twelve months for the parish wherein the property is situate; and (*e*) has on or before the 20th of the same July paid all such rates including borough rates (if any) as have become payable by him in respect of the qualifying property up to the then last preceding 5th of January. It is also enacted that every person so qualified shall be entitled to be enrolled as a burgess unless he (*a*) is an alien; or (*b*) has within the twelve months aforesaid received union or parochial relief or other alms; or (*c*) is disentitled under any Act of Parliament. The effect of Sec. 45 (8) of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, is that every person enrolled in the burgess roll shall be deemed to be enrolled as a burgess and every person not enrolled in the burgess roll shall be deemed to be not enrolled as a burgess. It should be added with reference to the parochial elector that, in the case of a parish in an urban district or in the County of London or in a county borough, the expression means a person who would be a parochial elector if the parish were a rural parish (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 75, Sub-Sec. 2).

18. Putting all technicalities on one side then, the qualification for entitling an elector to vote for the board of guardians is somewhat wider than the Parliamentary franchise?—Yes.

19. That is, it includes those entitled to the Parliamentary franchise plus certain others?—It includes some persons who are disqualified for the Parliamentary franchise.

20. Before we pass from this part of your evidence would you give the Commission the date of the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act?—That Act was passed in 1885, and I propose at a later stage to dwell rather fully upon it.

Disqualifications for office of guardian.

21. Now I think you have something to say concerning the qualification of guardians?—Yes, that is, I propose to say something about disqualification. No person is disqualified by sex or marriage for being elected or being a guardian (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 20); but a person is disqualified if he (*a*) is an infant or alien; or (*b*) has within twelve months before his election or since his election received union or parochial relief; or (*c*) has within five years before his election, or since his election, been convicted either on indictment or summarily of any crime, and sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour without the option of a fine, or to any greater punishment, and has not received a free pardon; or has, within or during the time aforesaid, been adjudged bankrupt, or made a composition or arrangement with his creditors; or (*d*) holds any paid office under the board of guardians; or (*e*) is concerned in any bargain or contract entered into with the board of guardians, or participates in the profit of any such bargain or contract or of any work done under the authority of the board of guardians. But disqualification does not arise by reason of interest (*a*) in the sale or lease of any lands, or (*b*) in any loan of money to the board of guardians, or in any newspaper in which any advertisement relating to the affairs of the board of guardians is inserted; or (*c*) in any contract with the board of guardians as a shareholder in a joint stock company; but the guardian interested must not vote at any meeting of the board of guardians on any question in which the company are interested, except that in the case of a water company or other company established for the carrying on of works of a like public nature this prohibition may be dispensed with by the county council (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 46, Sub-Secs. 1 and 2). Disqualification in the case of bankruptcy, composition or arrangement ceases when the adjudication is annulled, or when the bankrupt obtains his discharge with a certificate that his bankruptcy was caused by misfortune without any misconduct on his part, and in case of composition or arrangement, on payment of his debts in full. (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 46, Sub.-Sec. 4). Other grounds of disqualification arise out of corrupt practices at various elections or convictions under the Public Bodies Corrupt Practices Act, 1889.

Election of guardians, acceptance of office, fine, casual vacancies.

22. Does that finish the list of disqualifications?—Yes.

23. Now will you describe the procedure for the election of a guardian?—A candidate for the office of guardian must be nominated in writing by two parochial electors, and in this and in other matters relating to the election the proceedings are regulated by rules framed by the Local Government Board under the Local Government Act, 1894, and by various enactments applied by that Act. Every poll is to be taken by ballot (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 48, Sub-Sec. 3). Every qualified person elected or deemed to be elected to the office of guardian, unless exempt, must accept the office by making and subscribing a declaration or must pay a fine summarily recoverable. He must not act in the office until he has made and subscribed the declaration except in administering the declaration. If he omits to sign the declaration, his office becomes void and a casual vacancy arises. If a guardian is absent from meetings of the board of guardians for more than six months consecutively, except in case of illness or for some other reason approved by the board of guardians, his office becomes vacant (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 46, Sub-Sec. 6).

24. You have mentioned the liability to a fine; do you know if that fine has ever been imposed?—In certain cases I think it has been. I do not recall any very recent instance, but questions have frequently arisen as to whether the particular circumstances of the case justified any remission of the fine, or whether any remission could be given.

25. Then it is an effective part of the law?—Clearly.

26. As I understand he is fined if he refuses to act?—That is, if he does not accept the office which is now regarded as being on the same footing as a municipal office.

27. Is the amount of the fine stated in the Statute?—No; the amount of the fine depends upon the rules.

28. Who would determine the fine; would it be the Local Government Board?—It is determined by the rules; but I have not a copy of those rules with me. It comes from an application of provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882.

Term of service of guardian.

29. That I think finishes your evidence as regards the procedure for election, and we now come to the term of service; what have you to say about that?—The normal term of office of a guardian is three years (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 20, Sub-Sec. 6). Subject to the directions of the county council, guardians may retire by thirds on the 15th of April in each year, or they may retire simultaneously on the same day in every third year. Orders made under the Local Government Act, 1894, by a county council or Joint Committee of county councils with respect to the retirement of guardians may be rescinded in pursuance of the District Councillors and Guardians (Term of Office) Act, 1900 (63 and 64 Vict. c.16).

Ex-officio nominated guardians.

30. In the old days there were *ex officio* guardians I believe?—Yes.

31. What is the modern substitute?—Prior to the coming into operation of the Local Government Act, 1894, the Poor Law Acts had authorised an *ex officio* element in the constitution of each board of guardians. The *ex officio* guardians were the local justices of the peace. Also, under Sec. 79 of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, the Local Government Board were empowered to nominate guardians either from among the resident justices or from among resident ratepayers assessed on an annual value of not less than £40. By Sec. 20 of the Local Government Act, 1894, however, it is enacted that there shall be no *ex officio* or nominated guardians. In substitution, the Act of 1894 by Sec. 20, Sub-Sec. 7, empowers a board of guardians to elect a chairman or vice-chairman or both, and not more than two other persons from outside their own body, but from persons qualified to be guardians of the union. Any person so elected becomes an additional guardian and member of the board of guardians.

Additional guardians.

32. The qualification of the person so elected being the same as that of the other guardians?—Yes.

Guardians under Local Acts.

33. Have you any observations to make respecting guardians under local Acts?—The provisions that I have already summarised are by Sec. 60, Sub-Sec. 4 of the Local Government Act, 1894, made applicable to the case of guardians elected under local and personal Acts; but by Sub-Sec. 6 it is provided that nothing in the Act shall alter the constitution of the corporation of the guardians of the poor within the city of Oxford, or the election or qualification of the members except those members who are elected by the ratepayers of parishes.

34. Apparently the local Acts are insignificant in number?—I think there are twelve, but I am not quite sure as to the number.

eetings and oceedings guardians.

35. Now I think we come to the meetings and proceedings of guardians; what have you to say on that subject?—No guardian has power to act in virtue of his office except as a member at a meeting of the board of guardians (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 38). A meeting of a board of guardians must not be held in premises licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquor, except in cases where no other suitable room is available either free of charge or at a reasonable cost (Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 61). Sec. 199 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and the unrepealed provisions of Schedule 1 to that Act are applied to boards of guardians by Sec. 59 of the Local Government Act, 1894. The guardians accordingly are to make regulations with respect to the summoning, notice, place, management and adjournment of their meetings, and generally with respect to the transaction and management of their business. Other matters with which provisions in the schedule to the Public Health Act of 1875 are expressly concerned are—the quorum (one-third and not more than seven), the chairman, the record of members and votes, decisions, chairman's casting vote, the validity of proceedings, minutes of evidence, and the annual meeting. Nothing, however, in Sec. 59 of the Local Government Act, 1894, is to affect any powers of the Local Government Board with respect to the proceedings of guardians. The power thus reserved is that conferred by Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, and in a case in which, notwithstanding the prohibition in Sec. 61 of the Local Government Act, 1894, a board of guardians continued to meet at a licensed public house, the Local Government Board were advised by the law officers on the 2nd of August, 1898, that the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, gave the Board power to make an order with respect to the place of meeting of a board of guardians, and that this power was reserved to the Board who could by its exercise forbid future meetings at the public-house.

OOR LAW NIONS.

36. I think that completes your evidence as regards the powers of the local authority, and that we may therefore go now to the question of areas. Do you give a summary of the provisions relating to the area and jurisdiction of a board of guardians, of which there is some modern definition, I understand?—For use after the commencement of the Interpretation Act, 1889, that Act in Sec. 15 has supplied a convenient expression to denote the area of jurisdiction of a board of guardians. The Act says—"The expression 'Poor Law Union' shall as respects England and Wales mean any parish or union of parishes for which there is a separate board of guardians." The board of guardians referred to in the definition may be either a board of guardians elected under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, or a board of guardians or other body of persons performing under any local Act the like functions to a board of guardians under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

rmation Poor Law nions.

37. Will you describe the powers for the formation of Poor Law Unions?—The powers conferred by the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 for the formation of unions are contained in Sec. 26. That section enables the Central Authority by an Order to declare so many parishes as they might think fit to be united for the administration of the laws for the relief of the poor. The section continues—"And such parishes shall thereupon be deemed a union for such purpose, and thereupon the workhouse or workhouses of such parishes shall be for their common use." A certain limitation upon these powers was afterwards imposed by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844. Section 64 of that Act provided that when the relief of the poor had been administered in any parish by guardians appointed under a local Act and not by overseers, and the parish, according to the last enumeration of the population published by authority of Parliament, contained more than 20,000 persons, it should not be lawful for the Poor Law Commissioners after the passing of the Act of 1844 without the consent in writing of two-thirds at least of the guardians, to declare the parish to be united with any other parish for the administration of the laws for the relief of the poor. The section was afterwards repealed as regards the Metropolis by the Metropolitan Poor Act 1867 (Sec. 78); and other legislation has rendered it unimportant at the present time. With regard to single parishes the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, provided by Sec. 39 that, if the Commissioners should by any Order under their hands and seal direct that the administration of the laws for the relief of the poor of any single parish should be governed and administered by a board of guardians, the board should be elected and constituted and authorised and entitled to act for the single parish in like manner in all respects as was provided in respect to a board of guardians of a union.

Alteration or dissolution of Poor Law Unions.

38. If that is all you have to say as regards the formation of Poor Law Unions will you now tell us something about the power of altering or of dissolving Poor Law Unions?—The Poor Law Commissioners had power under Sec. 32 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, by Order to declare a Poor Law Union not united for purposes of settlement or rating to be dissolved, or any parish or parishes to be separated from and added to the union. But the concurrence of a majority of not less than two-thirds of the guardians was necessary. This condition was practically abrogated by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844. Section 66 of that Act gave the Poor Law Commissioners a free hand by enacting that they might proceed without the concurrence of the guardians, and that the Commissioners might also, if they saw fit, cause a board of guardians to be elected under the Act of 1834 for a single parish separated from a union, notwithstanding the provisions of any local Act in force in the parish.

39. With reference to the answers you have given us as to the formation of Poor Law Unions and their alteration and dissolution, are we to understand that the Local Government Board have power, regardless of the views of the board of guardians, to alter and change the area?—That is so at the present day.

40. Have they to report the scheme and get the approval of Parliament?—No. The instances in which a Provisional Order will be necessary I shall mention later on; they involve cases where there are local Acts.

41. Then this power is a power which is now absolutely vested in the Local Government Board?—Yes.

Difficulties due to Gilbert Act Incorporations.

42. I think you wish to mention certain obstacles that arose in the early formation of Poor Law Unions?—Yes.

43. Those, I understand, originated from the existence of unions and parishes under Gilbert's Act?—Yes.

44. As we are not all as learned as you, perhaps you will shortly define Gilbert's Act?—I propose to do so. The difficulty arose from the fact that the unions and parishes formed under that Act were scattered about the country. The Act known as Gilbert's Act was the 22 George III., c. 83. It was an adoptive Act, that is to say, in any parish two thirds of the owners or occupiers in number and value according to the poor rate and assessed after the rate of £5 per annum at the least, were empowered at a public meeting to notify their desire to adopt the Act, and to nominate persons from whom the justices might select for each parish a salaried official, namely, a guardian of the poor. The owners and occupiers also nominated candidates for the post of salaried governor of the poor-house—an appointment which the justices made from the nominees. Provision was made for the union of parishes, and the guardians of the united parishes were required to apply to the justices to appoint a visitor of the poorhouse out of a list of the guardians' nominees. The visitor, who could appoint a deputy, was a superior functionary whom the guardians and governors were bound to obey. It was to the provisions relating to the poorhouse and the administration of relief that the Commissioners took special exception. Their main trouble arose from the opinion of the Attorney General that in Gilbert Act Unions the guardians were bound to find employment out of the workhouse for persons professing willingness to work, but inability to obtain employment. The matter belongs now to past history; but it deserves mention here because, although the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, by Sec. 37 prevented the formation of future Gilbert Act Unions without the consent of the Commissioners, it was not until 1868 that the Poor Law Amendment Act of that year by Sec. 4 gave the power of dissolution which in 1835 the Attorney General thought to be the only way out of the difficulties of the Poor Law Commissioners.

Difficulties due to Local Acts.

45. Now will you tell us what the position was and is with regard to local Acts?—In 1867 difficulties of another

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian. C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

kind, namely those presented by the metropolitan group of local Acts, were effectually removed. This object was attained by Secs. 73 to 78 of the Metropolitan Poor Act 1867. In that same year Guardians outside the Metropolis were enabled by Sec. 2 of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1867 to co-operate with the Poor Law Board in getting rid of obsolete local Acts. The guardians were empowered to apply for a Provisional Order to repeal or alter any local Act controlling or regulating relief, or the making and levying of the poor rate in their Poor Law Union; and the Poor Law Board were empowered to make and issue such an order and to obtain Parliamentary confirmation. These powers were in the next year extended to the Metropolis by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868 (Sec. 3); and afterwards, by the Poor Law Act 1879 (Sec. 9), the like facilities were afforded to churchwardens, overseers and others having powers or duties under any such local Act. Now also, by the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act 1876 (Sec. 11), it is enacted that if it shall appear to the Local Government Board that it is expedient for rectifying or simplifying the areas of management or otherwise for the better administration of the relief of the poor that any Union, whether formed under the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 or otherwise, should be dissolved, the Board may, after inquiry held in some one of the unions to be affected, after public notice, so that all persons interested in the same may attend and be heard thereat, issue their order for the dissolution of any such union, and such dissolution shall have the same effect and be attended with the same consequences as in the case of a union dissolved under the provisions of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. Likewise by the Act of 1876 (Sec. 13) the Local Government Board are empowered to change the name of a union and direct how the change of name is to be published.

46. That brings us down to a period about 30 years back; there has been more recent legislation affecting Poor Law Unions, has there not?—Yes. New machinery for the alteration of unions was made applicable by the Local Government Acts of 1888 and 1894. Secs. 57 and 59 of the Act of 1888 gave power to County Councils, according to an opinion given in 1890 by the law officers, and the late Mr. Justice Wright (then Mr. R. S. Wright), to make alterations of poor law unions as consequent upon parochial changes, though not, apparently, according to a subsequent opinion of the law officers in 1894, as a consequence of the alteration of rural districts. Again, under Sec. 58 of the Local Government Act 1888, the Board are empowered in the case of a Poor Law Union situate in more than one county to provide that the union shall continue to be one union for the purposes of in-door paupers, or any of those purposes, and shall be divided into two or more poor law unions for the purpose of out-door relief, and to make such provisions as seem expedient for determining all other matters in relation to which the union is to be one union or two or more unions. Further, in cases in which under Secs. 52, 54 or 55 of the Local Government Act 1888, the Board are authorised by Provisional Order to make alterations of boundary affecting counties or boroughs or to bring about the other local changes mentioned in the sections, they are enabled by Sec. 59 to make incidental changes in relation to areas and authorities which include poor law areas and poor law authorities; and also to amend any local act.

Union changes under Local Government Acts, 1888 and 1894.

47. You have mentioned certain powers that county councils have of altering boundaries; were those powers subject to the approval of the Local Government Board?—Such powers as the County Council exercise under Sec. 57 of the Local Government Act with regard to alterations of parishes would necessitate confirmation by the Local Government Board.

48. Speaking generally is the assent of the Local Government Board always required as regards the alteration of area?—Confirmation is always required in the case of Orders making parochial alterations which affect the union.

49. Are there any provisions on this point which you wish to allude to in the Local Government Act, 1894?—The Local Government Act, 1894, gave an express power to county councils by Sec. 36, Sub-Sec. 6, to provide for alterations of Poor Law Unions in consequence of the provisions of the Act; but by virtue of Sub-Sec. 13 the power was intended for temporary use, and there was a special reservation of the powers of the Local Government Board. A permanent power was, at the same time, conferred upon joint committees of councils where alterations of the areas mentioned in Sec. 57 of the Local Government Act, 1888 would alter the boundaries of Poor Law Unions situate in two or more counties (Sec. 36, Sub-Sec. 11).

Adjustments on alteration or dissolution of Poor Law Unions.

50. Will you now give an account of the procedure consequent upon the alteration or dissolution of a Poor Law union?—It was from the first recognised that the alteration or dissolution of Poor Law unions necessitated the safeguarding of the rights and interests of the parishes affected. Accordingly, the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, by Sec. 32, made provision for adjustment. To facilitate the needful winding up of affairs an Act of 1870—the Dissolved Boards of Management and Guardians Act, 1870—provided for the continuance in office of the last acting members of a board of guardians for the purpose of paying and discharging the debts and liabilities of a Poor Law union dissolved or altered. The same Act dealt with the machinery for adjustment—a process which, as the result of successive enactments, had become exceedingly complicated. The methods prescribed by the Poor Law Acts continued in use for adjustment purposes for some years after the Local Government Act, 1888, had, in relation to changes under that Act, introduced procedure for adjustment by agreement of the authorities interested, or failing agreement, by the award of an arbitrator. With the two systems at work side by side during the years subsequent to the coming into operation of the Act of 1888, it was impossible not to recognise the elasticity of the more modern machinery as giving distinct advantages over the procedure under the Poor Law Acts. An attempt by the Local Government Board to use their powers under the Poor Law Acts for the purpose of making the adjustment of property in the form of an annuity dependent upon changing rateable values, though upheld by the Queen's Bench Division, was not supported by the Court of Appeal in the case of the Queen *v.* The Local Government Board and the Guardians of Willesden (Law Reports 1901, 1 Q.B., 210; 70 Law Journal, Q.B., 272). Still more recently a flaw in the provisions of the Dissolved Boards of Management and Guardians Act, 1870, with respect to the transfer of stock was disclosed in Morton and others *v.* The Bank of England (Law Reports, 1904, 1 Chancery, 664; 73 Law Journal, Chancery, 503). These cases led the Board to the conclusion that legislation was needed to put matters on a better footing than was possible under the somewhat antiquated provisions of the Poor Law Acts as they then stood. Accordingly, the aid of Parliament was invoked, and the needful amendment of the law was effected by the Poor Law (Dissolution of School Districts and Adjustment) Act, 1903, and the Poor Law Authorities (Transfer of Property) Act, 1904.

51. Now will you state the effect of the chief provisions of the Acts that you have just mentioned?—By Sec. 2 of the first-mentioned Act (3 Edward VII., c. 19), agreements may be made by boards of guardians and other authorities affected by the alteration of any Poor Law areas or authorities for the adjustment of any property, income, debts, liabilities and expenses. Sec. 62 of the Local Government Act, 1888, which relates to adjustments consequent upon the operation of that Act or things done under it, was applied, with modifications, to the case of Poor Law authorities; and the making of agreements and carrying out of agreements or awards for adjustment were included among the purposes for which persons continue in office under the Dissolved Boards of Management and Guardians Act, 1870. The other Act (4 Edward VII., c. 20) got rid of the uncertainty which arose out of the proceedings in Morton and others *v.* The Bank of England with regard to the survival of the corporate body of management, such as the managers or guardians, after the dissolution of a Poor Law district or union. As regards Poor Law Unions Sec. 1 enacts that the board of guardians of any Poor Law Union which has been dissolved or added to another Poor Law Union shall, by virtue of the Act, be dissolved, or, in the case of Poor Law Unions so dealt with before the passing of the Act, shall be deemed to have been dissolved as from the date of the dissolution or addition. Sec. 2 provides for the automatic vesting in their successors of the property and liabilities of a board of guardians dissolved or deemed to have been dissolved. The section further provides that where, at the date of dissolution, stock stands in the books of a company in the name of the board of guardians, the company, on the request of the

successors, and the production of a statutory declaration verifying the stock and the identity of the persons making the request, with a certificate of the Local Government Board verifying the succession, shall enter the stock in the names of the successors and pay them the dividends. Sec. 3 gives the Local Government Board power to revoke, extend or alter any Order relating to the dissolution or alteration of a Poor Law Union or to the continuance in office of the successors of a dissolved board of guardians, and empowers the Local Government Board also to make orders with regard to procedure.

52. Then in your opinion these new Acts have worked satisfactorily ?—We have had very few cases under them, but so far as they have gone they have been satisfactory. The procedure is very much more elastic than was the old procedure under Sec. 32 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

53. This is rather a general question ; but as the alterations which must arise must sometimes be a very pressing matter, have the Local Government Board, do you think, sufficient powers under these new Acts ?—As regards the procedure consequent upon alterations of areas, I think they have ; anyhow the principle of the system has now been established so long, practically since 1888, that one might fairly regard it as firmly fixed.

54. I think that completes your evidence as regards areas and that now we may come to the subject of the combinations ; what is the first of these combinations that you wish to speak about ?—The law affords facilities for the creation of other authorities than boards of guardians, with similar functions, but exercisable over a wider area. An example of voluntary combination on these lines may be found in Sec. 8 of the Poor Law Act, 1879. This sort of combination is not available in London. The enactment I refer to is in the following terms :—"Where, on any representation, it appears to the Local Government Board that the combination of two or more unions not in the Metropolis for any purpose connected with the administration of the relief of the poor would tend to diminish expense, or, would otherwise be of public or local advantage, the Board may, with the consent of the guardians of the unions to be combined, make an Order for combining such unions for the purposes named therein, and for constituting for the execution of such purposes a Joint Committee of the guardians of each of the combined unions. The Order shall define the powers, rights, duties, liabilities and obligations of the Joint Committee, and regulate the election, meetings and officers of the Joint Committee, the mode of defraying the expenses of the Joint Committee, and any other matter or thing (including the adjustment of present and future liabilities and property), which it appears necessary or proper to regulate for the better carrying into effect the Order. The guardians of a union included in such combination shall, save as otherwise provided by the Order, cease to exercise any powers and rights, and to be subject to any duties, liabilities, and obligations vested by the Order in the Joint Committee. All property acquired by the Joint Committee shall be vested in the boards of guardians of the unions included in the combination as tenants in common. An Order may be made for amending, adding to, or revoking any Order previously made under this Section."

MBINA-
NS.

untary
ibinations
side
ndon.

55. What has been done under this enactment which you have just quoted ?—Orders have been issued under that enactment for the erection and maintenance of special institutions for the reception of particular classes of paupers. The classes so treated have included imbeciles and epileptics. In a recent case it has been proposed to provide in this way for epileptic persons not certified as lunatics ; and feeble-minded persons who have not been so certified and who, by reason of mental deficiency, are incapable of receiving proper benefit from ordinary instruction, or are incapable of using ordinary means or precautions for protecting themselves from injury or improper usage or treatment, or incapable of maintaining themselves by work, and who are, in the opinion of a medical officer of a workhouse of any of the combined unions, suitable persons for treatment in the institution to be provided for the combination. These illustrations of what has been proposed under Sec. 8 of the Act of 1879 do not exhaust the possibilities of the enactment. The combination, it will be seen, may be "for any purpose connected with the administration of the relief of the poor ; " and the scope of the section, may, therefore, be most comprehensive.

56. Another form of combination is the school district, I believe ; what have you to say about that ?—I have already assumed that the educational aspect of the Poor Laws is hardly one which will specially engage the attention of this Commission ; and so I do not propose to enter at any length into the details of the enactments which authorised the formation of school districts. But I may say that by Sec. 40 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, the Local Government Board are empowered by Order to combine unions or parishes not in unions, or such parishes and unions into school districts. The object of the combination is described as "the management of any class or classes of infant poor not above the age of sixteen years, being chargeable to any such parish or union, who are orphans, or are deserted by their parents, or whose parents or surviving parent or guardians are consenting to the placing of such children in the school of such district."

School Districts.

57. I am afraid I do not quite understand ; there are certain children whose education is to be provided at the public expense ; but have the guardians power to send them to schools outside their district ?—I am here dealing with combinations, which, as I shall proceed to explain, are under the charge of managers, the managers being elected by the boards of guardians, but having separate powers for the maintenance of schools.

58. Then perhaps you will describe to us now what the powers and duties of managers are ?—The Act of 1844, by Sec. 42, provides for the constitution of a board of managers elected by the guardians. The managers have such of the powers and duties of guardians "for the relief and management of the poor within any school," "and for the appointment, payment, and control of paid officers" (Sec. 43) as the Local Government Board direct. The managers are to be members elected from amongst the persons rated within the district to the relief of the poor, and the Local Government Board have power to fix the qualification for membership, this qualification to consist in being rated within the district to the relief of the poor but not so as to require a qualification exceeding the net annual value of £40. The managers are to be elected at such periods not exceeding three years, and in such proportions and in such manner as the Board direct. The chairman of every board of guardians is to be an *ex officio* manager (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 42). In the Metropolis the Local Government Board may nominate fit persons from among the justices resident in the district, or from among resident ratepayers assessed to the Poor Rate on an annual value of not less than £40, or partly from one, and partly from the other ; but the nominees are not to exceed one-third of the full number of elected members (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 49). Then school districts may be altered and dissolved (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 43 ; Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, Sec. 1, Poor Law (Dissolution of School Districts and Adjustments) Act, 1903, Sec. 1). It may be added that the summary of provisions with regard to the incidents and consequences of the alteration or dissolution of a Poor Law Union will apply, with modifications, to the alteration or dissolution of a school district.

Boards of Management of District Schools.

59. What are the particular duties of the managers ?—The supervision of the children in the schools which they have power to erect.

60. They have power to erect schools, then ?—Yes, they provide special schools.

61. And those, I take it, are schools which are built entirely in connection with the Poor Law ?—Quite so.

62. I think you wish now to mention another combination for which power was given by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844 ?—Yes. It may be well to say a few words about a scheme which the Act authorises for the temporary relief of the houseless poor in certain towns. Sec. 41 recites that it is expedient that more effectual means should be provided for the temporary relief of poor persons found destitute and without lodging within the district of the Metropolitan Police or the City of London, and Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Leeds and Birmingham. An object which the section also had in view was to avoid the introduction of infectious disease by the reception of these poor persons into the workhouses established for the ordinary relief of the poor. Provision is accordingly made for the combination of unions and parishes into districts for the purpose of providing and

Asylum districts for houseless poor.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

managing asylums for the temporary relief and setting to work therein of destitute, houseless poor who are not charged with any offence and who may apply for relief or become chargeable to the poor rates within any such parish or union. As in the case of the school district provision was made for the constitution of a board of management and for other essentials.

63. Has anything been attempted or done at any time in the way of combining under these enactments?—A district was formed, but difficulties ensued. The combination was found to be unworkable, and by Secs. 14 and 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1851, the Poor Law Board obtained power to dissolve asylum districts of this type, and to provide for winding up the affairs; nevertheless the enactment is still on the Statute Book, and still in a limited sense available, one might say.

Metropolitan Asylum Districts.

64. Now we come to the Metropolis; there, I think, there has been a more recent form of combination?—Yes. Of modern combinations the most important are undoubtedly those authorised for the first time by the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867. The circumstances which led to the legislation embodied in the Act are explained at length in the report of the Poor Law Board for the year 1866-67. Briefly put, the position may be described thus: In 1865 the inquiries into the deaths of two workhouse inmates disclosed defects in the state and management of the sick wards. General inquiry into the condition of all the metropolitan workhouses was then set afoot, and the result was to show that partial reconstruction or addition might make the existing buildings fit for all the requirements of a workhouse in the majority of cases; and that, in the remainder the buildings might probably be used for the reception of particular classes. "But" said the Poor Law Board, "it appeared necessary to remove from the workhouse cases of fever or smallpox, the imbeciles and harmless lunatics, and also the children; and the establishment of separate hospitals or asylums for these classes, of dispensaries for the administration of medical relief to the out-door poor, and also of buildings for the sick or other classes of the poor in unions or parishes whose workhouses were inadequate and incapable of enlargement—objects which could not be effected without special legislation." The Poor Law Board further mentioned the considerable outlay consequent upon the contemplated improvements, and the need of relieving the poorer parishes of some of the liabilities which would otherwise be imposed upon them. "We therefore," said the Poor Law Board, "on full consideration of the subject thought it desirable that those charges which were to a certain extent limited in their nature, and could not give rise to extravagant expenditure, should be provided for by a fund raised by contributions from the several unions, parishes, and places in the Metropolis, according to their annual rateable value."

65. Will you now describe the object of these metropolitan combinations?—The combinations authorised by the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867 are combinations for the provision of asylums. Asylums according to Sec. 5 of the Act are institutions to be provided under the Act and to be supported and managed according to the provisions of the Act, and their purpose is defined as the "reception and relief of the sick, insane or infirm or other class or classes of the poor chargeable in unions and parishes in the Metropolis." The next Section enacts that in order to the provision of asylums the Local Government Board may from time to time by order combine into districts, unions or parishes, or unions and parishes in the Metropolis as they think fit, and may from time to time alter any such district by addition, sub-division and separation of part or otherwise. A later enactment—the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869 (Sec. 1)—enables the Board to dissolve any such district. The incidents and consequences of alteration or dissolution of asylum districts in London have special features which hardly need separate mention; but they are essentially similar to those which have been described in relation to unions. Then for each district I may add there is to be an asylum or asylums, as the Local Government Board direct.

Boards of Management of Metropolitan Asylum Districts.

66. Have you anything to say about the management of metropolitan asylums?—For the asylum a body of managers is to be constituted and the managers are to be incorporated with a common seal and power to hold land for the purposes of the asylum district (Secs. 7 and 8). The managers are in part elective, in part nominated. Managers of the former class are elected by the Guardians from among themselves or from among ratepayers qualified as prescribed by the Local Government Board, or partly from one and partly from the other (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 10; Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, Sec. 6). The nomination of managers rests with the Local Government Board. Their nominees are to be selected from among resident justices or from among ratepayers assessed to the poor rate on an annual value of not less than £40; or the choice may be made partly from one class and partly from the other (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Secs. 9 and 11; and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 9). The total number of managers is to be prescribed from time to time by order of the Local Government Board, who are also to prescribe the proportion of the elective and nominated managers—the prescribed number of the nominees being never in excess of one-third of the prescribed number of the elective. The Local Government Board are also to prescribe the number of elective managers to be elected for each union or parish and the qualifications, tenure of office, mode and times of election of the elective managers (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 12). The acts or proceedings of the managers are not to be invalid by reason only of a vacancy, failure to elect or nominate, irregularity in election or nomination, or want of qualification or disqualification (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 13) The managers may appoint committees; and in the exercise and discharge of their powers and duties the managers like guardians are to be subject to the orders of the Local Government Board (Secs. 27 and 28).

Powers, &c. of managers.

67. Have you anything that you wish further to say respecting the powers and duties of these managers?—The managers may be directed to purchase or hire or to build and in either case to fit up a building for the asylum; and they have the powers of guardians for the purchase or hiring of land (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 16). Moreover, one body of managers, namely, the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District, have special powers of land purchase. Thus under Sec. 5 of the Poor Law Act, 1889, they may, with the consent of the Local Government Board, purchase such land adjacent to an asylum as is required for the purposes of the asylum, and for the purpose of the purchase the provisions of the Public Health Act, 1875, incorporating certain provisions of the Lands Clauses Acts, and authorising the putting in force by Provisional Order of the provisions which relate to purchase otherwise than by agreement are made applicable. For the asylum the managers are to provide the necessary fixtures, furniture and conveniences (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 20). A building in use for a workhouse may with the needful alterations be used for an asylum (Sec. 18). The managers have the like powers as guardians for the relief, maintenance and management of the inmates of the asylum; and the mode of admission to the asylum, and the government of the asylum and the inmates, are matters to be controlled by the rules, etc. of the Local Government Board (Sec. 21-23).

Classes of poor for whom Metropolitan Asylums are provided.

68. Who may be received as inmates in the metropolitan asylums?—An asylum to which these provisions extend may include a workhouse or other building for the reception of any class or classes of the chargeable poor (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 40); and it may also include a ship, vessel, hut, tent or other temporary erection (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1871 Sec. 1). The classes for whom asylums may be provided have been extended to sufferers from diphtheria, children suffering from ophthalmia or other contagious diseases of the eye, children suffering from contagious diseases of the skin or scalp, children requiring special treatment during convalescence or the benefit of seaside air, children who by reason of defect of intellect or physical infirmity cannot properly be trained in association with children in ordinary schools, and children who are ordered by two justices or a magistrate to be taken under the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, to a workhouse or an asylum of the district.

Expenses of Metropolitan Asylums.

69. Have you anything to say about the outlay on Metropolitan asylums?—Subsequent legislation for sanitary purposes has widened the functions of one body of managers under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, namely, the Metropolitan Asylum Board; and

they are thus brought into relation with and incur expenses on account of persons who are not paupers. But when the position of the several Boards of Management is considered solely with reference to the pauper inmates of their asylums, the rules with regard to their outlay may be stated as follows:—The expenses of purchasing, hiring, building, repairing and fitting up, rent or compensation for use of a workhouse, the expenses of fixtures, furniture, conveniences, medicines, medical and surgical appliances, salaries, maintenance and officers, are to be defrayed by contributions from the constituent unions and parishes in proportion to the rateable value of the property comprised therein (Metropolitan Poor Act 1867, Secs. 31 & 55). The expenses of food, clothing, maintenance, care, treatment, relief and burials are to be separately charged to the unions or parishes from which the inmates are sent (Sec. 32). Some of the expenses of managers are repayable out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund; but the needful explanation of the working of this fund may be conveniently postponed.

LIEF IN NERAL. gulations Central thority.

70. Now we enter upon the general subject of relief; you would like, I believe, at this stage to say something concerning the regulations of the Central Authority?—Yes. Reference has already been made to the recommendation of the Commission of Inquiry in 1832 with regard to the powers of the Central Authority in the matter of regulations. As I am now approaching the subject of relief and its sub-divisions, indoor relief and outdoor relief, the opportunity offers for a few words about these powers of the Central Authority. Nowadays, the practice of confiding subordinate legislation to Government departments, and indeed, on certain conditions, to local bodies, is so well established that criticism of proposals of the kind is quite rare. But it was otherwise seventy years ago. When the Bill based upon the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry was before Parliament, the question of the powers to be conferred on the Central Authority received much consideration. On the 21st July, 1834, the Lord Chancellor, in moving the second reading of the Bill in the House of Lords, argued strenuously in support of the proposal. "I have said," observed his lordship, "that extensive and effective reform in the administration of these laws can only be accomplished by entrusting large discretionary powers to the Commissioners. Of this no doubt can exist, and a very slight attention to the subject will convince you of it. The bad practices have taken such root, and spread so widely, that a strong hand alone can extirpate them. But it must be not only strong—it must be ever ready; in other words, all must be left to the discretion of the men entrusted. . . . One uniform, inflexible rule prescribed by a statute can therefore never be applied . . . . and hence the operation must be performed by a discretionary power lodged somewhere that the hand which works may feel its way and vary its course according to the facilities or obstruction it may encounter; nay, an arbitrary discretion—to use a word which has been employed invidiously towards the measure—and arbitrary to a certain extent it must be, because it must be both ample and unconfined in order that the rules for its exercise may not paralyse its movements."

71. Subsequently did Parliament inquire into the mode in which the powers of the Poor Law Commission had been exercised?—The powers which were conferred upon the Poor Law Commissioners, and which in 1834 were described as unconstitutional, were closely watched by Parliament. In 1837 a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the administration of the relief of the poor under the orders and regulations issued by the Poor Law Commissioners. The Select Committee reported in July, 1837, that the authority of the Poor Law Commissioners had, in the opinion of the Committee, been exercised with great discretion, and that "a more difficult task could scarcely have devolved on any department of Government." Another Select Committee was appointed by the House of Commons in November of the same year; and this Committee reported in August, 1838. They made a variety of suggestions for the amendment of the law, and they specially noted the fact that, in the important duties committed to them, the Commissioners had evinced zeal, ability and great discrimination.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

Judicial decisions upholding discretionary powers of Central Authority

72. Questions arising out of the exercise of these powers came also before the Courts of Law, did they not?—Yes. For present purposes it is perhaps more useful to cite the support of the superior courts in the application of legal principles to the new system of procedure by departmental rules. It was, indeed, essential that these rules when questioned before the Court of King's Bench on the proceedings by *certiorari* under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, should be criticised with the fullest allowance for administrative discretion. That the rules were so judged will appear from the following quotations. In the King *v.* the Poor Law Commissioners, in the matter of the Newport Union (6 Adolphus & Ellis. 54) it was admitted on behalf of those who sought to quash an order for the purchase of a workhouse site that the only question was whether the Poor Law Commissioners had exercised a sound discretion. "It is clear," said Lord Denman, the Chief Justice, "beyond all doubt that this court cannot entertain such a question;" and the other judges concurred. The Lord Chancellor was equally emphatic in disclaiming authority to interfere with the exercise of the discretion of the central authority. On an appeal in Chancery proceedings against the Poor Law Commissioners and the Guardians of the Holborn Union with a view to stop the enlargement of the workhouse, the Lord Chancellor said "that so long as the Commissioners confined themselves to acts within their jurisdiction, the Court of Chancery would not interfere or examine into the question whether they had used their discretion judiciously; but that if they exceeded their jurisdiction the Court would treat them as persons dealing with property without legal authority." (The Queen *v.* the Poor Law Commissioners, etc, 6 Adolphus & Ellis, 56 & 73 (Note).) Again, in 1841, in the case of the Queen *v.* the Guardians of the Poor of the Braintree Union (1 Queen's Bench Reports, 130), the validity of an order of the Commissioners directing the appointment of a chaplain to the workhouse was in question. In enforcing compliance with the order by the award of a peremptory mandamus, Lord Denman observed: "We say nothing on the return which merely offers reasons of expediency and policy against this particular exercise of discretion. Of such matters those to whom the discretion is confided are the sole judges." The position was at a later date (1852) described more tersely by Lord Campbell in the Queen *v.* Greene (17 Queen's Bench Reports, 793). There, on an objection that the Act of 1834 did not require that any order which the Poor Law Board might choose to make should have force till a *certiorari* could be obtained, Lord Campbell remarked: "The clause must be understood with a limitation—if, in making their order, they have acted in pursuance of the statute; at least thinking that they carried it into effect. The protection would not apply if they ordered that a man should be beheaded."

Incidents, &c., of regulations of Central Authority.

73. Have you anything to say about the regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners?—The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, rendered liable to penalty on summary conviction persons wilfully neglecting or disobeying rules, orders or regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners or Assistant Commissioners, or guilty of contempt of the Commissioners sitting as a Board (Secs. 98–101). And rules, orders or regulations of the Central Authority can only be removed by *certiorari* into the King's Bench Division of the High Court (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Secs. 105–108); while no writ of *certiorari* is to be granted unless the *certiorari* be moved or applied for within twelve months next after the day when the copy of the Order has been sent to the local authority concerned (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849, Sec. 13).

The older Poor Law.

74. Do you wish at this stage to say anything about the older methods of poor relief?—Of late years there has been much discussion as to the exact effect of the provisions of the older law, including the statute of the 43rd of Elizabeth; so that before passing to the consideration of the subject of relief since the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, it may be useful to offer a brief comment upon the system as it existed at and shortly after the passing of the Poor Relief Act, 1601. It has been claimed for that Act that it is the foundation or the headstone of the existing Poor Law. On the other hand, it has been pointed out that the characteristic

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

features of the existing law owe nothing to the statute of Elizabeth. These features have, it has been urged, a common law origin. It has been pointed out that, according to the passage quoted from Horne's Mirror in Coke's Institutes (part 3, c. 40, folio 103) it was ordained by kings before the Conquest that the poor should be sustained by parsons, rectors and the parishioners "so that no one should die for lack of sustenance." ("Ordeine fuit que les povres fuisent susteinus per les parsons, rectors, et les parochians cy que nul ne morust per default de susteinance.") This enunciation of the common law principle, even if we put the production of the Mirror as late as the reign of Edward II., precedes by about two centuries the earliest Tudor legislation; and we meet with recognition of the principle long after the Tudor period. Thus the question of a possible exception to that principle was mooted about 100 years after the Poor Relief Act, of 1601. That was in the case of an unsettled foreigner in the second year of George I. (St. Giles' *v.* St. Margaret, 1 Sessions Cases) which was cited as decided by Lord Holt; see the King *v.* the Inhabitants of Eastbourne (1803, 4, East, 103); and the principle itself is expressly affirmed in 1756 in the case of the King *v.* the Inhabitants of Aythrop Rooding (Burrow: Settlement Cases, 412).

The Poor Law immediately before and after 1601.

75. Do you wish to make any observations on the system in operation before and after 1601?—I do not propose to attempt here any illustration of the methods by which effect was given to the common law rule which is said to have established parochial chargeability; but I think that in order that its true place and value may be assigned to the Poor Relief Act, 1601, something should be said about the working of the Poor Law before and immediately after it. It is to be observed, then, that the Act of 1601 was a temporary measure; it was, as Lord Coke says (2 Institutes, 733), a probationer. Its details too were largely a reproduction of an earlier statute—the 39 Elizabeth c. 3. In both respects the tentative character of the measure is clearly shown. The Act indeed closed the series of experimental legislation which, throughout the Tudor period, was concerned with those whom at one time it was usual to class as the impotent poor. Further the renewals of the Act of 1601 were experimental; each occasion of renewal (1 James I. c. 25, Sec. 23, and 3 Charles I, c. 4, Sec. 22) being used to make a fresh development. Thus on the first renewal an amendment to facilitate apprenticeship was introduced; while on the second renewal this amendment was coupled with a new provision designed to enlarge the scope of the possible employment of the poor, for which purpose the overseers, with the justices' consent, were authorised to set up, use and occupy any trade mystery or occupation. And after the Poor Relief Act of 1601 was made perpetual—that is by virtue of the 16 Charles I. (1641)—the experimental character of the Act was not wholly lost; for the Act seems to have been regarded as in effect adoptive (in our modern sense), and there is ground for believing that the operation of the Statute of Elizabeth was for many years partial. Moreover, it is well, I think, to bear in mind the fact that the legislation of Queen Elizabeth did not extend or profess to extend to every class of poor. For, as Lord Mansfield said in 1785 in the King *v.* Thames Ditton (2 Bott. pl. 272): "The Poor Law began in the time of Queen Elizabeth, perhaps before villeinage was out of use. Villeinage in gross may not perhaps be now"—that is in 1785—"abolished. But none of those statutes apply at all to villeinage. The legislature never thought of it."

Summary of Tudor legislation respecting the poor.

76. Now you can give us some account of the Tudor legislation respecting the poor?—The Tudor Acts, which ended with that of 1601, had for their chief aim the prevention of begging. The series begins with the 11th Henry VII., and the first compulsory assessment was reached when the 14th Elizabeth, c. 5 was passed. Up to that Act the effect of the Tudor statutes is summarised by Dr. Burn in his "History of the Poor Laws." I will quote the summary, but for convenience of reference I will add to each paragraph a note of the Acts upon which it is founded. Dr. Burn writes thus: "First, the poor were restrained from begging at large, and were confined to beg within certain districts (11 Henry VII. c. 2; 19 Henry VII., c. 12; 22 Henry VIII., c. 12). Next the several hundreds, towns corporate, parishes, hamlets, or other like divisions were required to sustain them with such charitable and voluntary alms, as that none of them of necessity might be compelled to go openly in begging, and the churchwardens or other substantial inhabitants were to make collections for them, with boxes on Sundays, and otherwise by their discretions. And the minister was to take all opportunities to exhort and stir up the people to be liberal and bountiful (27 Henry VIII., c. 25). Next houses were to be provided for them by the devotion of good people, and materials to set them on such work as they were able to perform. Then the minister after the Gospel every Sunday was specially to exhort the parishioners to a liberal contribution (1 Edward VI., c. 3). Next the collectors for the poor on a certain Sunday in every year, immediately after Divine Service, were to take down in writing what every person was willing to give weekly for the ensuing year; and if any should be obstinate and refuse to give, the minister was gently to exhort him. If he still refused, the minister was to certify such refusal to the bishop of the diocese, and the bishop was to send for and exhort him in like manner. If he stood out against the Bishop's exhortation, then the bishop was to certify the same to the justices in sessions, and bind him over to appear there; and the justices at the said sessions were again gently to move and persuade him; and finally if he would not be persuaded then, they were to assess him what they thought reasonable towards the relief of the poor. And this brought on the general assessment in the 14th year of Queen Elizabeth (5 and 6 Edward VI., c. 2; 5 Elizabeth, c. 3)." Thomas Harman published in 1567 an edition of his book "A Caveat or Warening for Commen Cursetors, etc." The book sufficiently shows that the beggars' trade was at that date thriving. Certainly, if a rogue could earn 13s. 4d. a day in Elizabethan money as a counterfeit crank or pretended sufferer from the falling sickness the calling must have been very lucrative. Twenty years later Harrison, in his "Description of England" (published in 1586) estimated that, although not quite sixty years had passed since the trade began, the beggars numbered about 10,000. The last statute in Dr. Burn's Summary—the 14 Elizabeth, c. 5—aimed at the suppression of the roaming beggar by a measure also designed for the local care of the aged, decayed and impotent. The Justices by Sec. 16 were empowered to appoint meet and convenient places for the habitations and abidings of the latter class. Those who refused to be bestowed in the appointed abiding places or left them to beg were to be punished as rogues or vagabonds (Sec. 18). The Act may also deserve mention as recognising the principle of non-resident relief. It seems that Bath and Buxton were the resorts of a great number of the poor, who repaired "to the baths there for ease of their grief." These persons were to be not only licensed by justices, but also "provided for by the inhabitants of such hundreds, parishes or places from whence they shall so be licensed to travel." Twenty-five years later these persons appear again on the Statute Book; but this time in very bad company, for the Act of 39 Elizabeth, c. 4, is entitled "An act for the punishment of Rogues and Vagabonds," and Section 7 of that Act remained in force until the 12th year of Queen Anne. It should be added that the Act of the 14 Elizabeth was shortly afterwards amended by the 18 Elizabeth, c. 3, and that the later Act required provision to be made of a competent stock of wool, hemp, flax, iron, or other stuff to be delivered to the poor, who might work the stock into yarn or other matter, and receive payment according to the desert of the work. For those who refused or spoilt work or went abroad begging or lived idly, houses of correction were to be provided.

77. There was a curious expression you referred to, namely, "To ease their grief"; what is the modern interpretation of that phrase?—I suppose it was to ease their gout. It is sad to find them coupled with the rogues later on.

78. Does that exhaust the Tudor statutes?—There is one more—the 39th Elizabeth, c. 3. That Act, as has been already pointed out, anticipates much of the legislation of 1601. In particular two leading purposes were common to the Act of 1597, and the Act of 1601. Those were (*a*) "Setting to work all such persons, married or unmarried (as) having no means to maintain them, use no ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by"; and (*b*) "Necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, blind and such other among them being poor and not able to work." Except for the clerical error arising from the omission of

"as" from the Act of 1601, the language of the two statutes is in these passages the same; so that when we learn what was regarded as feasible under the Act of 1597 we have a clue to the possibilities of the Act of 1601.

79. Now can you give us an illustration of the actual practice under the Act of 39 Elizabeth, c. 3?—In a Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the Collection of the Marquess of Lothian at Blickling Hall (Cd. 2319, 1905) there is on page 76 a copy of orders which apparently are those of Somersetshire justices in relation to the 39 Elizabeth, c. 3. The system set up by these orders made little provision with regard to work. The only direction under this head is that "the pore that doth worke in his own garding to have 2d a daye in week that he so worketh; so that it may appere to the overseers that there groweth good to the partie and Commonweale therby." Begging from door to door outside the parish was forbidden. Within the parish the beggar could only go to "such houses in such order as they shall be assigned by the overseers." This direction and the directions with regard to relief suggest that an attempt was to be made to work the proviso to Sec. 10 of the Act of 1597. The section forbade wandering abroad to beg, and the proviso was in these terms: "Provided always that this present Act shall not extend to any poor people which shall ask relief of victuals only in the same parish where such poor people do dwell so the same be in such time only and according to such order and direction as shall be made and appointed by the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of the same parish according to the true intent and meaning of this Act." The following directions would be within the proviso. "That the overseers assigne none to fetch releif at any house but as be merelie impotente or under the age of seven yeres and such as the overseers shall well prove that theire parents are not able to releif by theire worke or livelihoode: that such as shall be assigned to fetch any releife at any howse, be assigned to some howse nere and certeyne to fetch it, not wander about or from howse to howse at theire pleasures, and the howses to be assigned when they shall fetch theire releife." The rate on the other hand was to be applied "for the releif of hospitalls and spitle howses and such as receive losse by water or fyer within this sheire and for the releif of the poore persons of the Kings Bench or Marshalsye." So that the general view of the working of the Poor Law in these Somersetshire parishes is of beggars and recipients of relief in kind made to follow an appointed round within the parish, of payments to the working poor out of the moneys derived from other sources than the rates, and of a free use of the House of Correction for the idle and petty offenders.

80. Have you any note of higher authority than these Justices' orders for the procedure under the Act of 1597?—From Lambard's Eirenarcha (Book 2, Chapter 7) it is perhaps to be inferred that the Somersetshire orders were framed with some knowledge of the resolutions ascribed to Her Majesty's Justices at Westminster. These resolutions, which, according to Lambard, tended much to the right execution of the 39th of Elizabeth, contained a clause to the effect that "None may be suffered to take reliefe at any man's door, though within the same parish, unlesse it be by the order of the overseers according to the statute, neither may any bee suffered to begge by the highwaies, though in their owne parish." Again, the resolutions laid down the rules that "If the parents be able to worke and may have worke they are to finde their children by their labor and not the parish. But if they bee overburthened with children it shal bee a verie good way to procure some of them to be placed apprentices according to the statute. Noe man is to bee put out of the towne where he dwelleth nor to be sent to their place of birth or last habitation but a vagaraunt rogue, nor to be found by the towne except the partie be impotent, but ought to set themselves to labour if they bee able and can get worke; if they cannot, the overseers must set them to labour. Such persons as bee of any parish and have able bodies to worke, and be no wanderers abroade out of the parish, though they refuse to worke at such wages as is taxed (or commonly given) in those partes are notwithstanding not to be sent to their place of birth or last dwelling by the space of an yeare, but to the house of correction upon consideration had of both the statutes of the poore and rogues. But if they have any lawfull meanes to live by, though they be of able bodies and refuse to worke, yet they are not to bee sent to the House of Correction"

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

81. Have you anything to say about the funds from which assistance was provided for the poor when the system you have described was in vogue?—The Acts of 1597 and 1601 were alike in requiring quarter sessions to assess contributions from the parishes in their county towards the relief of poor prisoners in the King's Bench and the Marshalsea. In each Act, too, provision was made for contribution to hospitals and almshouses. The attention of the Commission has already been drawn to the fact that in the Somersetshire orders the only rate mentioned was one for these purposes. As an appendix to the book entitled "The Parish," by the late Toulmin Smith, there is printed an interesting series of extracts from the records of a Wiltshire parish during the first twenty-five years after the Poor Relief Act, 1601. These extracts are described as a "Register of. . . . Vestries or church reckonings, about ye stock and maintenance for ye poore." There are recorded dealings with a parish stock of money variable in amount and placed out at interest. Those who borrowed were apparently the poorer inhabitants. They had to find bondsmen and to pay interest usually at the rate of about 10 per cent. This interest was distributed for the benefit of the poor, or was sometimes added to the stock. But throughout the whole period, there is no mention of a rate, either as the source of the poor stock or as a means for providing for purposes outside the range of the poor stock. The last entry in these parish records is dated the 26th December, 1628.

Parish "Stocks" in 17th century.

82. Was there not a special enquiry by Royal Commission about that date; and did that Commission deal at all with the subject of rates or finance?—On the 5th January, 1630, a Royal Commission was appointed for putting in execution of the laws and statutes for relief of the poor, punishment of rogues, and employment of gifts to charitable uses. The Commissioners were empowered to set down and give such orders and directions "as that all and every the said laws and other necessary statutes may be duly and effectually executed." But the only mention of rating in the Commission is with reference to the sums appointed by the Poor Relief Act, 1601, for the relief of soldiers and mariners. It is true that the directions issued by the Privy Council under the authority of this Commission enjoined that the weekly taxations for relief of the poor and other purposes mentioned in the 43rd Elizabeth be raised to higher rates; but the same directions in ordering that the gift of money or stock for the relief of the poor should be no occasion of lessening of the rates, suggest that, as a matter of practice, voluntary contributions had been substituted for the compulsory levy. That there are to be found examples of assessments in conformity with these and similar directions may of course be admitted; nevertheless, I think that there exists no clear and overwhelming proof of inaccuracy in the statement quoted by Sir Frederick Eden ("State of the Poor," Vol. I, p. 144) from a pamphlet of 1698, that though parishes were enabled (by the 43rd Elizabeth) to make rates, and the owners of estates obliged to the payment, yet in many places no such rates were made in twenty, thirty or forty years after. Further, it seems to me to be doubtful whether even in 1673 the pamphleteer, whose estimate of £840,000 a year, Sir Frederick Eden, at page 188, accepted as the earliest account of the amount of the poor rate, is in fact an authority for the levy of a rate to that amount. We must, I think, look upon the estimate as a calculation of the total expenditure from all sources; for as an estimate of the produce of rates, it could not be easily reconciled with an estimate of the Board of Trade, in 1696, which arrived at the very different total of £400,000.

Royal Commission of 1630. Estimates of expenditure in 17th century.

83. Did the Board of Trade state that £400,000 was levied?—That was an estimate of the Board of Trade, and in that estimate John Locke was specially concerned. The materials for the estimate, I believe, were obtained through the Archbishops, who communicated with the various parishes, and the whole was digested under, I think, the superintendence of John Locke.

84. Is that the first authentic evidence you have of anything like a general rate?—That estimate of 1696, as will appear from a passage which I propose to quote later from the report of a Select Committee in 1817, was then treated as by no means absolutely acceptable.

85. What would be your deductions as to the extent to which the Poor Relief Act of 1601 was operative before

Sir Matthew Hale's "Discourse,"

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

the Revolution of 1689 ?—Perhaps on the authority of Sir Matthew Hale's "Discourse touching Provision for the Poor" it may be assumed that before 1683, the date of publication, there were rates in most of the populous parishes; but the inference from the same writer would be that the provision thus made for the poor unable to work was insufficient, while the supply from the rates of a stock for setting the poor to work was altogether rare. On the whole, therefore, the safest conclusion to adopt with regard to compulsory rating in the 17th and 18th centuries, seems to be that of a Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons in 1817 "to consider of the Poor Laws." That Committee reported as follows:—"What might have been the amount of the assessments for the poor during the 17th and 18th centuries the Committee have no means of ascertaining." The report then alludes to the fact that "the preamble of 13 and 14 Charles II. states 'the necessity, number and continued increase of the poor to be very great and exceeding burthensome.'" The Committee also remarked that in the year 1699, King William thus expressed himself in a speech from the Throne:—"'The increase of the poor is become a burthen to the Kingdom and their loose and idle life does in some measure contribute to that depravation of manners which is complained of, I fear, with too much reason; whether the ground of this evil be from defects in the laws already made, or in the execution of them, deserves your consideration.'" The report continues: "Though complaints appear certainly to have been since made of the increasing numbers of the poor, yet it was not till the present reign, in the year 1776, that authentic accounts of this expenditure were required under the authority of the legislature." So that it seems to be permissible to put forward the following deductions with respect to the Poor Relief Act, 1601, namely, (i) that the Act was originally intended for the regulation of a particular class only of the poor; (ii) that there is ground for the belief that long after its passing many parishes maintained their poor without recourse to its provisions; and (iii) that there is no sufficient ground for the belief that, at any time during this period, the use made of the means of setting the poor to work on a parish stock was other than exceptional.

Report of Select Committee of 1817.

Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 15.

86. You now wish to pass on to the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834; what provisions in that Act do you note with respect to relief in general ?—With regard to relief in general, the effect of Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, is that the administration of relief to the poor throughout England and Wales, according to the then existing laws or such laws as shall be in force at the time being, is to be subject to the direction and control of the Central Authority. The Local Government Board are accordingly authorised and required from time to time, as they shall see occasion, to make and issue all such rules, orders, and regulations for the management of the poor, and for the guidance and control of all guardians, vestries, and parish officers, so far as relates to the management or relief of the poor and the keeping, examining, auditing and allowing of accounts and making and entering into contracts in all matters relating to such management or relief, or to any expenditure for the relief of the poor and for carrying the Act of 1834 into execution in all other respects as the Local Government Board shall think proper. Power to suspend, alter or rescind rules, orders and regulations was at the same time conferred. Sec. 15 concludes with a proviso that nothing in it shall be construed as enabling the Local Government Board to interfere in any individual case for the purpose of ordering relief.

Accounts and audit.

87. Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, mentioned accounts and audit; have you anything to say about these matters ?—Yes. Following the enumeration of subjects in Sec. 15 of the Act of 1834, I draw attention to a selection of enactments relating to matters ancillary to the general purpose of relief. First, as to the keeping, examining, auditing and allowing of accounts, I have to point out that the law has been greatly developed since the Act of 1834 gave the Poor Law Commissioners power to make rules. The present system of accounts and audit is largely the outcome of a report by the Poor Law Commissioners in 1843 on Local Taxation. In that report the Commissioners at page 61 said: The essential requisites for the efficacy of any system of accounts are—first, that the officer responsible for the balance should be himself solvent or should afford solvent security for all the funds placed at his disposal; second, that what he ought to receive should be ascertained and defined; third, that what he is empowered to pay should be defined; fourth, that his account in detail should be enforceable effectually before an auditing officer, competent to surcharge, reduce and disallow items of account; and fifth, that effectual remedies be given for the recovery of the balances found. With regard to the keeping of accounts, the chief rules of general application are those contained in a general order issued by the Poor Law Board on the 14th of January, 1867. These rules have been supplemented in relation to various details from time to time. The most important of the additions was made when, on a change in the manner of providing for the expenses of audit, the District Auditors Act, 1879, imposed a scale of stamp duties, and by Sec. 3 enacted that where the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of a local authority are audited by a district auditor, the local authority should prepare and submit to the district auditor a financial statement in duplicate in the prescribed form, and containing the prescribed particulars. One duplicate is to have the stamp affixed, and the auditor, at the conclusion of the audit, is to cancel the stamp and certify the expenditure audited and allowed. With respect to the audit, provision had been made by the Act of 1834 in Sec. 47, but after the report on Local Taxation in 1843 very important alterations were made by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844. That Act authorised the combination of parishes and unions into audit districts. For these districts, auditors were to be elected by the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the boards of guardians. This mode of appointment lasted until 1868. By Sec. 24 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, the power of appointment was transferred to the Poor Law Board, and the auditors, by virtue of Sec. 25, became civil servants. The existing powers of the Local Government Board with regard to the appointment and districts of auditors, are derived from Sec. 4 of the District Auditors Act, 1879.

88. Have you anything to add about the powers and duties of the auditor ?—The chief functions of the auditor and the chief features of the audit are to be gathered from the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, and the Poor Law Audit Act, 1848. An outline of these is all that can here be attempted. The scope of the enactments of 1844 and 1848, though widened by successive legislation so as to include purposes other than those of the Poor Law, primarily concerns monies assessed for and applicable to the relief of the poor. The auditor has authority to examine, audit, allow or disallow of accounts and of items therein; to charge in every audited account the amount of any deficiency or loss incurred by the negligence or misconduct of any person accounting, or of any sum for which any such person is accountable but not brought by him into account; to certify money, books, deeds, papers, goods or chattels found by him to be due from any person; and to recover monies certified by him to be due.

The audit

89. Have you anything to say about appeals ?—The auditor's decision with regard to any allowance, disallowance or surcharge is subject to appeal. In one class of cases, however, the finality of his decision is recognised by Statute, with the result that in these cases appeals can be entertained only on equitable grounds. The cases are those of untaxed law costs incurred by overseers or boards of guardians. Sec. 39 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, enacts that, if any bill of this kind for business performed on behalf of a parish or union be not taxed before it is presented to the auditor, his decision on the reasonableness as well as the legality of the charges shall be final. Accordingly, the allowance or disallowance of the charges cannot be removed into the High Court by *certiorari* (Queen v. Napton, 25 Law Journal, Queen's Bench, 296; 2 Jurist, New Series, 1138). Generally, a person aggrieved may require the Auditor to state in the book of account his reasons for the allowance, disallowance or surcharge. The person aggrieved may then apply for a writ of *certiorari* to remove the allowance, disallowance or surcharge into the King's Bench Division. The auditor must appear and defend, and is to be reimbursed from the rates the costs of his defence. An alternative appeal is authorised. The person aggrieved, instead of going to the King's Bench Division, may apply to the Local Government Board to inquire into and decide upon the lawfulness of the auditor's reasons. The powers of

Audit appeals.

the Local Government Board on an appeal are wider than those of the High Court, for the Board have an equitable jurisdiction and may decide according to the merits of the case. Moreover, under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, 1887, expenses paid by any Local Authority whose accounts are subject to audit by a district auditor, are not to be disallowed by the auditor if they have been sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

90. I understand that these powers are now in operation?—That is so. They have also been extended to the accounts for other purposes than those of the Poor Law.

91. Then, practically, there has been no alteration as regards the powers of auditors and the statutes thereupon?—That is so—except the extension to which I have referred.

racts.

92. Have you any remarks to make on the subject of contracts?—Yes. By Section 49 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, it is enacted that any contract which shall be entered into by or on behalf of any parish or union for or relating to the maintenance, clothing, lodging, employment or relief of the poor, or for any other purpose relating to or connected with the general management of the poor, which shall not be made and entered into in conformity with the rules, orders or regulations of the Central Authority in that behalf in force at the time of making and entering into the same, or otherwise sanctioned by them, shall be voidable, and if the Central Authority so direct, shall be null and void; and all payments made under or in pursuance of any contract not made and entered into in conformity with such rules, orders, or regulations at any period after the Central Authority shall have declared the same to be null and void, shall be disallowed in passing the accounts of the overseer, guardian or other officer by whom such payments shall have been made. The rules made by the Central Authority respecting contracts will be found in the General Consolidated Order of the Poor Law Commissioners of the 24th of July, 1847, and in a General Order issued by the Local Government Board on the 31st of December, 1877.

93. Perhaps you will put those Orders in?—Yes, certainly. I will put in extracts from the General Consolidated Order, and a copy of the other General Order. (*See* Appendix, Vol. I. (A), No. I. (2).)

ers, intment, s, re- ration, issal.

94. Now, I think that you wish to summarise certain provisions relating to officers?—Yes. Under the general head of relief may be noted the provisions with regard to the local staff of officers. By Section 46 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, the Local Government Board are enabled by order to direct the appointment of such paid officers with such qualifications as the Board think necessary, for superintending or assisting in the administration of the relief and employment of the poor, and otherwise carrying the provisions of the Poor Law Acts into execution. The Board may define and specify and direct the execution of the respective duties of the officers, and the places or limits within which the duties are to be performed, and determine the continuance in office or dismissal of the officers, and the amount and nature of the security to be given by such of the said officers as the Board think ought to give security. When the Board see occasion they may regulate the amount of salaries, the time and mode of payment, and the proportionate contributions of parishes or unions. The Local Government Board may by order under Sec. 48 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, either upon or without any suggestion or complaint from the overseers or guardians, remove a workhouse master, or assistant overseer or other paid officer whom the board deem unfit for or incompetent to discharge the duties of his office, or who refuses or wilfully neglects to obey and carry into effect any rules, orders or regulations of the Board, and may require the appointment of a fit and proper person in the place of the removed officer. If the order dismissing a paid officer declare that the urgency of the case requires that the order shall take effect within the period of fourteen days, the Order will come into force at such time as the Board direct (5 and 6 Vic., c. 57, Sec. 4).

ire to int rs.

95. I understand that in certain cases of failure the Local Government Board have power to appoint officers?—That is so. If a board of guardians fail for twenty-eight days after the receipt of a requisition of the Local Government Board to appoint, either originally or on a vacancy, any officer whom the guardians are lawfully required to appoint, the Local Government Board may, at the expiration of the time, by Order appoint a fit person to be the officer, and determine the salary or remuneration to be paid to him by the guardians. The person so appointed shall recover his salary by action, and will have the same powers, rights and privileges, and shall discharge the same duties and incur the same responsibilities as if the appointment had been duly made by the guardians (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 7). This enactment had been preceded by a somewhat similar provision applicable to the Metropolis and to the managers of asylums and dispensary committees under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, and to the guardians of Metropolitan Poor Law Unions (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 80). In that case the period after failure was only fourteen days.

Liabilities of officers.

96. Have you anything to say respecting the liabilities of officers?—With regard to the liabilities of officers, it may be pointed out that so much of the Poor Relief Act, 1815, (55 George III., c. 137) as inflicts a penalty on persons having the management of the poor, if concerned in providing or in any contract for the supply of goods, materials or provisions for the use of a workhouse or otherwise for the support or maintenance of the poor for their own profit, is made applicable to every officer appointed under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834 (Sec. 51). A workhouse master or other paid officer, or any other person employed by or under the authority of the guardians, who purloins, embezzles or wilfully wastes or misapplies moneys, goods or chattels is liable to a penalty not exceeding £20, and treble the amount or value purloined, embezzled, wasted or misapplied; and becomes on conviction incapable of serving office under the Poor Law Acts (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 97). So also a person removed from office by the Local Government Board becomes incompetent to be appointed to or to fill a paid office connected with the relief of the poor in a Poor Law Union without the consent of the Board (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 48).

Protection of officers.

97. Have you anything to say about the protection of officers?—Protection is afforded to officers by several statutory provisions. A person convicted of assault upon a workhouse officer, a relieving officer, or any other officer in the due execution of his duty, or upon a person acting in aid of the officer may be sentenced to imprisonment (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1850, Sec. 9; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1851, Sec. 18). The guardians may pay or reimburse the expense necessarily incurred by an officer in repairing or restoring his property, when unlawfully, wilfully and maliciously damaged injured, or destroyed by an applicant for relief; and such costs and expenses of prosecution as may not be allowed by the court trying the case (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1851, Sec. 5; 14 & 15 Vic. c. 105).

Superannuation of officers.

98. Will you now give us the effect of the provisions relating to superannuation?—The superannuation of Poor Law officers is the subject of important provisions in the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, and in the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Amendment Act, 1897. The Act of 1896 confers the right to superannuation on every officer and servant in the service or employment of the guardians of a Poor Law Union, who becomes incapable of discharging his duties with efficiency by reason of permanent infirmity of mind or body, or of old age, or who has attained the age of sixty years, and has completed an aggregate service of forty years, or has attained the full age of sixty-five years. The guardians may enforce retirement when an officer or servant has attained the age of sixty-five. Section 3 of the Act prescribes a scale of allowances. The Act also provides for the aggregation of service (Sec. 4), and for the addition of years, not exceeding ten, in the computation of allowances in certain cases (Sec. 5). Contributions according to a percentage are made out of the salary or wages of officers and servants (Secs. 12 and 13). An officer or servant who is dismissed or resigns, or otherwise ceases to hold office in consequence of any offence of a fraudulent character, or of grave misconduct, forfeits his claim to a superannuation allowance, but the guardians may return his contributions. The return of contributions and the grant of gratuities are authorised in specified cases (Sec. 8).

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

The Act expressly applies to the managers of district schools and sick asylums, to the managers of the metropolitan asylum district, and to their officers and servants, and to superintendent registrars and registrars of births and deaths; and the expression "guardians" as used in the Act includes the trustees or overseers of a parish under a local Act, and a vestry or other authority charged with the administration of the relief of the poor for any union, parish, or other area (Sec. 19). Under Sec. 15 of the Act, officers might, within three months after its commencement signify their intention not to avail themselves of its provisions; and by the Act of 1897 special provisions of similar scope were made applicable to female nurses.

Compensation of officers.

99. Compensation, too, is sometimes payable to officers, I think?—Yes.

100. What are the cases?—Compensation for loss of office or emolument is secured to officers on changes of Poor Law areas. On the dissolution of any union, or the addition or separation of a parish and consequent deprivation of office, the Local Government Board may award compensation either in a sum certain or by way of annuity (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, Sec. 20; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 15). Other changes, involving also diminution of profits or determination or variation of contracts with officers of metropolitan workhouses, may likewise be the subject of compensation to be awarded by the Local Government Board (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 59; Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Secs 7 and 41). Further, in the Metropolis, compensation which is chargeable on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund may be awarded on the dissolution of an asylum or school district as well as on Poor Law Union changes (Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, Sec. 1). Dissolution of school districts elsewhere may give rise to compensation, as in the case of a dissolution of a union (Poor Law (Dissolution of School Districts and Adjustments) Act, 1903, Sec. 1).

Relief: Liability of husbands and fathers.

101. We have finished that branch of the subject, I think; and, therefore, we come now to another head of the general subject of relief; what do you range under this head?—Under this general head—relief—may be grouped various provisions relating to incidents and consequences of relief, and to methods of reimbursement and connected matters. In the first place, it may be well to consider the provisions affecting husbands and fathers. By Sec. 56 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, it is enacted that all relief given to or on account of the wife, or to or on account of any child or children under the age of sixteen, not being blind, or deaf and dumb, shall be considered as given to the husband or to the father, as the case may be. Every man who marries a woman having a child or children at the time of marriage, whether the child or children be legitimate or illegitimate, is liable to maintain the child or children as a part of his family. The man will be chargeable with all relief granted to or on account of the child or children until the attainment of the age of sixteen, or until the death of the mother (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, sec. 57). A soldier is liable to contribute to the maintenance of his wife, and children, and to the maintenance of a bastard, to the same extent as if he were not a soldier; and deductions may be made from his pay (Army Act, 1881, Sec. 145; Army Annual Act, 1883, Sec. 7; Army Annual Act, 1891, Sec. 7).

Neglect of duty to maintain.

102. Will you now mention the provisions available for enforcing the duty of maintaining a family?—Every person being able wholly or in part to maintain himself or his family by work or other means, and wilfully refusing or neglecting to do so, by which refusal or neglect he or any of his family whom he may be legally bound to maintain have become chargeable, is to be deemed an idle and disorderly person and to be liable to imprisonment and hard labour for a time not exceeding a calendar month (Vagrancy Act, 1824, 5, Geo. IV., c. 83, Sec. 3). It has been held that these provisions did not extend to the case of a man whose wife had left him and committed adultery (King *v.* Flintan; 1 Barnewall and Adolphus, 227), or to one who, being summoned for refusing to maintain his child, proved that there had been a separation three years before the child was born, and that since the separation the wife had led the life of a prostitute (Sibbet *v.* Ainsley, 3 Law Times, New Series, 583).

Contributions by husband to relief of wife.

103. What is the effect of the enactments for contribution by a husband to the relief of his wife?—When a married woman requires relief without her husband, the guardians may apply to the justices in petty sessions, and, after a summons to the husband and hearing the wife, or receiving other sufficient evidence, the justices may make an order upon the husband to pay a sum towards the relief of the wife (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 33). On the removal of a lunatic wife to an asylum, her husband may, on the application of the guardians, be summoned to show cause why an order should not be made upon him to maintain or contribute towards the maintenance of his wife in the asylum. The justices upon the man's appearance, or proof of the service of the summons, may make an order to pay a sum towards the maintenance of the lunatic (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1850, Sec. 5; Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 20).

Desertion.

104. Are there any provisions against desertion?—A person running away and leaving his wife or child chargeable, or whereby the wife or child becomes chargeable, is to be deemed a rogue and vagabond, and is liable to imprisonment for a time not exceeding three calendar months (Vagrancy Act, 1824, Sec. 4). The guardians may take proceedings at any time within two years after the commission of the offence, and the summons or warrant may be issued upon the information of a relieving officer stating that he is informed and believes that the husband or parent has left the wife or child and gone away (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 19). With reference to this provision, it should be noted that where a man was prosecuted for running away and leaving his children chargeable, a Metropolitan police magistrate refused to convict, as the man had been three times charged and twice convicted of the offence. But it was held, on a case stated for the opinion of the High Court, that the offence was continuing, the children having been continuously chargeable, and the prisoner having kept away and evaded arrest (Bannister *v.* Sullivan; 91 Law Times, New Series, 380). It was also held that a deserted wife, who, having no means to maintain her children, left them so that they became chargeable, could not be convicted as a rogue and vagabond under these provisions (Peters *v.* Cowie, Law Reports, 2 Queen's Bench Division, 131; 46 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 177). A similar conclusion was reached in the case of a widow who left her children at the workhouse gate with an order for admission (Queen *v.* Parr, 10 Common Bench, New Series, 99; 30 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 241).

Relief: Liability of wives, widows and mothers.

105. You now come, I think, to the provisions relating to the position of wives, widows and mothers in the matter of relief; will you give the substance of those?—Where the husband of a married woman, having separate property, becomes chargeable, the justices in petty sessions may, on the application of the guardians, issue a summons against the wife, and afterwards make an order upon her for contribution to the maintenance of the husband (Married Women's Property Act, 1882, Sec. 20). A married woman having separate property is subject to all the liability for the maintenance of her children and grandchildren to which the husband is now by law subject. But his liability is not relieved by that of his wife (Married Women's Property Act, 1882, Sec. 21). Relief given to or on account of a child or children under the age of sixteen of a widow is to be considered as given to the widow (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 56). So long as it appears that the husband of a woman is beyond the seas, or in custody of the law, or in confinement as a lunatic or idiot, all relief given to the woman or to her child or children shall be given as if she was a widow (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 25). This provision extends to a married woman living separate from her husband (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 18). The mother of a bastard, so long as she is unmarried or a widow, is bound to maintain the bastard until the attainment of the age of sixteen. All relief granted to the bastard under the age of sixteen is to be considered as granted to the mother (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 71).

Relief by relations.

106. Will you now give a short account of the law respecting relief by relations?—The Poor Relief Act, 1601, Sec. 6, enacts as follows:—"The father and grandfather and the mother and grandmother and the children of every poor, old, blind, lame and impotent person or other poor person not being able to work, being of a

sufficient ability, shall, at their own charges, relieve and maintain every such poor person in that manner and according to that rate as by the justices . . . . shall be assessed." (Poor Relief Act, 1601, Sec. 7; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 36). The needful orders under the Act of 1601 may be obtained by the guardians (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1848, Sec. 8). Orders can be made only in cases of blood relationship. A grandfather is liable to support a grandchild, but there is no reciprocal liability; and the grandfather's liability may be enforced though the father is alive, and whether the father is or is not able to support the child (The King *v.* Cornish, 2 Barnewall & Adolphus, 498). Originally the Poor Relief Act, 1601, attached a penalty to failure to comply with an order of the justices in any such case. But the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, by Sec. 36 repealed the old provisions as to penalties, and enacted that maintenance orders should be enforced in the manner prescribed by the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1848. Previously, therefore, to the Act of 1868, neglect to comply with a justices' order of maintenance was a criminal offence. But the effect of the Act of 1868, and of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, was to make the money due a civil debt; and an order for the payment of a civil debt is not, failing distress or otherwise, enforceable by imprisonment, unless it be proved that the defaulter has, or has had since the order, the means to pay the debt (In *re* Gamble, Law Reports, 1899, 1 Queen's Bench, 305).

107. Did that alteration in the law apply to the previous cases you mentioned?—It applied to such cases of orders upon relations as I have been dealing with.

108. And not as regards husbands?—Such orders as are authorised by the Poor Relief Act of 1601 are applicable only to cases of blood relationship such as the father, grandfather, and so on.

ıburse- of relief.

109. Are there any other provisions you would like to mention with regard to the reimbursement of relief?—As regards the reimbursement of relief, it is to be observed that Sec. 58 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, provides that any relief, or the cost price thereof, which shall be given to or on account of any poor person above the age of twenty-one, or to his wife, or any part of his family under the age of sixteen, and which the Local Government Board shall by any rule, order or regulation declare or direct to be given or considered as given by way of loan, and whether any receipt for such relief or engagement to repay the same or the cost price thereof or any part thereof shall have been given or not by the person to or on account of whom the same shall have been so given, shall be considered and the same is declared by the Section to be a loan to such poor person. Power is given to the justices to attach wages in the hands of a master or employer to recoup relief (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 59); or the relief may be recovered in the county court (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1848, Sec. 8). Where the wife or child or stepchild of a merchant seaman during his absence becomes chargeable, the Poor Law Union is entitled to be reimbursed out of the seaman's wages, provided the amount does not exceed half the wages where one is chargeable, and two-thirds of the wages where two or more are chargeable. Notice is to be given by the guardians to the shipowner, who will retain the proportion of wages, and is to give notice to the guardians of the seaman's return and notice to the seaman of the guardians' claim. The guardians may afterwards apply to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction for an order for reimbursement, and the order will be an authority for the payment by the shipowner of the amount to be reimbursed (Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, Secs. 182 and 183). If destitute Lascars or other natives of India, brought as seamen, or for employment as seamen, or for employment by the owner of the ship bringing them, are relieved and maintained by a board of guardians, they may obtain from the Secretary of State in Council of India repayment out of the revenues of India of the amount expended (Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, Sec. 185).

upment erty.

110. In what way can property be made available for the repayment of relief?—Recoupment from the property of a pauper is permissible in certain circumstances. Thus, where a pauper has in his possession or belonging to him any money or valuable security for money, the guardians may take and appropriate so much of the money or the produce of the security "or recover the same as a debt before any local court as will reimburse the said guardians for the amount expended by them . . . . in the relief of such pauper during the period of twelvemonths prior to such taking and appropriation, or prior to such proceeding for the recovery thereof, as the case may be." In the event of the death of a pauper having in his possession or belonging to him any money or property, the guardians may reimburse themselves the expenses incurred by them in and about the burial of the pauper, and in and about the maintenance of the pauper at any time during the twelve months previous to the decease (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849, Sec. 16). This enactment does not restrict the Common Law right of guardians to recover from the executor of a will under which a pauper child was entitled to a legacy, the cost of the child's maintenance for a period of six years (*re* Clabbon, deceased, and *re* F. W. Clabbon, an infant; Law Reports, 1904, 2 Chancery, 465; 73 Law Journal, Chancery 853). And where a woman had for more than six years prior to her death been maintained as a pauper lunatic, and during that period had been entitled to an annuity which had not been paid to her, it was held that the guardians were entitled to repayment for the twelve months before death and that for a further period of five years they could claim as ordinary creditors (Lambeth Guardians *v.* Bradshaw, 57 Law Times, New Series, 86). Again, a pauper lunatic became entitled to a fund; and thereupon the guardians on a summons in lunacy claimed six years' arrears for past maintenance. An order was made by the Court in Lunacy for the appointment of a receiver, and for the payment by him out of the fund to the guardians of part of the arrears, the balance being applied to future maintenance. On the death of the lunatic there was a balance in the hands of the receiver. The guardians then commenced a creditor's administration action in the Chancery Division against the lunatic's administrators, to obtain payment of the balance of the six years' arrears. It was held by the Court of Appeal that the balance was a valid legal debt enforceable after the lunatic's death (In *re* Taylor, Guardians of Edmonton Union *v.* Deely; Law Reports, 1901, 1 Chancery, 480). But the guardians are ordinary and not preferential creditors (Laver *v.* Botham and Sons; Law Reports, 1895, 1 Queen's Bench, 59).

111. Are there any other methods of reimbursement that you can mention?—Among other methods of reimbursement are the assignment of or charges on military and naval pensions (Pensions Act, 1839), payments by trustees out of annuities or periodical payments (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 23), and payments by trustees or managers out of sums payable by a friendly or benefit society, where the pauper has no wife or relative dependent on him, and the guardians or their relieving officer have declared the relief to be given on loan, and have notified the secretary or trustees within thirty days (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 23; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1879, Sec. 1). It may be noted that it has been held that a trade union is not a benefit or friendly society within these enactments (Winder *v.* Kingston-upon-Hull Guardians; Law Reports, 20 Queen's Bench Division, 412; 58 Law Times New Series, 583). This decision was based on the following ground, namely, that the language of Sec. 23 of the Act of 1876 contemplates legal liability, and is inapplicable to funds which, as in the case of trade unions under Sec. 4 of the Trade Unions Act, 1871, are as regards collection and distribution not subject to interference by the High Court. That was the ground of the judgment of Mr. Justice Mathew. This reasoning, however, since the decision of the House of Lords in the Yorkshire Miners' Association and Others *v.* Howden (Law Reports, 1905, Appeal Cases, 256; 92 Law Times, New Series, 701) is not unassailable; and the decision in the earlier case must, I think, be now regarded as questionable. Also it may be pointed out that where trustees or managers decline to make a payment and the guardians apply to the justices to make an order, the justices cannot intervene unless the right of the pauper to receive the periodical payment is undisputed (The Queen *v.* Richardson, Law Reports, 1894, 2 Queen's Bench, 323; 63 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 212; 70 Law Times, New Series, 805).

Pensions, annuities, payments by friendly societies.

112. Now we come to the point of electoral disqualification; I assume that the observations that you wish

Electoral disqualification.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

to make on this subject would be only in connection with its limited association with the Poor Law?—Quite so. The subject of electoral disqualification is, I think, for the most part outside the scope of the present inquiry; but the subject has, to a limited extent, an association with the Poor Law. For illustration of this aspect of the matter, I do not consider it expedient to attempt any exact explanation of details. The main object of what I have to say on the subject is to bring under the notice of the Commissioners some instances of the inter-relation of the Poor Law and Election Law.

Disqualifying relief or other alms.

113. Would your observations be confined to the case of the Parliamentary franchise?—Yes. The general effect of Sec. 36 of the Reform Act, 1832 (2 William IV., c. 45), as extended by the Representation of the People Act, 1867 (30 & 31 Vict., c. 102, Sec. 40) now is that no person shall be entitled to be registered in any year as a Parliamentary voter for any county, city, or borough, who within twelve calendar months next previous to the 15th day of July in that year has received parochial relief or other alms.

Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, 1885.

114. Has the original disqualification been modified?—The disqualification arising from parochial relief has been modified to a considerable extent by the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, 1885 (48 & 49 Vict., c. 46). Sec. 2 of that enactment is to the effect that where a person has in any part of the United Kingdom received for himself, or for any member of his family, any medical or surgical assistance, or any medicine at the expense of any poor rate, such person shall not by reason thereof be deprived of any right to be registered or to vote as a Parliamentary voter. The term "medical or surgical assistance" in the Act includes all medical and surgical attendance, and all matters and things supplied by or on the recommendation of the medical officer having authority to give such attendance and recommendation at the expense of any poor rate (Sec. 4).

Honeybone v. *Hambridge.*

115. Has this Act been the subject of interpretation by the Courts of Law?—There are two judicial decisions on this enactment. The first of these, (Honeybone *v.* Hambridge; Law Reports, 18 Queen's Bench Division 418; 56 Law Journal, Queen's Bench 46), illustrates the beneficial interpretation to which the Act has been subjected. In that case, the wife of the appellant asked a relieving officer for an order for the attendance of a medical man during her confinement. The guardians authorised the relieving officer to give such an order. That officer did not in fact give it, but he sent an uncertificated midwife to the woman and afterwards paid the midwife. The Revising Barrister decided adversely to the claim of the appellant to be registered. The High Court, however, were of opinion that the midwife's services were "medical or surgical assistance" within the Act of 1885. It was pointed out that the rights of the husband were not to depend upon the character of the attendant, but upon the nature of the service rendered, and that the fact of the woman being satisfied with the assistance of a less qualified person than the medical officer, could not make the attendance less "medical or surgical attendance" within the meaning of the Act.

Kirkhouse v. *Blakeway.*

116. Have you a note of any other cases before the High Court?—The second case (Kirkhouse *v.* Blakeway; Law Reports, 1902, 1 King's Bench, 306; 71 Law Journal, King's Bench, 130) affords some guide to the discrimination of ordinary relief and medical relief. The wife of the claimant in this second case had, during the whole of the qualifying period, been maintained at the cost of the poor rate as a pauper patient in the Gloucester county lunatic asylum, and nothing had been contributed by the claimant towards her maintenance. The Revising Barrister thought that the permanent maintenance of a lunatic or imbecile was distinguishable from the medical treatment of a patient under a temporary attack of mental disease, and that such maintenance was not medical assistance within the meaning of the Act of 1885. He thought it analogous to the maintenance of a disabled or crippled pauper in the workhouse, and that such medical assistance, if any, as was rendered to the patient was an incident additional to the maintenance. The Revising Barrister therefore rejected the claim. The court considered that in the decision of the Revising Barrister there was a finding of fact, which they could not and ought not to disturb.

Extract f judgment *Kirkhous Blakeway*

117. Did the court give any detailed reasons for this judgment?—The following passage from the judgment of the court shows the grounds on which it was based: "It seems to us that in all cases in which relief is given which is more or less of the nature both of medical relief and ordinary relief, a question of fact arises for the decision of the Revising Barrister. When in consequence of illness (and insanity is undoubtedly illness), a voter or claimant, or a member of his family whom he is bound to support, is given medical relief, it is not the less medical relief, within the statute because a certain amount of ordinary sustenance is given as well as medicine. And so where a pauper in a workhouse is removed to the infirmary in consequence of his illness, he would, whilst in the infirmary, still be receiving relief other than medical relief within the meaning of the statute. It would be a question of fact for the Revising Barrister in all such cases what the real character of the relief was, and which kind was merely incidental to the other. Where a member of a voter's or claimant's family is attacked with insanity, and is in consequence removed to an asylum at the expense of the union, we should have no doubt, and the Revising Barrister in this case seems to have had no doubt, that the case was in the first instance one of medical relief. But when the insane person, being a person for whose support the voter or claimant is liable, remains permanently in the asylum, and no payment is made by the voter or claimant, we think a question of fact arises as to whether the relief has not become ordinary relief, as distinguished from medical. When any payment is made, even although it is not as great as the cost to the union of the maintenance of the lunatic in the asylum, the inference might fairly be drawn that there is no ordinary relief, but this is for the Revising Barrister. Where the maintenance has continued for a long time without any payment whatever, we cannot say that the Revising Barrister is wrong in coming to the conclusion that the voter or claimant is in receipt of relief other than medical relief."

Magarill Overseers Whitehav &c.

118. Have you any cases to cite with regard to ordinary relief?—Yes. With regard to the effect of relief other than medical relief as a ground of disqualification for the Parliamentary franchise, the cases in which illustrations can be drawn from decisions of a Court of Law are comparatively few. Brief mention, however, may be made of some of these, and of the principles to be deduced from the judgments of the courts. At a time of distress, a claimant, on application to a relieving officer, was set to work at breaking stones. The quantity of stones to be broken according to the task of work was four bushels a day. The claimant for a day's work received 1s. 3d., and the employment continued for six weeks. The guardians were apparently unable to obtain such a price for the broken stones as would recoup them for their expenditure. And their allowance to the claimant was relief measured by his wants, and not by the quantity of his work. The Revising Barrister expunged the name of the claimant from the Register, and it was subsequently pointed out by the High Court, in upholding the decision of the Revising Barrister, that the work done by the claimant was not, so far as the ratepayers were concerned, remunerative, and that it was quite plain that it was intended to be and was received as parochial relief (Magarrill, appellant *v.* The Overseers of Whitehaven and Preston Quarter, Whitehaven, respondents; Law Reports, 1885, 16 Queen's Bench Division, 242; 55 Law Journal, Queen's Bench Division, 38).

119. That is rather an important case. Do I understand the law is that where work is given to a person by a Poor Law authority, and the profits from the work given do not compensate the pay given, the person is supposed to be in the receipt of poor relief and to be disqualified?—That is the effect of that particular decision.

Trotter Trevor, Queen Ireland

120. Are there any cases in which the question arose as to the effect of relief to a father?—The father of a claimant became an inmate of a workhouse. His son was called before the guardians and told that, if he did not pay something towards the maintenance of his father, he would be summoned before the justices to show cause why he should not be ordered to maintain his father. The claimant then made an offer to contribute 1s. 6d. a week, and the guardians accepted the offer. The Revising Barrister held that the claimant was not disqualified. The Court of Common Pleas supported

the Revising Barrister. The Chief Justice observed: "It is said that because the support of the pauper cost the parish funds more than the sum so paid (by the son), the excess must be considered as parochial relief given to the son, inasmuch as it relieved him from a burden which was cast upon him by the law. I cannot concur in that view (Trotter, appellant *v.* Trevor, respondent; 16 Common Bench, New Series, 48; 32 Law Journal, Common Pleas, 59). In a municipal case, the claimant's father had been in receipt of parochial relief, and it was contended that relief to the father was relief to the son, but the Court of Queen's Bench rejected this contention, and Mr. Justice Blackburn, referring to Sec. 56 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, said: "I do not think before the Act, relief to the father could be said to be relief to the son, and it certainly cannot be said to be since" (The Queen *v.* Ireland, 3 Law Reports, Queen's Bench, 130; 37 Law Journal; Queen's Bench 373).

iter v.
ish v.
ison v.
r.
v.
e.
ard v.

121. Are there any other points that you would like to refer to before we go from this branch of the subject? —Yes. Among other things I should like to mention that excusal from the payment of the poor rate on the ground of poverty is not parochial relief (Mashiter *v.* Dunn; 6 Common Bench, 30; 18 Law Journal, Common Pleas, 13). On the question of the disqualifying effect of relief by way of loan where the loan is in fact repaid, there is no clear judicial decision. But the inference from the report of one case (Devenish, appellant *v.* Digby, respondent; 13 Common Bench, New Series, 28) is that the Court of Common Pleas, in the absence of argument and a formal judgment, did not think it necessary to interfere with the decision of the Revising Barrister who, in such circumstances, struck out the name of a claimant on the ground that the granting of the loan was a granting of relief notwithstanding the subsequent repayment. It has been suggested that a different view might be taken in reliance upon what was said in Kirkhouse *v.* Blakeway as to the consequences of payment by the husband of a contribution towards the wife's maintenance. On the other hand, it has been argued that the principle of the judgment in Harrison *v.* Carter (Law Reports, 2 Common Pleas Division, 26; 46 Law Journal, Common Pleas, 57) applies notwithstanding the repayment, and that the original receipt of the relief establishes, in the words of the latter judgment, "the absence of that independence which is essential to the qualifications of a voter." Lastly, it may be noted that if the name of a person, to whom objection might be taken on the ground of the receipt of parochial relief, remains on the Parliamentary Register after revision, in consequence of no such objection having been made, his vote would not be struck off on a scrutiny. The Register is conclusive, except only in the case of "persons prohibited by any Statute or by the Common Law of Parliament." But the prohibition refers to some inherent, or for the time irremovable, quality in a person, such as sex, the holding of offices etc., and does not extend to a failure in incidents or elements such as the receipt of parochial relief which might be matter of objection at the revision (Stowe, appellant *v.* Jolliffe, respondent; Law Reports, 9 Common Pleas 734). Further, in the absence of notice of objection, a Revising Barrister is not bound at his revision of the Register to expunge the name of a person who has received relief (Hayward, appellant, *v.* Scott, respondent; Law Reports, 5 Common Pleas Division, 231; 49 Law Journal, Common Pleas, 167).

ts
g out of
dure on
sion of
rs' Lists

122. (*Mr. Booth.*) Does that mean, unless the Revising Barrister is asked to do so?—Yes; unless there was a notice of objection, the Revising Barrister is not under any obligation to take out the name.

123. (*Chairman.*) Even if the fact is brought to his knowledge, he is not bound, you say, to strike out the name of the man who has received the relief, unless somebody formally objects?—Unless there is a proper objection.

124. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Has it not been held that the lists which are given to the overseers by the Relieving Officers are objections?—Not in themselves, for the purposes of this particular decision, I think. There must have been special notice of objection in any case brought before the Revising Barrister.

125. By the overseers; that is, by those who make up the lists?—Possibly the decision might recognise notice by any one of the representatives of the sides appearing before the Revising Barrister.

126. (*Mr. Petten-Macdougall.*) Is there no duty upon the Relieving Officer to bring the list under the notice of those who are making up the roll?—He should undoubtedly supply the overseers with the names of persons who have received relief, and should produce his books to the overseers; but I take it that the objection which is in contemplation here might include an objection raised by one or other of the representatives of the parties appearing before the Revising Barrister.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

127. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Ought not the relieving officer to call the attention of the overseers to the fact that these people had received Poor Law relief?—Certainly. He furnishes lists, and produces his books.

128. And they are bound to act on them?—Yes. The documents in the overseers' possession would be at the Revision Court, but the mere presence of those documents in court, I take it, would not, within this decision, amount to such an objection as the court required the Revising Barrister to have before him. I am speaking now of the mere physical presence of the documents at the court.

129. In compiling the list which is to go before the Revising Barrister ought not the overseers to take into account the relieving officer's statement?—That is another matter. My answer is Yes, but that is not concerned with the revision—that is a matter preceding the revision. What the duty of the relieving officer to the overseer may be, is clear. The question here is, what is the duty of the Revising Barrister at the Revision Court?

130. (*Miss Hill*). Is it not the duty of the overseer to strike out the names?—There is no doubt as to what the duty of the overseer would be; but here we are considering the case where the overseer has left the names on the list for some reason or other.

131. I take it you use the term "the duty of the overseer" in a legal sense as well as in a moral sense; the overseer would be legally bound to strike out the name, would he not?—He should do it. As to the legal point I am not altogether prepared to say what the provision is for enforcing any obligation of this kind. Clearly the name ought not to be on the list.

132. It ought not to be on the list, and the question is, whose duty is it to see that it should be taken off the list —that is what one would like to know?—The only point decided in that case was that if on the list when the list comes before the Revising Barrister, he, without a special objection, is not bound to take it out.

133. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think the practice is this, is it not—the relieving officer sends to the overseers a list of persons who have received relief?—Yes.

134. The overseers then strike out the names of the persons who have received relief according to that list, or at all events are expected to strike them out?—Certainly, the overseers should strike them out.

135. If the overseers fail to do that, then a man's name cannot be removed from the list, unless objection is taken formally before the Revising Barrister?—That seems to be the position.

INDOOR RELIEF.

136. (*Chairman.*) That I think finishes the question of qualification, and now we go to the question of indoor relief. What reference to this question do you note in the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834?—By Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, the government of workhouses is enumerated as a special purpose to which rules, orders and regulations made by the Local Government Board may relate. Other purposes are set out in Secs. 26 and 42. These are classification, the nature and amount of the relief to be given to, and the labour to be exacted from, the persons relieved, and the preservation of good order.

Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Secs. 15, 26, & 42.

137. Do you wish to say anything about the expression "workhouse" as used in the Act of 1834?—In Sec. 109 of the Act there is a definition of the term "workhouse." The word, according to this interpretation, is to be construed to include "any house in which the poor of any parish or union shall be lodged and maintained, or any house or building purchased, erected, hired, or used at the expense of the poor rate by any parish, vestry, guardian, or overseer for the reception, employment, classification or relief of any poor person therein at the expense of such parish."

Definition of "workhouse."

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

Types of buildings included in definition.

138. Why was the definition so wide?—Respecting this definition, it is necessary for the better understanding of provisions to be hereafter explained that something should be said now about the state of things existing in 1834. The Act of that year had special reasons for the comprehensive terms of the definition which it contained. It was intended to bring under some measure of control all kinds of local institutions maintained for the reception of inmates at the cost of the Poor Rate. Of these institutions the houses under Jonas Hanway's Act (7 Geo. III. c. 39) for the reception of Metropolitan children were specially mentioned in Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834; but all other establishments, whether under local Acts or under the general law, were intended to be swept in by the definition. The definition was intended to include: (1) Poorhouses provided for the impotent under Sec. 4 of the 43 Elizabeth, c. 2, and at first taking the form of cottages or larger structures on the waste, or, at a much later date, buildings on ground purchased or leased by the churchwardens and overseers, (59 Geo. III. c. 12, Secs. 8–10.) (2) Buildings provided under a long series of local Acts beginning with a Bristol local Act of 1696, and designed at the outset to combine with the housing of the impotent (including the insane) facilities for carrying on manufactures by the labour of the inmates. It was probably to places of this kind that Sec. 2 of the 56 Geo. III. c. 129, was specially applicable in its prohibition of the chaining or confinement by chains or manacles of any poor person of sane mind. (3) Buildings originally designed either as part of the buildings of class 2, or separately, to answer the purposes of Houses of Correction for persons who did not employ themselves to work (43 Elizabeth, c. 2, Sec. 2), or for rogues, as in the case of the workhouses for London and Westminster under the 13 and 14 Ch. II. c. 12, Sec. 4. (4) Buildings provided under the general law during the period between the passing of the 9 Geo. I. c. 7 (Sir Edward Knatchbull's Act) and the passing of the 36 Geo. III. c. 23 (Sir William Young's Act). There was a remarkable difference in the characteristics of the workhouses of this period. The workhouse of the 9 Geo. I. c. 7, belongs to a system of the strictest administration; for if a pauper refused relief in a workhouse of that type, he was declared to be "not entitled to ask or receive collection or relief from the churchwardens and overseers of the poor" (9 Geo. I c. 7, Sec. 4). On the other hand, the workhouse of Gilbert's Act (22 Geo. III. c. 83) may be said to have given effect to local option in the direction of laxity; for the workhouse under that Act was not a place in which the test of labour could be applied.

Recommendations of Commission of Inquiry as to workhouses.

139. What was the plan of dealing with these workhouses under the new Poor Law Act of 1834?—With buildings of these various classes in existence, the Commissioners of Inquiry in 1832 (p. 312) came to the conclusion that, although a considerable proportion of parishes were without workhouses, their combination into unions would leave few districts in which the existing workhouse room would not suffice. The plan indicated in the Report of the Commissioners was followed when the Act of 1834 was framed. A definition wide enough to include every kind of existing establishment was adopted. And the Act of 1834 was directed specially to the utilisation of those establishments under the control of the Central Authority; while for the building of new workhouses the consent of the localities interested was made necessary. In principle the law at the present day is as the Act of 1834 left it.

Provision of new workhouses.

140. Will you state the effect of the law as regards the provision of new Workhouses?—By Sec. 23 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, the Central Authority, with the consent in writing of a majority of the guardians of a union not having a workhouse, or with the consent of a majority of the ratepayers and owners of property, may order and direct the guardians to build a workhouse, and to purchase or hire land for the purpose, or to purchase or hire a workhouse or a building for the purpose of begin used as or converted into a workhouse.

Alterations of workhouses.

141. What are the powers of the Local Government Board for the alteration of workhouses?—With the like consent, the Local Government Board may direct the enlargement or alteration of an existing workhouse, or the provision of an additional workhouse. But as regards existing workhouses, the Local Government Board under Sec. 25 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, may, without requiring the consent mentioned in Sec. 23, direct the guardians having a workhouse or a building capable of being converted into a workhouse to enlarge or alter the premises. Where the cost of an enlargement, alteration or improvement of the workhouse, or its premises, drainage or other appurtenances, does not exceed £500, the guardians may do what is necessary, with the consent, but without a formal order of the Local Government Board (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1866, Sec. 8). Also the power of the Local Government Board to give directions by an Order under Sec. 25 of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 is, by Sec. 8 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, made applicable to the provision of proper drainage, sewers, ventilation, fixtures, furniture, surgical and medical appliances and other conveniences at a workhouse.

Acquisition of land for workhouses.

142. What is the law as regards the acquisition of land?—With respect to the acquisition of land, the Union and Parish Property Act, 1835 (5 & 6 William IV., c. 69), empowered corporations and persons under disability to sell or exchange lands or buildings for use as or conversion into a workhouse, or as a site for a workhouse or for occupation with a workhouse or for any other purposes approved by the Central Authority. Guardians, by Sec. 3, are empowered, with the approval and subject to the rules, orders and regulations of the Central Authority, and, in the case of a union, with the consent of the owners and ratepayers of the parish concerned, to sell, exchange, or let or otherwise dispose of any workhouse or property, and to apply the proceeds towards the purchase or building of a workhouse or otherwise for the benefit of the Poor Law Union. The Act of 1835 further by Sec. 4 provided that all powers and authorities under a number of Acts which include the 59 Geo. III., c. 12 (Sturges Bourne's Act), the Poor Relief Act, 1831 (1 & 2 William IV., c. 42 and 1 & 2 William IV., c. 59) should be exercised by the guardians under the control and subject to the rules, orders, and regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners. The section continues: "All the aforesaid powers and authorities relating to the enclosing, purchasing, hiring or taking any waste, common, or other land for the purpose or purposes in the said Acts mentioned shall extend and apply to, and may be so exercised as aforesaid by the said . . . guardians for the purpose of being used as the site of a workhouse or of being occupied with a workhouse or for any other purposes of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834."

Applied visions Poor Re Act, 18 respecti land.

143. Have you any comments to make upon the passage which you have just quoted?—Of the old statutes to which Sec. 4 of the Act of 1835 refers, it may suffice to say that the most important is probably Sturges Bourne's Act or the Poor Relief Act, 1819 (59 Geo. III. c. 12). I refer to this enactment in connection with indoor relief because, whatever may be the practical value of the provision at the present time, it would seem that if the powers are exercisable they must be mainly, at least, if not invariably, exercised in connection with a scheme for housing the persons assisted.

144. Will you give the words of the provision in Sturges Bourne's Act?—I quote Sec. 12 of the Poor Relief Act, 1819, "And whereas by an act passed in the forty-third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth the churchwardens and overseers of the poor are directed to set to work certain persons therein described. And whereas by the laws now in force sufficient powers are not given to the churchwardens and overseers to enable them to keep such persons fully and constantly employed. Be it further enacted that it shall be lawful for the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of any parish with the consent of the inhabitants thereof in vestry assembled, to take into their hands any land or ground which shall belong to such parish, or to the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of such parish, or to the poor thereof, or to purchase or to hire and take on lease for or on account of the parish any suitable portion or portions of land within or near to such parish not exceeding twenty acres in the whole, and to employ and set to work in the cultivation of such land, on account of the parish, any such persons as by law they are directed to set to work, and to pay to such of the poor persons so employed as shall not be supported by the parish reasonable wages for their work, and the poor persons so employed shall have such and the like remedies for the recovery of their wages and shall be subject to such and the like punishment for misbehaviour in their employment as other labourers in husbandry are by law entitled and subject to."

145. There were amendments of this provision, were there not?—By the Poor Relief Act, 1831 (1 & 2 William IV. c. 42) the area of land to be hired or taken on lease for the employment of the poor was enlarged to an extent not exceeding fifty acres (Sec. 1). The parish officers with the consent of the lord of the manor and majority of commoners were empowered to enclose not exceeding fifty acres of waste for cultivation. By the 1 & 2 William IV. c. 59, Sec. 1, the powers of the Poor Relief Act, 1819, were made applicable to forest or waste lands belonging to the Crown, of which plots not exceeding fifty acres might be enclosed.

146. Perhaps you would explain to the Commission why you have drawn special attention to this Act?—I have quoted Sec. 12 of Sturges Bourne's Act *in extenso*, because it is a provision about which of late years much discussion has arisen. This discussion led the Local Government Board in 1893 to submit a case to the law officers. The opinion of the law officers upon the questions put with regard to the operative effect, at the present day, of the enactment above mentioned was that all the powers conferred on overseers under Sec. 12 of Sturges Bourne's Act had passed to the guardians by virtue of the Union and Parish Property Act, 1835, that the guardians could exercise their power under the first-mentioned provision and the amending Act (the Poor Relief Act, 1831) to the extent of fifty acres in respect of each parish, but that the power would be subject to the control of the Local Government Board in the direction of reducing but not increasing the acreage to be taken. The law officers were also of opinion that it was intended that the relief of persons to be set to work under the Poor Relief Act, 1601, should be given in the form of wages. The law officers further considered that the words in the Act of 1601 which refer to persons who "use no ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by" would include persons out of employment who are, at the time in question, carrying on no daily trade. On the legal aspect of the matter I only wish to add that with regard to the law officers' interpretation of the Poor Relief Act, 1601, as including persons carrying on no daily trade through being at the time out of employment, it is to be noted (1) That when in the case of The Attorney-General *v.* Merthyr Tydvil Union the Act of 1601 was considered by the Master of the Rolls in 1900, his Lordship said that he had not succeeded in finding any judicial interpretation of the words; and (2) That such contemporary explanation as is to found outside the reports of decided cases seems rather to favour the conclusion that the words may have originally described the habitual loafer, or, as the instructions to justices in the preceding reign phrased it, "the man that useth no trade whereby he may attain his living in truth to set his wife, children and families to work." Subsequently the President of the Local Government Board in the House of Commons stated his views on the position arising out of the existing law. It would probably be desirable that a copy of this statement should be handed in (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A) No. 1 (*b*)).

147. You have stated that the law officers of the Crown gave their opinion that the Local Government Board had the power of limiting the amount of land to be purchased; had they the power of prohibiting any land to be purchased?—They had the power to reduce below fifty acres, not to increase.

148. And not to prohibit?—The opinion did not expressly mention prohibition.

149. Have you any other comments to make on the Act of 1819?—It may be well now to draw attention to a few facts about the Act of 1819 and the amending provisions of 1831. The first fact is that an important proviso, which has no direct bearing upon the Poor Law, was attached to Sec. 12 of the Act of 1819. The proviso is to be found in the following section (13) and is to this effect: "Provided that for the promotion of industry amongst the poor, it shall be lawful for the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of any parish, with the consent of the inhabitants in vestry assembled, to let any portion and portions of such parish land as aforesaid, or of the land to be so purchased or taken on account of the parish to any poor and industrious inhabitant of the parish, to be by him or her occupied or cultivated on his or her own account, and for his or her own benefit at such reasonable rent and for such term as shall by the inhabitants in vestry be fixed and determined. Another fact is that it was in the main for the sake of this proviso that the extension to fifty acres was commended to Parliament by the member who brought forward the Bill which afterwards became law as the Poor Relief Act, 1831. So at least is to be gathered from the report in *Hansard* of the observations of Mr. Briscoe and Mr. Sturges Bourne on the introduction of the Bill. Thus, Mr. Briscoe, who moved to introduce the Bill, referred to it as a measure to amend the 59 George III. c. 12 "so far as it relates to the letting and leasing of land to labourers." Mr. Sturges Bourne approved of the proposed alteration. Another member instanced in support of the motion the case of many persons who had accepted small spots of ground on condition of not receiving parish relief, and who had all done well and brought up large families. Sir J. Shelley thought that parishes ought to take a quantity of land in order to give employment to their own poor; and thus in some measure enable the pauper to contribute to his own support. Another member, who thought that such a plan would be impracticable, and objected to patching up the then existing system, favoured the letting of small portions of land by private individuals to poor men who would thus be enabled to support themselves without entirely depending on parish assistance. In the House of Lords, on the other hand, the Duke of Richmond is reported in terms which are consistent with the view that the Bill had his support because it would enable the overseers to provide employment.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

150. The Act of 1831, I understand, was afterwards amended; what have you to say about the amendment?—Another fact worthy of note in connection with the letting of land to the poor is that in 1832, that is, in the next session after the passing of the 1 and 2 William IV. c. 42, and the 1 and 2 William IV. c. 59, the view of those measures as designed to facilitate the provision of allotments for poor persons desiring to rent them is illustrated by the extension, for the purposes of these Acts, of the 2 William IV., c. 42, which is entitled, "an Act to authorise (in parishes enclosed under any Act of Parliament) the letting of the poor allotments in small portions to industrious cottagers."

151. Do you wish to say anything about the origin of Sections 12 and 13 of Sturges Bourne's Act?—The origin of these Sections is probably traceable to a report of the Select Committee appointed by the House of Commons in 1817 to consider of the Poor Laws. In that report the Committee discussed at some length (p. 17) the question of the possible effect of interpreting the Poor Relief Act, 1601, as having for its object the finding of work for all by the State. The Committee considered that this was a condition which it was not in the power of any law to fulfil. Experimentally, however, they recommended that all possible facility of providing employment should be given; care being taken that the local work to be supplied should be such as would least sensibly interfere with existing occupations and trades. In country parishes agriculture, in the opinion of the Committee, afforded the most obvious and useful source of employment. They instanced the cases of two parochial farms in Kent. The Committee then observed: "Yet great benefit might, in the opinion of your Committee, be derived from some parishes being enabled to possess themselves of as much land as might produce at least an adequate supply of provisions for those whom they are bound to maintain, and would afford the means which otherwise might be wanting of bringing to the test the willingness to work of some of the applicants for employment; but it would operate still more beneficially if it enabled parishes collectively, under proper restrictions, to follow the example of those individual proprietors of land, who have been in the practice of letting very small portions of land on reasonable terms to industrious labourers to cultivate on their own account."

Report of Select Committee of 1817 respecting parish farms.

152*. Will you now return to your description of the modern Poor Law respecting the acquisition of land?—The guardians, by virtue of Section 7 of the Union and Parish Property Act, 1835, were for the purposes of that Act incorporated and empowered to accept, take and hold for the benefit of the union, buiid

Acquisition of land under Lands Clauses Acts.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

ings, lands, or other property; but the later machinery provided by the Lands Clauses Acts has only partially been made available for the transactions of the guardians. The instance in which the Lands Clauses Acts are applied occurs in the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867, as explained by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 35. By Sec. 52 of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, and the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts Amendment Act, 1860, were incorporated for the purposes of the Poor Law Acts not only in the case of guardians but also in that of managers. In a limited way, too, the Act of 1867, by Secs. 53 and 54, authorises the use of so much of the Lands Clauses Acts as relates to compulsory purchase. The restrictions on the use of the provisions relating to compulsory purchase are: (1) That these provisions shall only be put in force for the enlargement of a workhouse, hospital or school existing at the passing of the Act of 1867; and (2) That the Local Government Board shall direct the purchase by an order after advertisement and notice to the owners. The guardians may also, with the approval of the Local Government Board, but without an order, hire or take on lease for a term not exceeding five years, land or buildings for the relief or employment of the poor, and the use of the guardians or their officers.

Workhouse management.

152. Now perhaps you will indicate to us the provisions for workhouse management?—With regard to the management of a workhouse, mention may be made of the provisions of Sec. 21 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. By that section all statutory powers of preparing poorhouses or workhouses for the reception of poor persons, and the dieting, clothing, employing and governing of the poor, together with "all powers of regulating and conducting all other workhouses whatsoever and of governing, providing for, and employing the poor therein," and all auxiliary powers, are to be exercised under the control of the Local Government Board and subject to their rules, orders and regulations. But on the formation of a Union, under the Act of 1834, the workhouse of the union is to be governed by the Board of Guardians (Sec. 38). And the same result is to ensue upon the constitution of a board of guardians for a single parish (Sec. 39). There are, however, certain matters which Parliament has thought fit to make subjects of special enactment, instead of leaving them entirely to the regulations of the Local Government Board and their predecessors. A few instances may be given. The admission of the applicant for relief in a workhouse is in certain cases a matter of urgency. Where the person who applies professes to be a destitute wanderer or wayfarer, the master, porter or other officer, or the relieving officer or overseer to whom the application is made, may search the applicant or cause him to be searched, and may take from him any money found upon him and deliver it to the guardians. This provision is contained in the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1848, Sec. 10. That section continues: "Every person who shall apply for relief at any workhouse, or to any relieving officer or overseer, having at the time of such application in his possession and under his immediate control any money or other property, of which on enquiry made by the guardians or their officers, or by overseers, he shall not make correct and complete disclosure, shall be taken to be an idle and disorderly person within the meaning of the Vagrancy Act, 1824, and shall be punishable accordingly."

Workhouse discipline.

153. Have you anything further to say respecting the provisions relating to workhouses?—Yes, I have something to say in respect of discipline. Adults in a workhouse since the Poor Relief Act, 1814 (Sec. 7), have been exempt from corporal punishment; but refusal to work, drunkenness, or other misbehaviour, may, on conviction, subject a pauper to imprisonment by virtue of Sec. 5 of the Poor Relief Act, 1815, and Sec. 58 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844. These enactments, however, do not apply to the case of a pauper, who, being able bodied, refused to obey an order to transfer himself from one workhouse to another into which able-bodied paupers were receivable (Mile End Guardians *v.* Sims; Law Reports, 1905, 2 King's Bench, 200: 74 Law Journal, King's Bench, 647; 92 Law Times, New Series, 238). The unauthorised introduction of spirituous or fermented liquor into a workhouse is an offence rendering the offender liable to apprehension by the master or an officer acting under the master's direction, and upon conviction to a penalty or imprisonment in default (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 92).

Offences workhou inmates.

154. Are there any other enactments that you wish to enumerate as to the punishment of offences in workhouses?—Under Section 3 of the Vagrancy Act, 1824, every person "being able wholly or in part to maintain himself . . . by work, or by other means, and wilfully refusing or neglecting so to do, by which refusal or neglect. . . he shall have become chargeable . . . shall be deemed an idle and disorderly person." This enactment was considered by the High Court in St. Saviour's Union *v.* Burbridge (Law Reports, 1900, 2 Queen's Bench, 695; 69 Law Journal, Queen's Bench, 886). A relieving officer had knowledge that the defendant was suffering from delirium tremens at his own residence, and that he was dangerous to himself and others. The man was removed to the union infirmary as an alleged lunatic. On admission he was found to be suffering from delirium tremens, and thereupon an order of detention was obtained under the Lunacy Acts. He was discharged after having been chargeable for five days. The Magistrate before whom the summons obtained by the guardians was heard, dismissed the case. The High Court upheld the view of the Magistrate, and considered that the fact that the illness which rendered the defendant incapable of maintaining himself was produced by his own voluntary acts of intoxication did not render the omission to maintain himself neglect within the meaning of the enactment. The offence of absconding from a workhouse with clothes, linen or other goods or things belonging to the workhouse, entails liability to imprisonment with hard labour on conviction (Poor Relief Act, 1815, Sec. 2; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 58; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1850, Sec. 8). The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1842 (5 & 6 Victoria, c. 57) by Sec. 5 gives authority for prescribing "a task of work to be done by any person relieved in any workhouse in return for the food and lodging afforded to such person." The Pauper Inmates Discharge and Regulation Act, 1871, with regard to pauper inmates who are not casuals, enacts by Sec. 7 that any pauper who refuses or neglects to do the work or observe the regulations prescribed shall be deemed an idle and disorderly person within the Vagrancy Act, 1824; and that any pauper who commits the same offence, after previous conviction, is to be deemed a rogue and vagabond within the same Act.

Detentio workhou inmates.

155. Have you anything to add about detention?—The Act of 1871 also confers special powers of detention with regard to paupers who are not casuals. Thus Sec. 4, as amended by Sec. 4 of the Poor Law Act, 1899, provides that the guardians may direct that any pauper inmate of the workhouse, or the paupers of any class therein, shall be detained after giving notice to quit for times not exceeding the following limited periods; that is to say—(1) If the pauper has not previously discharged himself within a month before the notice—twenty-four hours; (2) If he has discharged himself once or oftener within the month—forty-eight hours; (3) If he has discharged himself more than twice within two months—seventy-two hours; (4) If he has in the opinion of the guardians discharged himself frequently without sufficient reason—one hundred and sixty-eight hours. These rules are subject to provisoes, of which the effect, as gathered from the two Acts, is as follows: (1) The guardians may alter or rescind their direction, and they, or in the interval between their meetings, the Visiting Committee (whose direction is to be entered in the Visitors' Book) may exempt, either wholly or partially, any pauper from the operation of Sec. 4 of the Act of 1871. (2) The master may, if the guardians be not sitting, or the Visiting Committee be not in attendance, discharge a pauper to whom Sec. 4 of the Act of 1871 applies before the expiration of a period, if any circumstances in his opinion require this to be done. The master is to report the facts to the guardians at their next meeting. (3) Sec. 4 of the Act of 1871 is not to apply to casual paupers. (4) A direction requiring a longer notice than seventy-two hours to be given must be entered in the Minutes, and must specify the name or names of the pauper or paupers to whom it applies.

Further offences workhou inmates.

156. Is there any law as to the prevention of such offences as absconding from workhouses?—A pauper who absconds or escapes from or leaves a workhouse during the period for which he may be detained therein or

wilfully gives a false name or makes a false statement for the purpose of obtaining relief, is to be deemed an idle and disorderly person. If he commits either offence after previous conviction, or if he wilfully destroys or injures his own clothes or damages any of the property of the guardians, he is to be deemed a rogue, and vagabond. And it may be added that by a later Act, that is to say, the Casual Poor Act, 1882, which is to be construed as one with the Act of 1871, the scope of possible offence has been enlarged; so that a person who, for the purpose of obtaining relief "for himself, or for any other person wilfully gives a false name, or makes or uses a false statement to the guardians of any Union or any of their officers" is to be deemed an idle and disorderly person within Sec. 3 of the Vagrancy Act, 1824 (Casual Poor Act, 1882, Sec. 5). In the case of a pauper who absconds or escapes from or leaves a workhouse when suffering from bodily disease of an infectious or contagious character, the Justice convicting him of the offence may suspend the execution of the warrant, or may order the pauper to be taken back to the workhouse to be cured. When the pauper is cured, the warrant is to be executed. A pauper absconding, escaping or leaving, may be apprehended by a workhouse officer or a constable without previous summons or warrant. The officer or constable may take the pauper when apprehended before a justice, and on the order of the justice may take the pauper back to the workhouse, Sec. 8 of the Act of 1871 enacts that the master or porter of the workhouse may take before a justice an inmate charged with any disorderly conduct, offence or misbehaviour, punishable upon a summary conviction without a summons or warrant. If the inmate be commited to gaol, and there be no constable present to execute the warrant, the master or porter may convey the inmate to gaol. For the purposes of this Section, the master or porter will have all the powers and authorities of a constable.

ention of khouse ates ering n rium nens or ctions ases.

157. Are there any other circumstances you wish to mention in connection with detention in a workhouse?—Another instance of detention is that authorised by Sec. 22 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, as amended by Sec. 342 of the Lunacy Act, 1890. The amended section is to the effect that when there is in any workhouse a poor person suffering from delirium tremens or from bodily disease of an infectious or contagious character, and the medical officer of the workhouse, upon examination reports in writing that the person is not in a fit state to leave the workhouse without danger to himself or others, the guardians may direct the master to detain the person in the workhouse, or, if the guardians be not sitting, the master of the workhouse may, until the next meeting of the guardians, detain him therein, and the person so detained is not to be discharged from the workhouse until the medical officer in writing certifies that the discharge may take place. The enactment is not to prevent the removal of a poor person after the parent or next of kin has given to the guardians such an undertaking as they deem satisfactory to provide for the removal, charge, and maintenance of the person with due care and attention while the malady continues,

hts, &c., workhouse ates.

158. Have you anything to say about the rights and privileges of workhouse inmates?—Certain rights and privileges of workhouse inmates are the subject of express legislation. Thus a husband and wife, both above the age of sixty, are not to be compelled to live separate and apart from each other (Poor Law Board Act, 1847, Sec. 23). Also where either husband or wife is infirm, sick, disabled by injury, or above sixty, the guardians may permit the husband and wife to live together. Every such case is to be forthwith reported to the Local Government Board (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, Sec. 10). No rules, orders or regulations or bye-laws may oblige an inmate to attend a religious service celebrated in a mode contrary to his religious principles. Any licensed minister of the religious persuasion of an inmate may at all times in the day, on the request of the inmate, visit the workhouse for the purpose of affording religious assistance to the inmate, and also for the purpose of instructing the inmate's child in the principles of their religion (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 19). A licensed minister means a person in holy orders, and a person teaching or preaching in any congregation for religious worship, whose place of meeting is certified and recorded according to law (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec 74). Every inmate for whom a religious service according to his own creed is not provided in the workhouse, is to be permitted, subject to regulations to be approved of or ordered by the Local Government Board, to attend, at such times as they allow, some place of worship of his own denomination within a convenient distance of the workhouse, if there be such in the opinion of of the Board But the guardians may, for abuse of the permission, or on some other special ground, refuse permission to any particular inmate. In that case the guardians must cause an entry of the refusal and its grounds to be made in their minutes (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 21.) As regards children, it is to be observed that no rules, orders, regulations, or bye-laws may authorise the education of a child in a workhouse in any religious creed other than that professed by the parents or surviving parent, and to which the parents or surviving parent shall object, or, in the case of an orphan, to which the godfather or godmother shall so object (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 19).

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

Creed register, &c.

159. What is the effect of the enactments relating to the creed register?—The master of a workhouse or the master or superintendent of a pauper school is to keep a register of the religious creed of the pauper inmates separate from all other registers, and in such form, and with such particulars as are prescribed by the Local Government Board by an order under their seal. Upon the admission of an inmate, the master or superintendent is to make due inquiry into the religious creed of the inmate and enter the religious creed in the register (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 16). In the case of a child under twelve, whether either of its parents be in the workhouse or not, or whether it be an orphan, or deserted child, the master or superintendent is to enter in the creed register as the religious creed of the child, the religious creed of the father, if the master or superintendent know or can ascertain it by reasonable inquiry, or if it cannot be so ascertained, the creed of the mother, if it be known to or can in like manner be ascertained by the master or superintendent. The creed of an illegitimate child under twelve is to be deemed to be that of its mother, when that can be ascertained (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 17). If a question arises as to the correctness of an entry in the creed register, the Local Government Board may, if they think fit, inquire into the circumstances of the case, and determine the question by directing the entry to remain or to be amended according to their judgment (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 18). Every minister of a denomination officiating in the church, chapel, or other registered place of religious worship of the denomination which shall be nearest to a workhouse or school or any ratepayer of any parish in the union is to be allowed to inspect the creed register at any time of any day, except Sunday, between the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 20). The minister may, in accordance with such regulations as the Local Government Board approve or prescribe, visit and instruct an inmate entered in the creed register as belonging to the religious creed of the minister, unless the inmate, being above fourteen, and after having been visited at least once by the minister, object to be instructed by him (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 20). No child who is regularly visited by a minister of his own religious creed for the purpose of religious instruction shall, if the parents or surviving parent, or, in the case of orphans or deserted children, if the minister make request in writing to that effect, be instructed in any other religious creed, or to be required or permitted to attend the service of any other religious creed than that entered in the creed register, except a child above twelve, who desires to receive instruction in some other creed, or to attend the service of any other religious creed, and who is considered by the Local Government Board to be competent to exercise a judgment on the subject (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 22).

Burial of workhouse inmates.

160. Now will you state the law respecting the burial of deceased inmates?—The burial of workhouse inmates is a matter for which statutory provision has been made. The workhouse is to be considered as situated in the parish in the union, where an inmate resided last previously to his removal to the workhouse. (Union Chargeability Act, 1865, Section 10). The guardians may cause the dead body (unless the deceased or the husband, wife or next of kin have otherwise desired) to be buried in the churchyard or other consecrated burial ground belonging to the parish, division of parish, chapelry or place in which the death may have occurred (Poor Law Amend-

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

8 Jan. 1906.

ment Act, 1844, Sec. 31). The burial fee or fees payable by the custom of the place, or under the provisions of an Act of Parliament, will be payable out of the poor rates to the person who by the custom or the Act is entitled to receive the fee. No officer connected with the relief of the poor may receive money for a pauper burial, or act as undertaker for personal gain or reward, or receive money from a dissecting school, or school of anatomy or hospital or from any person to whom the body may be delivered, or derive any personal emolument whatever for, or in respect of, the burial or disposal of the body (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 31). Guardians may contribute such a sum as the Local Government Board may approve towards the enlargement of any churchyard or consecrated public burial ground of the parish, in which the workhouse is situated, or in any other parish of the union, or towards obtaining any such consecrated burial ground. The guardians may bury in the ground so enlarged or obtained. But the obligation to bury elsewhere, if the deceased or the husband, wife or next of kin shall have so requested, will not be discharged or varied (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1850, Sec. 2).

SECOND DAY.

Tuesday, 9th January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. ALFRED DOUGLAS ADRIAN,* C.B., K.C., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

Transfer of inmates to other workhouses.

161. (*Chairman.*) Yesterday we finished the subject of the law relating to the burial of deceased inmates; the next question, I think, on which you propose to tender evidence to the Commission is, what powers of transfer of workhouse inmates have the guardians of two or more unions?—The Poor Law Acts give facilities for the accommodation in the workhouse of one union of the paupers of another union, where the exigencies of the case make this course desirable. An example may be taken from the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849. In Section 14 of that Act the circumstances in which recourse may be had to its provisions are described as: Overcrowding, Prevalence or Reasonable Apprehension of Epidemic or Contagious Disease, or Emigration. In such circumstances, the guardians may, with the consent of the Local Government Board, receive, lodge, and maintain in the workhouse, upon terms mutually agreed upon, any poor person belonging to another Poor Law Union. The poor person so received shall, while in the workhouse, be treated in all respects in like manner and be subject to the same regulations and liabilities as the other persons in the workhouse. The poor person also is to be deemed to be chargeable, in the first instance, to the Poor Law Union in the workhouse of which he is received. But, in all other respects, the abiding of the poor person in the workhouse is to be attended with the same legal consequences, as if the workhouse had been situated within the Poor Law Union from which the poor person has been sent. These provisions in 1876 were extended by Section 22 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act to the case of the managers of a district or other asylum, and to every case where the Local Government Board deem it expedient and give their consent, until the consent is withdrawn. Section 6 of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1851 (14 and 15 Vic. c. 105) as altered by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1866, Sec. 16, provides that where in a Poor Law Union there is a workhouse or building having adequate provision for the reception, maintenance and education of poor children, and there is more accommodation than the guardians require for the poor children of their own Poor Law Union, the guardians may, with the consent of the Local Government Board, contract with the guardians of another Poor Law Union for the reception, maintenance, and instruction of poor children under sixteen who are chargeable to the latter Poor Law Union, are orphans or deserted, or whose parents or surviving parent, consent. With the necessary modifications, the incidents and consequences recognised in the case of adult paupers attach to the children maintained and instructed in the foreign workhouse. Further, the guardians, with the consent of the Local Government Board, may send an idiotic, imbecile, or insane pauper, who may lawfully be detained in a workhouse to the workhouse of any other Poor Law Union with the consent of the guardians of that Poor Law Union, and pay the cost of the maintenance, clothing, and lodging of the pauper in the workhouse, as well as the cost of his conveyance thereto, or removal therefrom, and his burial expenses (Poor Law Amendment Act 1868, Sec. 13).

Transfer of inmates to other workhouses: Metropolitan provisions.

162. What is the law with regard to the transfer of inmates in London?—In the case of London the Local Government Board may initiate a transfer of inmates. Thus Section 50 of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, enacts that where, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, the workhouse of a Metropolitan Poor Law Union is adapted only for the reception of poor persons of a particular class or particular classes, but is capable of accommodating poor persons of that class or those classes from any other Metropolitan Poor Law Union, the Local Government Board may direct the guardians to receive, lodge, and maintain poor persons of that class or those classes; and the guardians are accordingly to receive these inmates on agreed or prescribed terms. Incidents similar to those mentioned in connection with Section 14 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849, attach to the reception in the Metropolitan Workhouse. In that case there is the additional provision that every guardian of the Poor Law Union from which a poor person is sent may at all reasonable times enter the workhouse and inspect any part thereof. The power of receiving inmates from other Poor Law Unions is extended by Section 17 of the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, to cases where wards or portions of workhouses are set apart for the reception of particular classes or descriptions of poor persons for whom separate maintenance and treatment are provided.

163. Do you know whether this power of the Local Government Board in reference to the Metropolitan area has been one which has been largely utilised?—I think it has been used, but I could not say precisely to what extent.

Regulations as to Indoor Relief.

164. Do you wish to make any comments on the regulations affecting indoor relief?—The part played by the regulations of the Central Authority in the control of

* N.B.—It should be borne in mind that, since the dates at which this witness appeared before the Royal Commission, various Statutory enactments and judicial decisions have, in several respects, affected the legal position as described in his Evidence.

indoor relief is most important. But the variety of cases which the regulations are designed to meet necessarily results in diversity of codes; also the needs of particular establishments frequently involve adaptations of, and departures from, accepted models. So that, for present purposes, it is difficult to attempt an illustration of what may be done by regulations in every department of indoor relief. But there is one code of very general application for purposes of workhouse management, and some account of this code may prove useful. The collection of rules to which I refer is usually known as the General Consolidated Order. It was issued by the Poor Law Commissioners on the 24th of July, 1847, and, with a substantially similar Order of the 8th of December, 1847, represented the final revision by the Commissioners of the rules made from time to time during their tenure of office.

les
erior to
neral
solidated
ler.

165. Could you give us any account of what was in operation before the General Consolidated Order?—The procedure of the Commissioners may be described briefly thus: In their 8th Report they explained that in the early stages they found it more convenient to issue separate orders to each Union. It would have been nearly impracticable for them, at that time, to issue their regulations in the form of General Rules, that is, orders addressed simultaneously to several Unions. That course would have necessitated repeated rescission of existing orders and the issue of General Rules in substitution, as often as each new Union was formed. But in 1842, when nearly the whole of England had been brought under the operation of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, and the regulations of the Commissioners had been for some time in force throughout the majority of the Unions, the Commissioners thought that they might safely rescind the existing separate orders and issue General Rules. These General Rules, however, were, in the issue of 1842, embodied in a number of orders according to subjects. So that, for example, workhouse regulations were in one order, and regulations as to the duties of officers in another. The work accomplished in 1847 was the consolidation of these separate orders, with certain exceptions and with amendments, in one general order. It may be said, I think, that in essentials the General Rules of 1842 and 1847 are the same. A comparison of the Order of 1847 with the first experimental orders of twelve years earlier discloses the important fact that much of the model Order for workhouses which is printed at page 96 of the first Report of the Poor Law Commissioners can be traced in the General Consolidated Order of 1847. So that it seems to be worth noting that the earliest regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners are at least shown to have stood the test of seventy years' experience, and that the amplified edition of those original regulations which was put forth by the Commissioners in 1842 embodied the greater part of the material improvements in the later edition of 1847.

eral
solidated
ler:
rkhouse
nagement.

166. Will you describe the contents of the General Consolidated Order as regards workhouses?—The General Consolidated Order in that part which relates to the government of the workhouse contains an explicit declaration that, subject to the rules and regulations therein contained, the guidance, government and control of every workhouse and of the officers, servants, assistants and paupers within the workhouse shall be exercised by the guardians of the unions. This declaration is in complete harmony with the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834 (Secs. 21 and 54), and it may be explained and emphasised by pointing out, in the language of the Local Government Board's Circular of the 29th of January, 1895, on workhouse administration, that the responsibility for the management of the workhouse and the welfare of the inmates rests with the guardians and the officers under their control. The General Consolidated Order contains provisions on the following subjects: Admission of paupers, classification of paupers, discipline and diet of paupers, punishment for misbehaviour of paupers, Visiting Committee, and repairs and alterations of the workhouse.

nission of
khouse
ates.

167. Let us take those subjects in the order that you have given them. What have you to say first about the admission of paupers?—Under the first head, "Admission of Paupers," are detailed regulations, in Articles 88 to 97, as to orders of admission and cases in which paupers may be admitted without orders, as to the examination of paupers on admission, and as to the cleansing, clothing and searching of paupers. The order does not deal exhaustively with the possible conditions under which a person may be received into a workhouse. There are cases arising under Statutes which appoint the workhouse as a place of reception, and the following instances may be mentioned: A workhouse may be a place of safety to which a child cruelly treated may be taken under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904 (Section 5); then certain lunatics or alleged lunatics may be conveyed thither under the Lunacy Acts. A workhouse is also a place to which children may be remanded under the Industrial Schools Act, 1866 (Section 19).

Classification of workhouse inmates.

168. Now we come to classification; will you state what is the effect of the Articles relating to classification?—Under the second head, "Classification of Paupers," the General Consolidated Order, in Articles 98 to 101, provides for the division of inmates into seven classes and the assignment of special quarters to each class. These classes are, with the exception of a variation of the ages of the boys and girls, the same as those prescribed in the earliest orders of the Poor Law Commissioners. But the guardians may under the General Consolidated Order subdivide any of the classes with reference to the moral character or behaviour, or the previous habits of the inmates, or to such other grounds as may seem expedient. Provision is also made with regard to married couples, to the employment of the inmates of certain classes, to exceptional classification of individual boys or girls, to children under seven years of age, and to interviews of parents and children. An important regulation is to the effect that the guardians are not to admit into the workhouse or any ward a larger number or a different class of paupers than that fixed by the Local Government Board, and any case of excess is to be reported by the clerk.

Discipline and diet of workhouse inmates.

169. Discipline and diet are the next subject: Will you please summarise the Rules on those points?—Under the head of "Discipline and Diet," it should first be noted that a recent Order known as The Workhouse Regulation (Dietaries and Accounts) Order, 1900, regulates the diet of the poor in workhouses with much elaboration, and for dietary purposes authorises a special classification of inmates. The Order was issued on the 10th of October 1900. Also by a General Order of the 8th of March, 1894, the guardians are empowered to cause dry tea, with sugar and milk, to be supplied to such of the female inmates of the workhouse as they may consider should be supplied. The quantity allowed in each case or in any class of cases is to be such as the guardians prescribe. With respect to discipline, the General Consolidated Order, in Articles 102 to 126, contains a variety of rules. The Order appoints times to be observed by the inmates for rising, work, leaving off and going to bed, with intervals for meals. There are also rules for a roll call, the places for meals, the clothing of inmates, their employment, the instruction of children, temporary absences, visits (including those of Ministers of religion), prayers and divine service, and the attendance of inmates at Church or Chapel. The circulation of papers of improper tendency and cards or games of chance are prohibited, and no pauper may have in his possession matches or other articles of a highly combustible nature. The original prohibition of smoking has been relaxed. Tobacco, under a General Order of the 3rd of November, 1892, may be allowed to inmates who are not able-bodied, or are employed on work of a specially disagreeable character. But no pauper may smoke, except in rooms and at times allowed by the guardians. One article under the head of Discipline and Diet seems to call for special mention. This is Article 115, which relates to discharges. The effect of subsequent legislation with respect to detention need not be here considered, and the Article may be discussed as having reference to cases not affected by that legislation. The Article provides that any pauper may quit the workhouse upon giving to the Master or (during his absence or inability to act) to the Matron, a reasonable notice of his wish to do so; and in the event of any able-bodied pauper, having a family, so quitting the house, the whole of such family shall be sent with him, unless the guardians shall for any special reason otherwise direct. The Article adds to the effect that the directions are to be in conformity with the regulations of the Central Authority. I mention the Article because it has been considered by the High Court in a case which went to the Court of Appeal. The case is that of Burge v. Power and others and a report will be found in 2 Times Law Reports, 760. The plaintiff sued a committee

Discharge of workhouse inmates.

Burge v. Power and others.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

of the guardians for damages for maliciously and negligently refusing to allow him to leave the workhouse for a short time, without his family, in order to obtain employment. On one occasion, the plaintiff alleged, the defendants did not hear his application properly. On another occasion they refused to read a written statement of his position and prospects of work. The plaintiff was non-suited. A new trial was refused by the Divisional Court, and the Court above dismissed the appeal to them. Lord Justice Bowen pointed out that, assuming that such an action would lie, the plaintiff was bound to bring the case home to each individual member of the committee. The guardians acted under Article 115 of the Consolidated Order, and, under that Article, the family must leave with the pauper unless some special reason was shown. The guardians had to enquire whether any such special reason existed, and the Court had to see whether there was any evidence that the defendants acted maliciously in such enquiry. That the guardians acted promptly in refusing leave was no evidence of malice, and the other incidents in the case, whatever their value might be, were not brought home to any of the defendants. The non-suit on every ground was right.

Punishment for misbehaviour of inmates.

170. What is the effect of the rules relating to punishment?—Under the head "Punishment for Misbehaviour of the Paupers" the General Consolidated Order contains a number of detailed provisions in Articles 127 to 147, the effect of which may be shortly stated as follows: Inmates who misbehave are divided into two classes—the disorderly and the refractory. The disorderly inmate is one who is guilty of certain offences against discipline which are of a comparatively minor character. By repeating any such offence within seven days, a disorderly inmate may become refractory, and offences of a graver character may subject an inmate at once to the consequences of being deemed refractory. The disorderly pauper may be punished by a change of diet, on the authority of the master with or without the direction of the guardians, and the punishment may last for a time not longer than forty-eight hours. The case of the refractory pauper requires a special direction by the guardians. His punishment may extend to confinement in a separate room for not more than twenty-four hours, unless a longer time should be necessary, when it is deemed right that the pauper should be carried before a justice. Circumstances of aggravation in the case of a refractory pauper may justify the master, without any direction of the guardians, in placing the refractory pauper in confinement for any time not exceeding twelve hours; but the confinement is to be reckoned as part of any punishment afterwards imposed by the guardians There are many safeguards against abuse of the rules about punishment. Mitigation of punishment is permissible in the case of a refractory pauper who may be punished as disorderly only. If punished as disorderly, he is not afterwards to be punished as refractory. If punished as refractory he is not afterwards to be punished as disorderly. Only in certain circumstances may an offence committed before the last admission to the workhouse be punishable. A medical certificate is necessary in the case of the sick and infirm, children under twelve, adults above sixty, and women who are pregnant or suckling. A bed and bedding and proper conveniences must be supplied in cases of punishment by confinement between 8 p.m. and 6 a.m. No child under twelve may be punished by confinement in a dark room or during the night. Only the schoolmaster or workhouse master may inflict corporal punishment on a male child, and both if possible, should be present. The rod or other instrument must be approved by the guardians or the Visiting Committee. Two hours must elapse after the commission of the offence. Flogging is not permissible in the case of a male above fourteen. No corporal punishment may be inflicted on a female child. A workhouse punishment book is to be kept by the master and submitted to the guardians for consideration and directions. A pauper above fourteen who unlawfully introduces or attempts to introduce spirituous or fermented liquor into the workhouse, or who absconds from the workhouse with clothes belonging to the guardians may be taken forthwith before a justice by the master. The case must be reported to the guardians. The master is to cause a legible copy of the articles describing offences to be kept suspended in the dining hall, in the room in which the inmates usually eat their meals, and also in the board room.

Visita workh

171. What provision is made for the visitation of workhouses?—Articles 148 and 149 of the General Consolidated Order relate to the Visiting Committee and their duties. This part of the Order is supplemented by a later General Order of the 26th of January, 1893. That order, by Article 1, authorises any guardian at any time to visit and examine any part of any workhouse of the Poor Law Union. Article 2 of the Order enables the guardians to appoint a Committee, or Committees of women, whether members of the board of guardians or not, and assigns to such a Committee the duty of visiting and examining the parts of the workhouse in which female paupers or pauper children are maintained, and to report to the board of guardians; but the appointment of such a Committee is not to affect the duty of the guardians to appoint one or more Visiting Committees as required by the Orders, nor the powers and duties of any such Committee. It may here be stated that if the guardians neglect to appoint a Visiting Committee for the purpose of visiting the workhouse, or when three months have elapsed during which the Committee have neglected to visit the workhouse, the Local Government Board are required by the Poor Law Board Act, 1847, Sec. 24, to appoint a visitor, not being a guardian, at a salary. The appointment of the visitor is to cease at the expiration of three calendar months next after the appointment of a Visiting Committee by the guardians, subject nevertheless to his reappointment in case of any repetition of the neglect of the guardians or Visiting Committee. Also, it may be well to point out that Justices still have power to visit workhouses under the Workhouses Act (30 Geo. III. c. 49), and under Section 43 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, though it may be doubted whether the objects of the visit could now be practically attained in the manner authorised by the two enactments.

Repair alterat workh

172. Have you anything to say about repairs and alterations?—The provisions in Articles 150 and 152 of the General Consolidated Order, under the head "Repairs and Alterations of the Workhouse," are designed to ensure cleanliness and the remedy of defects tending to injure the health of the inmates.

Duties workh officers

173. Will you now state briefly the duties of the officers on the workhouse establishment?—Besides the rules to which attention has already been drawn, it seems to be desirable to mention a few matters arising out of the duties of some of the chief members of the workhouse staff and affecting the care and control of the inmates.

Medic officer.

Apart from medical attendance, the medical officer has duties of an important character in relation to the daily routine of the workhouse. The examination of paupers on admission, directions and suggestions as to diet, classification and treatment, vaccination, defects in workhouse arrangements or in those of the infirmary, and excess of inmates, may be instanced as some of the matters within the scope of the medical officer's functions.

Chapla

It is the duty of the chaplain to read prayers and preach on every Sunday, Good Friday, and Christmas Day, unless the guardians with the consent of the Local Government Board may otherwise direct. He examines children, and catechises such as belong to the Church of England, and reports on the general progress and condition of the children and on the moral and religious state of the inmates generally. He also visits the sick, and administers religious consolation to them.

Master

The discipline and domestic economy of the establishment specially concern the master and matron, and their duties are set out in much detail. It may suffice to mention a few of the duties of the master. These concern the admission of inmates, the enforcement of regulations, the employment of inmates, visitation of wards, meals, custody of the keys, clothing, registration of births and deaths, care of stores, etc. Among other duties, it may be mentioned that it belongs to the master to apprise the nearest relation in the workhouse of the sickness of any pauper, and in the case of dangerous sickness to send for the chaplain, and any relative or friend of the pauper resident within a reasonable distance, whom the pauper may desire to see. The master must take care that no pauper at the approach of death is left unattended either during the day or the night, and must give information of death to the nearest relations, and, if the body be not removed within a reasonable time, must provide for its interment. Also, under a recent order issued on the 1st of December, 1900, it devolves upon the master when the death of a person of unsound mind occurs in the work-

house to send notice to the coroner, with a statement of prescribed particulars under the signature of the medical officer. The Nursing in Workhouses Order, 1897, which abolishes pauper nursing, aims at securing practical experience as a qualification of persons appointed to the office of nurse. The rules in the General Consolidated Order made the nurse subject to the directions of the medical officer so far as regards attendance and the administration of medicine. The nurse is also made responsible for taking care that a light is kept at night in the sick ward. The porter keeps the gate, and a record of those who enter or leave, and prevents entry or exit without leave. He receives paupers, examines parcels and suspects, and assists in the preservation of order.

174. Is the General Consolidated Order periodically revised and issued by the Local Government Board?—No. The General Consolidated Order is a fixed code; various alterations have been made in relation to particular subjects, but the order as a whole is not subject to such periodical revision, as, for example, is applied to the Code of the Board of Education.

175. I suppose the Amending Orders relate mainly to fresh legislation?—Or to improvements affecting particular officers or their duties as, for example, in the case of nurses under the order of 1897. That is a graft upon the old General Consolidated Order.

176. That finishes the subject of in-door relief, and we now come to the subject of out-door relief; upon that have you anything to say to us about the Royal Commission of 1832?—The Royal Commission of 1832 reported that the great source of abuse in the Poor Law system of their day was the out-door relief afforded to the able-bodied on their own account, or on that of their families. Out-door relief to the impotent, the Commission reported to be subject to less abuse. Out-door relief to the able-bodied was given either in kind or in money. Relief of this description when given in kind consisted rarely of food, rather less infrequently of fuel, and still less infrequently of clothes, particularly shoes. Its most usual form was found to be that of relieving the applicants either wholly or partially from the expense of obtaining house-room. Exemption from payment of rates on the ground of poverty was, in the opinion of the Commissioners, one method of partial relief of this sort; in other cases there was an actual payment of house-rent. Out-door relief to the able-bodied in money was classified as (1) Relief without labour; (2) the allowance system; (3) the roundsman system; (4) parish employment; and (5) the labour rate system. The heads, relief without labour and parish employment, explain themselves; the other three systems, that is to say, the allowance system, the roundsman system, and the labour rate system have this feature in common, namely, that the pauper was employed by an individual occupier. It is unnecessary, I think, to enter upon a recapitulation of the evils which arose out of each of these systems. The Commissioners, however, condemned the practices as being in violation of the letter as well as of the spirit of the law then in force. I cannot but think that, in this respect, the Commissioners took too favourable a view of the law, for in principle at least, apologists of the systems described by the Commissioners were in a position to collect both from statutes and judicial commentary an array of arguments in defence.

177. Can you give us an example of the defects in the law to which the Royal Commission referred?—When Lord Chief Justice Hale propounded a scheme for the reform of the Poor Law, he described the statute of the 43rd Elizabeth as generally making two provisions. First, for the impotent poor unable to work; and, second, for those poor that are able to work. Under the first head the Lord Chief Justice said "The plaister is not so large as the sore." This was published in 1683. Before the end of the century, the Court of King's Bench had made an attempt at enlarging the plaister in Waltham *v.* Sparkes (Michaelmas term, 6 William and Mary, Skinner 566, Comberbach 321, 1 Bott. pl. 439); and in the text books in use in 1832, the decision of the court will be found reproduced in the form of this proposition, namely, "A man who has more children than he can maintain, or who cannot obtain work, is entitled to relief under the term 'impotent.'" It might have been added that one of the judges had explained that the man was impotent as much as if he had been so by lameness. It may, therefore, be said that the opinion of the time regarded as sound law a doctrine which went far indeed to cover much that the Commissioners classed as illegal. And it may be well to add that Waltham *v.* Sparkes was treated as an authority so recently as in 1862 in the case of The Overseers of St. Pancras *v.* The Guardians and Overseers of St. Mary Islington (3 Best and Smith, 46; 31 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 233; 9 Jurist, New Series, 155). Again, the evils of the allowance system, or the system of relief in aid of wages, are exemplified by the so-called Speenhamland Act of Parliament. This was, in fact, a resolution of Berkshire Justices in 1795, and it embodied a table of allowances corresponding to the supposed necessities of each family of the industrious poor. But the justices who adopted and published the table seem merely to have aimed at uniformity in the exercise of powers which were conferred upon them by the 3 and 4 William and Mary, c. 11, and the 9 George I., c. 7, and which were amplified in favour of the industrious poor by the 36 George III., c. 23. Lastly, the arrangements made by parish officers with individual employers had in principle a show of statutory sanction in all places to which Gilbert's Act applied; for Section 32 of that Act empowered the guardian to agree for the labour of a poor person able and willing to work, but unable to obtain employment. It also authorised the guardian to receive the money earned, to apply it in the pauper's maintenance as far as it would go, and to make up the deficiency, if any. Elsewhere, too, there was some justification, in the language of the report of The King *v.* Anthony Collett (1823, 2 Barnewall and Cresswell, 324), for the view that if employment had to be found, there might be more than one way of finding it; for Chief Justice Abbott said, "It does not appear upon the case before us that the overseers of the poor considered themselves bound to provide work for the unemployed poor, if that were practicable; nor whether they in any way endeavoured to attain that object . . . .The case must go to the sessions again that we may be informed whether any, and if any, what endeavours were made to procure employment for them. All that the courts can now say is that undoubtedly it is the primary duty of the overseers to find employment for the poor if possible."

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, CB., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

"Speenhamland Act of Parliament"

178. I should like to go back for a minute to an answer that you gave a short time ago. I think you said that one of the methods by which relief was given to individuals was exemption from rates?—Yes. The Commissioners of 1832 treated that as a form of relief to the able-bodied.

Exemption from rates.

179. Do you know if the person exempted from paying rates *ipso facto* became a pauper?—I do not think he did. It was under the 54 Geo. III. c. 170—a section of which enabled a man to apply to the justices to obtain excusal from his rates on the ground of poverty. They classed it as out-door relief and there I think they were wrong. It was almost what one may call an instance of economic rather than legal doctrine applied to the subject.

180. But it came under the head of out-door relief?—The Commission of Inquiry of 1832 classed it so.

181. Did not the receipt of out-door relief make the man who received it a pauper?—This was not necessarily the case of a man in receipt of relief, but it was the case of a man who was so poor that he applied under the 54 Geo. III. c. 170, s. 11, to the justices for exoneration from rates on the ground of his poverty, and the Commissioners treated it as *ipso facto* out-door relief.

182. Did not the receipt of out-door relief make a man a pauper?—That particular form of exemption had never been classed by the law itself as out-door relief; but the Commissioners appear to have treated it as out-door relief.

183. Therefore, it was a form of relief which did not carry with it the disability that other forms of out-door relief do?—Clearly that would be so—or at least it has been so held for the purposes of the franchise.

184. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Can you tell me whether it was the fact that not only did they relieve him of the rate but they also paid the rates for him?—I do not know that that was so.

185. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Was the rate marked "irrecoverable"?—I do not know. Of course, it is just conceivable that such a case as Mr. Patten-MacDougall refers to might arise where non-resident relief was given and relief for payment of the rate in such circumstances might be out-door relief. But the words of the Commis-

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

sioners are very general, and they would extend to the case of a man with whom the overseers had an understanding, so that when he went before the justices, the overseers consented to his application and accordingly he was exonerated from his poor rate. I think you will find that the words are very general.

Defects of old law as to out-door relief.

186. (*Chairman.*) The conclusion you arrive at, therefore, is that the law was faulty in itself and that its practice was also faulty?—Yes; I think, therefore, in any review of the Poor Law, it would be unsafe to rely upon the Poor Relief Act, 1601, and the amending Statutes before 1834, as prohibitory of the methods which brought about the evils reported by the Royal Commission.

187. You have alluded to the 36 Geo. III., c. 23; is that the first Act in which wages were directly supplemented out of the rates?—No. That Act was really the statute under which out-door relief was given to people at their homes as a matter of right. I shall come to that Act almost immediately, I think.

Amendments of law in 1834.

188. Will you now state the Amendments made in the law after the report of the Royal Commission?—That material amendment of the law was thought to be essential is shown in the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. The course adopted in that Act was, by Sec. 53, to repeal outright the enactment, 36 Geo. III. c. 23, which had authorised the parish officers with the approbation of the vestry or of a justice to relieve the industrious poor at their homes; to repeal so much of the 55 Geo. III. c. 137, as related to the powers of justices to order out-door relief, and so much of Sturges Bourne's Act (59 Geo. III. c. 12) as was contained in Secs. 2 and 5, and regulated the action of the justices in making orders on complaints of the want of adequate relief. Having thus destroyed much of the defective legislation of the past, the Act of 1834 proceeded to construct the new system.

Changes effected by Poor Law Amendment Act., 1834, Sec. 27.

189. Will you now describe what the new system of the Act was?—First by Section 27, Parliament dealt with the powers of justices. The Section is as follows:—"In any union which may be formed under this Act it shall be lawful for any two of His Majesty's justices of the peace usually acting for the district wherein such union may be situated, at their just and proper discretion, to direct by order under their hands and seals that relief shall be given to any adult person who shall, from old age or infirmity of body, be wholly unable to work, without requiring that such person shall reside in any workhouse; provided always that one of such justices shall certify in such order of his own knowledge that such person is wholly unable to work as aforesaid, and provided further that such person shall be lawfully entitled to relief in such union, and shall desire to receive the same out of a workhouse." The power given by this section was in appearance a wide one; but decisions of the Court of Queen's Bench curtailed its scope. Thus, in 1845, in the Queen *v.* the Totnes Union (7 Queen's Bench, 690; 14 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 148), it was held that such an order could not be made without summoning the parties upon whom the burden would be imposed. Lord Chief Justice Denman pointed out that, though a justice might give a certificate of inability and with *bona fides*, "the guardians, if called upon to show cause, might convince the justices that there was no ground for granting an order." Mr. Justice Patteson said: "If it was right at the time of passing the Statute 9 Geo. I. c. 7, when all persons received out-door relief, that none should be granted till the overseers had been summoned to show cause, the power, now an extraordinary one, of directing such relief ought not to be exercised without first summoning those on whom the order is to be made." Mr. Justice Williams observed: "It is safest and most consistent with principle that there should be a summons before the order is made"; and Mr. Justice Coleridge, upholding the principle, remarked "The magistrate who certifies ought to have evidence before him. He may believe in the inability; but the applicant may be an impostor." In a later case, in 1851, a difficulty arose out of the use of the description of the justices as "usually acting for the district wherein such union may be situated." Two borough justices made an order directing the guardians of a union which comprised borough and county parishes to administer out-door relief to an aged and infirm pauper in a borough parish. To this, objection was taken on the ground that the order should have been made by justices for the county. Lord Chief Justice Campbell said, "It is clear that the justices were not justices usually acting for the district in which the union is situated, and the order is therefore bad."

Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sections 52 and 54.

190. What you have said relates to Sec. 27 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834; what are the next provisions to which you wish to call attention?—Secs. 52 and 54 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. I will quote these sections on account of their great importance; they are as follows: "LII. And whereas a practice has obtained of giving relief to persons or their families who, at the time of applying for or receiving such relief, were wholly or partially in the employment of individuals, and the relief of the able-bodied and their families is in many places administered in modes productive of evil in other respects: And whereas difficulty may arise in case any immediate and universal remedy is attempted to be applied in the matters aforesaid; Be it further enacted that from and after the passing of this Act, it shall be lawful for the said Commissioners, by such rules, orders, or regulations, as they may think fit, to declare to what extent and for what period the relief to be given to able-bodied persons or to their families in any particular parish or union may be administered out of the workhouse of such parish or union, by payments in money, or with food or clothing in kind, or partly in kind and partly in money, and in what proportions, to what persons or class of persons, at what times and places, on what conditions, and in what manner such outdoor relief may be afforded: and all relief which shall be given by any overseer, guardian, or other person having the control or distribution of the funds of such parish or union, contrary to such orders or regulations, shall be, and the same is hereby declared to be unlawful, and shall be disallowed in the accounts of the person giving the same, subject to the exceptions hereinafter mentioned; Provided always, that in case the overseers or guardians of any parish or union to which such orders or regulations shall be addressed or directed shall, upon consideration of the special circumstances of such parish or union, or of any person or class of persons therein, be of opinion that the application and enforcing of such orders or regulations, or of any part thereof, at the time or in the manner prescribed by the said Commissioners, would be inexpedient, it shall be lawful for such overseers or guardians to delay the operation of such orders or regulations, or of any part thereof, for any period not exceeding the space of thirty days, to be reckoned from the day of the receipt of such orders or regulations; and such overseers or guardians shall, twenty days at the least before the expiration of such thirty days, make a statement and report of such special circumstances to the said Commissioners; and all relief which shall be given by such overseers or guardians, before an answer to such report shall have been returned by the said Commissioners, if otherwise lawful, shall not be deemed unlawful, although the same shall have been given contrary to such orders or regulations, or any of them; but in case the said Commissioners shall disapprove of such delay, or think that for the future such orders or regulations ought to come into operation, notwithstanding the special circumstances alleged by such overseer or guardian, it shall be lawful for the said Commissioners, by a peremptory order to direct that from and after a day to be fixed thereby such orders and regulations, or such parts or modifications thereof as they may think expedient and proper, shall be enforced and observed by such overseers and guardians; and if any allowance be made or relief given by such overseers or guardians after the said last-mentioned period, contrary to any such last-mentioned order, the amount of the relief or allowance so given shall be disallowed in the accounts of the party giving the same: Provided also that a quarterly report of all such cases as shall occur in any quarter shall, at the end of every such quarter, be laid by the said Commissioners before one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State: Provided also, that in case the overseers or guardians of any parish or union in which such orders and regulations shall be in force shall depart from them or any of them in any particular instance or instances of emergency, and shall within fifteen days after every such departure report the same and the grounds thereof to the said Commissioners, and the said Commissioners shall approve of such departure, or if the relief so given shall have been given in food, temporary lodging, or medicine, and shall

have been so reported as aforesaid, then and in either of such cases the relief granted by such overseers or guardians, if otherwise lawful, shall not be unlawful or subject to be disallowed." "LIV. From and after the passing of this Act the ordering, giving, and directing of all relief to the poor of any parish, which, according to the provisions of any of the said recited Acts, or of an Act passed in the first and second years of the reign of His present Majesty, intituled 'An Act for the better regulating of vestries, and for the Appointment of Auditors of Accounts in certain parishes in England and Wales,' or of this Act or of any local Acts, shall be under the government and control of any guardians of the poor, or of any select vestry, and whether forming part of any union or incorporation or not (but subject in all cases to, and saving and excepting the powers of the said Commissioners appointed under this Act), shall appertain and belong exclusively to such guardians of the poor or select vestry, according to the respective provisions of the Acts under which such guardians or select vestry may have been or shall be appointed; and it shall not be lawful for any overseer of the poor to give any further or other relief or allowance from the poor rate than such as shall be ordered by such guardians or select vestry, except in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, in which cases he is hereby required to give such temporary relief as each case shall require, in articles of absolute necessity, but not in money, and whether the applicant for relief be settled in the parish where he shall apply for relief or not; Provided always, that in case such overseer shall refuse or neglect to give such necessary relief in any such case of necessity to poor persons not settled nor usually residing in the parish to which such overseer belongs, it shall and may be lawful for any justice of the peace to order the said overseer, by writing under his hand and seal, to give such temporary relief in articles of absolute necessity as the case shall require, but not in money; and in case such overseer shall disobey such order, he shall, on conviction before two justices, forfeit any sum not exceeding five pounds which such justices shall order: Provided always, that any justice of the peace shall be empowered to give a similar order for medical relief (only) to any parishioner, as well as out-parishioner, where any case of sudden and dangerous illness may require it; and any overseer shall be liable to the same penalties as aforesaid for disobeying such order: But it shall not be lawful for any justice or justices to order relief to any person or persons from the poor rates of any such parish, except as hereinbefore provided."

ents on Law dment 834, 4.

191. Have you any explanations to make about those sections?—Of the two sections, Sec. 54 may be disposed of in few words. The section is one of undoubted importance. It was intended as the ultimate safeguard against the possible danger arising from the failure of the new machinery to reach a case of destitution. Circumstances might take the case out of the cognisance of the relieving officer; but, as a last resource, the assistance of a local officer could always be, invoked. So the legislature imposed upon the overseer the duty of giving temporary relief in kind in cases of sudden and urgent necessity; and in the case of casual poor the duty was made enforceable by a justice's order, which might also extend to medical relief to parishioners or out-parishioners in cases of sudden and dangerous illness.

ents on Law dment 834, 2.

192. What observations do you offer on the other section, that is, Sec. 52?—The 52nd section calls for fuller comment. The general subject-matter of the section is the regulation of outdoor relief to the able-bodied and their families. The first recital records the defects of previous administration. It enumerates (1) a particular defect, and (2) general defects. The particular defect was the practice of giving relief to persons or their families who, at the time, were wholly or partially in the employment of individuals. The general defects were indicated by the statement that the relief of the able-bodied and their families was, in many places, administered in modes productive of evil in other respects. The second recital is specially noteworthy. It is in effect an explanation of the form chosen for much of the substantive enactments of the section. The second recital is, that difficulty may arise in case any immediate and universal remedy is attempted to be applied to the mischiefs recorded in the first recital. Taking the second recital as the key-note to the subsequent part of the section, we find that the safeguards provided against too hasty and too sweeping changes were the following: (1) a check placed in the hands of the Central Authority; (2) a provisional and temporary check available to the local authority. The first check took the form of enabling the Central Authority by their rules, orders, or regulations to declare to what extent and for what period the relief to the able-bodied might be administered out of the workhouse. The second check which the local authority could apply was designed to secure deliberate consideration of special circumstances in particular cases. This check was permissible after the issue of regulations to a Poor Law Union. When these appeared to the guardians to be such as, upon consideration of the special circumstances of the Poor Law Union, or of any person or class therein, to make the application and enforcing of the regulations inexpedient, the guardians might delay the operation for a period not exceeding thirty days. The guardians were to report the special circumstances to the Central Authority. The Central Authority on such a report could make a peremptory order directing that, from and after a fixed day, the regulations or such parts or modifications as they might think expedient and proper should be enforced. The section further recognised that, when regulations were fully in force, it might be necessary to relax their requirements in individual cases. These cases were described as instances of emergency. Departure in such instances was to be reported to the Central Authority. Relief was exempt from disallowance in these circumstances, either if the Central Authority approved of the departure, or if the relief had taken the form of food, temporary lodging or medicine.

Observations of Poor Law Commissioners on Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 52.

193. The Poor Law Commissioners, I understand, made some remarks upon Sec. 52; would you state what they were?—In the second report of the Poor Law Commissioners they point out (page 6) that "In the Poor Law Amendment Bill, as first submitted to the consideration of Parliament, a clause was inserted which directed that all relief to able-bodied paupers out of a workhouse should cease on the 1st of July, 1835. In the progress of the Bill through Parliament the clause was withdrawn, and the Commissioners were charged with the important duty of fixing the time when in each union that provision (which formed the first recommendation of the Commissioners of Poor Law Inquiry, and is in fact the main object of the Poor Law Amendment Act) should take effect. We have not ceased to bear in mind this very important part of our functions, and we have carefully watched the progress made in the districts first formed into unions, for the purpose of ascertaining at what time and to what extent the provision might be enforced in them." The Commissioners then, after recording the limited extent to which they had been able to apply the rule, reiterated the statement that no doubt could be entertained that it was the deliberate intention of Parliament in framing the Poor Law Amendment Act that all outdoor relief to the able-bodied should cease at the earliest period that it could safely and with propriety be put an end to.

Rules of Poor Law Commissioners under Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Secs. 15 and 52.

194. Will you give an account of the proceedings of the Poor Law Commissioners in carrying into effect Sec. 52 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834?—Yes. A few words may be said about the early proceedings of the Poor Law Commissioners under Sec. 52 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, supplemented by the wider enactment as to relief in Sec. 15. In their first report, the Poor Law Commissioners (Appendix, pages 84–86) printed a specimen order. This was of the type first prescribed for the new unions then in process of formation. On it the Commissioners observe (p. 27) that these first regulations were confined to the gradual substitution of relief in kind for relief in money, and to a few simple rules for the regulation of outdoor relief which had been extensively tried and had operated beneficially, but which would not involve a sudden or violent transition from the usual practices in the parishes united. These were elsewhere called preparatory rules. The substance of these rules was as follows: (1) Except in cases of sickness or accident, relief in money was not to be given to able-bodied males in employment on other than parish work; (2) an applicant for parish work was to have one half of his relief in kind; (3) one half of the relief of able-bodied widows or single women

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

was to be in kind; (4) relief by payment of rent was prohibited; and (5) except in cases of accident, sickness, or other urgent necessity, future non-resident relief was prohibited for paupers between sixteen and sixty. Another rule enabled the guardians to give relief to able-bodied males between twenty-one and sixty by way of loan. In their second report, the Poor Law Commissioners gave a form of order specially intended for the requirements of a town union. The chief point in this form of order was the simplification of the requirements in the case of the able-bodied as compared with the preparatory rules applicable to rural unions. The rule with regard to the able-bodied in a town union provided that "the guardians may, until accommodation can be obtained for the reception of such persons in the workhouse, give outdoor relief, one half of which at least shall be in kind: but such relief shall only be given in return for labour at task work."

History of Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order.

By 1839 the Poor Law Commissioners had developed a form of order prohibiting outdoor relief to the able-bodied; and a specimen is given in the appendix to their report of that year on the continuance of the Poor Law Commission and further amendments of the law. In 1842 the Commissioners made a further advance. In that year, on the 2nd of August, they issued a general order based upon the rules which they had previously issued to rural unions with respect to outdoor relief; and in 1844, on the 21st of December, they substituted an amended version in the form of the general order which is now in force and which is generally known as the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order.

History of Out-Door Relief Regulation Order.

195. What is the history of the regulations applicable to town unions?—As regards town unions, the Poor Law Commissioners left to their successors, the Poor Law Board, the work of codifying for general use the rules from time to time issued for the regulation of outdoor relief. The Poor Law Board made an attempt in this direction on the 25th of August, 1852. The main features of this order were the requirement by Article 1, that one-third at least of the relief to the helpless, or widows with dependants and one-half at least of the relief to the able-bodied should be in kind; the absolute prohibition by Article 5 of relief to any able-bodied male while employed for wages or other hire or remuneration; and the provision that every able-bodied male should be set to work by the guardians. To these should be added Article 10, which was as follows: "Provided always that in case the guardians of any of the said parishes or unions depart in any particular instance from any of the regulations hereinbefore contained (except those contained in Article 3) and within fifteen days after such departure report the same and the grounds thereof to the Poor Law Board, and the Poor Law Board approve of such departure, then the relief granted in such particular instance shall, if otherwise lawful, not be deemed to be unlawful." These requirements and provisions aroused much opposition. In the result, the General Order was rescinded, and the General Order which is now in force and is usually known as the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order, was issued on the 14th of December, 1852. In this order the Poor Law Board retained the prohibition of relief to able-bodied males in employment, and the requirement that able-bodied males should be set to work while in receipt of relief; but they modified Article 1 by confining it to able-bodied male persons and substituted a less stringent provision for Article 10.

Description of Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order.

196. Now I think you wish to give us an account of the chief provisions of the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order and of the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order?—Yes. I assume that I may hand in these Orders, and therefore my remarks on them will be practically confined to the enumeration of heads. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. I (*c*) and (*d*)). Taking first the General Prohibitory Order, I may point out that the three main divisions of the order are those which concern (1) The restriction of outdoor relief to the able-bodied; (2) the restriction of non-resident relief; and (3) the restriction of payment of rent. Under the first head Article 1 has to be noted. By this Article every able-bodied person, male or female, and the resident and unemployed members of the person's family must be relieved only in the workhouse. Exceptions to this rule are:—Sudden and urgent necessity; sickness, accident or infirmity; burials; widows in the first six months of widowhood; widows with legitimate children as dependants and with no illegitimate children since widowhood; imprisonment; family of soldiers, sailors or marines; and resident family of non-resident head. In the second division, Article 3 deals with non-resident relief. The prohibition is subject to the following exceptions:—casual poor; sickness, accident or infirmity; relief under justices' orders; widows in the first six months of widowhood; widow non-resident at husband's death, having legitimate children as dependants and no illegitimate children since widowhood; children under sixteen in outside workhouses or schools; and family of non-resident and not able-bodied head. Under the third heading, I note the prohibition in Article 5 of the payment of rent, with an exception for shelter procured in case of sudden and urgent necessity or mental imbecility. Provisions subordinate to the foregoing relate to the evidence required where out-door relief is given on account of sickness, accident or infirmity (Article 2), to constructive widowhood (Article 4) and to relief by way of loan (Article 7). Lastly, the order provides for the report and approval of departures.

197. What you have told us related to the Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order; now we come to the Out-Door Relief Regulation Order. Are we to understand that the Regulation Order superseded the Prohibitory Order?—No, one is the rural order, or rather the order applicable to the less populous centres, and the other is the town order—the present representative of the old town order.

198. Which is the town order?—The Out-Door Relief Regulation Order, which is the descendant of the town order of the Poor Law Commissioners.

199. Is the other order applicable to rural districts?—Yes, and also to many towns. It is the descendant of the original preparatory rules of the Poor Law Commissioners.

Description of Out-Door Relief Regulation Order.

200. Will you now please summarise the Regulation Order?—The Out-Door Relief Regulation Order roughly analysed is as follows: Article 1 requires one-half of the out-door relief of able-bodied males to be given in kind. Article 2 requires relief for more than a week to be administered weekly or at more frequent periods. Article 3 prohibits the establishment of an applicant in business, the redemption of articles from pawn, the purchase of tools or other articles, except clothing, bedding, and articles of absolute necessity, the payment of conveyance expenses, except under lawful authority and except in certain specified cases, and the payment of rent, except where shelter is procured in case of sudden or urgent necessity, or mental imbecility. Article 4 prohibits non-resident relief with these exceptions:—casual poor, sickness, accident, or infirmity, widows non-resident at husband's death having legitimate children as dependants and no illegitimate children since widowhood, children under sixteen in outside workhouses or schools, and family of non-resident head. Article 5 prohibits relief to able-bodied males while in employment. Article 6 requires every able-bodied male to be set to work and to be kept employed so long as he receives relief. To these last two rules there are exceptions. The exceptions are enumerated in Article 7, and are:—sudden and urgent necessity; sickness, accident, or infirmity; burials; family of prisoner; and family of non-resident. Article 8 requires the guardians to report arrangements for employment of the able-bodied. Article 9 relates to relief by way of loan. Article 10 relates to departures, and is in these terms: 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 Article 8), 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.

201. Is there a substantial difference between the two orders?—The first is the much more strict of the two orders.

202. The first is applicable, as I understand, to rural districts?—It is applicable to the larger area of England and Wales. The other is applicable to London and the populous centres.

oor
r Test.

203. Now we come to deal with the out-door labour test; what have you to say on that?—In the 9th report of the Poor Law Commissioners (Appendix B, Nos. 2 and 3, pages 379–386) will be found an example of an Out-Door Labour Order followed by a minute explaining the views of the Commissioners on the means of enforcing an out-door labour test. At the same time, in the body of their report they expressed the opinion that an out-door labour test is valuable as a substitute for an efficient workhouse or as supplementary to such an establishment. At a later date, Parliament recognised the expediency of the out-door labour test by providing a remedy for one of the difficulties to which the Commissioners had alluded, namely, refusal to work. Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867 (29 and 30 Vic. c. 113), is in these terms: "When the guardians of any union or parish shall prescribe a task of work to be performed by any poor person to whom or to whose wife (if he be liable to maintain such wife) or child, whether legitimate or illegitimate, under the age of sixteen, relief shall have been lawfully granted by such guardians out of the workhouse, such task being suited to the age, sex, strength, and capacity of such person and being of a nature and description of which the Poor Law Board shall have previously approved, and such person shall refuse or wilfully neglect to perform such task, or shall wilfully destroy or damage any of the tools, materials, or other property belonging to the said guardians, he shall be deemed to be an idle and disorderly person within the meaning of the eighty-third chapter of the statute of the fifth year of King George the Fourth and shall be liable to be prosecuted and punished in the manner therein provided in respect of idle and disorderly persons, and the fifty-ninth section of the one hundred and first chapter of the statute of the seventh and eighth years of her present Majesty shall apply to any such prosecution."

Door
ur Test
s.

204. Can you give us an account of the object and form of the Out-Door Labour Test Orders?—The modern form of the Out-Door Labour Test Order is designed to operate in Poor Law unions to which the Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order applies, and in effect authorises a relaxation of that order on the lines of the Out-door Relief Regulation Order. The Out-door Labour Test Order, in fact, deals with cases in which the Local Government Board approve of departure from the order of 1844, and annexes to such cases the following conditions, namely, (1) Half at least of the relief given to the pauper shall be given in food, clothing, and other articles of necessity; (2) no pauper shall receive relief while employed for remuneration; and (3) every pauper relieved shall be set to work by the guardians. The guardians are to report the arrangements for work. They are also to report departures from the Out-door Labour Test Order.

f to Men
rike:—
Case of
rney
ral v.
rdians of
thyr
l Union.

205. There was a leading case arising, I believe, recently out of the circumstances to which an Out-door Labour Test Order had been applied; have you anything to say about that case?—An order of this type was in force in the Merthyr Tydfil Union, when in 1898 a strike of colliers occurred, and as a consequence persons who were not colliers were thrown out of employment. Labour yards were established, and the necessitous workmen and their families were relieved. The guardians were aware that work was offered to the strikers in neighbouring collieries, and that they would not accept it. An action was brought by the Attorney-General at the relation of the Powell Dyffryn Steam Coal Co., Limited, against the Guardians of the Merthyr Tydfil Union (Law Reports, 1900, 1 Chancery 516; 69 Law Journal, Chancery, 299; 82 Law Times, New Series, 662); and at the trial the plaintiffs asked a declaration that the establishment and maintenance by the defendants of labour yards or relief works for the purpose of providing out-door relief for able-bodied persons, to the knowledge of the defendants otherwise able to maintain themselves and their families, and the expenditure by the defendants of parts of the common fund of the union for the purpose of relieving such able-bodied persons and their families, constituted a breach of the statutory duties of the defendants as guardians. The action was dismissed by the Chancery Division, but the Court of Appeal discharged the judgment of the court below, and declared that the payment by the defendants out of the poor rates of any money for setting to work or for the relief of able-bodied men, who were at the time able to obtain and perform work at wages sufficient to support themselves (and their wives and families, if any) was unlawful and ought to be disallowed by the auditor on auditing the defendants' accounts. The declaration, however, did not include relief given to or for the wives and children of these men.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

206. I believe you have a copy of the Judgment of the Master of the Rolls with you; would you call our attention to the more important passages in it?—The Master of the Rolls, in giving judgment, said, "Under the Poor Law Statutes passed before 1834, the only persons entitled to relief out of the poor rates were those described in the 43 Elizabeth c. 2, under three heads, namely, (1) The children of parents unable to keep and maintain them; (2) such persons who, having no means to maintain themselves, used no ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by; (3) the lame, impotent, old, blind and such others as were poor and not able to work. The first of these classes were to be relieved by being set to work. The third class were to be relieved without work. Omitting children and speaking only of adults, the older statutes drew a broad distinction between, first, the impotent poor, that is, the poor unable to work who were to be relieved without work, and, secondly, the able-bodied poor, that is the poor able to work but unable to maintain themselves. These were to be relieved, but only by being set to work . . . . I can find nothing in the statutes before 1834 which entitled an able-bodied person having the means of supporting himself, to obtain relief from the parish authorities by being set to work or otherwise. . . . The short effect of the poor laws before 1834 I understand to have been as follows: (1) No one who was starving could be lawfully refused relief, whether he was in that state by his own fault or not; (2) poor persons physically unable to work were entitled to relief out of the rates without being set to work; (3) poor persons physically able to work, but who could not obtain work, were entitled to relief by having work found for them at the expense of the ratepayers, if no other work could be found; (4) poor persons physically able to work were not entitled to relief in any other way; (5) but poor persons able to work and able to procure it might, by refusing to work, become so weak as to be no longer able to work, in which case they became entitled to relief out of the rates and, at the same time, liable to imprisonment. This was an anomaly, for it enabled a person to obtain a legal advantage by his own wrong-doing. The anomaly was justified on grounds of humanity. The penalty for refusing to work was imprisonment, not death by starvation. . . . I cannot find anything in the Act of 1834, or in any later Act which has enlarged the class of persons entitled to relief under the former statutes. I can find no section which entitles able-bodied persons to support out of the rates, if they can obtain work and can support themselves and their families if they choose to do so." The Master of the Rolls next considered whether the Poor Law Commissioners could authorise relief to be given to persons not entitled to demand it, and to what extent this power, if it exists, can be exercised by the Local Government Board. "I cannot," he said, "arrive at the conclusion that the Commissioners appointed under 4 and 5 William IV., c. 76, to carry out the improvements made by it are empowered to extend the scope of the Poor Law Statutes by their application to persons not entitled to relief under them." Further, the Master of the Rolls found nothing in the regulations which purported to authorise the granting of relief to persons not entitled to it. Then having examined the facts of the particular case, he went on, "I draw no distinction between strikers and other able-bodied men who can support themselves but who will not. There is no difference, so far as the poor law is concerned, either for better or for worse, between men on strike and other men who can but will not support themselves. To use the rates to support strikers or any other persons able to support themselves is, in my opinion, illegal, although, rather than let even such persons starve, relief may be given to them when physically unable to work."

Extracts from judgment in *Attorney General* v. *Guardians of Merthyr Tydfil Union.*

Points arising out of *Attorney General* v. *Guardians of Merthyr Tydfil Union.*

207. (*Mr. Loch.*) Does that judgment cover the question of the children and the wives?—The relief given to the children and the wives, although, as I think the Master of

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

the Rolls said, there was an impropriety in relieving them indirectly through the strikers, was held to be legal.

208. It was actually held to be legal?—Yes.

209. Was it under the Act of Queen Elizabeth?—The relief was given under one of the regulations. It was the validity of the regulations that was then under discussion. On the regulations, the Master of the Rolls made his remarks respecting the title to relief under the Poor Relief Act, 1601.

210. Then it was not decided under the section in Queen Elizabeth's Act, by which children can be maintained if their parents are unable to maintain them?—No, it was not decided only with reference to that Act. It was after upholding the regulations that the Master of the Rolls dealt with the case of the children.

211. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Did that case go to the House of Lords?—I ask that because in Scotland we may not give relief to the able-bodied at all, and that is due to a decision of the House of Lords given about 1850?—This case did not go to the House of Lords; it stopped at the Court of Appeal.

212. (*Mr. Loch.*) By the regulations do you mean the orders of the Local Government Board?—Yes. There were two orders in force at Merthyr Tydfil at the time. The main order was the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order; the second was an Out-door Labour Test Order. The combined effect of the two orders was considered by the Master of the Rolls in that case.

213. And his judgment had to do with those orders, but not with the law behind those orders?—Except that he went into the law behind the orders for the purpose of the interpretation of the orders.

214. (*Chairman.*) To put it in another way, the legality of the regulations was not questioned?—It was not. The Master of the Rolls actually said that the regulations were quite sound, inasmuch as they did not purport to authorise allowances to any persons except those who are entitled to relief. So far, he upheld the orders.

215. (*Mr. Loch.*) Am I to conclude from that, that practically the regulations have superseded the section in Queen Elizabeth's Act which refers to children?—The judgment shows that the regulations did not and could not supersede the Statute by enlarging the class of persons entitled to relief. Are you thinking of the Statute of Elizabeth so far as it refers to the setting to work or apprenticeship of children?

216. I am referring to the children being relieved if their parents are unable to maintain them?—I think then that the regulations harmonised with the Statute of Elizabeth, because they contained nothing at all counter to the claim of the children to be relieved as being entitled under that Statute.

217. Would the stress now be laid entirely on the order and not on the Statute in any case that arose?—The order could not authorise a payment in respect of a child who could not be relieved under the Statute of Elizabeth.

218. (*Chairman.*) As I understand it, the regulations were issued under the general statutory powers given to the Local Government Board, and those regulations did not allow this particular form of relief to be given?—That is so; they did not recognise as proper recipients of relief these people who could obtain work and did not.

219. And the action of the Attorney-General was taken on the regulations?—The action involved the consideration of their validity.

220. (*Mr. Loch.*) This man being an able-bodied man with dependants?—Yes, but the relief to the dependants was upheld by the court.

221. On the basis of the order?—I think the Master of the Rolls said the source through which the relief was administered was an improper one, or something to that effect.

Refusal to work:—The Case of *Poplar Guardians* v. *Martin.*

222. (*Chairman.*) There has been a subsequent judgment, has there not, to which you would like to call our attention?—Yes; it may be well to draw attention to another judicial decision which bears upon the present state of the law with regard to the refusal of work. An able-bodied person of 39, after admission to a workhouse, was taken with other inmates to a farm colony of the Salvation Army. By the terms of the agreement with the guardians, the pauper could have started work at the colony on probation, receiving as remuneration his food and lodging and sixpence a week in the nature of pocket money. If, after two or three weeks, he had been employed upon brickwork, he could have earned 4½d. a yard for digging clay, and at this rate it was possible for some men to earn 30s. a week. The pauper was told to go to work in the brickfield. The terms were explained, and he was asked to sign an undertaking to conform to the rules of the colony; but he refused to work upon the terms as explained or to sign the undertaking, and left the colony and again became chargeable. The magistrate before whom the man was charged as an idle and disorderly person under Sec. 3 of the Vagrancy Act, 1824, at a second hearing considered the conditions in the agreement which the pauper was required to sign. These would have bound the pauper to discourage entry on premises where intoxicating liquors were sold, to attend meetings in the form of a church parade, and some place of worship once on Sunday. The magistrate held that these were not reasonable conditions to be attached to the employment, and that the pauper was justified in refusing the work. The appeal against the magistrate's decision was dismissed by the High Court. The Lord Chief Justice said: "If a man goes to a colony of this kind, I do not think it unreasonable that he should be asked to report himself, or to attend meetings, or to put himself under certain restrictions as to intoxicating liquors, but when we are dealing with a criminal offence, that is not the test which we ought to apply. It being necessary to draw the line at some point, I think that the conditions imposed should be conditions which affect the man's work; and if the terms on which he is offered work are reasonable with reference to the work which he is called on to do, we ought to hesitate before holding that he was justified in refusing to do work offered him on such conditions. Instances of reasonable conditions are easy to suggest; for instance, to come to his work at certain hours, to obey orders relating to his work, to observe the hours for meals, to conduct himself properly during working hours and in connection with his work. But I doubt whether in considering a question arising under Sec. 3, we have a right to say that the Court may regard conditions which are imposed on a man and made obligatory on him, but which have no relation to his work at all." Mr. Justice Kennedy and Mr. Justice Ridley concurred. That was the case of the Poplar Guardians *v.* Martin (74 Law Journal, King's Bench, 306; Law Reports, 1905, 1 King's Bench, 728; 92 Law Times, New Series, 197; 53 Weekly Reporter, 398).

Minutes of Central Authority as to Out-Door Relief.

223. I understand it is the practice of the Central Authority to give expression to their views on out-door relief in published minutes; perhaps you can give us some references in connection with these?—The Central Authority have in some instances embodied their views in published minutes. The first to which I may draw attention is a minute of the Poor Law Board of the 20th of November, 1869. It relates to the metropolis and discusses the separate limits of the Poor Law and of charity, and how it is possible to secure joint action between the two. The principle of co-operation is advocated in the following suggestions:—"In all those cases where the Board of Guardians are granting relief—and in all such cases the relief must, by law, be adequate—the almoners of charities should abstain from giving food or money, or supplying any such articles as the guardians are themselves strictly bound to grant, and especially from giving their charity in such a manner as would constitute a regular increase of income. If the charitable agencies wish to interpose at all in such cases they should confine their assistance to donations of bedding or clothing or any similar articles which the guardians may not consider themselves bound to provide at a particular moment and which can be easily distinguished from other relief." On the 2nd of December, 1871, the Local Government Board addressed an instructional letter to their inspectors with a view to bringing about general improvement as well as greater uniformity in the administration of relief throughout the country. The Board considered the increase in the cost of out-door relief so great as to excite apprehension. The result of the inquiries of the Board led them to the conclusion. (1) That out-door relief was granted too readily; (2) that there was a great diversity of practice in its administration; and (3) that in numerous instances there was

Instructional letter to Inspectors.

disregard of the advantages of the offer of in-door in preference to out-door relief. The inspectors were requested to bring a series of recommendations under the notice of the guardians. These recommendations were in brief as follows:—(1) That out-door relief should not be granted to single able-bodied men or women; (2) that out-door relief should not, except in special cases, be granted to a deserted wife during the first twelve months after desertion or to an able-bodied widow with one child; (3) that in the case of an able-bodied widow with more than one child it might be preferable to take one or more of the children into the workhouse; (4) that where the Prohibitory Order is in force, the Workhouse test should be strictly applied; (5) that out-door relief should be granted for a fixed period not exceeding in any case three months; (6) that orders for the labour yard should only be given from week to week; (7) that out-door relief should not be granted without a relieving officer's visit to the home; (8) that the relieving officer should be required to make visits (*a*) at least fortnightly in cases of temporary sickness and relief in the labour yard; and (*b*) once a quarter in old and infirm cases; (9) that the provisions for compulsory maintenance of paupers by relations should be more generally acted upon; (10) that the recommendations of medical officers for meat and stimulants should be accompanied by reports; and (11) that in the most populous unions the appointment of inspectors of out-relief might be expedient. The Local Government Board, in a memorandum dated February, 1878, stated that the consideration and application of these rules had not been without effect. The Board gave facts and figures in support of this statement.

224. (*Mr. Loch*). Would the minutes you are going to hand in include the minutes of the Local Government Board with regard to out-door relief?—I am thinking particularly of the approval of what are called the Manchester rules, and so on. As you are aware, certain approvals were given to methods of conducting out-door relief which appear in the reports of the Local Government Board, and I have thought that those were in the nature of minutes?—They are not included in my evidence.

225. They are important, because they give, at any rate, the rules which approved themselves at the time to the Board's advisers?—The Manchester Rules are set out in the Memorandum of February, 1878.

226. (*Chairman*). Perhaps you would hand those in as illustrations?—Yes, I will hand in an Extract from the Memorandum. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. I (*c*).)

227. Are there not a great many other documents to the same purpose?—Not formal pronouncements such as were those which I quoted. The first is, I might say, almost a famous circular.

228. Is that not what is known as Mr. Goschen's circular?—Yes.

port of
ect Com-
ttee of
use of
rds in 1888.

229. Now I think you wish to give a brief account of a report of a Select Committee in a recent year on this subject?—In 1888 the House of Lords appointed a Select Committee to inquire as to the various powers now in possession of the Poor Law guardians, and their adequacy to cope with distress that may from time to time exist in the Metropolis and other populous places; and also as to the expediency of concerted action between the Poor Law authorities and voluntary agencies for the relief of distress. The substance of the report, which bears the date of the 30th of July, 1888, is as follows: The powers of the guardians were adequate; the restriction of out-door relief to operate without hardship to the poor depended on the organised active co-operation of charity with the Poor Law authorities; objection was taken to small weekly doles of insufficient amount in the case of the aged and infirm of respectable character; labour yards should only be opened in cases where, on account of exceptional distress, the ordinary workhouse accommodation is insufficient to meet an emergency; so-called relief works undertaken by public bodies or charitable associations were regarded by the Committee as open to most serious objections as part of a regular system of relief during the winter months; industrial villages or pauper farms, apart from practical difficulties, would lead to a widespread belief that it is the business of the Government to provide work at suitable wages for all who apply to it for employment; the powers of the guardians with respect to emigration appeared to be sufficient. The report also referred to casual wards and dealing with casual paupers; paupers frequently entering and leaving workhouses; Poor Law infirmaries; the education of children; transfer of parental rights to guardians; prosecutions for cruelty; the expediency of the concerted action mentioned in the reference; uniformity of procedure; and attachment of pensions from private sources.

230. Was any action taken on that report?—There has been legislation in the direction of some of the recommendations. An example will be found in the Poor Law Acts of 1889 and 1899 transferring parental rights to guardians.

Officers employed for Out-Door Relief.

231. Now will you give us some account of the duties of the officers employed for the purposes of out-door relief; take first the case of the district medical officer?—Taking first the case of the district medical officer, I note that the Poor Law Commissioners seem to have considered that medical relief was rather the outcome of practice than a creation of the law. But however this may have been; their earliest orders made provision on the subject, and those orders contain the germs of some of the regulations which apply at the present day to this matter. With regard to the duties of the district medical officer, it is to be noted that the General Consolidated Order contains regulations which are applicable to every medical officer appointed by the guardians, and supplements these by codes of duties specially appropriate to the distinctive classes, "district medical officer" and "workhouse medical officer." The common duties are prescribed by Article 205, and are in substance these: To give the guardians reasonable information respecting cases under his care; to make written reports on prevalent sickness; to attend meetings when requested; to give certificates as to proposed apprentices; to give certificates of the cause of attendance in individual cases; to use in his books the technology of the registrar general; and to distinguish visits paid by an assistant from his own. The duties of a district medical officer so far as they depend upon the General Consolidated Orders are defined by Article 206 and are as follows: (1) To attend duly and punctually upon all poor persons requiring medical attendance within the district of the union assigned to him, and, according to his agreement, to supply the requisite medicines to such persons whenever he may be lawfully required to furnish such attendance or medicines by a written or printed order of the guardians or of a relieving officer of the Union or of an overseer; (2) on the exhibition to him of a ticket according to Article 76 (that is, the ticket issued by the guardians in the cases of aged and infirm persons, and persons permanently sick or disabled) and on application made on behalf of the party to whom such ticket was given, to afford such medical attendance and medicines as he would be bound to supply if he had received in each case an order from the guardians to afford such attendance and medicines; (3) to inform the relieving officer of any poor person whom he may attend without an order; and (4) to make a return to the guardians at each ordinary meeting, and to insert therein the date of every attendance, and the other particulars required . . . Provided, however, that the medical officer may, with the consent of the guardians, but not otherwise, make the entries . . . on detached sheets of paper . . . and cause the same to be laid before the guardians at every ordinary meeting.

Duties of District Medical Officer.

Duties of Relieving Officer.

232. Now will you state the duties of the relieving officer?—The General Consolidated Order in Article 215 prescribes the duties of the relieving officer in the following terms: (1) To attend all ordinary meetings of the guardians, and to attend all other meetings when summoned by the clerk. (2) To receive all applications for relief made to him within his district, or relating to any parish situated within his district, and forthwith to examine into the circumstances of every case by visiting the house of the applicant (if situated within his district) and by making all necessary inquiries into the state of health, the ability to work, the condition and family, and the means of such applicant, and to report the result of such inquiries in the prescribed form to the guardians at their next ordinary meeting; and also to visit, from time to time, as requisite, all paupers receiving relief and to report concerning the same as the guardians may direct. (3) In any case of sickness or accident requiring relief by medical attendance, to procure such attendance

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

by giving an order on the district medical officer. . . or by such other means as the urgency of the case may require. (4) To ascertain from time to time from the district medical officer, the names of any poor persons whom such medical officer may have attended or supplied with medicines without having received an order from himself to that effect. (5) In every case of a poor person receiving medical relief, as soon as may be, and from time to time afterwards, to visit the house of such person, and until the next ordinary meeting of the guardians to supply such relief (not being in money) as the case on his own view, or on the certificate of the district medical officer, may seem to require. (6) In every case of sudden or urgent necessity to afford such relief to the destitute person as may be requisite, either by giving such person an order of admission into the workhouse, and conveying him thereto if necessary, or by affording him relief out of the workhouse, provided that the same be not given in money, whether such destitute person be settled in any parish comprised in the Union or not. (7) To report to the guardians at their next ordinary meeting all cases reported to him by an overseer . . . and to obey the directions of the guardians with reference to the relief administered in such cases. (8) To perform the duties with respect to pauper apprentices prescribed by Articles 60, 61, and 62 of the General Consolidated Order; the duties being to examine into the fitness of a proposed binding, and to take the child for examination by the district medical officer. (9) To give all reasonable aid and assistance, at the request of any other relieving officer of the Union, by examining into the case of any applicant for relief, or administering relief to any pauper whose name has been entered on the books of such other relieving officer and who may be within his own district. (10) Duly and punctually to supply the weekly allowances of all paupers belonging to his district, or being within the same, and to pay or administer the relief of all paupers within his district to the amount, and in the manner in which he may have been lawfully ordered by the guardians to pay or administer the same. (11) To visit, relieve, and otherwise attend to non-settled poor being within his district, according to the directions of the guardians, whose officer he is, and in no other way, subject always to the obligation imposed on him in cases of sudden and urgent necessity. (12) To set apart one or more pages in his out-door relief list, in which he shall duly and punctually enter up the payments made by authority of his own board of guardians to non-settled poor, and to take credit for such payments in his receipt and expenditure book. (13) To present his weekly accounts to the clerk for his inspection and authentication before every ordinary meeting of the guardians and to the guardians at such meeting for their approval. (14) To submit to the auditor of the union all his books, accounts, and vouchers, at the place of audit, and at such time and in such manner as may be required by the regulations. (16) To observe and execute all lawful orders and directions of the guardians applicable to his office.

Duties of Superintendeat of Out-Door Labour.

233. Next we come to the superintendent of out-door labour; what are his functions?—A superintendent of out-door labour is to superintend any able-bodied paupers not inmates of the workhouse, who may be set to work by the guardians, to take care that they perform the work respectively assigned to them, and to report truly to the guardians respecting the performance of the work.

Duties of District Nurse.

234. Now we come to the district nurse; what are her duties?—A district nurse has under a general order of the 27th of January, 1892, the following duties, that is to say: (1) To attend duly and punctually as a nurse upon any poor person or persons in receipt of medical relief when directed by the guardians, or upon receipt of a written or printed order from any relieving officer in any case in which such officer may be authorised by regulations to be prescribed by the guardians to give such order. (2) To obey any directions of the district medical officer in attendance upon any poor person in regard to the nursing and treatment of such person. (3) To keep a record in such form and containing such particulars as may be prescribed by the guardians in regard to cases which she attends. (4) To perform such other duties in relation to her office as the guardians may from time to time direct. No district nurse is to undertake the duties of a mid-wife.

Duties of Overseers.

235. Now will you describe the duties of the overseers?—With regard to overseers, whose duties in the administration of relief are statutory, a General Order of the 22nd of April, 1842, contains the following provisions:—(Article 1.) If any overseer of the poor of any parish shall, in any case of sudden and urgent necessity, have given temporary relief to any poor person in articles of necessity; or in any case of sudden and dangerous illness, shall have given an order for medical relief, the said overseer shall forthwith report such case in writing to the relieving officer of the district or to the board of guardians of the union, and the amount of such relief or the fact of having made such order. (Article 2.) If any overseer of the poor of the parish receive an order under the hands and seal of two justices according to the provisions of the said Act (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 27) directing relief to be given to any aged or infirm person, without such person being required to reside in any workhouse, he shall forthwith transmit the same to the relieving officer of the district to be laid before the guardians at their next meeting, that they may be enabled without delay to give to the relieving officer the necessary directions as to the nature and amount of relief to be given. (Article 3.) If any overseer receive an order for medical relief from any justice in case of sudden and dangerous illness, he shall, as soon as may be after complying with such order, report the fact of his having received the same, and the manner in which he has complied with it, in writing to the relieving officer of the district or to the board of guardians of the union.

Boarding-of Childre

236. That finishes, I think, all you have to say about the staff of officers connected with out-door relief; and now we come to the subject of the boarding-out of children. That, I understand, is a form of out-door relief; will you please describe it?—Under the head "Out-Door Relief" it may be desirable to advert to the system of relief in the form of placing pauper children in homes belonging to persons who undertake to act as foster-parents. This system is controlled by orders of the Local Government Board, and the orders are made under the general powers derived from Section 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. The titles of the orders are the Boarding of Children in Unions Order, 1889, and in succession to another order of 1889, the recently issued Boarding-out Order, 1905. Each order contemplates the working of the scheme through the medium of a committee who will undertake to find and superintend homes for pauper children. Such account as it seems to be necessary to give of the details of the system may be most conveniently taken from the latest form of order, namely, that of 1905. The foster-parent who receives a child under the orders is required to give an undertaking that in consideration of a weekly sum he will bring up the child as one of his own children, provide the child with proper food, lodging, and washing, endeavour to train the child in habits of truthfulness, obedience, personal cleanliness, and industry, take care that the child attends church or chapel and school, provide for repair and renewal of the child's clothing, report the child's illness, and permit the child to be visited and the home to be inspected. The undertaking of the foster-parent must also contain an engagement on the part of the foster-parent that he will on the demand of a person duly authorised in writing by the Boarding-out Committee or by the guardians give up possession of the child. A system of which the main features have thus been very briefly indicated necessarily requires somewhat elaborate arrangements for working it.

237. (*Mr. Loch.*) What is the particular advance that has been made in the 1905 order?—I think it has been mainly in the correction of minor details, one might say. I do not recall any great departure in principle.

238. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Are not adopted children included under that?—The authority for adoption is derived not from the Order but from the two Poor Law Acts of 1889 and 1899.

239. But under the recent order is not power given to board out adopted children—a power which was not previously given?—I cannot say that I carry all the details in my memory; that very likely is so.

240. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) May I ask if you may not board out where the parents are morally bad but have not been convicted of crime?—The suggestion is that the case is included.

Powers of Guardian relation t Children.

241. (*Chairman.*) There are certain powers that boards of guardians have over these children; are there any

legal points connected with these powers to which you would like to call our attention?—I would take the opportunity of drawing attention at this stage to a difficulty which arises out of the uncertainty of the guardians' powers over children whom they relieve. The matter may be mentioned now somewhat appropriately because the only judicial decision which throws any light at all on this subject arose out of proceedings before the High Court against a foster-parent. The Poor Law Commissioners at one time took the view that the guardians had over orphan children or children deserted by their parents the same control which a guardian has over his ward; but the only judicial authority which approximated to a recognition of this theory was perhaps the deduction to be drawn from what the Court of Queen's Bench said in The Queen v. Anon.) (15 Queen's Bench, 1060.) There a child of six was found wandering. The child appeared to be destitute and to have been assaulted and very ill-used. The child was received into the workhouse, and the guardians afterwards undertook the prosecution of the offender. Undoubtedly the Court said that in the circumstances the guardians were *in loco parentis*, and that as guardians they were bound to protect a destitute child. But something more than this was obviously necessary to supersede an opinion given to the Commissioners in 1840 by the Law Officers who advised that the guardians could not lawfully detain orphans or other children deprived of parental care, unless the children consented. It appeared at one time that as the result of procedure under the Boarding of Children in Unions Order, 1889, there was a likelihood of obtaining a definite exposition by the High Court of the scope of the guardians' authority.

242. Can you give any particulars of the case which came before the High Court, to which you are referring?—The case to which I refer is that of the Queen *v.* Dunhill or Durmill, *re* Tate. It has not been fully reported; but an account of it appears in the *Times* of the 24th of April and the 31st of May, 1899. According to that account, the question sought to be raised was whether the guardians have the rights of a testamentary guardian over a child under fourteen who had been placed in a home with a foster-parent. A female child, then seven and a-half years old, had been placed in a home belonging to the defendant. He was the uncle of the child's deceased mother, but the child was illegitimate. The defendant, by his agreement with the guardians, had undertaken to give up the child upon demand to any person duly authorised to receive her. The child remained with the defendant until she was thirteen. The guardians then procured a situation for her and required the defendant to deliver her up. The defendant refused to do so. The guardians obtained a writ of *habeas corpus* and moved to attach the defendant for disobedience. The official solicitor had reported to the Queen's Bench Division on the case, and when the case came before Mr. Justice Grantham and Mr. Justice Kennedy, they thought that the circumstances, including the age of the defendant (84) were such as to make it desirable that some arrangement should be arrived at. No arrangement, however, was made and the case came again before the Divisional Court, which consisted on that occasion of Mr. Justice Day and Mr. Justice Lawrence. The court then made the rule absolute for an attachment; but the want of a full report makes it unsafe to draw any definite conclusion from this result.

243. But what is your inference from that case?—So far as deduction is permissible, it would seem that the guardians are in a position to assert the right to custody against an unauthorised person. It may be questioned whether as against the child their rights extend further than the law officers of 1840 thought. At the same time it may be pointed out that under the Poor Law Act, 1899, the guardians may clothe themselves with parental rights in certain circumstances. Thus where a child is maintained by the guardians of a poor law union, and (i.) The child has been deserted by its parent; or (ii). The guardians are of opinion that by reason of mental deficiency or of vicious habits or mode of life, a parent of the child is unfit to have the control of it; or (iii.) A parent is unable to perform his or her parental duties by reason of being under sentence of penal servitude or of being detained under the Inebriates Act, 1898; or (iv.) a parent of the child has been sentenced to imprisonment in respect of any offence against any of his or her children; or (v.) a parent of the child is permanently bedridden or disabled and is the inmate of a workhouse, and consents to the resolution hereinafter mentioned; or (vi.) both the parents, or in the case of an illegitimate child the mother of the child are or is dead; the guardians may at any time resolve that until the child reaches the age of eighteen years all the rights and powers of such parent as aforesaid, or, if both parents are dead, of the parents in respect of the child shall, subject as in the Act mentioned, vest in the guardians, and thereupon those rights and powers shall so vest accordingly, and shall continue so vested whether the child does or does not continue to be maintained by the guardians. The measure of control to be obtained under this enactment is probably as great as the circumstances require; for Section 2 affords a fairly clear indication that the control is intended to be effective even against the will of the child. That section subjects, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding £20 any person who (*a*) knowingly assists directly or indirectly a child who has been placed under the control of the guardians to leave, without the consent of the guardians, the place where the child is under that control; or (*b*) knowingly induces, directly or indirectly, any such child to leave that place; or (*c*) knowingly harbours or conceals a child who has so left that place or prevents him from returning to that place. A child is to be deemed to be maintained by the guardians if it is wholly or partly maintained by them in a workhouse, or in any district school, separate school, separate infirmary, sick asylum, hospital for infectious diseases, institutions for the deaf, dumb, blind or idiots, or any certified school, or is boarded out by the guardians whether within or without the limits of the union (Poor Law Act, 1889, Sec. 1, Sub-Sec. 3).

244. I gather that in your judgment you do not think the law requires strengthening or rather defining on these points?—Of course, after all, that is a somewhat special class of children. It would only include the children who would come within those two Acts, or what is left of Sec. 1 of the Poor Law Act of 1889 and the Poor Law Act of 1899; but there are other children over whom the guardians might have control and as to whom the law is, I think, in a state of uncertainty. We have had instances of the sort—instances for example where the guardians have endeavoured to find a place of service for children and they have been met point blank by a refusal on the part of the boys or the girls to go to the place. Then there are other cases where the children have run away from the workhouse or have taken an opportunity of getting away.

245. Then you would say that the law is not as clear as you think it should be?—I do not think the law is as clear as it might be.

246. Now we come to a recent Order which the Local Government Board has issued, namely, the Relief (School Children) Order, 1905; I think you have something to say to us upon that?—I may as well draw attention to this Order respecting relief which will include, and perhaps mainly consist of out-door relief to school children. The Order was issued on the 26th of April last and was intended to deal with the cases of children who, while attending public elementary schools, are without adequate nourishment. To meet such cases the Order contemplates that an application (called in the Order a "special application") may be made to the guardians or to a relieving officer by the managers, or by an authorised teacher of a public elementary school, or by an authorised officer of the local education authority; the object of the special application being relief to a child attending the school. Where a special application is made to the guardians, and the case is not one of sudden and urgent necessity, the guardians under Article 2 must take steps to ascertain whether relief to the child is or is not rendered necessary by the habitual neglect of the father to provide adequate food for the child. If the guardians are satisfied that the case is one of habitual neglect, the relief is to be given or considered as given by way of loan. If the guardians are not so satisfied it is left to them to determine whether the relief is to be given or to be considered as given by way of loan. Provision is made for a notification to the father of the fact that relief will be given or will be considered as given by way of loan. Relief may not be allowed for more than a month without a fresh application. Articles 3 and 4 relate to cases of sudden and urgent necessity. If relief is given by the guardians or by the relieving officer on

Relief (School Children) Order 1905.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

his own responsibility in cases of this kind, the notification to the parent that the relief is on loan must be made when the guardians order the relief, or when the relieving officer gives it, or in either case as soon as possible after the relief is given. Article 5. provides that where the relief will be given, is given, or will be considered as given by way of loan, the able-bodied father is not to be required under the orders and regulations in force in the union to be relieved only in the workhouse or to be set to work by the guardians. But, under Article 6 the guardians are to take proceedings for the recovery of the relief, except where they report the circumstances and the Local Government Board approve of the guardians abstaining. Article 7 is framed so as to show that the Order is not intended to apply to a child who is blind or deaf and dumb or to any other relative than the father. Secs. 56 and 58 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, make these restrictions necessary. Also the child must reside with the father, and the father must not be in receipt of relief other than relief given in accordance with the Order. Article 8 gives the short title of the Order, namely, The Relief (School Children) Order, 1905.

Points arising out of Relief (School Children) Order, 1905.

247. Is not the general purport of this Order rather to relax the principle that relief given to a child is attached to the parent?—No, I do not think it relaxes any legal principle. The main feature in the Order is to put on a regular footing applications which might otherwise have been made without system. The Board and their predecessors have always held that an application for relief may be made practically by any one cognisant of the facts. The object of the Order rather was to say that persons of a certain class who might be cognisant of the circumstances necessitating relief to a child of this particular class, should be, as it were, under such regulations as the order contemplated; and that the procedure of the applicants should be followed by the consequences mentioned in the order.

248. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I do not quite follow how it is that relief given to a child who is a dependant does not pauperise the parent?—I do not think we do anything there in violation of that principle. We rather recognise the principle in its full force, that is to say, we deal with the child only as to whom under the particular sections of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, it is said that relief to the child shall be relief to the parent; and that is why we except the case of the blind and so on.

249. (*Miss Hill.*) Is the father disfranchised for such relief?—That is a moot point. I do not think the Board have ever made a pronouncement on the subject, and I do not know that we have ever actually arrived at a conclusion. There is a great deal of law—law which perhaps might be called somewhat uncertain—arising out of those particular sections of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

250. (*Mr. Loch.*) But the general purport of the sections in the Act of 1834 would be to disfranchise or to affect the father if the child received relief?—Yes, it would undoubtedly affect the father.

251. (*Chairman.*) I understand your contention is that this Order only regularised certain spasmodic applications that were made, and that it is not intended to extend, and you do not believe that it does extend, outdoor relief, or to exempt a parent from the disqualification which he suffers if his child is relieved?—That would be the conclusion that I personally should maintain; but of course there are difficulties which arise out of the present state of the law, as well as those which arise out of decisions on these particular sections of the Poor Law Act.

252. This order has only recently come into operation, so that there has been no test case upon anything that has occurred yet in connection with it, I presume?—I am not aware of any.

253. (*Mr. Loch.*) It says that a parent who neglects may get relief on loan for his child; what is the definition of "neglect" there?—I think that the expression "habitual neglect," as used in the order, was intended to include such neglect as is within the contemplation of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904.

254. That is your interpretation of it?—Yes. I think that the expression would include neglect of that magnitude, if one might call it so.

Out-Door Relief to members of Friendly Societies.

255. (*Chairman.*) We have finished the subject of relief to school children; the next matter that you would like to give evidence upon is, I think, the relief to members of friendly societies?—Yes. Where paupers who are members of friendly societies are applicants for outdoor relief their cases will now be subject to the operation of the Out-door Relief Friendly Societies Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vic., c. 25), and the Out-door Relief (Friendly Societies) Act, 1904 (4 Edw. VII., c. 32). The effect of these enactments is that the guardians may grant relief out of the poor rates to any person otherwise entitled, notwithstanding that the person is, by reason of his membership of a friendly society, in receipt of any sum. In estimating the amount of the relief, it is discretionary with the guardians whether they will or will not take into consideration the amount received from the friendly society. But this exercise of discretion is subject to the limitation that the guardians are not to take into consideration any sum received from a friendly society as sick pay, except in so far as the sum exceeds 5s. a week.

Regulation Establishments receiving paupers under Contract.

256. I understand there are various forms of out-door relief which are the subject of express enactment; could you give us the references?—Assistance to be afforded out of the workhouse at the cost of the rates is the subject of many enactments of later date than the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. An early example is afforded by the Poor Relief Act, 1849. That Act was designed to provide a more effectual regulation and control over the maintenance of poor persons in houses not being the workhouses of any union or parish. The establishments are those in which the poor are lodged and maintained under contracts. The Local Government Board by Sec. 1 are, from time to time, as they shall see occasion, to make and issue all such rules, orders and regulations for the management and government of any such establishment, or for the education of any poor children therein in like manner and to the same extent as they are empowered to do in the case of a workhouse. The rules, orders and regulations may be directed to any person being or acting as the proprietor, manager, or superintendent or as officer or assistant (Sec. 3). The Local Government Board may prohibit by order the reception or retention of any poor person or class of poor persons in any such establishment. They may by order remove any officer, servant or assistant. They may regulate contracts and may appoint an inspector (Secs. 4-7). Power is also given to justices to visit (Sec. 8). The Act does not apply to county lunatic asylums, registered hospitals, or licensed houses for lunatics, nor to hospitals, infirmaries, schools, or other institutions supported by public subscriptions and maintained for purposes of charity only (Sec. 2).

Enactment as to maintenance of defective paupers in special institutions.

257. There is power to send paupers to special institutions, is there not?—By Section 21 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867, the guardians are empowered to provide for the reception, maintenance, and instruction of any adult pauper being blind, or deaf and dumb, in a hospital or institution established for the reception of persons suffering under such infirmities. They may pay the charges incurred in the conveyance of the pauper to and from the hospital, as well as those incurred in his maintenance, support and instruction. The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, by Section 13 enables the guardians, with the consent of the Local Government Board, to send an idiotic pauper to an asylum or establishment for the reception and relief of idiots maintained at the charge of the county rate or by public subscriptions.

Poor Law certified schools.

258. Can you now state the effect of the provisions with respect to certified schools?—It may be well to notice here somewhat briefly the powers which the guardians possess for educational purposes. Attention has already been drawn to the provisions applicable to district schools. Mention has here to be made of other facilities of which the guardians may avail themselves. Under the Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, as enlarged by later enactments, the guardians may send any poor child, whether legitimate or illegitimate, to a school certified under the Act and supported wholly or partly by voluntary subscriptions, if the managers are willing to receive the child. Schools of this type are certified by the Local Government Board on the application of the managers and after an examination and report. The certificate may be withdrawn if the Local Government Board are dissatisfied with the condition or management

of the school (Sec. 2). The school must be open to the visitation and inspection of any inspector of the Local Government Board and also of a member deputed by the guardians who have sent a child to the school (Sec. 4). A child who may be sent to a certified school must be an orphan or a deserted child or a child one of whose parents or surviving parent consents (Sec. 6). In the case of an illegitimate child the consent of the mother, if she has the care, custody or possession of the child, will be sufficient (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 23). In such cases, the guardians may pay the expenses incurred in the maintenance, clothing and education of the child (Sec. 1), and the outlay must not exceed such rate of payment as may be sanctioned by the Local Government Board (Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1882, Sec. 13). The guardians may also pay the cost of the conveyance of the child to and from the school and, in case of death, the expenses of burial (Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, Sec. 1). If the parent, step-parent, nearest adult relative or, failing these, the god-parent of a child not belonging to the Established Church but relieved in a workhouse or a district school makes application to the Local Government Board, they may order the child to be sent to a certified school of the religion to which the child is proved to belong (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1866, Sec. 14). The Board may make the like order in the case of a deserted child or an orphan without any such application (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 23.) If the Local Government Board are of opinion that any person is aggrieved by any child being sent to or kept at a certified school, they may order the child to be removed (Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, Sec. 3). "The guardians may at any time at their discretion and shall upon the requisition of the managers of the school or upon the withdrawal of the certificate . . . cause any such child to be removed from any such school and brought back to their parish or union" (Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, Sec. 5). The guardians may not keep a child in a school against the will of the child if above fourteen, or against the will of the parents or surviving parent, whatever be the age of the child (Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, Sec. 7). A child must not be sent to a school conducted on the principles of a religious denomination to which the child does not belong (Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, Sec. 9). The expression "school" as used in the enactments summarised above extends to any institution established for the instruction of blind, deaf, dumb, lame, deformed or idiotic persons, but does not apply to a certified reformatory school (Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, Sec. 10); and by Sec. 13 of the Elementary Education (Blind and Deaf Children) Act, 1893, the powers of the guardians for sending blind or deaf children to school are limited to the cases of children who are (*a*) idiots or imbeciles; (*b*) resident in a workhouse, or in an institution to which they have been sent by a board of guardians from a workhouse; or (*c*) boarded out by guardians. "Blind" for the purposes of the Act of 1893 means too blind to be able to read the ordinary school books used by children; and "Deaf" means too deaf to be taught in a class of hearing children in an elementary school. Other powers with regard to certain deaf or dumb, blind, defective or epileptic children, I do not describe in detail for the reasons given at the beginning of my evidence.

ints sing out of ctments ating to or Law tified ools.

259. What is the meaning of certified schools in this connection?—Schools which are certified by the Local Government Board.

260. For the reception of defective children?—For the reception of Poor Law children. They are schools which were originally founded for the care of particular classes who may be described as defective.

261. What is the special meaning of the term under this head?—"School" according to the definition extends to any institution established for the instruction of blind deaf, dumb, lame, deformed, or idiotic persons.

262. Assuming that the child is not defective, would any school which complies with the conditions laid down by the Board of Education and is part of the supply of the locality come under the head of a certified school?—No. These are schools specially certified by the Local Government Board. Those other schools would be public elementary schools or schools of a special class under Acts which I did not notice, because they are rather outside the scope of my evidence.

263. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are there conditions of certification which are set forth in any paper of the board?—Not in any paper, but they are in the Statute. The schools must be such as will satisfy the Board as to the management, that is, they must be well conducted and well managed.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

264. Those are the conditions, put in broad terms?—Yes. I think I have quoted the Act. They are schools supported wholly or partly by voluntary subscriptions. One can gather what the requirements that must be satisfied will be, because the certificate may be withdrawn if the Local Government Board are dissatisfied with the condition or management of the school.

265. It depends on the negative?—Sec. 2 reads, "The Poor Law Board," now the Local Government Board, "may, if they think fit, upon the application in writing of the managers of any such school as aforesaid appoint such person as they shall deem proper to examine into the condition of the school, and to report to the said Board thereon, and, if satisfied with such report, that board may, by writing under the hand of one of their secretaries, certify that such school is fitted for the reception of such children or persons as may be sent there by the guardians."

266. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Are they day schools?—No.

267. They are all boarding schools then?—Certainly, as far as I remember.

Subscriptions to hospitals.

268. (*Chairman.*) Now we come to the question of subscriptions; there is power to subscribe to hospitals, I understand?—Among powers which may be classified under the head of out-door relief are those given by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1851, with regard to subscriptions to hospitals. Section 4 of that Act enables the guardians, with the consent of the Local Government Board, to pay out of the funds of the guardians an annual subscription towards the support and maintenance of a public hospital or infirmary for the reception of sick, diseased, disabled or wounded persons, or of persons suffering from any permanent or natural infirmity. The Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, Sec. 16, enables the guardians, with the consent and sanction of the Local Government Board, to enter into arrangements with a public general hospital or dispensary within the Poor Law Union to receive and treat paupers on terms to be arranged between the guardians and the authorities of the hospital or dispensary.

Subscriptions to other institutions and associations.

269. The power of subscription has, I think, been extended of late; could you describe what is the present position?—Section 10 of the Poor Law Act, 1879, enlarges the guardians' powers of subscription, so that the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1851, Sec. 4, is to extend to authorise the guardians, with the consent of the Local Government Board, to subscribe towards an asylum or institution for blind persons, deaf and dumb persons, or for persons suffering from any permanent or natural infirmity, or towards any association or society for aiding those persons, or for providing nurses, or for aiding girls or boys in service, or towards any other asylum or institution which appears to the guardians, with such consent as aforesaid, to be calculated to render useful aid in the administration of the relief of the poor. But a subscription to an asylum or institution will not be authorised unless the Local Government Board are satisfied that the paupers under the guardians have or could have assistance therein, in case of necessity. The guardians may also, with the consent of the Local Government Board, subscribe to any association or society for the prevention of cruelty to children (Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904, Sec. 26).

Enactments as to provision of dispensaries in London.

270. In London there are, I understand, special provisions with regard to the arrangements for out-door medical relief; could you state those?—Under the head of medical out-door relief, special arrangements are authorised for London by the Metropolitan Poor Acts. Section 38 of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, empowers the Local Government Board by order to direct the guardians of a poor law union to provide a dispensary, and for that purpose to purchase or hire, or to build and to fit up and furnish, a building of such nature and size, and according to such plan and in such manner as the Board, think fit. As an alternative, the guardians may be directed to set apart, adapt, fit up and furnish a portion

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

Other enactments relating to dispensaries.

of the workhouse. Where the Local Government Board so direct, the guardians may borrow for the purpose (Sec. 38).

271. What other enactments do you wish to speak on with regard to dispensaries and their management ?—Where the guardians provide a dispensary, places at which the medical officers may see the sick poor are also to be provided by the guardians according to the direction of the Local Government Board (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Secs. 39–42). If the guardians provide a dispensary under any other Act than the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, they shall, if required by the Local Government Board, provide a proper room at the dispensary so that the sick may be seen there by the district medical officer; and the district medical officer personally or by his authorised substitute must attend during the times fixed for the purpose by the guardians with the approval of the Local Government Board (Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, Sec. 13). Originally by Sec. 39 of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, the guardians were required to elect a Dispensary Committee. But by Sec. 12 of the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, it is enacted that where the guardians provide a dispensary it shall not be necessary that a Dispensary Committee shall be appointed for the dispensary unless, on the application of the guardians, the Local Government Board issue an order for that purpose. A proper place for meetings of the Dispensary Committee is to be provided by the guardians (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 42). The Dispensary Committee are to appoint dispensers of medicine and other officers and servants, and the duties, qualifications, number, and salaries are to be such as the Local Government Board approve or direct. The guardians, on the requisition of the Dispensary Committee, are to provide proper medicines and appliances and requisites for the sick. These are to be dispensed on the prescription of the district medical officer, subject to the regulations of the Local Government Board (Sec. 44). The district medical officers were originally to be appointed by the Dispensary Committee. But there was a saving in the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, for persons who were in office when the Dispensary Committee entered on their duties, though the Central Authority might vary districts, salaries, and contracts (Secs. 45 and 46). Since the passing of the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, the arrangements with regard to metropolitan dispensaries have been regulated by an order of the 22nd of April, 1871, and subsequent orders on the same model. The order of 1871 provides for the appointment of Dispensary Visiting Committees by the guardians, who are also to appoint one or more of their district medical officers to the dispensary. The duties of the Committee, of the medical officers, of the relieving officers, and of the dispensers are defined by the order. Lastly, it may be pointed out that if the guardians, after being required by the Local Government Board to provide a dispensary, neglect or refuse to comply with the requisition, they will receive no repayment from the Metropolitan Common Fund in respect of medicine, medical or surgical appliances, or salaries of the medical officers until the guardians provide a dispensary (Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, Sec. 14).

272. (*Mr. Booth.*) That applies only to the metropolis, I understand ?—Only to the metropolis.

Apprenticeship.

273. (*Chairman.*) Can you give an account of the guardians' powers as to apprenticeship ?—Formerly the statutory provisions which began with the 43 Elizabeth c. 2, Sec. 3, involved a system of compulsory assignment of children to inhabitant occupiers. But Sec. 13 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, repealed so much of the Poor Relief Act, 1601, of the 8 & 9 William III. c. 30, or of any other Act as compelled any person to receive any poor child as an apprentice. And by Sec. 12 of the Act of 1844 the power of the overseers to bind was taken away and was vested in the guardians upon whom the section conferred the needful authority to execute the indentures, with the addition that indentures so executed should not need to be allowed, assented to, or executed by a justice. Binding to the sea service was excepted from the operation of this enactment, and the Central Authority were empowered by order to prescribe the duties of the masters to whom poor children may be apprenticed and the terms and conditions to be inserted in the indentures; while every master wilfully refusing or neglecting to perform any such terms or conditions was made liable on conviction to a penalty not exceeding £20 (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 12). The apprenticing of the children of poor persons is also a subject as to which the Central Authority are enabled to make rules, orders, and regulations under Sec. 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834. The regulations applicable to apprenticeship by the guardians are contained in the General Consolidated Order of the Poor Law Commissioners, dated the 24th of July, 1847, and amended in this particular by an order of the Local Government Board of the 15th of February, 1898. The Local Government Board may assent to departure from the regulations in particular cases but, subject to this condition, the regulations provide very fully for the varying circumstances of apprenticeship under the guardians. Some of the principal requirements may be enumerated. No child under nine, and no child (other than a deaf and dumb child) who cannot read and write his own name, can be bound (General Consolidated Order, Article 52). No child is to be bound to a person who is not a housekeeper, or assessed to the poor rate in his own name, or who is a journeyman, a minor, or a married woman (Article 53). No premium other than clothing is to be given on the binding of a person above sixteen, unless he be maimed, deformed, or suffering from some permanent bodily infirmity (Article 55). An apprentice is not to be bound for more than eight years (Article 56). A person above fourteen is not to be bound without his consent. A child under sixteen is not to be bound without the consent of the father, or if he be dead or disqualified or the child be a bastard, without the consent of the mother, unless she be disqualified (Article 57). Except where the Central Authority on application otherwise permit, the place of apprenticeship must not be more than thirty miles from the place of the child's residence (Article 58). Various requirements are prescribed as preliminaries to the binding. These include medical certificates, examination into the circumstances of the case, and in some instances communication with other guardians (Articles 59 to 66). Provision is then made with respect to the indentures (Articles 67–69), and the duties of the master are set out in much detail. Instruction, food, lodging, clothing, medical assistance, opportunities of attending places of worship and of religious instruction, wages after the age of seventeen, production of the apprentice, etc., are among the requisites which the master is bound to afford (Articles 70–74).

Effect of General Consolidated Order.

274. What have you to say about apprenticeship to the sea service and to sea fishing ?—Apprenticeship to the sea service, and to the sea fishing service, is the subject of regulation by the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (Secs. 105–109; 392–398). Pauper apprenticeships to the sea service are to be made in the same manner and subject to the same laws as other apprenticeships made by guardians. There must, however, be an attestation of the indenture by two justices (Sec 107). Apprentice ships of pauper boys to the sea fishing service are to be made by guardians only in conformity with the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (Sec. 393). Indentures in the case of boys under sixteen are to be made before superintendents under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (Sec 395). On the 2nd of March, 1895, the Local Government Board addressed to the several boards of guardians a circular forwarding a revised form of apprenticeship indenture and endorsements which had been issued by the Board of Trade. The Local Government Board at the same time drew the attention of the guardians to certain points in the form of indentures and to various recommendations. These related to medical examination, the arrangements for the apprentice's reception, reports of grave misconduct, holidays, instruction in cookery, and other subjects.

Apprenticeship to sea service and sea fishing.

275. Will you now state the effect of some of the provisions for the protection of apprentices and servants ?—Guardians on a certificate of two justices under the Offences Against the Person Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vic. c. 100), may be required to conduct and pay the costs of the prosecution for offences by masters against apprentices or servants (Secs 26 and 76). The Poor Law (Apprentices, &c.) Act, 1851 (14 & 15 Vic. c. 11), requires the guardians to register every young person under sixteen who is hired or taken as a servant from the workhouse (Sec 3). Young persons so hired or taken as servants or bound as apprentices by the guardians are, while under six een and known to be in the service into which the young person went from the workhouse or on apprenticeship

Apprentices and young servants; supervision, &c., by guardians.

within the Poor Law union or within five miles of any part of the Poor Law union, to be visited twice a year by a relieving officer or other authorised officer, who is to report to the guardians whether he has found reason to believe that the young person is not supplied with necessary food, or is subjected to cruel or illegal treatment in any respect (Sec 4). Where the residence of the master or mistress is more than five miles from the Poor Law union, the guardians are to send a notice of the hiring or binding, with the name and age of the apprentice or servant and the name, description, and residence of the master and mistress to the guardians of the Poor Law union comprising the residence. The latter guardians are thereupon to cause the particulars to be registered and the young person to be visited as frequently, and in the same manner in all respects, as if the young person had been hired or taken or bound from their own workhouse (Sec. 5).

276. Have there been any prosecutions under these clauses by the Local Government Board against masters ?—The prosecutions would be by the board of guardians. I do not recall any specially. The legislation arose out of some serious cases of maltreatment of apprentices or of young servants.

277. (*Mr. Loch.*) In this case the guardians other than the board directly interested in the case can visit the apprentice, can they not ?—That is so, if the child is within the union.

278. It is rather an exceptional provision, is it not, by which another board of guardians can intervene ?—Although the apprentices may have been sent from the workhouse of one union, the guardians of another union in which the apprentice actually is shou'd visit where the residence of the master is more than five miles from the first union.

tance to dates oyal

279. (*Chairman.*) What are the guardians' powers to help candidates for the Royal Navy ?—By Sec. 28 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, it is provided that if any boy, not already an apprentice in the Merchant Service who or whose parent or parents shall be receiving relief in any union or parish, be desirous of serving in the Naval Service of His Majesty, and be forwarded for approval by competent authority for that service, the guardians may enable any such boy to be so forwarded, and may pay out of their funds the sum required by the regulations of the service for providing outfit or otherwise, and the necessary expenses of the conveyance of the boy in charge of a proper person to and from the port, or place in the United Kingdom at which he may be required to attend for examination, and, if accepted, for entry into the Naval Service.

ts.

280. Outfits may be provided by the guardians in certain cases, I understand ?—Provision is made by a General Order of the Local Government Board of the 10th of July, 1897, for the outfitsof children on going to service. The effect of the Order is to enable the guardians when they deem it expedient to incur a reasonable expenditure in providing an outfit for a child chargeable to the union when the child is sent to service after being boarded out or in other circumstances.

ration.

281. Have you anything to tell us about emigration ?—The guardians may, with the order of the Local Government Board, and in conformity with their regulations, procure or assist in procuring the emigration of an irremovable pauper, or of a person who, if relieved, would be chargeable upon the Common Fund of a union or be irremovable from a separate parish (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1848, Sec. 5). By Section 20 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849, a limit of £10 a head was put upon the possible expenditure of the guardians upon each case of the settled poor. But it is at least questionable whether this limitation which was applicable specially to circumstances of parochial chargeability, extends to the exercise of the powers of the guardians under conditions of union chargeability. With regard to orphan or deserted children under the age of sixteen who are chargeable to a Poor Law union, the guardians are empowered by Section 4 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1850, to procure or assist in procuring emigration with the order and in conformitywith the regulations of the Local Government Board. But no emigration of an orphan or deserted child can take place until the child has consented before the justices and a certificate of their consent has been transmitted to the Local Government Board. Perhaps I should also add a reference to a provision in the Local Government Act 1888 which, though hitherto unused, is not to be regarded as useless. This is the provision in Section 69 of the Act 1888, which enables the county council to borrow on the security of the county fund and of any revenues of the council for a purpose connected with emigration. The purpose is described in the following terms : "For making advances (which they are hereby authorised to make) to any persons or bodies of persons, corporate, or unincorporate, in aid of the emigration or colonisation of inhabitants of the county, with a guarantee for repayment of such advances from any local authority in the county or the Government of any colony." Before quitting this particular subject, I may add a short statement to illustrate a difficulty which recently arose to prevent the adoption of a scheme for training children in a colony. The plan was to acquire agricultural land in the colony, to build farmhouses, and to maintain in them children emigrated from England, and destined, after instruction in farming, to become settlers in the colony. And a feature of the scheme was that the guardians should contribute towards the maintenance of the children in the colony. It was argued that Section 10 of the Poor Law Act 1879 was wide enough to enable the guardians, with the consent of the Board, to subscribe to such an institution. The Board, however, were unable to take this view. But they submitted a case to the law officers, who confirmed the opinion of the Board that the institution did not fall within the terms of Section 10 of the Poor Law Act 1879, and who also said that they were not aware of any other means by which the guardians could legally provide funds for the furtherance of the scheme.

Points arising out of enactments relating to Emigration.

282. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are there not under the Emigration Acts special rating powers by which a rate could be raised for emigration ?—Nowadays the expenses would be paid out of the common fund of the union.

283. Therefore the power of a special rate for emigration is altogether suspended ?—There was a power to borrow for emigr.tion purposes originally, but all payments nowadays would be made out of the common fund, because all emigration expenses are chargeable upon the common fund of the union.

284. So that the power under which you could in former days have a special rate for emigration purposes, the terms of which are all precisely set out, is a bygone thing ?—Yes, I think so.

285. Formerly there might be a parish meeting and a rate raised specially for emigration purposes ?—Yes.

286. I thought that was valid still ?—I never heard of that procedure being followed if it has any real existence, but I should hardly think it has.

287. One of the questions raised in connection with dealing with the unemployed by emigration was whether that power was still in force ?—I do not think so. It is practically dead.

288. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is there any limitation of the amount of rates that may be raised for the purpose ?—There was a limitation of the amount per head. It is doubtful whether that is statutory now. It was originally clearly statutory. Anyhow, it is I think safe to say that, as a limitation, £10 per head would only have force because it might happen to be an administrative rule adopted by a board of guardians.

289. (*Mr Loch.*) So that the Act might be read without that limitation now ?—It is certainly arguable that there is now nothing to prevent the guardians from going further than £10 per head.

290. The point is of some importance, because that limitation has been quoted as one reason for inaction in regard to this matter ?—Quite so. I do not think that it is strictly applicable.

291. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Is there any statutory limitation under the Local Government Act, 1888, on the borrowing power for the purposes of emigration ?—The same limitation would apply there as to other borrowing powers. The total debt of a county council must not exceed a tenth of the rateable value of the county.

292. (*Chairman.*) Do I understand aright that a power by which formerly they were able to raise a rate without limitation for emigration purposes has lapsed now that they are combined for a Common Fund ?—I

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

should say practically that it has lapsed and legally also, I think, though it has not been actually taken away by repeal.

Early scheme of Migration.

293. There was an experiment made I understand by the Poor Law Commissioners to set on foot a scheme of migration; can you give us any account of the experiment?—On reference to the earliest reports of the Poor Law Commissioners, it will be seen that the experiment of migration was tried for a time with success. The Poor Law Commissioners were the medium of communication between manufacturers in the north and labourers in southern parishes which were exceptionally burdened. Two migration agents were employed by the Commissioners. One had charge of the experiment in Lancashire, Chester and Derby, and the other in the West Riding. In July, 1836, each agent reported what had been done in the six months ending on that date. The Lancashire agent stated that 2,673 persons had been provided with employment, and had arrived at their places. For 383 persons negotiations were in progress or journeys had begun. And in the case of 398 persons there had been a refusal to accept the offers of employment. Of the Lancashire agent's total some had been provided with employment in Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Somersetshire, Warwickshire and Westmorland. The other agent reported that employment had been found for 712 persons and that these were in their new locations 102 persons were on their way to places of employment or were the subject of pending negotiations; 344 had refused offers. Travelling arrangements for those who migrated through London were these: The migrants were met in London by a local agent of the Commissioners. This agent conveyed the migrants to the City Basin, Paddington, and saw them aboard a Canal boat for Manchester. The boats left in the evening of every weekday, and the passage to Manchester occupied from four to five days. The cost was 14s. for each person over fourteen years of age, and 7s. for each person under fourteen years of age. A hundredweight of luggage was allowed for each family, and the migrants had to supply their own provisions. Very shortly, however, the system of migration received a check owing to a change in the condition of the labour market. In 1839 the Poor Law Commissioners reported as follows: "The embarrassments in the manufacturing districts, and the extensive commercial depression occasioned by the temporary suspension of the trading intercourse with the United States placed the condition of the manufacturing population during the past year in too perilous a position to render an augmentation of their numbers by home migration expedient or desirable. The families who had previously migrated under our sanction have in a few instances only sustained any inconvenience from these causes. The number who have from any cause returned to their parishes form but an inconsiderable percentage (probably not 5 per cent.) of the whole of the migrants, the far greater proportion of whom have attained circumstances of comparative independence and comfort. Where sickness or other casualties may have rendered relief necessary it has been afforded, and usually at the cost of the parish from whence the migration was effected."

Points arising out of early scheme of Migration.

294. (*Mr. Phelps.*) What is the date of that?—1839. The depression was the depression in the United States of that year.

295. (*Mr. Loch.*) Was there any legal obstacle to continuing it?—I do not know precisely what the legal position may have been at that particular time. Nowadays there would be a difficulty in arranging for the relief; it was essentially non-resident relief.

296. (*Chairman.*) From what fund was the expense defrayed?—It was defrayed out of the poor rate. The Commissioners' expenses I suppose were not considerable; they only included the costs of the two local agents and of the subordinate agent in London, and I suppose they were defrayed out of the Imperial funds. The advances for the boat journey, for provisions and so on were made by the Union from which the migrants started.

297. Then unless the law has been altered it would be still possible I suppose to continue that?—Of course, it is non-resident relief, and non-resident relief it would be, almost of necessity, until these people were established in their employments in the distant location; and that might create a difficulty.

298. (*Mr. Loch.*) But the legal position as to non-resident relief is not what it was?—It is not what it was then. There are difficulties as regards non-resident relief which have been created since that date. They arise out of a judicial decision upon the General Consolidated Order.

299. (*Chairman*). This scheme was prior to the General Consolidated Order?—Yes, it was in 1839; it was in the early days.

FINANCE.

The Common Fund of a Poor Law Union.

300. Now I think we have reached the subject of finance; how would you propose to consider that?—The subject has to be considered in relation to (*a*) the guardians and (*b*) the various combinations authorised by the Poor Law Acts. The expression "Poor Law Union," as I have elsewhere pointed out, is now used to include a single parish under a separate board of guardians and also a collection of parishes formed into a union under the Poor Law Acts. The case of a Poor Law union constituted under a local Act does not arise for consideration in a statement of the general law. With regard to a parish under a separate board of guardians it is not necessary to say much. In this instance, beyond the fact that the whole outlay is borne by the single parish, there is little to call for special mention as distinguishing the case from that of the union. Practically the explanation which applies to the union will apply to the separate parish with the substitution of the parochial fund for the union fund. In the case of a union, the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, by Section 28 called into existence a common fund to which the several parishes were to contribute and be assessed for certain specified purposes. These purposes were at first limited to workhouse provision, alteration and maintenance, the provision of land, the payment of officers, the providing of utensils and materials for setting the poor on work and any other expense incurred for the common use or benefit. Successive enactments, however, widened the scope of the common fund, and by the Union Chargeabili y Act, 1865, that fund was made chargeable with "all the costs of the relief of the poor and the expenses of the burial of the dead body of any poor person under the direction of the guardians, or any of their officers duly authorised . . ."

Basis of and contribution to Common Fund.

301. Will you describe the basis of, and the method of contribution to the common fund of a union?—Originally the parishes contributed to the common fund on an average of the expenses of each parish for the preceding three years. The Poor Removal Act, 1861, by Section 9 substituted a system of contribution in proportion to the annual rateable value of the lands, tenements, and hereditaments assessable in each parish to the relief of the poor. Since the Union Assessment Committee Act, 1862 came into operation, Section 30 has required the guardians in computing the amount of contribution to the common fund to take the annual rateable value of the property in each parish from the last approved valuation list, with an estimated addition in the case of Government property. In London since the Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869, the lists formed under that Act are conclusive as to the value on which contributions may be levied (Sec. 45). The charges upon the common fund are distributed by the guardians during and at the close of every half year in the proportions according to which the orders for the contributions to the common fund were made upon the several parishes at the commencement of the half year, notwithstanding the change which may be made in the valuation list of any parish during the period (Union Chargeability Act, 1865, Sec. 12). The clerk to the guardians four weeks at least before the 29th of September and the 25th of March in each year is to estimate the probable amount of the expenditure in relief of the poor and other charges by the guardians on behalf of the union, as well as any separate expenditure chargeable against any parish during the then next ensuing half year, and to estimate the probable balance due to or from each parish at the end of the current half year, and to apportion the sums to be contributed by the several parishes according to the law for the time being in force, and to prepare the orders for contributions (Consolidated Order Amendment Order of the 26th of February, 1866, Article 1). By Article 2 of the same order it is provided that the guardians shall make orders on the overseers at the commencement of each half year, and from time to time as occasion may arise for the payments to the guardians of all such sums as may be required by them as the contribution of the parish to the common fund

of the union, and for any other expenses separately chargeable to the guardians on the parish. In these orders the contributions are to be directed to be paid in one sum or by instalments on days to be specified in the orders. The Poor Law Commissioners by Article 5 of a General Order of the 22nd of April 1842, made it the duty of the overseers to pay out of the poor rates collected all such sums as by any order of the guardians in the prescribed form should be directed to be provided from the poor rates. The payments are to be made as directed and the overseers are to produce the order and receipt to the auditor.

302. (*Mr. Loch*). Might we understand what charges still remain on a parish in a union?—Practically none in respect of relief. I am not sure if there are any school fees still payable for non-paupers. There may be cases of that sort, in which the requirement to pay school fees for children under the Elementary Education Act, 1876, may still be in operation; but I do not know positively about that.

303. (*Sir Samuel Provis*). There would be the salaries of the collectors of the poor rate, would there not?—Yes, there would, and there would be certain valuation expenses. There would be miscellaneous charges, but not charges in connection with the relief of the poor; at least I do not remember any; the school fees are the nearest approach to relief that I can recall.

ibution
s: their
ement.

304. (*Chairman.*) What are the statutory provisions relating to the enforcement of the contribution orders of guardians?—The effect of Sec. 1 of the Poor Rate Act, 1839, is that where a contribution by overseers is in arrear any two justices, on application under the hand of the chairman or acting chairman of the board of guardians, may summon the overseer to show cause at a special sessions why the contribution has not been paid, and, after hearing the complaint, may, by warrant under the hands and seals of the justices, cause the contribution so in arrear together with the costs to be levied and recovered from the overseers as moneys assessed for the relief of the poor (Poor Rate Act, 1839, Sec. 1). Where the guardians make an order for contributions upon overseers, and a copy of the order is served upon any one of the overseers, the guardians may enforce the order against the person served as fully and effectually as if a copy had been also served upon every one of the overseers (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1849, Sec. 7). If the overseers wilfully neglect to make or collect sufficient rates for the relief of the poor, or to pay such moneys to the guardians as they may require, and if, by reason of the neglect, any relief directed by the guardians to be given to any poor person be delayed or withheld during a period of seven days, every such overseer shall, upon conviction, forfeit and pay for every such offence a sum not exceeding £20 (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 63).

equer
ibution
unt.

305. Under the system established by the Local Government Act, 1888, there is an appropriation of Imperial funds for local purposes; could you tell us to what extent the guardians are interested in this arrangement?—The proceeds of the duties collected on the licences referred to in the Local Government Act, 1888, as the local taxation licences and a portion of the probate and estate duty being made payable to the councils of counties and county boroughs and being carried to a separate account of the county fund known as the Exchequer Contribution Account, the council, by Secs. 24 and 26 of the Act, are required to make certain payments in substitution for local grants. The council, for instance, are required to pay to the guardians such sums as the Local Government Board from time to time certify to be due from the council towards the remuneration of teachers in Poor Law schools; also the school fees paid for pauper children sent from a workhouse to a public elementary school; likewise a sum equal to four shillings a week for each pauper lunatic maintained in an asylum etc., for whom the net charge upon the guardians, after deducting receipts from other sources than the rates, is equal to or exceeds 4s. a week (Sec. 24). Further, except in London, the council are to grant to the guardians an annual sum for the costs of the officers of the union and of district schools to which the union contributes. The annual sum, until Parliament otherwise determine, is to be the sum certified by the Local Government Board to have been expended by the guardians during the financial year ending on the 25th day of March, 1888, on the salaries, remuneration, and superannuation allowances of the officers (other than school teachers), and on drugs and medical appliances.

306. What provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888, with regard to payments by the county council, are specially applicable to London?—In London the county council, by Sec. 43 of the Act of 1888, are required to pay to the guardians of every Poor Law Union wholly in the county the sums certified by the Local Government Board to be due in substitution for the local grants towards the remuneration of Poor Law medical officers and towards the cost of drugs and medical appliances. The council are also to grant an amount equal to 4d. a day per head for every indoor pauper, the grant being reckoned according to the average number of indoor paupers maintained during the five financial years ending on 25th of March, 1888. The council were further required to pay to the guardians of every Poor Law Union partly situate in their county such proportion of the annual sum which is, under the other provisions of the Act, payable by the county council of a county to the guardians of that union, as the rateable value of the portion within the administrative county of London bears to the rest of the union. This last provision, however, has ceased to be of importance since there is now no union which is partly within and partly without the administrative county of London. The expression "Indoor pauper" in Sec. 43 of the Local Government Act, 1888, includes all paupers maintained in workhouses, district schools, separate schools, separate infirmaries, sick asylums, hospitals for infectious diseases, institutions for the deaf, dumb, blind or idiots, and certified schools, as well as children boarded out, within or without the limits of the union. Further, in the Metropolitan Asylum District the expression includes all inmates of any asylum for imbeciles provided by the managers, but excludes paupers in casual wards and such number of indoor paupers in a workhouse, school, infirmary or asylum as exceeded the number prescribed by the Local Government Board. It also excludes paupers maintained for part of a day only. As regards paupers maintained under contract, the section provides that these shall be included only in the number of indoor paupers of the union to which they are chargeable. The section likewise leaves it to the Local Government Board to direct the manner in which the average number of paupers is to be estimated.

Payments of London County Council for Poor Law purposes.

307. What have you to say about the general financial scheme applicable to Poor Law combinations? Take first the case of a school district?—As regards combinations, it may be noted that, in the case of a school district, the expenses incurred by the board of management are, with the exception of those relating to the relief of the children, and separately chargeable to the unions or parishes from which the children are sent to the district school, to be borne by the several constituent Poor Law Unions according to the annual rateable value of the property (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Secs. 46 and 47; Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, Sec. 11). The board of management are to call on the constituent Poor Law Unions for the requisite contributions; and fourteen days at least before a contribution becomes due notice in writing of the amount is to be forwarded to the clerk to the guardians and to two, at least, of the overseers from whom the contributions, or any part, will become due. If a contribution is not duly paid, the board of management, in addition to any other remedy available against a board of guardians, have the like remedy for recovery of the contribution from the overseers as is given to guardians for the recovery from overseers of the contributions of parishes (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 46). Where the school district is in the metropolis all common charges are to be defrayed by contributions from the constituent Poor Law Unions in proportion to the annual rateable value of property in the Poor Law Union. If the contribution is not duly paid, the managers are to have their remedy against the overseers; and the overseers, if they pay to the managers any money on account of the contribution, are to be entitled to credit for the payment in the accounts of the union with their parish (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Secs. 55–58).

Combinations: School Districts: Contribution of Constituent Poor Law Unions.

308. Now can you give us the case of a combination under the Poor Law Act, 1879?—In the case of a combination formed under Sec. 8 of the Poor Law Act,

Voluntary Combinations: Contribution of Constituent Poor Law Unions.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

Metropolitan Combinations: Financial arrangements applicable to Asylum Districts.

1879, the modes of defraying the expenses of the joint committee for the combination will be determined by the order which forms it.

309. Will you describe the financial arrangements of a metropolitan asylum district?—The Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, provides by Sec. 31 that the expenses incurred by managers in or about the purchasing, hiring, building, repairing, and fitting up of a building for an asylum, compensation paid to guardians, expenses of fixtures, furniture, conveniences, medicines, medical and surgical appliances, necessaries and salaries and maintenance of officers shall be defrayed by contributions from the constituent Poor Law unions (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 31). Expenses of food, clothing, maintenance, care, treatment, relief, and burials of inmates are to be separately charged to the Poor Law Unions from which the inmates are sent (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Sec. 32). Sums to be contributed by Poor Law Unions are to be assessed on and contributed by them in proportion to the annual rateable value of the property therein. The managers are from time to time to call upon the guardians for the contributions. Notice of the amount is, fourteen days at least before a contribution becomes due, to be delivered to the clerk to the guardians. If the contribution is not duly paid the managers, in addition to any remedy against the guardians, have the like remedy against the overseers as the guardians have for the recovery of their contributions (Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, Secs. 55-58).

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

310. Would you now explain the working of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—The fund was first established by Sec. 61 of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, and is raised by contributions from the several Poor Law Unions. A receiver is appointed by the Local Government Board, and he keeps an account with the Bank of England (Secs. 62 and 63). The Local Government Board assess the contributions of the several Poor Law Unions in proportion to the annual rateable value of the property in the Poor Law Unions (Sec. 64). This procedure takes the form of the issue of precepts to the guardians who raise and pay their contributions into the bank to the credit of the receiver's account (Sec. 65). If the contribution is not duly paid, the receiver, for its recovery, has against the guardians the like remedy as guardians have against the overseers for recovery of contributions (Sec. 68). Expenses which, under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, were first authorised to be repaid out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund are these: maintenance of lunatics in asylums, registered hospitals and licensed houses, and of insane poor in asylums under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867; maintenance of patients in asylums for fever or small pox; medicine and medical and surgical appliances; salaries of officers of guardians, school managers and asylum managers and salaries of dispensers where the appointments have been sanctioned by the Local Government Board; compensation; maintenance of pauper children in district, separate, certificated, and licensed schools; relief of destitute persons certified by the auditor and provision of temporary wards or other places of reception approved by the Local Government Board under the Metropolitan Houseless Poor Acts of 1864 and 1865; and other purposes not directly connected with relief (Sec. 69). The salaries of the receiver and his assistants, and all expenses incurred by him in the execution of the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, were also to be paid out of the fund (Sec. 71).

311. (*Mr. Loch.*) Was the receiver appointed by the Local Government Board?—Yes.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund: Additional charges.

312. (*Chairman.*) Have these purposes been extended to other Poor Law objects by later Acts?—Additions to the list I have just given have been made by subsequent legislation. Thus the cost of the maintenance and instruction of orphan or deserted children placed out by the guardians with the consent of the Local Government Board is made repayable by the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act 1869 Sec. 21. So by the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act 1870, the repayment of the expenses of patients in asylums for fever and small pox was extended to the expenses of maintaining paupers in any other asylums under the Metropolitan Poor Act 1867 and of maintaining paupers above the age of sixteen years in any Metropolitan workhouse. But the repayment in these cases is subject to the following provisions:—The Local Government Board are to certify the maximum number of paupers to be maintained in a workhouse or asylum; no repayment is to be made in respect of a greater number of paupers in an asylum on any one day than will complete the certified maximum, nor in respect of a greater number of paupers in a workhouse on any one day than will, together with the children under sixteen, complete the certified maximum. The amount repaid is to be at the rate of 5d. a day. If the guardians or managers have refused or neglected to comply with an order of the Local Government Board as to the alteration or enlargement of the workhouse, the provision of proper drainage, sewers, ventilation, fixtures, furniture, surgical and medical appliances, appointment of an officer, the maximum number of paupers to be maintained or the classification of paupers, the guardians or managers are to be deemed in default; and the Local Government Board may omit from their precept the amount to which the guardians to whom the workhouse belongs, or the guardians of the Poor Law Unions in the district to which the asylum belongs would have been entitled to be repaid. If, however, the guardians or managers comply with the order before the end of the next half year the Local Government Board may include the omitted amount in their precept for that half year (Section 1).

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund Further charges.

313. How would the guardians make good that amount?—They would have to pay it out of their common fund. It would not be chargeable on the whole Metropolis. The same Act by Section 2 extends "the salaries of officers" for which repayment may be made so as to include the cost of the rations according to a fixed scale. Again the effect of Section 3 Sub-Section 4 of the Poor Law Act 1889 is that after the date of an order of the Local Government Board authorising the Metropolitan Asylum Board to receive diphtheria patients into their hospitals the cost of the maintenance of these patients is to be repayable. The Metropolitan Poor Act 1898, for the purpose of repayment from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund of the cost of maintaining pauper children, provides that any institution which would otherwise come within Sub-Section 8 of Section 69 of the Metropolitan Poor Act 1867 is not to be excluded because the children are educated outside the institution (Section 1, Sub-Section 1). It is at the same time enacted that, if on any day the number of pauper children maintained in a district or separate school exceeds the certified maximum, no repayment is to be made in respect of the maintenance during that day of the children in excess (Section 1, Sub-Section 2).

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund: Repayment

314. Will you proceed to describe the mode of repayment out of the Common Poor Fund?—The method of repayment out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund is thus described by Section 70 of the Metropolitan Poor Act 1867:—After each half yearly audit the auditors within such time and in such manner as the Local Government Board from time to time direct are to certify to the Board the amount actually expended by each Poor Law Union in respect of expenses which are to be repaid out of the Common Poor Fund; and the Local Government Board are then by precept under their seal to direct the receiver to pay out of that fund to the guardians of the Poor Law Unions the several sums so expended. The amount repaid is to be applied by the guardians in aid of the fund chargeable with the relief of the poor (Metropolitan Poor Act 1867, Section 70).

315. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is the receiver practically part of the Local Government system; is he practically an officer of the Board here?—No; he has powers that are independent of the Board. He would be regarded for some purposes as an independent authority although appointed by the Board.

Borrowing powers.

316. (*Chairman.*) Have you anything to say about borrowing powers?—A comprehensive power of borrowing is conferred by the Poor Law Act, 1889. Section 2 of that Act enables the guardians, with the sanction of the Local Government Board, to borrow for the purpose of raising the expenses incurred or proposed to be incurred for any permanent work or object, or any other thing, the costs of which ought, in the opinion of the Board, to be spread over a term of years. A loan must not be of an amount which exceeds or will make the total debt of the guardians under the Poor Law Acts exceed one-fourth of the total annual rateable value of the union. The Local Government Board may by Provisional Order extend the maximum to double

the amount. This enactment applies to the managers of a school district, or of any asylum district in the Metropolis, but in the case of a school district one-sixteenth, and in the case of an asylum district, one-tenth of the annual rateable value of the district is fixed as the maximum which the loan must not exceed without an express enlargement by a Provisional Order (Poor Law Act, 1897, Sec. 2). A loan raised after the passing of the Poor Law Act, 1897, under Section 2 of the Poor Law Act, 1889, must be repaid within such period not exceeding sixty years as the guardians or managers with the consent of the Local Government Board may determine. The repayment may be either by equal yearly or half yearly instalments of principal or principal and interest or by means of a sinking fund set apart invested and applied in accordance with the Local Loans Act, 1875; the prescribed rate for the purpose of the application being a rate not exceeding 3 per cent. per annum, and the guardians and managers being forbidden to invest in their own securities. A loan contracted to be repaid by annual instalments may with the consent of the lenders be repaid by half-yearly instalments. Guardians and managers may borrow under Section 2 of the Poor Law Act, 1889, without the consent of the Local Government Board, for the purpose of repaying any outstanding part of a loan which the guardians or managers have power to repay. "Outstanding" means not repaid by instalments or by means of a sinking fund, or out of capital monies other than borrowed money. Any money so borrowed is to be repaid in the manner directed by the Poor Law Act, 1897, and within the same period as that originally sanctioned for the repayment of the loan, unless the Local Government Board consent to an enlargement, but the period is not to exceed sixty years from the date of the original borrowing (Poor Law Act, 1897, Sec. 1).

ment of
ts:
rseers.

317. Under the head "Payment of debts" what is the legal position?—It had been held in an early case that, if an overseer laid out money of his own for parish purposes, and did not repay himself before his term of office expired his successors could not make a rate to reimburse him (King *v.* Rotherhithe (8 Modern 338).) The Poor Relief Act 1743 (17 George II., c. 38) by Sec. 11, had provided that, where there were arrears of poor rate, those arrears might be levied by overseers succeeding those by whom the rate was made, and that the succeeding overseers might out of the arrears so levied re-imburse their predecessors. In 1795 the Court of Kings' Bench had before them the case of an overseer who had been in office for four successive years, and during that time had, without recoupment, expended a considerable amount for the use of the parish out of his own resources. Having been appointed overseer for part of the fifth year, the defendant had taken the opportunity to reimburse himself by means of rates made in his period of office. On an appeal against the defendant's accounts, it was pointed out by the Chief Justice, Lord Kenyon, that overseers ought not to include in their accounts charges for several years. Otherwise as the inhabitants of a parish were a fluctuating body, the present inhabitants would be burdened with the expenses of their predecessors. (King *v.* Goodcheap, 6 Term Reports, 159). Subsequently, in 1801, by the 41 George III., c. 23, Sec. 9, quarter sessions were authorised, on default of the parish officers, to make an order for re-imbursement in circumstances such as arose in Goodcheap's case. But the matter was not put upon a satisfactory footing until the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act 1876, by Sec. 29, provided that the payment of an overseer to his predecessor in respect of any money paid by him in excess of the amount recovered by him or his successors in the rate "if otherwise lawful, may be allowed by the auditor if it appear to him that the said payment in excess did not arise from the negligence or wilful action of the overseer so paying the sum out of his own funds."

318. What is now the general rule with regard to payment of debts by overseers?—The general rule with regard to the payment of overseers' debts has been laid down by the Poor Law Audit Act, 1848 (11 and 12 Victoria, c. 91). Section 1 of that Act is to the effect that: If the overseers lawfully by virtue of their office contract a debt within three months before the termination of their year of office, and it has not been discharged by them before their year of office has determined, it will be payable by and recoverable from their immediate successors. If the debt has been contracted during the year of office, but more than three months prior to its termination, it will be payable by and recoverable from the immediate successors if the vestry and Local Government Board consent, but not otherwise. In the case of law costs, Sec. 2 provides that the amount when duly taxed, if otherwise chargeable against the parish, shall be payable out of the poor rates within one year next following the termination of the proceedings, but not afterwards unless the Local Government Board authorise the payment by annual instalments not exceeding five.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

319. Will you explain the law applicable to the debts of other Poor Law authorities?—The Poor Law (Payment of Debts) Act, 1859, is concerned with the debts of Boards of Guardians and Boards of Management. Generally, these are to be paid within the half-year in which they have been incurred or become due, or within three months after the expiration of the half-year. But the Local Government Board may, if they see fit, extend the time within which a payment may be made for a period not exceeding twelve months after the date of a debt, claim or demand. Provision is made with regard to the beginning of the time of limitation in the case of loans (Sec. 3). If within the time limited by the Act, or within the time to which the Local Government Board grant extension, proceedings are begun in the High Court, or before a justice or other competent authority, and the claimant with due diligence prosecute the proceedings to judgment or a final settlement, the judgment is to be satisfied, notwithstanding that it may be recovered, or the settlement may be arrived at after the expiration of the limited or extended period. Proceedings by mandamus or otherwise for enforcing the judgment without delay are to be deemed to be within the operation of the provision (Sec. 4). A solicitor's bill of costs need not be paid until the final determination of a proceeding in any court or until the solicitor has ceased to be retained by or for the guardians or managers. But the bill of costs must be duly taxed and paid within a year next after the final determination of the proceedings or retainer, unless the Local Government Board authorise an extension of time not exceeding six months. If the solicitor take proceedings for the recovery of his bill within the year or the extended time, he will have the same right to be paid as a claimant prosecuting proceedings to a judgment or final settlement. Moreover, the guardians or managers may at any time pay money on account of the suit or proceeding (Sec. 5). Lastly, the Act contains a saving to validate calls or orders for contributions to provide for debts the payment of which is authorised by the Act (Sec. 6).

Payment of Debts: Guardians and other Authories.

320. Has the Act been the subject of judicial interpretation, and if so, can you give us the effect of the cases?—The first section of the Poor Law (Payment of Debts) Act, 1859, is not in the nature of a Statute of limitation. It is a fetter on the action of the guardians—a prohibition against payment after a certain date. This was said by Lord Herschell when Lord Chancellor, in the Midland Railway Company *v.* The Edmonton Union (Law Reports, 1895, Appeal Cases, 485; 64 Law Journal, Queen's Bench, 710): "It is not designed to prevent stale demands, though it may incidentally bar the remedy of creditors who delay asserting their rights. Both in form and purpose it is an injunction on the guardians to discharge their obligations promptly." This also was said by Lord Herschell in the Guardians of West Ham Union *v.* The Churchwardens, etc., of St. Matthew, Bethnal Green (Law Reports, 1896, Appeal Cases, 477; 65 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 201). On an appeal to Quarter Sessions, there is no debt, claim or demand in respect of costs before taxation, and the period mentioned in the Act does not begin before the date of taxation. So an order of the House of Lords for payment of the costs of an appeal does not constitute a debt, claim or demand lawfully incurred, or become due within the meaning of the Act, until the amount has been certified by the clerk of the Parliaments. There cannot, in fact, be a debt, claim or demand which is neither an ascertained sum nor a sum capable of being ascertained by ordinary process of law (Guardians of West Ham Union *v.* Churchwardens, etc., of St. Matthew, Bethnal Green). So where a claim had been referred to arbitration, the sum owing in respect of the claim did not become due until the amount had been determined by the arbitration. (Sharpington *v.* Fulham Guardians, Law Reports, 1904, 2 Chancery, 449; 73 Law Journal, Chancery, 777).

Cases on Poor Law (Payment of Debts) Act, 1859.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

PAUPER LUNATICS. Scope of summary of law.

321. That, I think, finishes your evidence on finance. The next branch is pauper lunatics; do you wish to offer any general remarks upon that subject?—The Lunacy Act, 1890, in Sec. 341, defines "pauper" as a person wholly or partly chargeable to a union, county or borough, and "lunatic" as an idiot or person of unsound mind. Primarily, for the purposes of the present inquiry, the case of the pauper lunatic has to be considered with reference to the prescribed methods of dealing with him as a proper subject for treatment in an institution for lunatics, or as one for whom other treatment is allowable. For the purposes of my summary of the statutory provisions, I leave out of consideration the case of a lunatic who is not a pauper and is not wandering at large, but is not under proper care and control, or is cruelly treated or neglected. The omission tends to simplification, although it must be borne in mind that a lunatic of this class may be technically classed as a pauper until it is ascertained that he is entitled to be classified as a private patient (Lunacy Act, 1891, Sec. 3). Dealing then only with the case of the pauper, I may point out that a resident pauper lunatic (Sec. 14) or a pauper lunatic wandering at large (Sec. 15) may be sent to an institution for lunatics on the authority of a summary reception order; and two or more Lunacy Commissioners may make a reception order with the like result in the case of a pauper lunatic not in an institution for lunatics or in a workhouse (Sec. 23). The chairman of a board of guardians may also be empowered by the Lord Chancellor to sign orders for the reception of pauper lunatics in institutions for lunatics (Lunacy Act, 1891, Sec. 25). A summary reception order may be made by any justice within whose jurisdiction a pauper lunatic is resident or is found wandering at large (Secs. 14 and 15).

Summary reception orders: How obtained.

322. Will you describe the mode in which a Summary Reception Order is obtained?—The procedure for obtaining a summary reception order is in the main as follows: A district medical officer who has knowledge that a pauper resident within his district is or is deemed to be a lunatic and a proper person to be sent to an asylum must, within three days after obtaining the knowledge, give notice to the relieving officer, or, if there is none, to the overseer. A relieving officer or an overseer who, by such a notice or otherwise, has knowledge that a resident pauper is deemed to be a lunatic, must, within three days after obtaining the knowledge, give notice to a justice having jurisdiction where the pauper resides (Sec. 14). The justice, on receiving the notice, must order the relieving officer or overseer giving the notice to bring the pauper before that justice, or some other justice having jurisdiction, at an appointed time and place within three days from the time of the notice (Sec. 14). A constable, a relieving officer, or an overseer who has knowledge that a pauper wandering at large within the relief district or parish is deemed to be a lunatic must immediately apprehend and take the alleged lunatic or cause him to be apprehended and taken before a justice. Also, a justice upon information on oath that a pauper wandering at large within his jurisdiction is deemed to be a lunatic, may order a constable, relieving officer or overseer of the district or parish where the alleged lunatic is, to apprehend and bring him before that justice or any other justice having jurisdiction (Sec. 15).

Reception in workhouses of pauper lunatics.

323. What are the circumstances in which pauper lunatics may be taken to the workhouse?—If a constable, relieving officer or overseer is satisfied that it is necessary for the public safety or the welfare of the pauper that, before proceedings are taken under the Lunacy Acts, he should be placed under care and control, the constable, relieving officer, or overseer may remove the pauper to the union workhouse. Unless there is no proper accommodation, the workhouse master must receive and relieve and detain the pauper. He must not, however, be detained for more than three days, and before the expiration of that time, the constable, relieving officer, or overseer must take the requisite proceedings (Sec. 20). Also in a case where a summary reception order might be made, a justice, if satisfied on the like grounds that the pauper lunatic should forthwith be placed under care and control and that there is proper accommodation at the Workhouse may make an order for taking the pauper lunatic to and receiving him in the workhouse. Where the summary reception order has been made, an order may be made to provide for the detention of the pauper lunatic until he can be removed. But the detention must not be for more than fourteen days (Sec. 21). At this stage it may be proper to note some exceptional provisions applicable to lunatic soldiers and sailors. As regards soldiers, the Army Act, 1881 (Sec. 91) as amended by the Army (Annual) Act, 1891 (Sec. 6), and the Army (Annual) Act, 1894 (Sec. 5), provides that a Secretary of State may, if he think proper, on account of a soldier's lunacy, cause any soldier of the regular forces on his discharge and his wife and child or any of them to be sent to the parish or union to which under the Statutes for the time being in force he appears from the statements made in his attestation paper and other available information to be chargeable. If the soldier or his wife or child after reasonable notice is delivered at the workhouse in which persons settled in the parish or union are received, he must be received by the master or other proper officer; but if it appears to the Secretary of State that the soldier is a dangerous lunatic and is in such a state of health as not to be liable to suffer bodily or mental injury by his removal, the Secretary of State may by order send the lunatic direct to an asylum, registered hospital, licensed house or other place of legal confinement. For the purposes of the order, the parish or union of chargeability according to the attestation paper or other available information is to be deemed to be the parish or union from which the lunatic is sent. And the order of the Secretary of State will have the same effect as a summary reception order. As regards sailors, the Naval Enlistment Act, 1884 (Sec. 3), applies the machinery above described. In these cases "the Admiralty" is substituted for "a Secretary of State," and the declaration made on entry into the Naval Service is substituted for the attestation paper.

Investig by Justi of cases pauper lunatics.

324. Will you describe the further investigation of the case of a pauper lunatic?—The justice before whom a pauper is brought must call in a medical practitioner, and examine the pauper, and make such inquiries as he thinks advisable, and if satisfied that the pauper is a lunatic and a proper person to be detained and the medical practitioner signs a medical certificate, the justice may by order direct the pauper lunatic to be received and detained in the institution for lunatics named in the order; and the relieving officer, overseer, or constable who brought the pauper lunatic before the justice, or in the case of a pauper lunatic wandering at large any constable required by the justice must forthwith convey the pauper lunatic to the institution, (Sec. 16). A constable relieving officer, or overseer, whose duty it is to convey a lunatic to or from an institution may make proper arrangements for the performance of the duty by some other person, (Lunacy Act, 1891, Sec. 2). The justice's examination may be made at the pauper's own house or elsewhere, (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 17). The medical examination must be made by a practitioner who is duly registered under the Medical Acts, but who is not in any of the various prohibited relations to the institution into which the pauper lunatic will be received, (Sec. 32, Sec. 341). The medical practitioner too (if the pauper lunatic will be received into a hospital or licensed house) must not be a Lunacy Commissioner, nor a visitor of licensed houses, unless directed to visit the patient by competent authority (Sec. 33). The medical examination must be made not more than seven days before the date of the reception order, (Sec. 29). The certificate must state the facts on which the practitioner has formed his opinion. Facts observed by the practitioner must be distinguished from facts communicated by others, (Sec. 28). A reception order must not be made on a certificate founded only upon facts communicated by others, (Sec. 28).

Conditio affecting summary receptio orders.

325. Will you now state the conditions subject to which a summary reception order may be made and suspended or executed?—The justice must not sign an order for the reception of a person as a pauper lunatic unless satisfied that the alleged pauper is either in receipt of relief or in such circumstances as to require relief for his proper care. If it appears by the order that the justice is so satisfied, the lunatic is to be deemed to be a pauper chargeable to the union, county, or borough properly liable for his relief. A person who is visited by a medical officer, at the expense of the union, is to be deemed to be in receipt of relief, (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 18). A justice making a summary reception order may suspend its execution for

such period not exceeding fourteen days as he thinks fit, and, in the meantime, may give such directions or make such arrangements for the proper care and control of the pauper lunatic as he thinks proper, (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 19, Sub-sec. 1). If the medical practitioner who examines a pauper lunatic as to whom a summary reception order is made certifies that the pauper lunatic is not in a fit state to be removed, the removal must be suspended until that, or some other practitioner certifies that the pauper lunatic is fit to be removed. Every medical practitioner who has certified that the pauper lunatic is not in a fit state to be removed must, as soon as in his judgment the lunatic is fit to be removed, certify accordingly. (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 19, Sub-sec. 2.)

ption uper tics in ims.

326. Into what asylums may a pauper lunatic be admitted under a summary reception order?—A pauper lunatic cannot be received under a summary reception order into any asylum other than that belonging wholly or in part to the county or borough in which the place whence the pauper lunatic is sent, or the parish in which he is adjudged to be settled, is situate, "unless there is a subsisting contract for the reception of lunatics of such county or borough therein, or such borough otherwise contributes to the asylum into which the pauper is to be received, except the order is endorsed by a visitor of that asylum" (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 27, Sub-sec. 3). Where, however, the pauper lunatic is in a workhouse and the workhouse is situate in a county which does not include the union to which the workhouse belongs, the summary reception order may order the pauper lunatic to be received in any asylum in which pauper lunatics chargeable to the union to which the workhouse belongs may legally be received (Lunacy Act, 1891, Sec. 6).

ody of per tics by ions and ids.

327. What other arrangements than asylum treatment can be made for the care of pauper lunatics?—A relation or friend of a pauper lunatic as to whom a summary reception order may be made, may retain or take the lunatic under his own care, if a justice having jurisdiction to make the order, or the visitors of the asylum are satisfied that proper care will be taken of the lunatic (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 22). And provision is also made for boarding out with relatives or friends of pauper lunatics after reception in asylums. (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 57.)

ention of per tics in khouses.

328. Will you now explain under what circumstances pauper lunatics may be kept in workhouses?—Attention has already been drawn to provisions under which pauper lunatics may be temporarily bestowed in workhouses. Other instances of the use of the workhouse for the accommodation of pauper lunatics may now be mentioned. These instances may be classified thus: (1) Pauper lunatics discharged from institutions; (2) pauper lunatics received by arrangement; and (3) pauper lunatics detained on certificate of medical officer and order of justices.

329. (*Mr. Loch.*) May I ask what "discharged from institution" means?—It means discharged from institutions for lunatics.

330. Asylums?—Asylums, hospitals, or licensed houses.

ention in khouses unatics harged n lums, etc.

331. (*Chairman.*) What are the characteristics of the first of these classes?—Under the first head, it may be pointed out that where a pauper lunatic is discharged from an institution for lunatics, and the medical officer of the institution is of opinion that the pauper lunatic has not recovered and is a proper person to be kept in a workhouse, the medical officer is to certify this opinion. The pauper lunatic may thereupon be received and detained against his will in a workhouse without further order, if the workhouse medical officer certifies in writing that the accommodation is sufficient for the pauper lunatic's proper care and treatment, separate from the inmates of the workhouse not lunatics, or that the lunatic's condition is such that it is not necessary for the convenience of the lunatic or of the other inmates that he should be kept separate (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 25).

tention in rkhouses chronic atics t from lums.

333. Now we will take the second class; will you state what that class comprises?—The second class of cases is the subject of provision in Sec. 26 of the Lunacy Act, 1890. That section is as follows: "(1) The visitors of any asylum may, with the consent of the Local Government Board and the Commissioners [namely, the Commissioners in Lunacy] and subject to such regulations as they respectively prescribe make arrangements with the guardians of any union for the reception into the workhouse of any chronic lunatics, not being dangerous, who are in the asylum and have been selected and certified by the manager of the asylum as proper to be removed to the workhouse. (2) Every lunatic received in a workhouse under this section shall, while he remains there, continue a patient on the books of the asylum for the purposes of this Act so far as it relates to lunatics removed to asylums."

Detention in workhouses of lunatics on certificates, etc.

334. What cases do you group in the third class?—The third class of cases embraces all those not included in the first and second. To the third class, Sec. 24 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, as amended by Secs. 4 and 5 of the Lunacy Act, 1891, specially applies. Sec. 24 of the Act of 1890 provides that:—(1) Except in the cases mentioned in that Act and already described, no person is to be allowed to remain in a workhouse as a lunatic unless the medical officer of the workhouse certifies in writing (*a*) that the person is a lunatic, with the grounds for the opinion; and (*b*) that he is a proper person to be allowed to remain in the workhouse as a lunatic; and (*c*) that the accommodation is sufficient for his proper care and treatment, separate from the inmates of the workhouse not lunatics, unless the medical officer certifies that the lunatic's condition is such that it is not necessary for the convenience of the lunatic, or of the other inmates that he should be kept separate. (2) A certificate under the section is sufficient authoriy for detaining the lunatic against his will in the workhouse for fourteen days from its date. (3) No lunatic may be detained against his will for more than fourteen days without a justice's order. (4) That order may be made upon the application of a relieving officer, supported by a medical certificate under the hand of a medical practitioner, not being an officer of the workhouse, and by the certificate of the workhouse medical officer. These medical certificates are by Sec. 5 of the Lunacy Act, 1891, required to be attached to the justice's order. (5) The guardians may pay reasonable remuneration to the medical practitioner. (6) If the workhouse medical officer does not give the necessary certificate for detention, or if at or before the expiration of fourteen days from the date of his certificate a justice's order for detention is not made, or if after such an order has been made the pauper lunatic ceases to be a proper person to be detained in a workhouse, the medical officer of the workhouse must forthwith give notice in writing to a relieving officer. Thereupon, proceedings, as provided by the Act, are to be taken for the removal of the lunatic to an asylum, and, pending those proceedings the lunatic may be detained in the workhouse.

Statutory exceptions as regards certain lunatics in Metropolitan Poor asylums and in workhouses.

335. Are there any exceptions from the provisions to which you have called our attention?—Special provision is made in the Act of 1890, and in the Act of 1891 as regards lunatics in asylums under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867. And the Act of 1890 excepts from the requirements of Sec. 24 paupers in workhouses at the commencement of the Act as to whom certificates had been signed under Sec. 20 of the Lunacy Acts Amendment Act, 1862, which the Act of 1890 repealed. The Act of 1891 also excepts from the requirement of an order under Sec. 24 of the Act of 1890 the case of every pauper suffering from mental disease in a workhouse at the commencement of the Act of 1890, as to whom a report had before that date been made under Sec. 22 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867.

Period of Detention: Opinion of Law officers.

336. Has not the last enactment (Sec. 24 of the Lunacy Act, 1890) been the subject of an opinion of the Law officers?—Yes. With reference to the cases coming within Sub-sec. 6 of Sec. 24, the position according to the opinion of the law officers is that the lunatic, pending proceedings for his removal to the asylum, may be detained in the workhouse for the following further consecutive periods:—(*a*) for the three days within which the relieving officer must under Sec. 14, Sub-Sec. 2, give notice to a justice that a person resident in his district is deemed to be a lunatic; (*b*) For the further period of three days which may elapse before the alleged lunatic is brought before a justice (Sec. 14, Sub-Sec. 3); (*c*) After a summary reception order has been made, for a further period of fourteen days under Sec. 21, Sub-Sec. 2, pending the removal of the lunatic to the asylum. But an order could not be made by a justice for the further

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

Jan. 1906.

detention of the lunatic under Sec. 21, Sub-Sec. 1 of the Act of 1890.

Reception of discharged lunatics in workhouses.

337. Can you give instances of the use of the workhouse as a place for the reception of a discharged pauper lunatic?—Under this third head it seems convenient to group those instances in which there is express authority for the temporary use of the workhouse as a place of discharge; for the subsequent treatment of cases may quite conceivably involve consideration of the effect of Sec. 24 of the Lunacy Act, 1890. Thus, when the visitors of an asylum order a pauper lunatic confined therein to be discharged, except on the application of a relative or friend, they may, when they think fit, notify their intention to a relieving officer of the union to which the lunatic is chargeable or to the clerk of the local authority liable for his maintenance. Upon receipt of the notice the relieving officer or clerk is to cause the lunatic on discharge to be forthwith removed to the workhouse of the union to which he is chargeable, or to the workhouse of the union from which he was sent to the asylum (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 80). Again, the authority liable for the maintenance of a pauper lunatic detained in a hospital or licensed house may make an order for the removal of the lunatic and may direct the mode of removal (Sec. 61, sub-Sec. 1 of the Lunacy Act, 1890). But the effect of Sec. 11 of the Lunacy Act, 1891 is that the removal must be to the workhouse of the union to which the lunatic is chargeable, or if the lunatic is chargeable to a county or borough to the workhouse of the union from which he was sent to the hospital or licensed house.

Miscellaneous enactments as to lunatics in workhouses.

338. Can you give an account of any miscellaneous provisions relating to pauper lunatics in workhouses?—The miscellaneous provisions of the Lunacy Acts, which relate to pauper lunatics in workhouses may be summarised thus:—Carnal intercourse with females by persons employed in workhouses is a misdemeanour punishable with imprisonment with hard labour for two years (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 324). A pauper lunatic who escapes may, without a fresh order or certificate, be retaken within fourteen days by the master or a person authorised by the master in writing (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 85). Regulations with respect to the visitation of lunatic inmates by guardians, the workhouse medical officer, the Lunacy Commissioners, and persons whom the Lunacy Commissioners direct in cases calling for immediate investigation are contained in Secs. 54, 202, Sub-Sec. 1, 203 and 204 of the Lunacy Act, 1890. Pauper lunatics may be discharged from workhouses by the guardians (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 81). The visiting Lunacy Commissioners may direct the removal of lunatic inmates to institutions for lunatics. But the guardians may appeal against any such order to the Secretary of State, who may employ a person to make a special visitation and report and whose decision is to be conclusive (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 60). Mechanical means of restraint can only be applied to lunatics in workhouses subject to medical certificates and records and subject to the Lunacy Commissioners' regulations determining the instruments and appliances (Lunacy Act, 1890, Sec. 40).

Expenses of pauper lunatics.

339. What other provisions of the Lunacy Acts have you now to consider?—I do not propose to enter upon those provisions of the Lunacy Acts which are concerned with the administration of lunatic asylums. But it may be well to say a few words about the financial provisions in Part X. of the Lunacy Act, 1890. That part is headed "Expenses of Pauper Lunatics." The part contains Section 283. The section provides that (1) every visiting committee shall fix a weekly sum, not exceeding 14s., for the expenses of maintenance and other expenses of each pauper lunatic in the asylum, and of such amount that the total of such weekly sums shall be sufficient to defray such expenses, and also the salaries of the officers and attendants of the asylum, and such weekly sum may, from time to time, be altered. (2) If 14s. a week is found insufficient for the payment aforesaid, the local authority to whom the asylum belongs may, by order, direct such addition to be made to the weekly sum as to the local authority seems necessary, and every such order shall be signed by the clerk of the local authority and forthwith published in a local newspaper. (3) A committee may fix a greater weekly sum, not exceeding 14s., to be charged in respect of pauper lunatics other than those sent from or settled in a parish or place within the county or borough to which the asylum belongs. These enactments have been the subject of recent discussion in the High Court. In the case of Fitch *v.* The Bermondsey Guardians (Law Reports, 1904, 2 King's Bench 709; Law Reports, 1905, 1 King's Bench 524; 73 Law Journal, King's Bench 985; 74 Law Journal, King's Bench, 250) the Visiting Committee of the City of London Lunatic Asylum had, under Sub-Section 1 of Section 283, fixed the weekly charge for pauper lunatics chargeable to the City of London Union at 12s. 3d. Under Subsection 3 the committee purported to fix the weekly charge for pauper lunatics chargeable to unions outside the City at 21s. The guardians of the Bermondsey Poor Law Union were charged at this rate. They paid at the rate of 14s. a week and declined to pay more. The viewof the guardians as to the limit of the charge to outside unions was upheld by the King's Bench Division and by the Court of Appeal. The greater weekly sum which may be fixed for outside unions must not exceed the maximum for home lunatics.

340. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are the lunatics in a workhouse inspected by the Lunacy Commissioners?—Yes.

341. That is wherever they are certified?—Yes; and they always would be certified in some way.

342. Are the guardians under statutory obligation to make special provision for lunatics in a workhouse?—No.

Orders of maintenance etc.

343. (*Chairman.*) I understand that orders of justices upon guardians may include payment for maintenance; is that so?—Payment of charges on the scale authorised by Section 283 will form one of the matters for which an order of a justice or justices may be made upon the guardians. Thus Section 287 provides that the justice by whom a pauper lunatic is sent to an institution for lunatics or any two justices of the county or borough in which the institution is situate or from any part of which the pauper lunatic has been sent, or any two justices being visitors of the institution may make an order upon the guardians of the union to which the lunatic is chargeable for payment to the treasurer or manager of the institution of the reasonable charges of the lodging, maintenance, medicine, clothing and care of the lunatic The order may be retrospective or prospective. It is not subject to appeal. It is, in fact, an order which will cease to operate when there has been a final adjudication of the settlement of the pauper lunatic.

Adjudication of settlement of lunatics.

344. What are the provisions of the Lunacy Acts with respect to the settlement of pauper lunatics?—For the adjudication of settlement any two justices for the county or borough in which an institution where a pauper lunatic is or has been confined is situate, or to which the institution being an asylum wholly or in part belongs, or from any part of which a pauper lunatic is or has been sent may at any time inquire into the settlement (Lunacy Act, 1890, Section 288.) Where the justices adjudge the settlement in a poor law union they are to order the guardians of the poor law union to pay to the guardians of any other union the expenses incurred in or about the examination of the pauper lunatic, the bringing him before a justice or justices, his removal and conveyance to and from any institution for lunatics, and the amount paid by the latter guardians for maintenance expenses within twelve months prior to the date of the order. If the lunatic is still in confinement the first mentioned guardians are to be ordered to pay to the treasurer or manager of the institution the reasonable expenses of future maintenance (Lunacy Act, 1890, Section 289). The Act further provides for cases in which a settlement cannot be ascertained. In such circumstances, the pauper lunatic may be made chargeable to a local authority (Section 290). But if the lunatic should afterwards be adjudged to be settled in a Poor Law Union the local authority may be reimbursed, under an order of justices, the expenses of maintenance incurred within twelve months previous to the order, and the future expenses will become chargeable to the guardians (Lunacy Act, 1890, Section 291).

Other provisions of Lunacy Acts.

345. Are there any other provisions of the Lunacy Acts to which our attention should be drawn?—Other provisions of the Lunacy Acts do not appear to call for detailed mention. It may suffice to notice that among the other matters with which Part X is concerned are Appeals, including abandonment of orders (Secs. 301-313); expenses of examination of paupers (Sec. 285); jurisdiction of justices, their orders and their extent (Secs. 292 and 293); irremovable pauper lunatics (Sec. 294); payments by guardians without orders (Sec.

295); the liability of relations for maintenance, and of guardians for the cost of removal, discharge or burial (Secs. 296 and 297); the application of the lunatic's property (Secs. 299 and 300), and the recovery of expenses (Sec. 314).

Act,

346. Now will you state the effect of the Idiots Act, 1886?—The Idiots Act, 1886, is entitled "An Act for giving Facilities for the Care, Education and Training of Idiots and Imbeciles." In this Act the expressions "idiots" and "imbeciles" do not include lunatics, the expressions "hospital" and "institution" mean any hospital or institution or part of a hospital or institution (not being an asylum for lunatics) wherein idiots and imbeciles are received and supported wholly or partly by voluntary contributions, or by any charitable bequest or gift, or by applying the excess of payments of some patients for or towards the support, provision or benefit of other patients, and the expression "licensed house" means any house licensed by the Commissioners in Lunacy or by the justices of any county or borough for the reception, care, education and training of idiots and imbeciles (Sec. 17). An idiot if under age may be received into and until full age detained in a hospital, institution or licensed house upon the certificate of a duly qualified medical practitioner accompanied by a statement signed by the parent or guardian or person undertaking the duty of parent or guardian. The hospital, institution or licensed house must be registered under the Act (Sec. 4). The registration is by the Commissioners in Lunacy (Sec. 7). The idiot may, with the consent in writing of the Commissioners in Lunacy, be retained in the hospital, institution or licensed house after he is of full age; and an idiot of full age may be received on a certificate and statement as in the case of an idiot under age (Sec. 5). On the first reception of an idiot, the superintendent or principal officer must within fourteen days certify the fact and time to the Commissioners in Lunacy (Sec. 9). Death or discharge is also to be notified to the Commissioners, who have power to discharge any idiot of full age, and have the duty of visiting and inspecting every registered establishment (Secs. 6, 10 and 12). Nothing in the Act is to deprive the guardians of the poor of any union of the power of sending pauper idiots to establishments registered under the Act or from receiving Parliamentary grants as if the idiots were pauper lunatics (Sec. 15).

347. (*Mr. Loch.*) Has the word "imbecile" any separate meaning in the Idiots Act?—Not by definition, beyond the statement that it does not include a lunatic.

348. Then practically it might be merged into the other?—Its meaning has to be discovered from expert opinion or judicial decisions; there is no Parliamentary definition.

349. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Are there any institutions supported entirely out of the rates for the maintenance of weakminded and idiot children under age?—I thought that there were asylums provided at the charge of the county rate, and I said so before the Commission on the Feeble-minded, but I was told there that there were none; that there were only wards at county asylums, but not actually separate asylums for idiots.

EMENT

VAL. W of AW.

350. (*Chairman.*) We now come to the question of settlement; perhaps you will tell us something about the early phases of the law?—The Royal Commission of Inquiry (p. 152) pointed out that the Statute of the 43rd of Elizabeth contained no definition of settlement, but that, in a long train of legislation, a person had been considered settled in the parish in which he was born or in which he had dwelt, or had been principally conversant, for the preceding three years, or, under the 39th of Elizabeth, c. 4, in the case of vagabonds, whose place of birth could not be ascertained, for one year. It is perfectly true that the Poor Relief Act, 1601, contains no definition of settlement. The earlier Statute of the 14th of Elizabeth, c. 5, contains apparently the first legislative reference to settlement. That Act in Sec. 16 recites that charity would that aged and impotent poor people should have convenient habitations and abiding places throughout this realm to settle themselves upon, to the end that they, nor any of them should hereafter beg or wander about. Accordingly, the Act requires the justices to inquire of all aged, poor, impotent, and decayed persons born within their divisions or which were there dwelling within three years which live or of necessity be compelled to live by alms of the charity of the people. The justices were then to devise and appoint meet and convenient places to settle the same poor people for their habitations and abidings, if the parish within which they should be found should not or would not provide for them. The poor who refused to be bestowed in any of the abiding places, but coveted still to hold on to their trade of begging, or, after being once bestowed, departed and begged were to be punished as rogues and vagabonds. This process of settlement, it will be observed, was concerned solely with beggars. In the resolutions ascribed by Lambard to the judges and already quoted there is a rule to the effect that no man was to be put out of the town where he dwelt nor to be sent to his place of birth or last habitation except a vagrant rogue. At a later date, the Judges formulated rules with regard to persons who were neither beggars nor rogues. This was in 1633. The resolutions of that year declare that "the law unsettleth none who are lawfully settled, nor permits it to be done by a practice or compulsion; and everyone who is settled as a native, householder, sojourner, an apprentice or servant for a month at least without a just complaint made to remove him or her shall be held to be settled." Possibly this view of the law may have been present to the mind of Mr. Justice Lee who said in 1735 in St. Maurice *v.* St. Mary Ka lender (2 Bott. pl. 237) "Settlements are given as a reward for labour, and the Poor Laws in favour of them have always been construed liberally because they are made in restraint of liberty; every man being anciently free to go wherever he had the best probability of maintaining himself."

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

351. I think you wish to draw attention to other judicial decisions in the 18th century and afterwards?—The opinions of judges in the 18th century as to the origin of settlement afterwards became somewhat divergent. In 1736 Lord Hardwicke in the case of the King *v.* the Inhabitants of St. Nicholas in Ipswich (Burrow; Settlement Cases, 91) remarked that "The present notions of settlements have taken their rise from 13 and 14 Charles II., c. 12." In 1755 in the King *v.* St. Botolph Bishopsgate (Burrow; Settlement Cases, 367) Chief Justice Ryder said that the 13 and 14 Chas. II. c. 12 first created the right of settlement in parishes. In 1756 irremovability consequent upon the possession of an estate, however small, was carried back to Magna Charta in the King *v.* The Inhabitants of Aythrop Rooding (Burrow; Settlement Cases, 412). In 1788 in Steel *v.* Houghton-et-Uxor (1 H. Blackstone, 51) Lord Loughborough thought that the right to a maintenance by settlement was first introduced by the Statute of the 43rd of Elizabeth. But Mr. Justice Gould said, "I think ever since the settlement of parishes the poor inhabitants were esteemed as parishioners, and their necessities to be relieved by the parish to which they belonged." He also said that, before the Poor Relief Act, 1601, "it seems the settlement was by birth." Still later, in 1835, Lord Denman, Chief Justice, in the King *v.* The Inhabitants of St. George Exeter (3 Adolphus and Ellis, 373) said, "At the time of the passing of the Statute 43 Elizabeth there was no law of settlement." An old and simple definition of settlement was given by Lord Chief Justice Parker in 1713 in the case of Harrow v. Edgware (2 Bott, pl. 608) "A parochial settlement," said the Lord Chief Justice, "is nothing more than the privilege of living irremovable in the parish." Another old definition of settlement was as follows: "By the term 'settlement' is to be understood a permanent indestructible right to take the benefit of the poor laws in a particular parish or place which maintains its own poor." The definition was open to criticism, because the right once acquired ceases on the acquisition of a new right elsewhere. Judicially the definition of settlement took in general the form of eliminating possible qualities or attributes. Thus, in the King *v.* St. Botolph's 1755 (2 Burrow; Settlement Cases, 367) Lord Chief Justice Ryder said, "A man cannot give away or release or suspend his settlement for the public is concerned as well as himself." Again, in the King *v.* The Inhabitants of St. Mary Cardigan (1794, 6 Term Reports, 116) Lord Kenyon said "A settlement, is not the property of any man. It cannot escheat. Neither can it be called a franchise." And in the King *v.* The inhabitants of Haddenham (1812, 15 East, 463) Lord Ellenborough observed "A settlement is not at all analogous to an inheritance."

Judicial decisions as to origin, etc. of settlement.

352. Are there any passages which you would wish to note in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1832?—

Observations of Commission of Inquiry.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

The Commissioners of 1832 took the view that the 13 & 14 Charles II. c. 12, which gave power to remove any newcomer from a parish, though not applying for relief, but merely on suspicion of prospective chargeability, in effect created a settlement or right to remain in the parish in the words restricting the general power of removal. On this point the Commissioners said :—"It was required therefore that it [the power of removal] should be exercised within the first forty days after the arrival of the new settler, and persons settling in a tenement of the yearly value of £10, a sum equal, according to the present value of money, to more than £50 were directly excepted. Forty days' residence, without removal, or occupying a tenement of £10 annual value gave, therefore, a right to remain or, as it is now called, a settlement, and the direction that persons should be removed to the place where they were last legally settled as natives, householders, apprentices, servants, or even sojourners for forty days made also forty days' residence a means not only of acquiring a settlement, but also a means of losing any previous settlement and established birth as a settlement where no other had been acquired. To these the Common Law added estate, or property in land, because no person ought to be removed from his estate, and marriage in the case of a woman and parentage in the case of a legitimate child, on the ground that a wife must not be separated from her husband, or a child until emancipated from its parents; and the 3 & 4 William & Mary c. 11, Sec. 6, added serving an annual public office and contributing to the public taxes of a parish." But although the settlements created or recognised by the 13 & 14 Charles II. were originally qualifications upon the power of removing all new comers whom the overseers thought likely to become chargeable, the subsequent legislation the object of which was to limit the modes of acquiring a settlement, was left unchanged on the cessation of the primary power of removal under the statute of Charles II. This termination of the power to remove where chargeability was probable, though not actual, was brought about by the operation of the 35 George III. c. 101, which enacts that no poor person shall be removed, by virtue of any order of removal, from the parish or place where such poor person shall be inhabiting to the place of his or her last legal settlement, until such person shall have become actually chargeable to the parish, township or place in which such person shall then inhabit. And the words "actually chargeable" cover the case of a man who, though possessing property sufficient to maintain him, in fact receives relief (King *v.* Ampthill; 2 Barnewall & Cresswell, 847). Further, actual chargeability is assumed where the pauper has been convicted of larceny or other felony (35 George III. c. 101, Sec. 5), where he has been convicted of being an idle or disorderly person, rogue or vagabond (5 George IV. c. 85, Sec. 20), or where he appears to two or more justices on the oath of a credible witness or witnesses to be a person of evil fame or a reputed thief (35 George III. c. 101, Sec. 5).

Actual chargeability since 35 Geo. III., c. 101.

Former modes of acquiring a settlement.

353. What were the modes of acquiring a settlement in 1832 ?—At the time of the Commission of Enquiry the modes of obtaining a settlement were (1) Birth, (2) Parentage, (3) Marriage, (4) Estate, (5) Apprenticeship, (6) Renting a Tenement, (7) Payment of Parochial Rates, (8) Serving a Parochial Office, and (9) Hiring and Service.

Recommendations of Commission of Inquiry.

The Commissioners of 1832 recommended the abolition of the methods numbered 4 to 9, *i.e.* Estate, Apprenticeship, Renting a Tenement, Payment of Parochial Rates, Serving a Parochial Office, and Hiring and Service. There remained Birth, Parentage and Marriage. With regard to birth, the Commissioners' proposal had reference to facilities for proof. They thought that where a question arose as to the settlement by birth of a person, whether legitimate or illegitimate, "the place where such person shall have been first known, by the evidence of such person, by the register of his or her birth or baptism, or otherwise to have existed, shall be presumed to have been the place of his or her birth, until the contrary shall be proved." Next as to parentage, they recommended that (subject to the obvious exceptions of persons born in prisons, hospitals and workhouses) the settlement of every legitimate child born after the passing of the intended Act should follow that of the parents or surviving parent of such child, until such child should attain the age of sixteen years, or the death of its surviving parent; and that at the age of sixteen or on the death of its surviving parent such child should be considered settled in the place in which it was born. Further, with regard to parentage, the Commissioners recommended that every illegitimate child born after the passing of the Act should, until it attained the age of sixteen, follow its mother's settlement.

Amendment of law in 1834.

354. How far did Parliament act upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1832 ?—Parliament, in the Act of 1834, adopted the suggestions of the Commissioners of Inquiry with regard to the settlement by hiring and service, and the settlement of an illegitimate child. The Act prohibited the acquisition of a settlement by hiring and service after the passing of the Act, or by residence under the same (Sec. 64). The Act also provided that every child born a bastard, after its passing, should have and follow the settlement of its mother until the child should attain the age of sixteen or should acquire a settlement in its own right (Sec. 71). The Act further abolished the future acquisition of a settlement by serving an office (Sec. 64), and by apprenticeship so far as regards the sea service (Sec. 67), and made the payment of rates a condition of the acquisition or completion of a settlement by occupying a tenement (Sec. 66); modifying at the same time the settlement by estate by limiting its retention to the period of inhabitancy within ten miles of the parish (Sec. 68).

Observations of Commission of Inquiry on settlement by residence.

355. Have you any special remarks to make at this stage with reference to settlement by residence ?—The Commissioners drew attention to the fact that they did not recommend settlement by residence (p. 343). They considered that it would tend to the separation of master and man, to the demolition of cottages, and to the deterioration of the unsettled labourers who were then superior in morals and industry to the settled. In circumstances very much changed from those which prevailed at the time of the Commission of Inquiry, settlement by residence has a place in the list of modern settlements.

Present forms of settlement.

356. Will you enumerate the existing forms of settlement ?—These are: (1) Birth; (2) Parentage; (3) Marriage; (4) Estate; (5) Apprenticeship; (6) Renting a Tenement; (7) Payment of Parochial Rates; and (8) Residence.

357. There were nine before, were there not ?—Yes.

358. Hiring and service and serving an office are omitted, and residence added ?—Yes.

Settlement by birth.

359. We will take those in order; first, settlement by birth ?—The first or birth settlement, may be described as the *prima facie* settlement of every person born in England, but liable to be superseded by the independent acquisition of a settlement, or by any parentage settlement. The rule thus stated is subject to exception by statute in the case of births in prisons or lying-in hospitals (54 George III. c. 170, Sec. 2) and in workhouses (Sec. 3).

Settlement by parents.

360. Now will you take the second, settlement by parentage ?—Settlement by parentage belongs to the class of derivative settlements. It is, therefore, a settlement to which the 35th section of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876 (39 and 40 Vic. c. 61), applies. The section is as follows: "No person shall be deemed to have derived a settlement from any other person, whether by parentage, estate or otherwise, except in the case of a wife from her husband, and in the case of a child under the age of sixteen, which child shall take the settlement of its father or of its widowed mother, as the case may be, up to that age, and shall retain the settlement so taken until it shall acquire another. An illegitimate child shall retain the settlement of its mother until such child acquires another settlement. If any child in this section mentioned shall not have acquired a settlement for itself, or being a female shall not have derived a settlement from her husband, and it cannot be shown what settlement such child or female derived from the parent without inquiring into the derivative settlement of such parent, such child or female shall be deemed to be settled in the parish in which he or she was born." Upon this enactment it was said in the House of Lords, in the Reigate Union *v.* the Croydon Union (Law Reports, 1889, 14 Appeal Cases, 465; 59 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 29), that it put an end to all nice questions as to emancipation or non-emancipation by enacting that, on attaining the age of sixteen, every child shall, without regard to its physical or mental capacity cease to follow its parent's settlement and become capable of acquiring a settlement in its own right. The clause

leaves the old law applicable to parentage settlements unchanged in all other respects. Without attempting an elaborate illustration of the possible cases to which this much discussed enactment will apply, it may suffice to say that: As regards a legitimate child, (1) the child up to the age of sixteen will take the settlement of his father, if alive, and (2) the child up to the age of sixteen will retain the father's settlement if the father die and the child have no mother; otherwise, the child will take the settlement of his widowed mother. As regards an illegitimate child, the child up to the age of sixteen retains the settlement of his mother. Both cases, however, are subject to the condition that if it cannot be shown what settlement the child derived from the parent without inquiring into the derivative settlement of the parent, the child is to be deemed to be settled in the parish in which he was born. But it would also appear from the case of West Ham Union *v.* Holbeach Union (74 Law Journal, King's Bench, 868) in the House of Lords that, at least in the case of an illegitimate child, a settlement by residence may be independently acquired by a child under sixteen.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906

ement arriage.

361. Then we come to the third case, that of settlement by marriage; what do you wish to say about this?—With regard to settlement by marriage, the wife follows her husband's settlement, and it would seem that during the subsistence of the marriage she cannot acquire a settlement of her own. She will retain the husband's settlement during widowhood.

ement tate.

362. Now as to the fourth case, settlement by estate?—Settlement by estate may be acquired by a person who has a freehold or other estate in a parish and resides in the parish for forty days. But the effect of Sec. 5 of the Poor Relief Act, 1722 (9 George I. c. 7), is, that no person can acquire a settlement by virtue of the purchase of an estate unless the price is £30, or unless he inhabits or actually lives on the estate. And, as has already been pointed out, Sec. 68 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, allows the settlement to be retained only so long as the person who gained it inhabits within ten miles of the parish in which it was gained.

lement pren- hip.

363. The fifth kind of settlement is by apprenticeship: have you anything to say on that?—It is only necessary to say very briefly and generally that, except in the case of sea service, to which section 67 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, applies (as has been already stated), or of the service of a turnpike toll collector, a person who is bound apprentice by indenture, deed writing or contract and who inhabits in a town or parish will thereby gain a settlement (3 William and Mary, c. 11, Sec. 7.)

lement enting nement.

364. On the sixth description of settlement, that by renting a tenement, what do you wish to say?—A settlement by renting a tenement may now be acquired by a person who for one whole year rents *bona fide* a tenement consisting of a separate and distinct dwelling-house or building, or of land or of both at £10 a year at the least, who actually occupies the tenement under the yearly hiring, who pays the rent or at least £10 of the rent, who is assessed to and for one year pays the poor rate on the tenement, and who resides in the parish for forty days (6 George IV. c. 57, Sec. 2; 1 William IV. c. 18, Secs. 1 & 2; 4 & 5 William IV. c. 76, Sec. 66; 13 & 14 Charles II. c. 12, Sec. 1).

lement payment arochial s.

365. The seventh kind of settlement is that by payment of parochial rates; how is that acquired?—A settlement by payment of parochial rates may be gained by a person, who is charged with and pays his share of the public taxes of a parish in respect of a tenement of the yearly value of £10 in his ownership, or in respect of a tenement not owned by him, but consisting of a separate and distinct dwelling house or building or of land or of both *bona fide* rented by him for one year at £10 a year at the least, and occupied under the hiring for the term of one whole year at the least for which term £10 at least of the rent shall be actually paid. Forty days' residence after payment of the rates is a condition in this settlement (3 William and Mary c. 11, Sec. 5; 35 George III. c. 101, Sec. 4; 6 George IV. c. 57, Sec. 2; 1 William IV. c. 13, Sec. 2; 3 William and Mary c. 11, Sec. 6).

tlement residence.

366. We now come to the last case, that of settlement by residence; will you explain the law as to this variety of settlement?—As regards the case of a settlement by residence, attention has already been drawn to the observations of the Commission of 1832, on the objections to this kind of settlement. It is, however, to be noted that a long trial of the expedient of an irremovable status had been made before Parliament undertook the creation of this new form of settlement. The settlement was first authorised in 1876. By Section 34 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, it was enacted that where any person shall have resided for the term of three years in any parish, in such manner and under such circumstances in each of such years as would in accordance with the several statutes in that behalf render him irremovable, he shall be deemed to be settled therein until he shall acquire a settlement in some other parish by a like residence or otherwise. Provided that an order of removal in respect of a settlement acquired under this section shall not be made upon the evidence of the person to be removed without such corroboration as the justices or court think sufficient. Generally it may be said of this enactment that it requires: (1) The residence to be continuous and (2) The residence to be in one parish or place maintaining its own poor.

Points arising out of definition of residence.

367. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Is residence defined?—Only judicially, not by statute.

368. (*Mr. Loch.*) By continuity?—There are only deductions from decided cases.

369. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Are you going to quote any of those cases?—I have some here.

370. (*Chairman.*) What is the judicial definition, or is it only deductive?—The definitions are derived from cases which have been the subject of various judicial decisions, and of which there is a considerable number, involving the construction of this particular section.

371. Are the decisions tolerably consistent?—They have been in conflict until harmonised by the House of Lords.

372. Then is this the answer to Mr. Phelps' question—that there is no definition of the exact period of residence necessary to qualify?—The three years is the exact period of residence. That period of residence must be continuous, or ought to be continuous, in the statutory sense; that is, in the same sense as residence is required to be continuous for the purpose of acquiring a status of irremovability. In acquiring the status of irremovability there are certain gaps as, for instance, when a man might be in a workhouse—that is excluded from the period. So for the purpose of the acquisition of settlement by residence, that interval may be excluded too, but each of the three years must be complete without any such interval. The three years must also be consecutive. I have several cases before me. One is the case of a woman who resided continuously for upwards of three years with her mother in the union and then went to live out of the parish as a domestic servant for a month upon trial. She intended to return to her mother's house in the event of receiving notice to leave within the month. She received notice and returned to her mother's house. In that case it was held that the continuity was broken. Then a man left his wife and children in a cottage, he himself sleeping every night for four years in another parish, as he was bound to do under the terms of his engagement. He was dismissed, and on his return was held removable. In another case absence for the purpose of fulfilling a short contract was held to be no break of residence. A woman was employed for five years as a resident nurse at an infirmary under the authority of the lady superintendent. For five months in one year and three months in the following year she acted as nurse at a branch establishment in another parish, returning each time to the infirmary where she during the first period of absence left the greater part of her effects and to which she went for change of clothing. It was held in that case that neither period of absence constituted a break of residence. (Manchester *v.* Ormskirk, 1886, 16 Queen's Bench Division, 723; 50 Justice of the Peace, 518). Then an illegitimate child was elected a pupil at a school for indigent blind and was allowed to return to his mother for five or six weeks each summer. It was held in his case that while at the school he had an *animus revertendi* (which is, of course, a most important point in dealing with cases of this class), and that he had constructively resided with his mother and her husband. (Queen *v.* Abingdon, 1870, Law Reports, 5 Queen's Bench, 406; 39 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 153; 22 Law Times, New Series, 603). I can supplement my evidence with a further list of cases on this point.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

9 Jan. 1906.

Settlement by residence as affecting children.

373. I should like to ask you now what is the effect on the position of children as regards this kind of settlement; that is, settlement by residence?—With regard to the position of children under this enactment, it may be well to advert to the question whether a child under the age of sixteen can acquire in its own right a settlement by residence. In a case which came before the House of Lords in 1889 (Highworth and Swindon Union *v* Westbury-on-Severn Union, Law Reports, 14 Appeal Cases, 465) the pauper was legitimate and born in the parish of Wanborough in the Highworth and Swindon Union on the 27th of October, 1861. The pauper's father was also born in the same parish. The pauper's father and mother left Wanborough in 1862 and went to reside in the parish of Rhydgwern in the Newport Union. The father died at Rhydgwern. After his death the widow and daughter (the pauper) continued to reside at Rhydgwern, and in 1871 the widow married again and resided at Rhydgwern until the second husband died there in 1884. In 1885 the widow married a third husband and went with her husband and the pauper to reside in the parish of Westbury-on-Severn in the Westbury-on-Severn Union. The pauper was sixteen on the 27th of October, 1877. She had received no relief during eighteen years' residence at Rhydgwern, and she had resided in Rhydgwern more than three whole years after the passing of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876. Of that time the period of a year and two months was while she was under sixteen and the period of two years eight months after sixteen. The pauper became chargeable to the Westbury-on-Severn Union, and the guardians of that union obtained an order for her removal to the Highworth and Swindon union on the ground that Wanborough was the last legal settlement of her father. The House of Lords affirmed the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division quashing the order of removal. It was pointed out by Lord Halsbury, Lord Chancellor, that the pauper had by more than the necessary period of residence acquired a status of irremovability and so was settled in the parish of Rhydgwern. "It is true," his Lordship continued, "that during a part of that period she was under sixteen years of age, and it is true that if it be assumed as it was by the Court of Appeal, that unemancipated residence will not suffice, then she had not accomplished the necessary period of emancipated residence. The statute knows no such distinction. It makes the emancipated and the unemancipated equally irremovable, and if so the periods of emancipated an unemancipated residence may be put together." It will have been noticed that in this case the pauper about whose settlement the question arose had become emancipated before the requisite period of residence had been completed. In a recent case (West Ham Union *v.* Holbeach Union, 74 Law Journal, King's Bench, 868) Lord Halsbury, as Lord Chancellor has on an appeal to the House of Lords advanced matters to an important result. The mother of the pauper, who was illegitimate, was herself an illegitimate child and had while under the age of sixteen resided for three years with her mother and her husband in the parish of West Ham. The man resided in circumstances such as to render him irremovable and to give him a settlement in the parish. The question was whether the pauper's mother by residence during the same period in the same place with her mother and her mother's husband had, since the residence was completed before the pauper's mother attained the age of sixteen, also acquired a settlement. It followed that if the settlement was so acquired by the pauper's mother it would be an independent settlement and therefore one which the pauper would retain. The Lord Chancellor is reported to have said that the case of the Queen *v.* Elvet, expounded as it was by the House of Lords in the Highworth and Swindon case, decided the question. "Rightly or wrongly," his Lordship observed, "this House has decided that unemancipated residence could found a settlement in the Highworth case. I see no answer to what the Master of the Rolls pointed out [when the case of West Ham Union *v.* Holbeach Union was before the Court of Appeal] that if a part of the residence while under sixteen may be made available to make up the settlement that the whole residence under sixteen cannot do so also. If that decision was wrong we must abide by it till it is altered by Act of Parliament." The report of West Ham Union *v.* Holbeach Union implies that Lord Macnaghten, although he agreed in the conclusion that the pauper was to be regarded as settled in West Ham, had some hesitation about holding that an unemancipated child can acquire a settlement by residence no part of which is after emancipation. His Lordship did not expressly disagree with the Lord Chancellor, but found another way of arriving at the same conclusion on the actual facts of the case then before the House of Lords.

THIRD DAY.

Monday, 15th January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.
Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. ALFRED DOUGLAS ADRIAN*, C.B., K.C., recalled ; and further Examined.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

374. (*Chairman.*) On the last occasion we had finished your evidence as regards settlement by residence, so far as it affects the position of children. Before we leave this subject, I should like to ask you a general question, namely, has there been litigation in the past on this subject to such an extent as to put any appreciable charge on the rates?—I think so, especially in olden times ; of course, when the chargeability was parochial, there was a very great deal. Union chargeability has reduced it somewhat, but even now, occasionally, in a well fought case there is a good deal of expense.

375. These recent decisions, I assume, would tend to diminish litigation?—Clearly.

376. I think there is a system in Scotland of arbitration?—So there is in England, and I propose to explain the procedure in the course of my evidence.

377. You propose to deal with that in your subsequent evidence?—Quite so.

378. Would you like to make some comments on the effect of parochial alterations upon settlements. Will you describe the difficulties which have arisen?—From time to time, questions have arisen as to the effect of alterations of parishes upon settlements. As the older cases have been reviewed of late years, it seems to be necessary only to state the effect of the more modern decisions. In 1898, the Court of Appeal had to consider the case of the Guardians of the Dorking Union *v.* the Guardians of St. Saviour's Union (Law Reports 1898, 1 Queen's Bench, 594). It appeared that the pauper whose settlement was in question had been born in the Hamlet of Westcott, which, at the time, formed part of the Parish of Dorking, in the Dorking Union, and that he had never acquired a settlement elsewhere. On his becoming chargeable to the St. Saviour's Union, an order had been obtained for his removal to the Dorking Union. The guardians of the Dorking Union appealed against the order. As a consequence of the Local Government Act, 1894, Sec. 1, Sub-sec. 3, the part of the Parish of Dorking which was within the Dorking Rural Sanitary District, and the part outside became separate parishes, and the old parish ceased to exist. The Surrey County Council, under the Act of 1894, named the new parishes "Dorking" and "Dorking Rural." The hamlet of Westcott is within the parish of Dorking Rural and the Dorking Union. The Queen's Bench Division held that they were bound by the principle of the older cases, and affirmed an order of Quarter Sessions which had been made on the view that, through the destruction of the old parish of Dorking, the pauper's birth settlement had been wholly lost. The Court of Appeal upheld the decision of the Queen's Bench Division. The Court followed a decision of 1842, in the Queen *v.* Tipton (3 Queen's Bench, 215) which they found to have been established law for fifty years.

379. What was the next case before the High Court?—In 1900 the case of the Calne Union *v.* St. Mary, Islington (69 Law Journal, Queen's Bench, 400 ; 82 Law Times, New Series, 121) also had reference to a divided parish. There the division was effected by an order of the County Council, afterwards confirmed by the Local Government Board, under the Local Government Act, 1888. By the order the parish of Calne was, from and after the 25th of March, 1890, divided into the parishes of Calne Within and Calne Without. The pauper whose settlement was in question had resided from May, 1887, to September, 1891, in that portion of the original parish of Calne which became the parish of Calne Within. His residence was in such manner and under such circumstances as to render him irremovable from the Calne Union. The order contained a provision to the effect that every person who, on or before the 25th of March, 1890, had acquired a settlement in the then existing parish of Calne, should be deemed to have acquired a settlement in Calne Within or in Calne Without, according to the circumstances. In September, 1891, the pauper ceased to reside in Calne Within, but, had the order not been made, he would have acquired a residential settlement in the parish of Calne by virtue of Sec. 34 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876. The order of removal from Islington to Calne Union was quashed by the London Quarter Sessions. The decision of Quarter Sessions was upheld by the Queen's Bench Division. The Court pointed out that though the Local Government Board, by the terms of their order, had endeavoured, partially at all events, to meet the difficulty which arose out of the Dorking decision, the terms of the order did not cover the particular case. Those terms applied to persons who had acquired a settlement and not to persons who were in the process of acquiring a settlement. And the pauper on the day when the division took place had not acquired a settlement since the period of his residence fell short by about two months of the required time.

Union Mary ton.

380. Have you another case of parochial change?—In another case it appeared that a pauper had, by residence from 1886 to 1891, acquired a settlement in the parish of Broadwater. By virtue of the Local Government Act, 1894, the parish of Broadwater had been divided into two parishes, namely, Broadwater and Worthing. The residence had been in that part of the original parish of Broadwater which became the parish of Worthing. In 1902, by a Provisional Order under the Local Government Act, 1888, for the extension of the Borough of Worthing, a part of the then parish of Broadwater with parts of other parishes was formed into the new parish of Worthing. Certain other divisions and amalgamations of parishes were made by the same Provisional Order. The Provisional Order enacted that, for all purposes of settlement and removal, residence prior to its commencement in any part of the existing parishes of Broadwater and Worthing should be deemed to have been residence in the parish in which the part was included. It was held by the Queen's Bench Division that the Provisional Order did not operate to restore the settlement of the pauper in the old parish of Broadwater, which had been destroyed by the Local Government Act, 1894, and that the pauper was not settled in the parish of Worthing. (East Preston Union *v.* Lewisham Union ; 91 Law Times, New Series, 498 ; 68 Justice of the Peace, 404).

East Preston Union v. Lewisham Union.

381. Will you now give the particulars of the latest instance of this kind?—A pauper lunatic had been born in the parish of West Ham, and had resided there for seventeen years so as to render her irremovable. By an order of the Local Government Board in August, 1886, a certain part of the parish of Wanstead became, under the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, and the Poor Law Act, 1879, amalgamated with

West Ham Union v. London County Council.

* N.B.—It should be borne in mind that, since the dates at which this witness appeared before the Royal Commission, various Statutory enactments and judicial decisions have, in several respects, affected the legal position as described in his evidence.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

the parish of West Ham. The pauper lunatic left the parish of West Ham and did not thereafter acquire a settlement in any parish, but in February, 1900, was adjudged chargeable to the County of London. A subsequent order of justices adjudged the settlement to be in the West Ham Union. The London Quarter Sessions quashed the order, holding that the reasoning of the Tipton case of 1842, and of the Dorking case applied "not only to a district where a parish is divided, but also to where a district is destroyed by reason of amalgamation." The case eventually came before the House of Lords. Some of their Lordships commented upon the Queen *v.* Tipton, and the Dorking case, in terms suggestive of doubt as to the soundness of the views taken in those cases. But the Lord Chancellor pointed out that the particular case then before the House presented none of the circumstances on which the other cases had been decided. His Lordship went on to remark that the argument was that something had been added to the parish of West Ham, and that the addition was to make the whole difference in the rights and liabilities of the parish. "I am wholly unable," said the Lord Chancellor, "to follow the reasoning which suggests that this parish has changed its identity. It is the same parish in all the things which constitute identity of an administrative body, and the fact that a small part has been added to it so as to bring it within the area of that which is the limit for administrative purposes, seems to me not in the smallest degree to interfere with the identity of that which is really the same parish which existed before. It would indeed be only an attempt at logic run mad to suggest that by reason of an addition to a parish it ceased to be the same parish and became a new creature created by the mere fact of that addition." Accordingly the House of Lords upheld the decision of the Court of Appeal restoring the order whereby the pauper lunatic was adjudged to be settled in the West Ham Union, (Guardians of West Ham Union *v.* The London County Council; Law Reports, 1904, Appeal Cases, 40; 73 Law Journal, King's Bench, 85; 89 Law Times Reports, New Series, 614.)

Remedial. Clauses in recent Orders as to Parochial changes.

382. Have the Local Government Board made attempts to meet the difficulties to which you have referred?—It has been seen that in some of the cases involving parochial alterations attention was drawn to provisions in orders of the Local Government Board respecting settlement and removal. Changes have from time to time been made by the Board with the object of bringing these clauses into line with the later decisions. The subject is confessedly most difficult. But in their later clauses the Board have endeavoured as fully as possible to cover the cases in which parochial alterations concern settlements and the status of irremovability in course of acquisition as well as actually acquired. I hand in specimens of these Clauses taken from recent Orders and Provisional Orders. (*See* Appendix, Vol. I. (A), No. I. (*f*)).

Points arising out of *Dorking Union* v. *St. Saviour's Union.*

383. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Does the Dorking case still stand notwithstanding the recent judgment of the House of Lords in the case you have just cited?—The Tipton decision, on which that case rested, has been shaken somewhat, but it has not been actually over-ruled.

384. It is the case, is not it, that it has been said in the Court of Appeal that the result of the Dorking case is a very unreasonable one?—I do not recall that.

385. Leading to this: that where there is an alteration in the boundary of the parish for the purpose of settlement, a pauper is practically held to be born nowhere?—I do not remember that; and, moreover, the Dorking case is one that is curable by order and provisional order. The vice of the Dorking case, if it had one, was, according to the suggestion of the House of Lords, that it followed too rigidly the decision in the Tipton case in 1842; but it is one of the cases that are curable without an alteration of the law.

386. Still the administration has proceeded upon the Dorking case in many individual instances. I suppose, if questions arise as between parishes, the Dorking case has resulted in this; that it has been difficult to fix a settlement, when the settlement, but for it, would have been clearly within the parish the boundary of which had not been altered?—Undoubtedly that may have been so in the past, but it need not be so, as regards the future, I take it.

Irremovability.

387. (*Chairman.*) You now wish to discuss the law respecting the status of irremovability?—It may be noted that in the older law there are some slight traces of judicial attempts to recognise irremovability as apart from settlement, in cases not expressly classed as casual poor. Thus in Cowred's case (1694 Comberbach, 287), a Dutch woman and her two children landed at Harwich from Holland, and, removing to another place, were sent back to Harwich by an order of two justices. "Landing makes no settlement," said one judge; and another observed: "You must keep them when you have them, for aught I know, for it seems to be *casus omissus.*" In Berkhampstead *v.* St. Mary North Church (1735, 2 Bott, pl. 51), a deserted wife had been left two houses; she resided with her children in one; and, on her application for relief, two justices made an order for the removal of the children to the place of the father's settlement. On the case as stated for the opinion of the Court of King's Bench, Lord Hardwicke the Chief Justice, could only deal with the question of a derivative settlement from the mother. On that question he took the view that the mother could not gain a settlement for her children; but Mr. Justice Lee thought that, though the mother could not gain a settlement for the children, she could gain a right of residence for them. About the same time, in The King *v.* Barton Turfe (Burrow; Settlement Cases, 49), Mr. Justice Lee cited an earlier authority, namely, a case between the parishes of Edgware and Harrow, in Queen Anne's time, in which Chief Justice Parker had held that the settlement of children was gained, not by inheritance, but by their being "irremovable." The present state of the law, which exempts a poor person from removal from a union other than that which contains his parish of settlement, has been reached by a succession of stages, beginning in 1846, and ending in 1865. In 1846 Parliament passed the Poor Removal Act, 1846. By this Statute (9 and 10 Vic., c. 66), it was enacted that: "No person shall be removed, nor shall any warrant be granted for the removal of any person, from any parish in which such person shall have resided for five years next before the application for the warrant; provided always that the time during which such person shall be a prisoner in a prison or shall be serving Her Majesty as a soldier, marine, or sailor, or reside as an in-pensioner in Greenwich or Chelsea Hospitals, or shall be confined in a lunatic asylum or house duly licensed or hospital registered for the reception of lunatics, or as a patient in a hospital, or during which any such person shall receive relief from any parish or shall be wholly or in part maintained by any rate or subscription raised in a parish in which such person does not reside, not being a *bona fide* charitable gift, shall for all purposes be excluded in the computation of time hereinbefore mentioned." By the Poor Removal Act, 1861 (24 and 25, Vict., c. 55) it was enacted that after the 25th of March, 1862, three years should be substituted for five years, and that residence in any part of a union should have the same effect as residence in any parish; so that, with the further amendment effected by the Poor Removal Act, 1864 (27 and 28 Vict., c. 105, Sec. 1), the time required for the status of irremovability may be made up from periods of residence in any part of a union. The alteration made by the Act of 1861 was followed by the Union Chargeability Act, 1865, which, from and after Lady Day, 1866, reduced the statutory period to one year. Legislation subsequent to the Poor Removal Act, 1846, added, as periods to be excluded in the calculation required by that Act, the following: The time of detention in a lunatic asylum (12 & 13 Vic. c. 103, Sec. 4); the time of detention in an industrial school (29 & 30 Vic. c. 118, Sec. 31); the time of detention in a retreat for drunkards, or inebriate reformatory (42 & 43 Vic. c. 19, Sec. 31; 61 & 62 Vic. c. 60, Sec. 22). At this stage, it may be convenient to supplement what I said on a previous occasion with regard to the explanation of the law so far as it affects the question of residence for the purpose of acquiring a *status* of irremovability. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the law, being dependent almost entirely on judicial decisions, is of such volume as to render it impracticable for me to attempt more than a very brief summary of the effect of the principal cases. The summary may be divided into two parts. The first part deals with the question: What constitutes residence? The second part is concerned with the question of continuity, and with illustrating the nature of the absence permissible without breach of continuity. Residence, then, for this purpose has the simplest characteristics. "Where the object is to ascertain the settlement of a pauper," said Mr. Justice Coleridge, in Blackwell *v.* England (1857, 8 Ellis & Blackburn, 541), "there he resides where his head lies at night." "The beginning of a settlement," said Mr. Justice Erle in the same case, "was when the inhabitants had notice that the party in-

Principle recognised in judicial decisions of 17th and 18th Centuries.

Development of Modern Statute law.

Blackwell v. *England.*

Summary of judicial decisions as to residence.

tended to abide with them as an inhabitant. For that purpose his sleeping in the parish was most important. In that branch of law, therefore, pernoctation is the test of residence. But that is a very narrow ground of construction confined to the Poor Law." In order to constitute residence within the meaning of the Poor Removal Act, 1866, "it need not necessarily be in a house," said Cockburn, the Lord Chief Justice, in The Queen *v.* St. Leonard's Shoreditch (Law Reports, 1865, 1 Queen's Bench, 21; 6 Best & Smith, 784; 35 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 48). "There are unfortunate persons who constantly sleep in such temporary shelter as the dry arches of a bridge afford . . . " and the Lord Chief Justice thought that a person living in the open air is, as to residence, in the same position as one who has a house to live in. With regard to continuity, it is to be observed that there must be no breach of residence; but what amounts to a break in construction of law is a question which is often one of considerable difficulty. Removal under an order is a complete break. "We take it to be clear, as a general proposition," said Lord Denman, the Chief Justice, in The Queen *v.* The Inhabitants of Halifax, (12 Queen's Bench (848) 111) "that removal puts an end to residence. A review of the statutes . . . shews that the pauper was considered originally as an intruder upon the inhabitants and the power of removing was given to prevent his becoming an inhabitant. A removal, therefore, is in its nature a disruption of residence and inhabitancy." But as a general proposition it may also be laid down that an absence for a merely temporary purpose does not necessarily cause a break of residence. There must, however, in all such cases be an intention to return; there must also be a residence to which to return; and the absence must not be too prolonged. The cases are very numerous, and it is impossible to present them here in any complete form; but two may be selected as illustrative. In The Queen *v.* Glossop (Law Reports, 1866, 1 Queen's Bench, 227), Mr. Justice Blackburn remarked: "The cases on this subject turn on their particular circumstances, but the result of them is that where a person goes away from a parish for a temporary purpose, leaving a house or lodging behind him, he is still in effect residing in the parish. On the other hand, if he goes away, even leaving wife and children behind him, and establishes himself elsewhere, there is no residence. There must be both a place which he has a right to return to and an intention to return, to constitute a constructive residence; and where a man has gone away and left no residence, though he means to return at a future time, the *animus revertendi* is immaterial. In The Queen *v.* Stapleton (1 Ellis and Blackburn, 766), Lord Campbell, the Chief Justice, said, "I think when a man is absent for a temporary purpose with an intention to return when that temporary purpose is served, as, for instance, when he is absent for a week's work in another parish, meaning to come back at the end of the week, it is no break in his residence. The phrase 'temporary purpose' is not very definite; still I think it may, in each case, be known whether the purpose was temporary or not." And Mr. Justice Crompton added: "An absence for a mere temporary purpose with an intention to return, will be no break in the residence. But an intention to return at a remote period, after a permanent absence, is not sufficient to prevent the absence from being a break. When the *animus revertendi* merely means that, though the absent person has what amounts to a residence elsewhere, it is his intention to return when that residence is at an end, I think that the *animus revertendi* cannot be said to make his absence temporary and not permanent." Another feature which has to be borne in mind when the statutory provisions respecting the acquisition of a status of irremovability are under consideration is the deduction of time authorised by Statute in the computation of the period of residence. Attention has already been drawn to the language of the Acts on this subject. But in this instance also the cases are numerous, and the rules furnished by them can only be stated in very general terms. These rules are: that the time of absence, in the circumstances described by the Statute, is to be deducted from the total period of residence; that the period arrived at by this method of computation will be effective for the purposes of the Acts if the pauper immediately returns to the parish on the completion of the term of absence. It should be added that the foregoing explanation with regard to the residence required for the status of irremovability applies also to the acquisition of a settlement by residence, subject to the condition that there must not be in the qualifying period of three consecutive years any such interval as may be excluded for purposes of irremovability.

388. Have you any observations to make on the subject of casual poor?—Judicial decisions have established the *status* of irremovability in the case of casual poor; that is to say, a person who, being casually within a parish, without any intention of taking up a residence there, requires relief. Thus, in an early case (The King *v.* The Inhabitants of St. James in Bury St. Edmunds, 10 East, 25,) the Court of King's Bench confirmed an order of sessions quashing an order for the removal to his parish of settlement of a day labourer employed to drive a load of hay to another parish from which he was to return with a load of another description, and in which, as it happened, he broke his leg and required relief. Lord Ellenborough, referring to the words of the 13 & 14 Charles II. c. 12, which describes persons who may be removed as persons coming to settle, observed that this expression "denotes that the party comes *animo morandi* or *manendi*; it may be for a temporary purpose, but still it must be understood that he comes to settle there . . . but how can it be said that the pauper went into this parish *animo morandi* at all?"

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

Irremovability of Casual Poor.

King v. Inhabitants of St. James, Bury St. Edmunds.

389. What other instances of irremovability do you wish to give?—A man may not be casual poor. He may have come to settle, but before the expiration of the time needed for the acquisition of a *status* of irremovability, he may need temporary relief on account of sickness. To meet such a case, the Poor Removal Act, 1846 (Sec. 4) provided that no warrant should be granted for the removal of any person becoming chargeable in respect of relief made necessary by sickness or accident, unless the justices granting the warrant should state in such warrant that they are satisfied that the sickness or accident will produce permanent disability. The same Act further provided that no woman residing in any parish with her husband at the time of his death should be removed; and that no warrant should be granted for her removal from the parish for twelve calendar months next after his death, if she so long continue a widow. (Sec. 2.) With regard to children, the Act (Sec. 3) prohibits the removal of a child under the age of sixteen (whether legitimate or illegitimate) residing in a parish with his or her father or mother, stepfather or stepmother, or reputed father, in any case where the father, mother, stepfather, stepmother, or reputed father may not lawfully be removed from the parish. With respect to orphans, it is enacted by the Poor Removal Act, 1861, that "where a child under the age of sixteen, residing with its surviving parent shall be left an orphan, and such parent shall, at the time of death, have acquired an exemption from removal by reason of a continued residence, such orphan shall, if not otherwise irremovable, be exempt from removal in like manner and to the same extent as if it had then acquired for itself an exemption from removal by residence" (24 & 25, Vict. c. 55, Sec. 2). The Poor Removal Act, 1848 (11 & 12 Vict. c. 111) added as a proviso to Sec. 1 of the Poor Removal Act, 1846, the following: "Provided always that whenever any person should have a wife or children having no other settlement than his or her own, such wife and children should be removable from any parish or place from which he or she would be removable, notwithstanding any provisions of the said recited Act, and should not be removable from any parish or place from which he or she would not be removable by reason of any provision in the said recited Act. The case of a deserted wife is met by the Poor Removal Act, 1861, Sec. 3, and the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1866 (29 & 30 Vict. c. 113, Sec. 17). The combined effect is that where a married woman is deserted by her husband, and, after the desertion, resides for a year in such a manner as would, if she were a widow, render her exempt from removal, she is exempt from removal from the parish of her residence, unless her husband return to cohabit with her.

Irremovability in cases of Sickness, widows, children, deserted wives.

390. You now wish to advert to the cases of Scotch and Irish paupers, and paupers born in the Isle of Man the Isles of Scilly, Jersey and Guernsey?—A very brief mention may suffice for the law as it affects paupers in England who have been born in Scotland, Ireland, the Isles of Man, Scilly, Jersey or Guernsey. (8 and 9 Vic. c. 117; 10 and 11 Vic. c. 33; 25 and 26 Vic. c. 113; 26 and 27 Vic. c. 89). If any such person is not settled in England, and becomes chargeable, he may be removed to his native country. To this rule there are important exceptions in the case of Irish paupers. The Poor Removal Act, 1900 (63 and 64 Vic. c. 23), with regard to this class, enacts that a person who has resided continuously for five years in England shall not thereafter be removable to Ireland. The Act also allows agreements for non-resident relief in England at the cost of

Removal of paupers born in Scotland, Ireland, &c.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.,

15 Jan. 1906.

an Irish union in any case in which a pauper would be removable to Ireland.

391. The Irish pauper, I understand, becomes chargeable to England after five years' residence?—Practically so.

392. What you have told us as regards the previous questions would answer the question as to what place you would charge for the maintenance?—Quite so.

393. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) There is no appeal in England to the Local Government Board against the action of a board of guardians for removal to Ireland or Scotland, is there?—There is an appeal by the Irish Local Government Board to Quarter Sessions, as if they were a party. That authority has been exercised in some instances. I shall refer to one of those cases.

394. I am rather alluding to England. There is a power to appeal, by a board of guardians in England or in Ireland, against the removal from Scotland to England or Ireland, but I understand there is no parallel appeal in England to the Local Government Board here by a parish in Scotland to which a pauper is to be removed?—Not to the Local Government Board.

Removal of Scotch and Irish paupers. Procedure.

395. (*Chairman*). What is the procedure for the removal of Scotch and Irish paupers?—Provision is made as regards those paupers who are removable from England for the attendance of the pauper before two justices. The justices are to hear and examine into the complaint by the English board of guardians, and must be satisfied that the person is liable to be removed, and that he is in such a state of health as not to be liable to suffer bodily or mental injury by the removal. If they see fit, the justices may issue a warrant for the removal. Before execution, a copy of the warrant is to be sent by post to the Scotch or Irish Poor Law Authority. Women and children must not be removed to Scotland or Ireland as deck passengers during winter. No person employed in the execution of a warrant may wilfully desert a person mentioned in the warrant before that person has been conveyed to the place of destination. In the case of Irish paupers, the Irish Local Government Board may appeal against the order of removal. A brief reference may be made to decided cases which illustrate the working of this branch of the law. The person born in Ireland, and those other places mentioned, must be one of those to be removed. If he be dead, or have absconded, or be not removable, his children cannot be removed. So two legitimate children born in England of of a man born in Ireland who had deserted and whose wife, an Irishwoman, was dead, were held to be removable to their birth settlement in England, and not to Ireland (Queen *v.* All Saints, Derby; 14 Queen's Bench, 207; 19 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 14.) A girl born in England of Irish parents, without settlement in England, lived with a man in an English parish, from which her father was not removable. It was held that she was properly removed to the place of her birth settlement. (Queen *v.* St. Giles' Without, Cripplegate; 17 Queen's Bench, 636; 21 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 26; 15 Jurist, 1152.) An Irishwoman deserted by her husband cannot be removed to Ireland, because the procedure only applies where the head of the family is removable and the husband and wife are removed together. (Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland *v.* Vestry of Liverpool; Law Reports, 5 Queen's Bench, 79; 10 Best and Smith, 921; 39 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 25). A woman with an English settlement married an Irishman who never had a settlement in England. The wife was deserted, and she and her children were held to be removable to the place of her maiden settlement in England (Much Hoole Overseers *v.* Preston Overseers; 17, Queen's Bench, 518; 21 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 1; 15 Jurist, 1152).

Queen v. *All Saints, Derby.*

Queen v. *St. Giles' Without, Cripplegate.*

Poor Law Commissioners of Ireland v. *Vestry of Liverpool.*

Much Hoole Overseers v. *Preston Overseers.*

396. As I understand if an Irishwoman marries and is deserted by her husband, there is no power of removal?—There is no power of removal to Ireland.

397. Assuming she became in any way chargeable to the parish in which she resided, would they have power to recover against the husband?—They could proceed against him for desertion. They could proceed against him under the English law, assuming of course, that he was in England.

398. But assume he was not in England?—Then they could not.

399. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is that because the wife follows her husband's settlement?—No; it is because under those Statutes the removal can only take place when the head of the family is one of the persons to be removed.

400. (*Mr. Booth.*) That solely concerns the Irish parts?—And the Isles of Man, Scilly, Jersey and Guernsey.

401. And Scotland?—Yes.

Order of removal: Procedure

402. (*Chairman*) Will you describe the procedure for obtaining an order of removal?—With regard to the procedure for obtaining an order of removal from one part of England to another, it is perhaps unnecessary to say any more than will suffice to indicate the broad outline of practice. Before proceeding to obtain an order, a notice of chargeability may be given to the Poor Law Union of settlement so as to obviate subsequent difficulty about the recovery of the cost of maintenance. No order is needed where the guardians of the Poor Law Union of settlement elect to receive the paupers. In other circumstances the proceedings begin by a complaint made to two or more justices in Petty Sessions, a stipendiary, or a Metropolitan Police Magistrate. An examination of the pauper usually follows, and if he is suffering from sickness or the effects of an accident, it will be necessary to ascertain his actual condition since Sec. 4 of the Poor Removal Act 1846 enacts that no warrant shall be granted for the removal of any person becoming chargeable in respect of relief made necessary by sickness or accident, unless the justices granting the warrant shall state in such warrant that they are satisfied that the sickness or accident will produce permanent disability. Where an order of removal is made, it must expressly adjudicate and aver that the place named as that to which the pauper is to be removed is the place of his last legal settlement (Trowbridge *v.* Weston, 2 Salkeld, 473; 2 Bott pl. 834; Bury *v.* Arundel, 2 Salkeld 479: 2 Bott pl. 835). The fact of chargeability should also be adjudged, and if members of the pauper's family are to be removed they should be named. When the order has been made, the guardians to whom the order is directed may agree to receive the pauper, and the removal may then take place without delay (4 & 5 William IV. c. 76, Sec. 79); otherwise the removal cannot be effected until 21 days after a notice in writing of the pauper's chargeability or relief and a copy of the order with a statement of the grounds of removal, including the particulars of the settlement, have been sent to the guardians to whom the order is directed (4 & 5 William IV. c. 76, Sec. 79; 11 & 12 Vic. c. 31 Sec. 2). If, within the period of 21 days, notice of appeal is given, the pauper cannot be removed until after the time for prosecuting the appeal has expired, or if the appeal is prosecuted, until after its final determination (4 & 5 William IV. c. 76, Sec. 79). Also within the same period of 21 days, the guardians to whom the order is directed may apply for a copy of the depositions upon which the order was made. In that case they will have an additional 14 days for giving notice of appeal (11 & 12 Vic. c. 31, Sec. 9).

Trowbridge v. *Weston*

Bury v. *Arundel.*

Suspension of order.

403. Have you any observations concerning the suspension of orders of removal?—At the time of making an order, its execution may be suspended where the pauper is unable to travel by reason of sickness or other infirmity (35 Geo. III. c. 101, Sec. 2), and the suspension will continue until the order can safely be executed without danger to any person who is the subject of the order, unless meanwhile the person ordered to be removed dies.

Incidents, &c., of order of removal.

404. Will you advert to other incidents and consequences of an order of removal?—Where the order is executed and, within 12 months after the removal, and without the consent of the guardians, the pauper returns and becomes chargeable to the union from which he was removed, he is to be deemed an idle and disorderly person within the meaning of the Vagrancy Act 1824 (5 Geo. IV. c. 83). An order of removal may be abandoned. It may also be made the subject of an appeal. The procedure on appeal is the subject of detailed regulation in the Poor Law Acts. The order, however, may also be made the subject of a Special Case stated for the opinion of the High Court under the 12 & 13 Vic. c. 45, Sec. 11 (Baines's Act). The same Act (12 & 13 Vic. c. 45, Sec. 12) also authorises references to arbitration.

Determination of questions Central Authority

405. The Poor Law provides facilities for the official determination of questions of chargeability. Will you describe the procedure?—In their first annual Report the Poor Law Board drew attention to a legislative experiment designed to provide an inexpensive method of determining questions arising with regard to the chargeability of paupers between the parishes in a union or between the guardians and any parish. This experiment was authorised by the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 110, Sec. 4

(the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1848). The effect of the enactment was that, where a question arose with reference to the charging of the cost of the relief of a pauper or as to whether a pauper were exempted from removal, the parties might jointly submit the question to the Poor Law Board, who might thereupon, if they thought proper, entertain the question and by an order under seal determine it. Upon this enactment the Poor Law Board remarked: "We do not presume to claim great or undue weight for the judgments which we may form upon such questions, so far as they involve legal construction or the application of principles of law, but we are enabled to give immediate answers to questions which require to be promptly disposed of, as they relate to the charge of certain current expenses; and our jurisdiction in this matter is free from the legal technicalities which attend proceedings in courts of law, and no charge is entailed on the parties appealing to us." A further experiment of a more comprehensive character was made in 1851. The Poor Law Amendment Act of that year materially enlarged the scope of the references to the Poor Law Board. Sec. 12 of the 14 & 15 Vic. c. 105 is in these terms: "The guardians of any two unions or parishes, or the guardians of a union and the guardians of a parish, or the guardians of a union or parish and the overseers of any parish, or the overseers of any two parishes, between whom any question affecting the settlement, removal or chargeability of any poor person shall arise may, if they think fit so to do, by agreement in writing executed in respect of any guardians by sealing with their common seal, and in respect of overseers by the signatures of a majority of them, submit such question to the Poor Law Board for their decision, and the said Board may, if they see fit, entertain such question, and by an order under seal determine the same, and every such order shall be in all courts and for all purposes final and conclusive, between the parties submitting such question, as to the question therein determined." The Poor Law Board were able very soon after the passing of the Act to report as follows: "We have already reason to believe that this cheap and simple mode of determining such controversies will be adopted very extensively, and though it may increase our own labours materially, we have the satisfaction of believing that it will be productive of important public benefits, not only by effecting a large pecuniary saving to ratepayers, but by diminishing those animosities and heartburnings which costly litigation so naturally produces and exasperates."

406. Have there been many applications to the Local Government Board under the procedure you have described?—I have not the numbers with me. Of course, in the past there naturally would be more when parochial chargeability involved questions between parish and parish. The present number, I should say, is not very large.

rliamen-y inquiries o law of tlement l removal.

ect mmittees 1847 and 4.

407. You would like to refer to one or two instances of Parliamentary inquiry into the operation of the law of settlement and removal?—The object of my reference is merely, and in as brief a way as possible, to direct the attention of the Commission to a few reports which they may think it worth while to peruse. A Select Committee of the House of Commons, in 1847, inquired into the operation of the law of settlement and of the Poor Removal Act (9 and 10, Vic. c. 66.) The Committee reported that there were difficulties in the administration of the Act attributable to doubts entertained as to the construction of an important proviso in the first section, but that, whatever might be the extent of the evils attributable to these doubts, the Committee did not consider them urgent enough to require immediate legislation. On the general subject (the operation of the law of settlement) the Committee eventually reported on the 6th of July, 1847, that they had taken much evidence and had received suggestions, that from the evidence reported to the House it would be seen that almost every different plan suggested for the reform of the existing laws of settlement and removal had been distinctly brought before the Committee and discussed by them. The Committee, however, did not submit any specific plan for the amendment of the law. It is because these various plans are enumerated in their Report that mention is made of that Committee. In 1854 the House of Commons appointed a Select Committee to enquire into the operation of the Act 8 and 9 Vic., c. 117 relating to the removal from England of chargeable poor persons born in Scotland, Ireland, the Isles of Man, Scilly, Jersey or Guernsey, and also into the operation of the Act 8 and 9 Vic., c. 33 relating to the removal from Scotland of chargeable poor persons born in England, Ireland or the Isle of Man. The Committee merely reported evidence and recommended the resumption of their inquiry. The Committee by whom the inquiry was continued reported on the 13th of June, 1855, and their Report is exceedingly interesting. It is not necessary to set out the details of the recommendations.

408. Was any action taken on these recommendations?—Yes, small amendments were made. The Report is interesting as a whole.

Select Committees of 1860 and 1879.

409. (*Mr. Nunn.*) May I ask the year of that report?—1855. On the 6th August, 1860, another Select Committee was appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into the operation of the English Acts. The last investigation was that by a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1879. The Select Committee reported on the 10th of July, 1879. The following passages deserve mention: "Three modifications of the law have been suggested which may be briefly stated as: first, one year's residence in a union or birth to be the only heads of settlement, certain derivative settlements being retained; second, chargeability orders to be substituted for removal orders, so that a pauper while relieved in the place where he applies for relief would be paid for by the place of his settlement; third, the county rate which is now in certain cases chargeable for lunatics and for the burial of bodies washed on shore to be made chargeable in other cases. . . . Your Committee having given due weight to the various arguments and opinions that have been placed before them, recommend that in England the law of removal should be abolished, and that for the purposes of poor relief settlement should be disregarded, with the following exception: That with respect to seaport towns, persons landing in a destitute condition, and immediately applying there for relief, be chargeable to the place of their settlement for non-resident indoor relief."

410. (*Chairman.*) No action has been taken on the Report of that Committee?—Unless the action of Parliament in passing the Irish Act of 1900 may be said to be a step in the direction of that part of the recommendation which related to non-resident relief.

411. That finishes your evidence with regard to the law of settlement, I think.—Quite so.

412. I wish to ask you a general question, if you can answer it. You have given very valuable evidence and your experience must be very great. Assuming there must be a law of settlement, are you fairly well satisfied with the operation of the law as it is, and as it is interpreted? Are there any obvious improvements to your mind that could be made in the law of settlement?—Possibly the procedure could be simplified.

413. In looking at the complexity of the subject, you are of opinion on the whole, that the law operates fairly well?—Because you start from the proposition as a basis that there must be a law of settlement. I think from that it does follow that a great deal of the existing law must be retained.

414. Have you ever considered whether it is possible to abolish the law of settlement?—I cannot say that. I am afraid that is much too thorny a subject. The nearest approach that I can indicate to what may be thought to be a line of possible amendment is the Irish Act of 1900.

415. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall*). Shall we be able to get approximately the cost of litigation on questions of settlement as between English parishes?—I could not give the evidence.

416. (*Sir Samuel Provis*). There was a Parliamentary Return some few years ago, I think?—I do not know of it

417. (*Mr. Phelps*). Do you find a growing tendency on the part of boards of guardians to appeal to the Local Government Board in cases of settlement rather than to litigation?—I can only say that there are a fair number of cases that come before the Local Government Board each year, but one hardly has the information necessary to enable one to say whether those references or the appeals to the Sessions are the more numerous.

BASTARDY.

418. (*Chairman*). With regard to the subject of bastardy, I understand that the Royal Commission of 1832 made various representations. Have you a summary of their views?—On the subject of bastardy, the Royal Commission of 1832 found the law in a very unsatisfactory state. Under the 49 Geo. III c. 68, any single woman might declare herself to be pregnant, and charge any person with being the father. Thereupon a justice, on the application of the overseers or of a substantial

State of law in 1832.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

householder, might issue a warrant for the immediate apprehension of the putative father, who could be committed to gaol unless he gave security to indemnify the parish, or entered into a recognizance with sufficient surety to appear at the Quarter Sessions and to perform the order to be made at the Sessions. Under this Act, the proceedings might be altogether *ex parte*. There was no machinery for bringing the putative father before the justice. When brought up by warrant, the committing justice had no power to examine into the merits. Committal to gaol was inevitable, failing security or a recognizance. The practice under this law was regarded by the Commissioners as open to grave objection. On the birth of a child, an order was made on the woman and the man for a weekly contribution to the parish. Nothing was in fact paid by the woman. Whatever the man paid was handed over to the woman; but the woman was in any case guaranteed by the parish in respect of the amount of his contribution whether actually received by the parish or not. The sum exacted from the man was in most cases higher than what would be charged for putting the child out to nurse, or than the parish allowance if the child had been legitimate and the father dead. Several illegitimate children became a source of emolument to the mother, and marriage was often brought about by the desire of the man to escape imprisonment or by the attraction of the woman's income. The conclusion of the Commissioners was that the evidence had shown that, as a general rule, the Bastardy Laws increased the expense which they were intended to compensate and offered temptations to the crime which they were intended to punish, and that their working was frequently accompanied by perjury and extortion, disgrace to the innocent and reward to the shameless and unprincipled, and all the domestic misery and vice which are the necessary consequence of premature and ill-assorted marriage. The Commissioners accordingly recommended the entire abolition of the Bastardy Laws. They further recommended in substitution: 1. That every illegitimate child born after the passing of the intended Act for the amendment of the law should, until it attained the age of sixteen, follow its mother's settlement; 2. That the mother of an illegitimate child born after the passing of the Act should be required to support it, and that any relief occasioned by the wants of the child should be considered relief afforded to the parent; 3. That the same liability should be extended to her husband; 4. That there should be repealed that part of the 35 Geo. III. c. 101, Sec. 6 which made an unmarried pregnant woman removable, and the 50 Geo. III. c. 51, Sec. 2, which authorised the committal of the mother of a chargeable bastard to the House of Correction; and lastly, 5. That the second section of the 18 Elizabeth, c. 3, and all other Acts which punished or charged the putative father, should, as to all bastards born after the passing of the intended Act, be repealed.

Views and recommendations of Commission of Inquiry.

Alterations made by Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

419. What was done by the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, to give effect to these recommendations?—In Sections 57 and 69 to 76 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, effect was given to the main proposals of the Royal Commission and a new procedure against the putative father was set up. Of the sections referred to two only are nowadays of importance. These are Sections 57 and 71. Sec. 57 enacts that every man who, after the passing of the Act of 1834, marries a woman having a child or children, whether legitimate or illegitimate, shall be liable to maintain the child or children as part of his family, and shall be chargeable with all relief granted to or on account of the child or children until the child or children shall attain the age of sixteen, or until the death of the mother, and the child or children shall, for the purposes of the Act, be deemed a part of the husband's family. Sec. 71 provides as follows:—"Every child which shall be born a bastard after the passing of this Act shall have and follow the settlement of the mother of such child until such child shall attain the age of sixteen or shall acquire a settlement in its own right, and such mother so long as she shall be unmarried or a widow shall be bound to maintain such child as a part of her family until such child shall attain the age of sixteen, and all relief granted to such child while under the age of sixteen shall be considered as granted to the mother: Provided always that such liability of such mother as aforesaid shall cease on the marriage of such child, if a female."

Existing statute law as to bastardy.

420. Can you describe the more modern statute law?—The existing statute law on the subject of bastardy is contained in more recent enactments. These are to be found in the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844 (Secs. 4 to 10, and Sec. 70), in the Bastardy Act, 1845 (8 Vic. c. 10), in the Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1872 (35 & 36 Vic. c. 65), the Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1873 (36 Vic. c. 9), and the Bastardy Orders Act, 1880 (43 & 44 Vic. c. 32). The effect of the more material of these provisions is as follows:—Any single woman with child or delivered of a bastard may, either before the birth or at any time within 12 months from the birth of a child, or at any time thereafter on proof that the putative father has within the 12 months next after the birth paid money for the maintenance of the child, or at any time within 12 months next after the return to England of the putative father on proof that he ceased to reside in England within the 12 months next after the birth, make application to a justice for a summons against the putative father. If the application is made before the birth the woman must make a deposition on oath stating who is the father. The justice shall issue his summons requiring the putative father to appear at a Petty Session (35 & 36 Vic. c. 65, Sec. 3). Another form of application is permissible. This application is authorised by the 36 Vic. c. 9, Sec. 5. It is made by the guardians, and it can only be made after the birth of the child, and after the child becomes chargeable. Where the guardians apply, their application must be made to two justices, and thereupon the justices may summon the putative father to appear before any two justices to show cause why an order should not be made upon him to contribute towards the relief of the child.

Application for order by woman and by guardians.

421. Will you give some explanation of these kinds of procedure?—The application by the mother may be made by a widow or even by a married woman. Instances of the latter sort are those where the woman lives apart from her husband. A married woman living with her husband cannot apply (Jones *v.* Davies; Law Reports, 1901, 1 King's Bench, 118; 70 Law Journal, King's Bench, 38). But the cases do not extend to that of a woman who, being single when the child is born, marries before making the application, or who, having made an application while single, and having failed to serve the summons through the man having absconded, marries and then renews the application. With regard to the other kind of application, that of the guardians, it is to be observed that the foundation for this is the actual chargeability of the child. Hence there may be a difficulty in making the putative father contributory in the event of the cessation of chargeability, unless within the prescribed time the woman has also availed herself of her right to apply. The marriage of the woman to a man who has the means of maintaining the child is not a bar to proceedings against the putative father where the child is chargeable (Plymouth Guardians *v.* Gibbs; Law Reports, 1903, 1 King's Bench, 177; 72 Law Journal, King's Bench, 33; 87 Law Times, New Series, 683.) In that case the woman, after the birth of the bastard, married. Shortly afterwards her husband left her. She was unable to maintain the child, which was taken to the workhouse and there maintained by the guardians. Husband and wife came together again, but the husband refused to take the child out of the workhouse and maintain it. The guardians took proceedings against the putative father under Sec. 5 of the Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1873. The justices dismissed the application on the ground that the husband was primarily liable to maintain the child; but the Divisional Court took a different view. They considered that in the enactment referred to the word "chargeable" did not mean "ultimately chargeable" but "chargeable in fact." "It is not, I think," said the Lord Chief Justice, "an unfair way of stating the argument for the respondent to say that it does not give to the word 'chargeable' its proper or ordinary meaning, but makes it refer to the ultimate fact that the husband is not able to maintain the child. I, therefore, come to the conclusion that the justices may, upon the application of the guardians, make an order against the putative father, notwithstanding it be shewn that the husband of the illegitimate child's mother has means to maintain it, though the justices may take that fact into consideration."

Plymouth Guardians Gibbs.

Application by woman: its essentials.

422. Have you anything further to say upon the application of the mother?—It has been seen that the application of the mother may be made before or after birth. Where the application has been made after birth, it must be made within 12 months after birth, unless it can be proved that the putative father has paid money within the first 12 months, or that he ceased to reside in England within those 12 months. If the application be within the time, the summons may be issued after its expiration, provided that it be issued by the justice to whom the application was made. Corroboration of the

payment of money is not needed to found the issue of the summons; and where proof has been omitted the irregularity may be waived. In strictness, however, the proof should be on oath. A second summons will not be issued after the expiration of the year, if the case has been heard and dismissed on the first summons. In cases where the putative father has left England, it is obvious that difficulty arises from possible inability to obtain evidence amounting to proof of his departure and return.

423. What is the procedure on the hearing of an application?—At the hearing, in cases where the application is made by the mother after the birth of the child, the justices, on the appearance of the person summoned, or on proof of due service of the summons, are to hear the evidence of the woman, and such other evidence as she may produce, and also any evidence on behalf of the putative father; and if the evidence of the mother be corroborated in some material particular by other evidence, to the satisfaction of the justices, they may adjudge the man to be the putative father of the bastard child. The proceeding at the hearing on the application of the guardians is, up to this point, essentially similar.

424. Will you give some illustrations of the difficulties or questions which arise under the present law?—In connection with the two varieties of procedure, there are many questions which, in practice, assume importance in relation to the facts of particular cases; but for present purposes it may suffice to draw attention to one matter about which difficulty has sometimes arisen. This concerns the nature of the corroborative evidence which the statute requires. The corroborative evidence must be to the satisfaction of the justices. It must also be corroborative in some material particular. A certain latitude is here allowed to the justices. Their decision as to the degree or value of corroboration is not subject to review; for the King's Bench Division will not interfere to say what should or should not have satisfied the justices. (Queen *v.* Pearcy; 17 Queen's Bench, 902; 16 Jurist, 193.) Presumably, however, the evidence must be something to show that the story told by the woman is a probable one. Perhaps an extreme example is furnished by Harvey *v.* Anning (87 Law Times, New Series, 687; 67 Justice of the Peace, 73). There, with the dissent of one judge, it was held that evidence that the pair were seen out together of evenings in the lanes, and that, after the birth of the child, the man asked a third person if the girl was going to swear the child, was corroboration in a material particular. The justices, however, are not restricted to circumstances of recent date. They may have regard to antecedent facts; so that where a child was born in October of one year, and evidence was adduced as to the behaviour of the parties in the summer of the previous year, the Queen's Bench Division thought that the magistrate was mistaken in rejecting the evidence because it had reference to conduct so long before. (Cole *v.* Manning, 46 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 175). Silence may in certain circumstances, corroborate, as where a young man who admitted that he had walked out with the applicant was silent on being taken to the house of the girl's step-mother and asked whether he was the father. (Hill *v.* Denmark; 59 Justice of the Peace, 345). The payment of money for the maintenance of the child will be corroborative if someone other than the woman testify to the fact. (Queen *v.* Berry; 28 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 86).

425. Have you any observations as to orders that may be made by the justices; we will take first, the case of the mother's application?—As to the judgment of the justices, it may be observed that an arrangement by the putative father to pay by agreement with the mother a certain sum for the support of the child, is no bar to the jurisdiction of the justices to make an order (Follitt *v.* Koetzow; 29 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 128). The order on the application of a woman takes various forms according to the varying circumstances of cases The cases are these: (1) Where the application was made before the birth of the child and the child is alive. (2) Where the application was made before the birth of the child and the child has been born and is dead. (3) Where the application is made after the birth of the child and the child is alive; and (4) where the application is made after the birth of the child and the child is dead. If the justices adjudge the man to be the putative father of the child, they may also, if they see fit, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, proceed to make an order on the putative father according to the exigencies of the cases above enumerated. Thus the order may direct payment to the mother or to any person appointed to have the custody of the child (that is, where the mother is of unsound mind or a prisoner), of a weekly sum not exceeding five shillings for the maintenance and education of the child; also (*a*) the expenses incidental to the birth of the child; (*b*) the funeral expenses of the child, if it has died before the making of the order; (*c*) the costs incurred in obtaining the order; and where the application is made before the birth or within two months after the birth the weekly sum may, if the justices think fit, be calculated from the birth (35 & 36 Vic., c. 65, Sec. 4).

Order on application of woman: its enforcement.

426. What is the procedure for enforcing payments under orders made on the mother's application?—Provision is made for enforcing payment of arrears under such an order by empowering a justice by warrant to cause the putative father to be brought before any two justices, and, "in case such putative father neglect or refuse to make payment of the sums due from him under such order, or since any commitment for disobedience to such order as hereinafter provided, together with the costs attending such warrant, apprehension, and bringing up of such putative father, such two justices may, by warrant under their hands and seals, direct the sum so appearing to be due, together with such costs, to be recovered by distress . . . . and may order such putative father to be detained and kept in safe custody until return can be conveniently made to such warrant of distress, unless he give sufficient security by way of recognisance or otherwise to the satisfaction of such justices for his appearance before two justices on the day which may be appointed for the return of such warrant of distress." If no sufficient distress can be had, any two justices may commit the putative father to gaol for a term not exceeding three months unless the sum and costs be sooner paid (35 & 36 Vic. c. 65, Sec. 4). With regard to the amendments which the legislation of 1872 and 1873 effected in the law, it may be noted that any reasonable sum may be ordered to be paid as incidental to the birth of the child and of its funeral; and the recovery of the weekly sums is not limited to a particular arrear; payments may be directed to continue until the child reaches sixteen years of age. Where an order has been made on the application of the mother, and the child has become chargeable after the death of the mother, the guardians are empowered to make any such application for the enforcement of the order as the mother might have made if alive (7 & 8 Vic., c. 101, Sec. 7). Also during the lifetime of the mother in a case where an order has been made on her application, and where the child has become chargeable, two justices may appoint some relieving officer or other officer of the Poor Law Union to receive, on account of the Poor Law Union, such proportion of the payments then due or becoming due as may accrue during the period for which the child is chargeable (35 & 36 Vic., c. 65. Sec. 7).

Order on application of guardians.

427. Will you describe the procedure in the case of an order which is made on the application of the guardians?—Where the application is made by the guardians under Section 5 of the Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1873, the order may direct the putative father to pay to the guardians or one of their officers such sum weekly or otherwise towards the relief of the child during such time as the child shall continue or afterwards be chargeable as shall appear to them to be proper. Any payment will be recoverable by the officer appointed to receive it. Procedure in regard to and under the order is subject to the important conditions set out in the form of provisoes to Section 5 of the Act of 1873. The provisoes are as follows "(1) That no payments shall be recoverable under such order except in respect of the time during which the child is actually in receipt of relief; (2) That an order under this section shall not be made and if made shall cease except for the recovery of arrears when the mother of the child has obtained an order . . . ; (3) That nothing in this section shall be deemed to relieve the mother of a bastard child from her liability to maintain such child; (4) That any person upon whom an order is made under this section shall have the same right of appeal against such order as in the case of an order obtained on the application of the mother; (5) That if after an order has been made under this section the mother should apply for an order . . . . . the order made under this section shall be *primâ facie* evidence that the man upon whom the order is made is the father of the child" (36 Vic. c. 9, Sec. 5.) With reference to the second proviso it is to be observed that in the event of the child being no longer chargeable the order obtained by the guardians will not authorise the mother to obtain payment from the putative father. For this

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

she will need a fresh order and this must be obtained on her own application. This apparently she may obtain during the currency of the order obtained by the guardians. But her application must be made within the time allowed to her apart from the proceedings of the guardians.

Appeals.

428. These orders may be made the subject of appeals, may they not?—An order made either upon the application of a woman or of a board of guardians may be the subject of an appeal to the Court of Quarter Sessions. For present purposes it is unnecessary to discuss the details of the procedure in such circumstances since there is little to differentiate an appeal of this kind from other appeals. It may, however, be pointed out that a decision by Quarter Sessions upon the merits, with the result that the order in the mother's favour is quashed, is final (Queen *v.* Glynne and another; Law Reports, 7 Queen's Bench, 16; 41 Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases 58); and the matter cannot be re-opened by the woman on a fresh application for a summons. Such a re-opening is, however, permissible where the Court of Quarter Sessions have quashed the order otherwise than on the merits. (Queen *v.* May and others; Law Reports, 5 Queen's Bench Division, 382). Also it may be noted that the Court of Quarter Sessions may, if they think fit, reduce the amount directed to be paid for the maintenance and education or on account of the child (35 and 36 Vic., c. 65, Sec. 9). It may further be remarked that, while the remedy of an application to the High Court of Justice on a special case stated under the 20 and 21 Vic., c. 43, or under the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1879 is available in bastardy, as well as procedure by writ of *certiorari*, there is nothing in the special subject matter to distinguish these proceedings from others of the same class.

Queen v. Glynne and another.

Queen v. May and others.

Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 8.

429. There are some miscellaneous provisions to which you wish to draw attention. Will you mention them?—Among provisions of a miscellaneous character under this head may be mentioned Sec. 8 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844. That section is as follows:—"If any officer of a union, parish or place endeavour to induce any person to contract a marriage by threat or promise respecting any application to be made, or any order to be enforced with reference to the maintenance of any bastard child, such officer shall be guilty of a misdemeanour; and every person having the custody of any bastard child under any order of justices as hereinbefore provided, who may misapply moneys paid by the putative father for the support of such child, or may withhold proper nourishment from such child, or otherwise abuse or maltreat such child, shall, on conviction before any two justices, forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding ten pounds." Lastly, it may be pointed out that by Sec. 6 of the Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1873, the Local Government Board are empowered to issue forms of proceedings in matters of bastardy, and that the Board in the exercise of this power issued sets of forms in their orders dated the 4th of August, 1873, and the 8th of January, 1874.

Bastardy Laws Amendment Act, 1873.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Deputation expenses.

430. I think you have something you desire to say as regards deputation expenses?—There are various miscellaneous matters which concern the working of the Poor Law, and which may deserve some mention. Among these matters are provisions for facilitating personal communication between boards of guardians and the Central Authority and the meetings of local representatives for consultation and conference. A general order of the Poor Law Board, dated the 27th of June, 1870, made provision for the expenses of deputations sent by boards of guardians to confer with the Central Authority. Where the Central Authority appoint a time for the reception of any such deputation, the district auditor may allow the reasonable costs, properly verified, of three members, together with the clerk, acting or assistant clerk. When the guardians send a deputation to any other body or authority than the Central Authority in respect of any matter affecting the union, which the guardians are empowered by law to inquire into, or to report upon, or to discuss, the same limitation as to the number of members to form the deputation must be observed, unless the guardians, by special resolution, setting forth the grounds of the exception, appoint a larger number of members to form the deputation.

Poor Law Conferences.

431. What is the exact position of the law with regard to Poor Law Conferences?—Sec. 2 of the Poor Law Conferences Act, 1883, enables the guardians, subject to any regulations made by the Local Government Board, to pay the reasonable expenses of any guardian or guardians, or clerk to the guardians, incurred in attending any conference of guardians held for the purpose of discussing any matter which is connected with the duties which devolve on them, and any reasonable expenses incurred in purchasing reports of the proceedings of any such conference. By a general order of the 26th of February, 1903, the Local Government Board provided, in relation to the expenses to be incurred by the guardians of any union, that the conference should be the central conference held in London, or a conference convened for a district including that union, and that the attendance of representatives at any conference should be expressly authorised by a resolution of the guardians, that where the attendance of more than one guardian was authorised, the number should be specified in the resolution; that the maximum number of guardians authorised to attend the central conference held in London should be two for each union, and that the maximum number of guardians authorised to attend any conference convened for a district should be three for each union included in the district. The same order left it to the guardians to determine how many copies of the report of the proceedings of the central conference or of any conference convened for a district should be purchased.

Poor Law Unions Association expenses.

432. Have you anything to say on the subject of the Poor Law Unions Association (Expenses) Act, 1898?—The Poor Law Unions Association (Expenses) Act, 1898, was passed in view of a proposal to form an Association of Poor Law Unions in England and Wales for the purposes of consultation as to their common interests and the discussion of matters relating to the Poor Law and other matters relating to their powers and duties. Sec. 1 of the Act enacted as follows:—"(1) The guardians of any Poor Law union may, when empowered by and subject to any regulations made by the Local Government Board, which regulations the said Board is hereby authorised from time to time to make, vary, or rescind, pay any sum not exceeding five pounds in any one year as an annual or other subscription to the funds of the Association as well as the reasonable expenses of the attendance of representatives, not exceeding in any case two, at meetings of the Association, and may charge such payments to their common fund, or if they have no common fund to the fund under their control. Provided that no payment shall be made by the guardians in respect of the attendance of any representative at a meeting of the Association unless the attendance of such representative at that meeting shall have been expressly authorised by a resolution passed at a meeting of the guardians held after not less than seven days' notice in writing that the proposal is to be considered at such meeting of the guardians has been sent to each guardian. Any such representative shall be either a guardian of the Poor Law union or (without power of voting) the clerk to the guardians of the union." Sec. 2 of the Act is in these terms:—"(2) No payment shall be made in pursuance of this Act until the Local Government Board have certified that the Association has been established." An Association called the Association of Poor Law Unions in England and Wales having been formed, the Local Government Board, by a general order of the 17th of February, 1899, certified that the Association of Poor Law Unions in England and Wales had been established and empowered the Guardians of any Poor Law Union in England and Wales to pay any sum not exceeding five pounds in any one year as an annual or other subscription to the funds of the Association, as well as the reasonable expenses of the attendance of representatives, not exceeding in any case two, at meetings of the Association.

Paupers' conveyance expenses.

433. What has been done under the Paupers' Conveyance (Expenses) Act, 1870?—The Paupers' Conveyance (Expenses) Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vic. c. 48), enables the Local Government Board to define and direct in what cases and under what regulations the guardians may pay the reasonable expenses incurred by them in conveying persons chargeable to their Poor Law Union from one place to another in England. By a general order of the 7th of February, 1898, the guardians are authorised to pay the reasonable expenses of conveying any person chargeable to their Poor Law Union from the Poor Law Union to any of the institutions mentioned in the order for the purpose of visiting an inmate who is the husband, wife, child, or other relative of the person, and of conveying the person back to the Poor Law Union. The husband, wife, child, or other relative must be an inmate of any one of the following institutions: workhouses, separate workhouse infirmaries, separate workhouse schools, district schools, certified schools, non-certified schools for the reception of poor deaf and dumb

or blind children, asylums provided under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, asylums for the reception and relief of idiots, hospitals, institutions or licensed houses under the Idiots Act, 1886, institutions for lunatics, hospitals or institutions for blind or deaf and dumb persons, and houses or establishments not being workhouses with respect to which the Local Government Board have issued rules, orders, and regulations under the Poor Relief Act, 1849. The expenses of conveyance will not be payable unless permission for the visit is given by the guardians and recorded in the minutes of the guardians. To meet cases of urgency, the Guardians may, if they think fit, authorise the master of the workhouse, as regards indoor paupers, and the relieving officer, as regards outdoor paupers, to pay the reasonable expenses in urgent cases.

nt life ection.

434. There are some provisions which concern the guardians and the workhouse in the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897. Will you explain what they are?—Powers of another kind are those conferred upon guardians by the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897. Outside the County and City of London the guardians are the local authority for the purpose of that Act. The local authority are to provide for the execution of the Act which has for its main object the supervision of persons receiving for hire or reward more than one infant under the age of five years for nursing or maintenance apart from the parents. In certain circumstances infants are to be received under this Act into the workhouse. Thus, where a person retains or receives an infant under two years on consideration of a sum not exceeding £20 paid down and without any agreement for further payment, as value for the care and bringing up of the infant until it is reclaimed or of an age to provide for itself, the person must give notice of the fact to the local authority. If he does not give notice to the local authority, he will be liable to forfeit the amount of the sum received, or any less sum, and the court having cognizance of the case shall give directions as to the manner in which the sum forfeited shall be applied for the benefit of the infant, "and shall, if necessary, cause the infant to be removed to a workhouse or place of safety, and the master of such workhouse shall receive such infant which shall be maintained in the workhouse or place of safety until it can be otherwise lawfully disposed of." (Sec. 5.) So also should any infant in respect of which notice is required to be given under this Act, (*a*) be kept in any house or premises which are so unfit or so overcrowded as to endanger its health; or, (*b*), be retained or received by any person, who by reason of negligence, ignorance, or other cause is so unfit to have its care and maintenance as to endanger its health, an inspector under the Act may apply to the local authority for an order in writing directing him to remove the infant to a workhouse or place of safety, until it can be restored to its relations or guardians or be otherwise lawfully disposed of. A person refusing compliance with an order of the local authority will be guilty of an offence under the Act, and the inspector may apply to a justice for an order directing the removal of the child and the order may be enforced by any police constable. The master of a workhouse shall receive into the workhouse any child brought there under the justice's order, and the child is to be maintained in the workhouse until it can be otherwise disposed of. (Sec. 7.)

ense of aining rmation guardians.

435. Perhaps you will add a summary of the few remaining provisions to be noticed under the miscellaneous head of your evidence?—First, there are the powers of the guardians under Secs. 15 and 16, of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876. By these sections guardians are enabled to pay reasonable expenses incurred in the preparation and collection of information required of or by them respecting any matter submitted to their management, supervision or control. Also the guardians are empowered to authorise their clerk or other officer to make or resist any application, claim or complaint or to take and conduct proceedings before justices out of session, although the clerk or other officer be not a solicitor (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 68). The guardians likewise have powers for giving certificates of chargeability. (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1844, Sec. 69.) And attention may at the same time be drawn to Sec. 86 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, which is to the effect that no mortgage, bond, instrument, or any assignment thereof, given by way of security in pursuance of the rules, orders, or regulations of the Local Government Board and conformable thereto, nor any contract or agreement or appointment of any officer made or entered into in pursuance of such rules, orders, or regulations and conformable thereto, nor any other instrument made in pursuance of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, nor the appointment of any paid officer engaged in the administration of the laws for the relief of the poor, or in the management or collection of the Poor Rate, shall be charged or chargeable with any stamp duty whatever. (Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, Sec. 86).

duct of ceedings clerk on alf of rdians.

emptions n Stamp ty.

436. Will you furnish the Commission with a copy of the Irish Act of 1900, to which you referred, as relating to the case of paupers who would otherwise be removable from England to Ireland?—Yes, I will do so. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A) No. I. (*g*).

Poor Removal Act, 1900.

437. (*Mr. Booth.*) In question 9 the regulations and the general rules of the Local Government Board are referred to. Are those published so as to be generally accessible?—They would only be published by private enterprise. They are officially published in the *Gazette*, but that could hardly be called generally accessible.

Accessibility of regulations of Local Government Board.

438. Are they in a form in which we can get access to them?—Possibly the Commissioners could be supplied with copies from the department.

439. In question 10 the chairman says: "I think you mention there is a Committee connected with the Local Government Board consisting of certain high officers of State." The answer to question 8 does not say they were a Committee. Were they at that time a Committee of the Lord President of the Council and the Principal Secretaries of State?—No, they are nominally *ex-officio* members of the Board.

Constitution of Local Government Board.

440. Has the board any existence apart from its president and these *ex officio* members?—Even the *ex-officio* members have no real functions for the purpose of the ordinary business of the Board. For that purpose the Board is the president.

441. Has the committee ever been summoned?—I have no recollection of a meeting of the *ex-officio* members within modern times.

442. Question 11 was put by the chairman—"I assume, however, any order issued by the Local Government Board, if it has the approval of the president"—that would seem to imply that the Local Government Board had an executive existence apart from its President. Has it?—No, the order is that of the President.

443. There is really no board consisting of a number of individuals?—Not for any practical purpose.

Laying of Board's orders before Parliament.

444. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Under Sec. 1 of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1868, the Local Government Board are required to cause a copy of any general order or regulation to be laid before both Houses of Parliament. I want to know the purpose of that, and whether Parliament can take any action?—Originally the somewhat similar arrangement required by Section 17 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, may have been due to jealousy of the proceedings of the Commissioners, and what was probably intended was that as this was an entirely new departure, Parliament should have continuously under its eye the actual proceedings of the Commissioners. The arrangement becomes now almost a formality.

Scope of power of Local Government Board.

445. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I desire to ask you as to your opinion on the limitations as to the President of the Local Government Board. Where does his authority stop and where does the necessity for legislative enactment begin?—The legislative enactment defines the scope within which the minor legislation, if one may so call it, which the President may initiate, can take effect. For example, there was the case to which I referred and in which Lord Chief Justice Campbell said in effect that the President of the Local Government Board could not order a man to be beheaded. There must be legislative authority to define the range of subjects to which the orders are to apply.

446. To take a modern instance: Was there anything in the Infant Life Protection Act which the President of the Local Government Board could not have carried out by means of orders?—Yes; that was entirely outside the scope of orders.

447. I suppose, for instance, a provision dealing with children who were suffering from the cruelty of their parents, deciding what place they should be taken to—the workhouse—would not be a subject on which he could have founded an order?—No, that is to say, an order could not have been made requiring removal of children to the workhouse in certain circumstances. As to the reception in the workhouse, that might be another matter,

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

448. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Would it be within the power of the Local Government Board to extend the operation of the Infant Life Protection Act with regard to one-child cases? The Act, as far as I understand it, does not apply to one-child cases: that is, where one child only is taken out to nurse. Could the Local Government Board include one-child cases under the operation of the Act?—No.

449. (*Professor Smart.*) Is there any connection or subordination between the three Local Government Boards, or are they entirely independent?—Entirely independent.

Guardians' powers as to medical relief.

450. (*Dr. Downes.*) With regard to medical relief, I think the guardians have very extensive powers under their general powers of relief?—Quite so.

451. They can send cases, on the recommendation of the medical officer, for treatment to various places?—Quite so.

452. Without the sanction of the Central Authority?—Certainly.

453. Is there any check on unreasonable expenditure in that direction?—The sanction of the Local Government Board would be required to the subscriptions to hospitals and places of that sort, and the expenses that the guardians incur would be subject to audit.

454. The auditor could review the reasonableness of the money expended?—Yes.

Limits to powers of Local Government Board.

455. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) The President of the Local Government Board can, by issuing his order, practically change the character of relief that is given by the Local Board of Guardians, but I suppose he can only do that within the limits of the law?—He can only do that within the limits of the law, and the law having been defined so recently by the Master of the Rolls, practically the case of the Attorney-General *v.* the Merthyr Tydfil Board of Guardians would be the leading case to which all questions of that sort would be referable. There the Master of the Rolls carried back the rule of procedure to the Statute of Elizabeth, so that, according to him, what was not relief under the Statute of Elizabeth could not be made relief by an order of the Local Government Board.

Effect of Board's Circulars.

456. And when the President issues a circular urging more generous out-relief to the aged poor, for instance, is that binding on the Guardians, or is it only a matter for their goodwill?—A circular would only be exhortation.

457. It has the effect, practically, of an order?—I do not know that.

458. (*Chairman.*) Would not it be taken as an indication of policy?—Yes, no doubt.

459. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In that case he almost has the power of initiating a change in the law?—Hardly by a circular. The change (if any is suggested) would not be in the law, but in its administration.

460. In the policy?—Yes, that is it, really.

Statutory Authority for orders and regulations.

461. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) On what statutory enactment does the power of the Local Government Board to issue orders and regulations depend?—There are many enactments, but for the purposes of the enquiry by this Commission the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 is in itself so comprehensive that it covers nearly everything in the way of authority for orders.

462. Upon that depends the power of the Board to issue all the orders and regulations to which we have been referred?—Practically it is so. Of course here and there an Act has given a special power which, where it exists, I have referred to. The Poor Law Amendment Act itself is most comprehensive.

463. I only ask that because in Scotland we have had difficulty, and we are anxious to get that power.—You have not, I suppose, anything corresponding to Section 15 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

Constitution of Local Government Board.

464. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think with regard to the constitution of the Local Government Board the case is really this, is not it, the Board consists of the President and certain *ex officio* members?—Quite so.

465. And any act may be done by the President or by an *ex officio* member of the Board except the issue of an order, or by a Secretary or Assistant Secretary if authorised by a general order of the Board?—That is so.

466. An order must be a document under seal signed by the President, or an *ex officio* member of the Board, and countersigned by a Secretary or Assistant Secretary?—That is so.

467. As a matter of fact, I think you told us that the Board does not meet?—That is so.

468. So that it has been described, in fact, as a phantom Board which has really no existence?—Clearly so.

Bill to substitute Secretary of State for the Local Government Board.

469. There has been, has not there, some proposal to get rid of it altogether?—Yes, last session the Government introduced a Bill, providing that if His Majesty should appoint a Secretary of State with the superintendence of those subjects which are now the subjects of administration by the Local Government Board, certain powers should be transferred to that Secretary of State. The Bill was introduced towards the end of the session, but I have no doubt the question of the policy involved in it will come up again.

Powers of *ex officio* members of Board.

470. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Do I understand that, supposing the Chancellor of the Exchequer obtained the signature of the permanent Secretary of the Local Government Board to a regulation, it would have the same force as if the Local Government Board had issued it itself?—Practically the way it is done is this: when the President is absent from the country, an order taken to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and countersigned by the Secretary, would be as good as though it were signed by the President.

471. That would never happen when the President was present?—It has happened when the President has been abroad. It is practically only a vacation provision.

472. (*Chairman.*) That gives legality to it?—Yes.

Overseers: Appointment and duties etc.

473. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the appointment of overseers to which you referred in the answer to question 13, the state of things at present is practically this, is it not—that in rural parishes the overseers are appointed by the parish council, or, if there is no parish council, by the parish meeting?—Yes.

474. In urban parishes either they are appointed by the justices, or if the urban district council have the powers of a parish council, in that matter, they are appointed by the urban district council?—Yes.

475. In London—to finish the history—except in the City, the borough council are, in fact, the overseers?—Quite so. There are also cases in which there are provisions in local Acts dealing with the question of their appointment.

476. Then I think, as a matter of fact, a very large number of orders have been made transferring the power of appointment of overseers in urban parishes to the urban district council?—Quite so.

477. So that practically in urban parishes we may take it that, generally speaking, the urban district council do appoint the overseers?—I have no doubt that is so.

478. The primary main duty of the overseers is, I take it, to make and collect the poor rate?—Yes.

479. They have no doubt other powers and duties but perhaps that might be taken as their primary duty?—Quite so.

Urban district council as overseers.

480. Would you think that there would be any advantage in making it clear that in all cases in urban parishes, the overseers either should be appointed by the urban district council or that the urban district council themselves might be the overseers as in London?—The latter is a change which, I think, would need careful consideration. Possibly the advantages are greater than the disadvantages; I think on the whole that would be so.

481. You think that the advantages would predominate if I understand you rightly?—I think so.

482. If that were done, might it not be necessary to make some subsidiary alterations such as imposing upon some officer of the district council personal duties which devolve upon the overseers now?—Yes, or on some other officer. In saying that, I was thinking more particularly of the powers of the overseers under the Registration Acts. At the present time there is power to the guardians under the County Electors Act 1888 to appoint an official there called a Registration Officer. It might be a question whether the registration powers should not be given to a special officer appointed, perhaps not by the urban council but by some other authority.

483. That is to say, the overseers would cease to have anything to do with the preparation of the local lists?—Quite so.

484. And that that duty should devolve upon a separate officer?—Yes; but then the question of relief would also arise.

485. Overseers have certain powers of giving relief have they not?—Yes.

486. Would it be necessary to do something with regard to that if a change of the sort we are considering were made?—I should think it would be,—certainly in rural parishes.

487. In what direction?—Either in the way of retaining the powers in some local officer, or of keeping the overseers alive for that particular purpose.

pintment sistant seers.

488. I was rather considering for the moment the case of the urban parishes, following still on the lines of the case in London. Then we come to the case of the assistant overseers; if I remember rightly, you told us that the law now was practically this—that in rural parishes the parish council, or if there is no parish council, the parish meeting appoints the assistant overseer?—Yes, that is so.

489. In urban parishes he is appointed by the vestry or, where the powers of the vestry in this matter have been transferred to the urban district council, by the urban district council; and that, again, is subject to any provisions in any local Acts?—Quite so.

490. I think in a very large number of cases the power of appointing the assistant-overseer has been transferred to the urban district council?—That is so, no doubt.

491. In London, where the borough council are overseers, the borough council have power to appoint persons for the purpose of assisting them in the discharge of their duties as overseers, in other words, to collect the rate?—Yes.

ction of in n areas.

492. If some change of the kind we were mentioning just now were made, I suppose it would be necessary that there should be some provision to enable the urban district council to collect the rate?—No doubt.

493. Would you think that advisable in urban parishes?—I cannot say that I have thought the question out at all completely. Of course, such a change should apply to all the rates, and to that extent it is to be commended, because there would be only one collection I take it. I do not know that I have any strong view for or against.

494. I daresay you remember that the matter was, to some extent, considered by the Royal Commission on Local Taxation?—Yes, certainly.

495. And they made some recommendation, I think, on the subject?—Yes.

496. They thought, did they not, that in boroughs, the town council should collect the rate?—Quite so.

497. But they did not say anything about the urban district council's collecting them outside the boroughs, I think?—That was so.

ods of ing dians.

498. Just before question 28 you were dealing with the constitution of boards of guardians; I think, at the present time it is the case, is it not, that throughout the country, boards of guardians are all elected in one and the same manner—in England and Wales of course I mean—except, as regards Oxford?—That is so. Of course there is that exceptional community, the Isles of Scilly, in which no guardians are elected at all, and which is still under the 43rd of Elizabeth.

accept- and nation ice by dians.

499. At question 24—28 something was said about the fines which are leviable on non-acceptance of office by a guardian; I think the guardians themselves, by regulations, have power to fix the amount of the fine?—That is to say the rules made by the Local Government Board apply certain provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, with adaptations and the effect is that the guardians have the power to make regulations.

500. Then in the event of their failing to make regulations on the subject, what happens?—In that case, the rules themselves fix the amount.

501. The amount is £20 is it not?—I think so.

502. Can a guardian resign his office?—Yes. The provision in the Poor Law Act, 1842, still remains in force (5 and 6 Vic., c. 57, Sec. 11.)

503. That renders it necessary, does it not, that the Local Government Board should accept his resignation?—That is so.

504. So that he can only resign his office for a cause which the Board consider reasonable?—Yes, that is so.

505. At the same time, if he fails to attend for six months, his office would become vacant?—That is so.

506. So that practically by his simple abstention from attending, the same result would be attained as if he resigned?—Clearly.

507. Supposing that a board of guardians generally abstained from attending, what would be the result?—That is an extreme case of default.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

508. (*Mr. Booth.*) Does the fine apply if any guardian who is elected never attends, and, therefore, ceases to be a guardian at the end of six months?—No, that provision does not apply.

509. (*Chairman.*) He is fined if he refuses to act?—Yes.

510. But if he absented himself for six months, he would not be fined?—No; the provision does not apply to that case.

511. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The fine is not exactly for refusing to act, but it is for non-acceptance of office?—It is for non-acceptance of office; that is the legal position.

512. (*Chairman.*) If he accepted office and attended once and he then absented himself for six months, he would not be fined?—That is so.

513. But if he were to decline to act and then absented himself he could be fined?—If he did not accept the office, certainly. That follows from Section 34 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, which is applied in an adapted form.

514. So that anybody to avoid being fined has merely technically to accept office by attending once, and then to absent himself for six months; in that way he exempts himself from the fine?—That is so.

515. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In the case of an urban district council, if I remember rightly, there is a fine on resignation?—I should not like to speak as to that, for I have not the rules with me, and the matter is so exceedingly technical that one ought not to trust to memory.

Effect of general default of guardians.

516. Coming back to what I was saying just now, supposing a board of guardians generally failed to attend, and there was a general default in the discharge of their duties, what would happen?—The result would be that the relief of the poor would devolve upon the overseers, and also upon those officers charged with duties appropriate to the matter, if called upon by the Local Government Board to perform the duties.

517. Are you thinking of such officers as relieving officers?—Yes.

518. And, I suppose, masters of workhouses?—No doubt.

519. But there is no power, is there, to make provision in such a case to appoint any persons to discharge the duties of the defaulting authority?—No, there is no such power.

520. Do you remember any case in which a difficulty of this kind has arisen?—In olden times there were cases of the sort, though I can hardly say whether there were many such cases. In those days there was, of course, the *ex officio* element, and while the *ex officio* element was part of the board of guardians, the justices could always be relied upon to take the places of the absentee elected guardians.

521 (*Mr. Nunn*): Could they form a quorum?—Yes.

522. And did they form an actual quorum?—Yes; or they were ready to do so.

Powers as to alteration of areas.

523. (*Sir Samuel Provis*). I was proposing to pass on to Question 38 with regard to areas. I understand the position to be this—that the Local Government Board may dissolve any union, whether formed under the general law, or under a local Act?—That is so.

524. Also they may add parishes to any union formed under the general law, or take away parishes from any union formed under the general law?—That is so.

525. But except under exceptional circumstances they would have no power to alter the boundaries of parishes—not of unions, but of parishes?—As a rule they would not.

526. Alteration of parishes are commonly made now, are they not, by orders of the County Councils or of County Borough Councils under Sec. 57 of the Local Government Act, 1888?—Yes, or by provisional orders of the Local Government Board under Sec. 54.

527. Those provisional orders being orders altering boroughs usually, I think, and there being necessary alterations in parishes in consequence of the alterations in boroughs?—Yes, that would be so; those orders would be for altering counties or boroughs.

528. Suppose an order is made under Sec. 57 altering parishes if a parish in one union is added to a parish in

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

another union the result is that the union is altered, is it not?—That is so.

529. Consequently inferentially, or practically the union may be altered by the operation of an order under Section 57?—Yes.

530. There may be appeals, may there not, against orders under Section 57?—Yes.

531. Although an order under Section 57 requires the confirmation of the Local Government Board, unless there was an appeal the Board would have no power to refuse to confirm the order, would they?—Unless, as the law officers advised, the order itself was so bad that it could not possibly be justified.

532. That it was practically *ultra vires*?—Quite so.

533. So that taking an ordinary case, and supposing that an alteration of parishes was made which appeared to the Board to involve an undesirable alteration of the union they could do nothing?—That is so.

534. Do you think any alteration of the law upon that subject is required?—An alteration of the law would certainly be needed to give the Board full power in that direction; but, of course, such an alteration would involve a material departure from the scheme of devolution which was contemplated by the Local Government Act, 1888. I think the power would be useful myself, but the point is, for the reason already given, a debateable one.

535. That is to say, the principle of Section 57 of the Act of 1888 was to give county councils powers in these matters?—Clearly.

536. And what I was mentioning just now would be practically some departure from the principle of that section?—It would be so.

537. There are powers, are there not, to make consequential alterations where parishes are altered?—Yes.

538. Is there not such a power in Section 59?—Section 59, Sub sec. 4, is very wide, but I think it might be widened with some slight advantage. That would only mean the addition of a very few words to the section.

539. (*Mr. Booth.*) Does not the alteration of the boundary of one body necessarily affect the boundary of some other district which it touches?—It must necessarily do so.

540. So two or more districts must be involved in an alteration of boundary?—It must necessarily be so.

541. If the authority is to devolve upon the county council who is to judge between two county councils if they differ?—I am afraid I do not follow that.

542. You cannot alter the boundary of one county without affecting the boundary of the next, and in that case do not they not need to get the authority of the Local Government Board?—Alterations of county boundaries are not within the scope of the particular sections we have been considering. Alterations of county boundaries can only be effected, under the Local Government Act, 1888, by provisional orders of the Local Government Board. Therefore the Local Government Board retain very full power of determining as to whether the county boundary is, or is not, in accordance with their views.

543. The boundaries you are considering are those within a county area?—Especially parochial boundaries.

544. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) And you are considering, I think, the case of boundaries within one county—Yes.

545. Supposing you were dealing with two parishes, one of which was in one county and the other of which was in another county, then one county council could not, I apprehend, make any alteration, and you must have a joint committee of the two county councils?—Yes, and you must include representatives of any county boroughs which may be affected, if there were any; that is, if any area such as a union area extended into two or more of these jurisdictions.

Combinations.

546. In the answer to Question 54 I think you enter into the subject of combinations. Combinations, I think, may be of three kinds, may they not?—you may either have a combination under Section 8 of the Act of 1879, or you may set up a school district under the Act of 1844, or in London you may set up asylum districts under the Metropolitan Poor Acts. Is not that practically what it comes to?—That is so.

547. The combination under Section 8 of the Act of 1879 is a good deal simpler; that merely means, does it not, the formation of a joint committee of the two or three boards of guardians who are content to carry out the object of the combination for a particular purpose for which they are combined?—Yes.

548. That section, I think, does not extend to London?—No.

549. Is there any particular reason in your opinion why it should not be made to extend to London?—I think not. I think it might fairly be extended to London; it would be useful.

550. I suppose that probably the reason why it was not was the existence of the powers for the formation of districts under the Metropolitan Poor Acts?—Yes, I think that was so.

School districts.

551. Coming now to the school districts which are formed under the Act of 1844, I believe those school districts are formed for pauper children, who presumably would be in the workhouses if they were not in the schools provided under that Act?—Yes.

Difference between qualificati of school managers of guardia

552. They are placed as you have told us under the superintendence of boards of management, but there is a difference, is there not, between the qualification of a manager of a school district and the qualification of a guardian?—That is so.

553. Would you mind telling us the difference?—The members of a board to be constituted for the management of a school district formed under the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1844 are to have a qualification to be fixed by the Local Government Board, and the qualification will "consist in being rated within the district to the relief of the poor, but not so as to require a qualification exceeding the net annual value of £40."

Scope of combinations unde Metropoli Poor Acts

554. With regard to the formation of districts under the Metropolitan Poor Act it is essential, I think you told us, that there should be an asylum?—That is so.

555. Meaning by an asylum not what is ordinarily understood by an asylum, namely, a building for persons of unsound mind, but a building in which the persons relieved are received and maintained?—Yes, and the building may include a tent or a ship.

556. It is under that provision of providing a ship that the "Exmouth" is provided, where pauper children are trained for sea service, is it not?—Yes.

557. Inasmuch as there must be an asylum, that is to say, there must be a building in which the people are relieved, you could not form a district, I presume, under the Metropolitan Poor Acts for the purposes of outdoor relief?—That is so.

Effect on franchise maintena in infectio hospitals under Metropoli Asylums Board.

558. There is one other point I wanted to mention in regard to the condition of persons who are received into buildings provided by the Metropolitan Asylums Board; they provide hospitals, I think, for cases of infectious disease?—Yes.

559. If anybody is received into one of those hospitals is he disfranchised?—In the case of infectious disease, the provision in Sec. 80 of the Public Health (London) Act, 1891, is to the effect that "the admission of a person suffering from an infectious disease into any hospital provided by the Metropolitan Asylum managers, or the maintenance of any such person therein shall not be considered to be parochial relief, alms, or charitable allowance to any person, or to the parent or husband of any person, nor shall any person or his or her parent or husband be by reason thereof deprived of any right or privilege, or be subjected to any disability or disqualification."

560. Consequently a man would not be disfranchised by being received into one of the hospitals of the Asylums Board; but if he were received into one of their other institutions such for instance as an institution for imbeciles he would be disfranchised?—Yes.

Resignati of guardia

561. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do I understand that a member of a board of guardians may not resign his position as a member of the board as and when he so pleases?—That is so; his resignation is subject to acceptance by the Local Government Board.

562. That is an unusual provision, is it not?—It has been in existence for a great many years—since 1842.

Overseers' duties as t relief.

563. As regards the overseers—I am afraid that I may be asking something that is very elementary—who has the main duty of administering relief; is it the relieving officer or the overseer?—The guardians have the main duty of administering relief.

564. Through the relieving officer?—Yes, or through the master of the workhouse *qua* indoor relief.

565. Have the overseers any such duty?—Yes, in cases of sudden and urgent necessity.

566. That is exercised, I suppose, to a considerable extent, is it?—I should not have thought it was exercised to a considerable extent, because the relieving officer has almost identically the same duties.

lection of s.

567. The Local Taxation Commission as I understand it recommended that the collection of the rates should so far as possible be done by one authority?—Yes.

568. How far would that affect the duty of the overseers; who would collect the different rates?—That would depend upon the scheme that eventually is adopted with that end. If the overseers are abolished it is manifest that some other body or officer must take their place; if they are retained and are used as the medium of collection for all sorts of rates—then, again, the scheme would differ.

569. The object which was desired was that the areas should be assimilated and that the rates should all be collected by one collector upon one demand note, was it not?—Yes.

570. Which I suppose in your opinion would be a very desirable thing if it could be effected?—I should not like to be committed to the precise views of the Local Taxation Commission.

ect of l Acts.

571. In answer to Question 14 you say, "Many local Acts contain provisions which depart materially from the general law with respect to the appointment and functions of these officers"—that is, of the overseers. Does not the existence of so many local Acts lead to complication and difficulties of administration, and necessarily to expense?—Most undoubtedly. Those particular local Acts, which I had in mind, as a rule are not draughted on the most desirable lines, and have not infrequently led to an immense amount of difficulty.

572. And from your point of view I suppose they are very undesirable, if that be so?—Those particular provisions in local Acts I should be very glad to see amended.

573. It would be very much better that there should be a general law applying to the whole country and no local Acts?—Yes, but that is a consummation that it would be very difficult to reach.

tirement guardians.

574. At Question 29 you say, "Subject to the directions of the county council, guardians may retire by thirds on the 15th April in each year, or they may retire simultaneously on the same day in every third year; as a matter of fact do they in many cases retire by thirds, can you say?—I could not say—I have never seen statistics on the subject,

575. I dare say you cannot tell us whether in such cases the expense is very much greater than it would be if there were an election every three years?—No.

576. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In London, I think, they all retire together?—Yes.

ss of ldren sent District ools.

577. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) In regard to Question 56, where you deal with school districts, have the guardians power to deal with any children, except those who are orphans or who are deserted, when they send them to schools outside the union?—Guardians outside the Combination can only send, with the Managers' consent, children of the classes for which the Combination was established.

578. (*Miss Hill.*) But surely the children of widows are sent to the District Schools?—The provisions which relate to the admission of children from outside a Combination do not vary the powers of classification.

579. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What you say is "The management of any class or classes of infant poor not above the age of 16 years, being chargeable to any such parish or union, who are orphans or are deserted by their parents, or whose parents or surviving parent or guardians are consenting to the placing of such children in the school of such district." That makes it clear that the children of the widow would be eligible, I fancy?—Yes, but the same cases would be taken in under the provisions relating to admission, whether from within or from without the Combination.

orkhouse ldren at blic ementary ools.

580. That is a separate organisation and a separate administration entirely. There is no provision by which the children who are in the workhouse are sent to the ordinary public schools in England, is there?—The children in a workhouse may be sent to ordinary public elementary schools, certainly.

581. As a matter of fact, is it a very small proportion of them that do go to the public schools?—I should think a large proportion do.

582. Referring now to the answer to Question 65 regarding the asylums which are under the charge of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, I believe these asylums are for cases of infectious and other diseases removed from workhouses?—Or from the actual homes of the people.

583. Cases of infectious disease from the workhouses are not taken charge of by the Public Health Authorities, are they?—Are you speaking of the Metropolis only, or are you speaking of the country generally?

Provision for treatment of workhouse immates suffering from infectious disease.

584. I am afraid I am not able to discriminate, but I should like to know whether, either in the Metropolis or in the country generally cases of infectious disease occurring in the workhouse are taken charge of and handed over to the Public Health Authorities or whether they are dealt with under a separate organisation?—Very frequently they are dealt with by the Public Health Authorities.

585. But not exclusively?—No, not exclusively. In London the position is different, that is to say, a case of infectious disease would be taken to the asylum of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

586. But these asylums, as I understand it, are asylums maintained and supported by the poor rate and not by the public health rate?—Yes, that is to say, they are provided and maintained by a poor law authority.

587. Although they are asylums for the treatment of infectious disease?—Certainly.

588. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In the case of a rural district where you have an isolation hospital you send your patients suffering from an infectious disease from the workhouse to the isolation hospital, do you not?—That is so, if you have an agreement between the two authorities.

589. But only where there is an agreement?—There must be an agreement either express or implied.

590. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Are the infectious diseases hospitals not sufficiently large or able to cope with the cases that come from the workhouses or why is it that there is a separate administration in London?—In London there are no infectious disease hospitals provided by the local authorities as distinct from the poor law authority.

591. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In the country it would be so, because there is a want of accommodation. and the sanitary authority would object very much to taking any paupers because of the want of accommodation for them?—A good many sanitary authorities, I think, take paupers by agreement. We generally provide for it in our Provisional Orders.

Conditions of overseers' office.

592. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I am not quite sure whether the overseers are paid officials?—They are not, they are unpaid; the assistant-overseer is paid.

593. Is the position of overseer a voluntary position, or are overseers bound to serve?—They are bound to serve.

594. For a term of years?—For one year. There are exemptions; and the list is a long one.

Disqualifications of guardians.

595. Turning to the qualifications of guardians, does the receipt of relief by dependents of guardians disqualify them from continuing as guardians?—If the cases are within Sec. 56 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, which says that all relief given to or on account of the wife, or to or on account of any child or children under the age of sixteen, not being blind or deaf and dumb, shall be considered as given to the husband of such wife, or to the father of such child or children, as the case may be. That relief would disqualify; but relief given to a parent would not.

596. What I had in my mind were cases of guardians parents being relieved?—Those would not disqualify.

597. Then referring to question 17, does the indirect payment of rates through the landlord as in tenement houses qualify for a guardian?—Yes.

598. The same as the direct payment of rates would?—Yes.

599. I believe that there is a definition of alms in the section to the effect that a man must not within twelve months have received union or parochial relief or other alms?—The definition is rather through a series of cases and not from the statute.

600. Would the ordinary charitable relief disqualify?—There the cases come into play. I should not like to trust my memory for a statement of their general effect, but there have been instances in which the receipt of charity moneys has been held to disqualify. There is one

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

case in especial. The case is Harrison *v.* Carter; it was referred to, I think, in my previous evidence. It was a Petersfield case. There the money was charity money given to poor agricultural labourers at the discretion of the trustees.

601. That would be a case of endowed charities?—Yes, I think it was.

Guardians' office compulsory.

602. Upon the question of the guardian's fine, can a man be nominated as guardian without his consent?—Yes; but he would not then be liable to the fine, if elected.

603. So that really it is a compulsory office?—Yes, it is in a sense.

604. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Has he not powers of withdrawal before a certain date?—Yes, certainly.

Reason for tripartite retirement of guardians.

605. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) With regard to the election of guardians in three-yearly portions—that is retiring by thirds—I suppose the idea is to secure continuity of policy on the part of the Board?—Yes, I think I have seen that advanced as one special reason; and also the reason that ratepayers get irritated by too frequent elections, has been alleged as a ground for preferring triennial retirement of the entire body.

606. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) As regards the duties of overseers in reference to the assessment, are there frequent complaints as to the way in which committees of boards of guardians who sit to hear appeals discharge their duties?—I think that is outside the scope of my evidence—that is local taxation.

Out-relief Unions.

607. At Question 46 you told us that under Sec. 58 of the Local Government Act, 1888, the Local Government Board has power to divide a union comprised of parishes situate in two or more counties for the administration of out-door relief; is it compulsory that the union should be divided for the purposes of out-door relief in that case?—When the Board have exercised their power—where an order has been issued—then it is compulsory.

608. Take a union one parish of which is in Surrey and one parish of which is in Hampshire; may the Board sit as a Board to hear applications for out-relief from both Hampshire and Surrey?—Certainly; unless action is taken under that particular section that would be the normal course of things.

Difference between Metropolitan Asylums Board and London County Council Hospitals.

609. Then at Question 65, which deals with the provision of asylums under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, and the Metropolitan Poor Amendment Act, 1869, would you kindly explain the difference between the asylums provided by the Metropolitan Asylums Board and those provided by the London County Council? Would it be expedient that the care of all mentally afflicted persons should be under the control of a single authority?—The asylums under the control of the Metropolitan Asylum Board are not concerned only with the particular class that would be sent to the asylums of the London County Council. The asylums of the London County Council are for lunatics, who are certified and subject to summary reception orders. The asylums of the Metropolitan Asylum Board are not only for imbeciles—those form only one class of the paupers whom they receive—but they are also for a variety of other classes of paupers. The imbeciles for whom the asylums of the Metropolitan Asylum Board would provide are imbeciles who ordinarily would be retained in workhouses and would not be sent to asylums. Therefore there is a distinct line of demarcation between the two sets of institutions.

610. Is it to the public advantage that they should remain under the control of two authorities?—I can hardly express opinions on questions of expediency.

Transfer of patients from County Asylums to Poor Law institutions.

611. (*Dr. Downes.*) Following the question last asked, I think there is power for the county council to transfer cases of a certain class from their asylums to the asylums of the Metropolitan Asylums Board?—There is that power, and the power arises in the country in relation to workhouses also.

612. It is a power which I think I may say is exercised in London?—I have no doubt.

Certificates for admission to Asylums.

613. Referring to the admission of cases to the County Council Asylums and to the Asylums Board Asylums, is there not some difference with regard to the certificates required; the Act of 1891 amends the Act of 1890 in that respect, I believe?—Yes. The certificate in the case of admission to an asylum of the London County Council is a certificate necessary to establish the issue of a summary reception order; but no such certificate is required in the other case, the certificate there being a certificate in part authorised by the regulations of the Local Government Board.

614. Would there be any difference as to the fees payable in regard to those two kinds of certificates?—I could not put the answer in figures.

615. It would follow the provision of the Lunacy Law, I take it?—In the one case, yes.

616. These are all pauper cases which are admitted in imbecile asylums, are they not?—Quite so.

Non paupers in Metropolitan Asylums Board hospitals.

617. With regard to the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which are, as a matter of fact, provided for small-pox, fever, and diphtheria, those cases need not be paupers?—No, they need not.

618. Do you know how the non-paupers are admitted?—We are not dealing with non-paupers, and I would rather not go outside the scope of my evidence.

619.—Still, dealing with the Metropolitan Asylum Board, the Act defines their purpose as for the "reception of the sick, insane, infirm, or other class or classes of the poor;" do "the other class or classes" include such a class as the casual poor or the able-bodied poor?—Certainly those words would include the able-bodied poor; but for the casual poor you have another machinery, and, therefore, that other machinery would presumably take the provision for them out of the range of possible Asylum Districts under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867.

620. They need not be *ejusdem generis* with the sick, insane, or infirm?—Certainly not, I think.

Disappearance of "Gilbert Act" Unions.

621. At Question 44, reference was made to the Gilbert Unions; and I think you have stated that it was not until 1868 that the power of dissolution was conferred on the central authority?—That is so.

622. Are there any Gilbert Unions still remaining?—No.

Power of fixing number of guardians.

623. According to your answer to Question 17 the county council have power to fix a number of guardians for the parish, and the Local Government Board have also power under the order constituting the union; have they any other power?—Practically no power that is now available.

624. So that there is no question of dual control as to the number after the order has once been fixed?—No. In some instances recourse has been had to powers that are generally obsolete in order to help county councils, and the matter is one sometimes dealt with in Provisional Orders; but I think it may be said that generally the Board's power is no longer exercisable.

Parliamentary proceedure for local Acts.

625. With reference to the local Acts which depart materially from the general law, and are so far inconvenient; is there any check in Parliamentary procedure on promotion by local authorities of such Acts?—The provisions to which reference was made are found in the local Acts relating only incidentally to such poor law matters as parochial changes and overseers and assistant-overseers. The Parliamentary procedure so far as the central department is concerned, consists chiefly in a report on the Bill.

626. Take such a Bill as that promoted by the London County Council for the reception of lunatics; would that be under any check in Parliamentary procedure as to its promotion?—I suppose it was introduced as a Private Bill—I am almost sure that it was—and would be subject to the procedure appropriate to that kind of legislation.

Varieties of local Acts.

627. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the local Acts I understand there are two classes of local Acts, namely, those which alter the constitution of the board of guardians—I mean the old local Acts prior to 1834—and those that apply to assistant-overseers?—Yes.

628. They are altogether different classes, are they not?—That is so.

Local Acts affecting constitution of Boards of Guardians.

629. With regard to the local Acts which alter the constitution of boards of guardians, I think that with the exception of Liverpool (whose local Act was re-enacted about 1839), those local boards were all formed prior to 1834?—Yes, but some of those that were in existence prior to 1834 had amending local Acts; for instance, Oxford had one in 1850, I think.

630. Would it be possible to have a list of those local Acts which affect the constitution and working of boards of guardians?—Yes, and I have brought a list with me to-day. I have no doubt it would be advantageous to put that list in. There are exactly twelve. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. I (*h*).)

631. I make out from Glen (the addition of 1896), tha-

there are about seventeen?—I merely guessed the number the other day at twelve, and I find there are exactly twelve.

632. I notice you say with regard to the election of guardians working under those Acts, that the disparity was done away in 1894?—Section 60 of the Local Government Act, 1894, practically deals with it.

633. Does any other peculiarity remain with regard to the constitution under those local Acts?—As regards Oxford, there is a special provision.

634. I know the Oxford case, but excluding Oxford, is there?—No.

635. With regard to the regulations—for instance, as to apprenticeship—they had diffierent regulations; do they still obtain?—I think not. The only case, so far as I am aware, in which there arose a difficulty requiring general legislation to remove it, was with regard to out door relief. In one or more of the older local Acts there was no power whatever to give out-door relief; a provision was introduced, into one of the Poor Law Acts—it was the Act of 1848, I think—to the effect that guardians under local Acts should have all the power and duties of guardians in that particular matter under the Act of 1834. (See 11 and 12 Vic. c. 91, sec. 12).

636. I gather that it is optional on the part of the Local Government Board to dissolve those unions?—They have power to do it.

637. Have they done it?—In some cases. Nowadays it is generally done at the express wish of the locality.

638. Why do they elect to have 12?—I do not know that there is any magic in the number.

639. In 1834, the unions which were excluded from the Act of 1834, under local Acts were, I think, about 60 or 70?—That would be because of the Gilbert Act places.

640. Excluding those there were a very considerable number?—There was a very considerable number in the Metropolis.

641. They came to about 40 or 50, I think?—Yes, possibly.

642. Then there were Bristol, Norwich and Coventry?—Yes, a very large diminution was effected when the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, was passed.

643. Can you tell us anything as regards Norwich, Bristol, Coventry and Gloucester?—I cannot tell you the history of those now; I am afraid I cannot venture upon the history of individual cases.

644. Would it be possible to find out when these local bodies were dissolved and replaced by the ordinary law?—I should think there would be no difficulty about it.

645. Could that information be obtained?—No doubt.

646 I asked for the reason that I have noticed that there is a spirit of prohibition in the administration, which has been inherited from the clauses of those local Acts in Norwich and in Bristol and in Plymouth; and I rather wanted to have the Acts with a view of finding out what those clauses were?—I can give you the Norwich Act; it was 26 & 27 Vic. c. xciii. Do you want the Plymouth Act?

647. I do not particularly want the Plymouth Act; I rather wanted to have a complete list of the local Acts in force in 1834 with the dates at which they were dissolved by the Local Government Board?—That would require a good deal of careful research. I should think that the Local Government Board might be able to supply the information.

648. If it could do so, I should be very much obliged, for I think it does affect the administration. Some of those local Act bodies, take Plymouth for example, had important charity funds; do you know what has happened to them?—No. That would be outside the scope of my knowledge.

649. What exactly is the procedure with regard to a provisional order dealing with those peculiar local bodies; is it laid before Parliament?—Yes, exactly the same machinery is used as in the case of other provisional orders.

650. Is there a public inquiry before?—Yes, after notice by advertisement and posters.

651. I suppose all the penal clauses which were in those local Acts have been practically abrogated by the Local Government Board?—And by the earlier statutes in many cases. Those provisions about putting people in chains and confining the refractory were all swept away.

652. With regard to the alteration of the areas of boards of guardians, how do you proceed? Do you hold a public enquiry when you are going to alter the areas of unions and when you are going to rearrange parishes and unions?—Yes.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906

Alterations of Union areas.

653. Could we have a list of the cases in which you have made these alterations or would it not be easy to get?—I am afraid the work involved would be formidable.

654. Is altering these areas then a very constant affair?—I take your question to apply to the whole of them since their constitution in 1834.

655. Is it a case of perpetual alteration?—The mass would be very considerable in the early days.

656. Not now?—No, I do not know that there are many now.

657. How many a year about?—Perhaps two or three a year now.

658. Has the policy with regard to areas changed? Chadwick's policy was always to unite a rural and urban district; has that been changed?—I am not speaking on policy.

Dissolution Gilbert Act Unions.

659. With regard to the Gilbert Act Unions, I see you say that it was in 1868 that you had power to dissolve?—Yes, that was the last—the death blow.

660. It was then you had the power to dissolve?—Yes.

661. Can you tell me whether they were all dissolved at once then?—No, they were dissolved gradually. Some were parishes, and others were unions formed by agreement, that is, they were united parishes. I should say that the dissolution extended over some years.

662. Was there any dissolution before 1868?—Yes, there was. In some instances, I believe, the agreement under which the combination had been brought about was found to be invalid and in those cases, I think, under a little pressure, the local authorities dissolved.

663. The Local Government Board had not power to dissolve them till 1868, had it?—Not to enforce dissolution.

664. Were there any enquiries before they dissolved a Gilbert Union, or did they do it wholesale on a general principle?—I do not think that there could be wholesale procedure, because almost necessarily the consequences of dissolution had to be considered, that is to say, if a Gilbert Union were broken up the question was whether the constituent parishes should be formed wholly into a new union, or whether they should be distributed amongst the adjoining unions, or other areas.

665. How many Gilbert Unions were there?—I really could not say, but I think there were 50 at least.

666. Is there any report in which we could get the exact particulars about the number of Gilbert Unions?—There is one report in which a list is given.

667. Does that give the dates of dissolution?—No.

668. Where could we get that?—I am afraid you would have to search the archives of the Local Government Board.

669. Could a list of the Gilbert Unions, and the dates of dissolution be put in?—I think so, if the Commission ask the Local Government Board for the information, but I am afraid it would not be absolutely exact. In some instances I do not think that the Local Government Board would know the exact date of dissolution, but they might be able to tell you approximately the date. I am speaking entirely from memory, but I should think that in some instances all that the Local Government Board would be able to say was that at a certain period a number of parishes appeared under the name of a Gilbert Union, and then on and after a certain date there was no such union.

670. Could they not give you the actual dates when the union was dissolved?—They could not give the actual date of legal dissolution in every instance, I think, but probably they could give you approximately some dates.

Difficulties as to Asylum districts for houseless poor.

671. I only wanted to know, because I have noticed that that has an effect on administration, at least I have thought I had noticed that. You mentioned at question 62 that under the Act of 1844 the power was once exercised of forming a district to relieve the houseless poor of certain towns, but difficulties ensued, and the district was dissolved, though the power still remained.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

Where could we get information about those difficulties?—I do not know that all the difficulties are actually mentioned in the Reports, but difficulties arose through the refusal of some Metropolitan Guardians to elect members of a board of management, and, in the case of another board, difficulties occurred after the purchase of some land; what precisely they were for the moment I do not recollect. There was litigation, and I think after the litigation which was started by the vendor of the land to compel specific performance, there was general unwillingness to go on with the experiment.

672. I suppose we could get the orders that were issued by the Poor Law Board with regard to that, could we not?—I dare say they could be discovered; I should think copies have been kept.

Preparations for voters' lists.

673. (*Miss Hill.*) In answer to question 17 you spoke about the qualifications for election as a guardian. As I gather the list is prepared by the overseers from the information supplied by the relieving officers for the purpose of striking out those that are disqualified by receipt of Poor Law relief?—Yes.

674. And then the only check upon that would be an objection before the Revising Barrister if any cases were missed and remained on the list, that is, if the lists were inaccurate, the only remedy would be by application before the Revising Barrister that those disqualified people should be struck off?—That was the effect of the decision in the case of Hayward *v.* Scott to which I drew attention.

675. Is it within your knowledge whether there has been really any efficient means of striking off disqualified people?—I have been told by members of Parliament that it is rather the other way, and that they always reckon upon seeing a number of paupers amongst their electors.

676. I should expect that you would have been told that?—Yes, I have been told that, but I do not know it of my own knowledge.

Ex-officio guardians.

677. In answer to Question 31 you speak about *ex officio* guardians, I think they were done away with in 1894?—That is so.

678. Have you any knowledge of the effect that has had on boards of guardians; in your opinion, has it been inadvisable to strike them off, or the reverse?—I ought not to answer that, I am afraid.

679. Do you know what the effect has been?—It has been productive of inconvenience in certain cases.

Franchise for guardians' elections.

680. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Is a freeman disqualified for voting at the election of guardians by the receipt of relief?—That would depend upon whether he is on the burgess roll.

681. For parliamentary purposes he is not disqualified?—No; if he is on the burgess roll he would be qualified.

682. (*Professor Smart.*) In the answer to question 17 you say that married women are entitled to be registered and to vote as parochial electors. I am not quite sure what is the franchise qualification of married women and in what relation they stand to their husbands?—The qualification would be the property qualification that the ordinary ratepayer would have.

683. The property must be independent of the husband, must it?—Yes, presumably so.

684. Presumably so, you say?—I do not know that the investigation would be very close. Supposing the married woman appeared in the rate book, for example, as the owner, and occupier, of a particular property, no one would go behind that.

685. Suppose the house were altogether in the name of the wife, where does the husband come in? Have such questions never been raised?—Yes, when the Board had to deal with election cases instances of the sort frequently arose. Then generally there was an agreement produced, especially after the last Married Women's Property Act, which showed that the house was the property of the wife.

686. Then there is some certainty?—I do not know that; perhaps if every case were investigated closely in its distinct legal aspects there might be uncertainty.

687. (*Miss Hill.*) Does it not practically turn very much on whose name stands in the rate book?—Really it does.

Superannuated officers as guardians.

688. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Referring to your answer to Question 21, are superannuated officers eligible for the position of guardian?—Yes, I think they are.

Retirement guardians.

689. Going on to Question 29, has a county council power at any time to alter the method of retirement of guardians without the consent of the board of guardians which it would affect?—Yes, in connection with orders under Sections 57 and 59 of the Local Government Act, 1888, the County Council probably have the power, but I should think that in no instance has such a thing been done; I do not remember any.

Provision for treatment of infectious paupers.

690. I do not recollect exactly the number of the question in which it is dealt with, but a point has been raised with regard to the infectious Poor Law cases being removed to infectious hospitals, which might be under a borough council; is it not the duty of borough councils to deal with all infectious cases apart from the Poor Laws?—That is a very doubtful point of law. There are two cases in which the high court has endeavoured to solve the difficulty, but I do not think, up to the present, one can say that the high court has solved it.

691. Even where the union is entirely within the council area?—Yes. The ordinary recommendation to boards of guardians is that they should invariably enter into an agreement with the local authority in order to avoid the question.

692. Without an agreement would it be within the right of the county council to refuse to take any infectious cases from a workhouse hospital?—Not of the county council. I take it you are speaking now either of a hospital committee or of a town council.

693. Either a town council or a county borough Council?—They say that; that is the position they take up very frequently.

694. I thought the question in dispute was where the union was in more than one county?—There have been two cases, I think. Rawtenstall was a case in which they fought over the question of the reception into a borough hospital of the paupers who were inhabitants of the borough. That case, it was hoped, would settle the difficulty, but it did not. Recently another case has involved the question of liability arising otherwise than on contract, but there again the question has not been settled—at least not in a way which would afford satisfactory guidance to local authorities.

695. In the event of a county council refusing to take the cases, would it devolve upon the board of guardians to provide its own infectious hospital for small-pox, scarlatina, and other infectious diseases?—Yes.

Powers of Local Government Board over Metropolitan Asylums Board.

696. (*Mr. Nunn.*) As to the relation between the Local Government Board and the Metropolitan Asylums Board, when a question arises as to the provision of a hospital or asylum for a fresh class of cases, has the Metropolitan Asylums Board power to decide upon that without any veto on the part of the Local Government Board?—No. It would be necessary, in order to authorise the establishment of asylums for a fresh class of cases, that a district should be formed for that particular purpose; and only the Local Government Board could form the district.

697. When the Ringworm Schools were opened by the Metropolitan Asylums Board was it necessary then?—Yes; an order was issued dealing with all those classes.

698. On the other hand, what powers of resistance has the Metropolitan Asylums Board. I presume it has no power of resistance to an order of the Local Government Board?—It would not have in that case. The formation of the district entails certain consequences.

699. If the Local Government Board ordered a fresh class of cases to be provided for, would they have to be provided for by the Metropolitan Asylums Board?—A fresh district could be formed for dealing with a fresh class of cases.

Detention of lunatics in London workhouses.

700. On the question of detaining lunatics in workhouses, would it be within the power of the Local Government Board to order that the class of persons suffering from senile dementia in London, should be provided for by the guardians and not sent to the Asylums of the London County Council, or of the Metropolitan Asylums Board?—No, not by the guardians.

701. Could that be made the subject of an order by the Local Government Board?—In the present state of the law, I should doubt whether the Board could make an order which would have the effect indicated. In the workhouse these persons would presumably be subject to the provisions of the Lunacy Laws as to imbeciles who can only be retained in a workhouse on certificates.

Revision of list of voters in Metropolitan boroughs.

702. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Referring to question 14, you state there that "Sec. 30, Sub-sec. 1 of the

London Government Act, 1899, provided for the transfer to the Metropolitan borough council of assistant overseers and other officers employed in the performance of the duties of overseers;" I want to know whether *ipso facto* any official of the borough council becomes assistant overseer, or whether the borough council would have to appoint specially?—Certain existing assistant overseers, under the Act of 1899, were taken over by the borough councils and became officers of the borough councils. Apart from that, the borough councils have power to appoint officers of the same class or with the same duties.

703. They had the power but not the necessity—that is they were not compelled; is that it?—They were not absolutely compelled, but almost of necessity they had to do it where they did not take over the old officer.

704. Would it then be the duty of such an officer, or of a Metropolitan borough council generally to expunge the names of those who have received parochial relief from the list of voters?—That would be the duty of the Town Clerk. He would have to do for the borough council the particular duty which elsewhere arises for performance by the overseer under the Registration Order of 1895.

705. Then the power of expunging rests now with the Town Clerk in a metropolitan borough?—That would be so.

706. I will go now to question 31, although I do not know whether you are the witness to whom I should put this: The guardians now have power to elect not more than two persons outside their own body, "from persons qualified to be guardians of the union"; have you ever heard anything showing whether that is done or whether any complaint has been made about it, or whether there has been any suggestion that it is an unwise thing?—I should have no definite knowledge of the subject.

707. In your replies to questions 62 and 63 I think what you have told us is that the difficulty in regard to combination for providing for the houseless poor arose through a vendor objecting to sell some land?—I think it was rather the other way about. I think that the vendor tried to enforce specific performance; anyhow the matter got into litigation, and after that I rather think everybody was unwilling to go on with it.

708. May I take it that the power to combine for that purpose is still a power though not exercised?—It is still a power.

709. Then, for instance, two or three Metropolitan boards of guardians may combine for the purpose of providing shelter for the houseless poor with work to be done after they had received their relief?—That is to say, they would become constituents of the district to be set up by the order of the Local Government Board; but the institution, whatever you might call it—whether an asylum or any other institution—would be under the control of the board of management.

710. There was never anything, I suppose, obliging any houseless person to go to any special institution?—I think not; the experiment never got beyond the mere formation of the district.

711. Then it has never had a fair trial?—Never.

712. (*Mr. Booth.*) Turning to Question 13 (although you deal with the subject under the particular head of administration later), I desire to ask you generally on a point which I think comes better here, but I am afraid my question is a very ignorant question. I wish to know. Do the powers of the overseer supplement or act as a check upon those exercised by the guardians?—In the matter of relief?

713. I am talking of their entire duties, whatever they are?—No.

714. It would be so in a matter of relief surely?—In the matter of relief the powers of the overseers are limited by statute to the simple case of sudden and urgent necessity.

715. So that they do in fact supplement those exercised by the guardians?—Yes, to that extent.

716. Do their duties apply to in-door as well as to out-door relief?—Not in the case of overseers.

717. In their case it is out door relief only?—Yes.

718. (*Chairman.*) I am not quite clear about the powers of the Local Government Board over guardians. If the guardians were in default the Local Government Board has no power to supersede them, I understand?—That is so.

719. Assuming a board of guardians to be contumacious and decline to obey an order of the Local Government Board, what powers have the Local Government Board to enforce the order?—Essentially the power would be that given by mandamus.

720. Is there no direct power at all of superseding a board of guardians, either for its default in refusing to obey an order, or because it was extravagantly performing its duties?—There is the power of dissolving the union and distributing the parishes amongst other unions.

721. Assuming that you keep the union in its entirety and continue it there is no such power.—That is so.

722. Now from your long experience can you tell us whether the Local Government Board have ever felt the absence of that power?—Of late years I should say it has.

723. Would you mind giving us an independent opinion? As legal adviser to the Local Government Board, would you like to have the power of declaring a board of guardians in default?—I take it that the power that would be needed would be the power of appointing substitutes for the existing guardians. There is such a power, I believe, under the Irish law; and in olden days as I have mentioned, *ex-officio* guardians supplied the element from which practically the vice-guardians or the substitutes for the elective guardians could be obtained.

724. Were there any cases in the old days of the *ex-officio* guardians where they superseded the elected guardians?—The supersession was in very small matters and on perhaps only single occasions, because I think that generally the knowledge that the *ex-officio* guardians were there and ready to act checked the default.

725. Would you say that the knowledge of the reverse, namely, that there is no such power now, encourages default?—I should not like to go so far as to say that.

Dissolution of unions under local Acts.

726. (*Sir Samuel Provis*). I want to ask you one question arising out of an answer that you gave about the local Acts. The Local Government Board have power, have they not, on their own motion, to dissolve a union whether formed under the general law or not?—Yes.

Repeal or amendment of local Acts.

727. They cannot, can they, repeal or alter a local Act except upon application?—That is so.

728. And the application must come, must it not, from the guardians or from other bodies having powers or duties to discharge under the Act?—Yes, there is one exception, and I mention it simply because there have been instances in which the power has been exercised. That one exception is in the case where the alteration of a local Act is possible in connection with an order under Sec. 54 of the Local Government Act, 1888—that is, an order altering the boundary of a borough or county.

729. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Do I understand that, as a matter of fact, the Local Government Board could not dissolve a local Act union if the persons objected?—They could dissolve the union, certainly.

730. I mean the Local Act Body?—They could dissolve the union altogether and then the Local Act Body would disappear, because, by virtue of a recent enactment, on the dissolution of the union, the Local Act Body disappears, that is, the corporation is dissolved with the union. It is the Local Act that cannot be altered, ordinarily, except upon the application of the Local Act Body.

731. If you can dissolve the union you can practically destroy the Local Act?—Not necessarily.

732. I do not quite understand?—The Local Act might conceivably contain provisions—and many of them do—that would be outside the mere range of Poor Law duties. That is sometimes a difficult position.

733. Then practically it comes to this—that you could destroy the local Act in so far as it affected the constitution of the body?—Certainly.

734. But not in so far as it affected the function of the body?—That is to say, the new body would not have the functions of the old body, but it would be difficult in concrete cases to decide where those powers or duties were left; it might be chaos.

735. They might be left in an obsolete body, hung up in the air without any other functions?—That is so.

736. Like some of the directors of the poor in London now—for there are directors of the poor?—Yes, but they are still charity trustees.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

Paupers in hospitals of Sanitary Authorities.

737. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) With reference to the removal of patients from workhouses to infectious diseases hospitals, when these patients are so removed, have the authorities of the infectious diseases hospital the right of recourse against the Poor Law authorities for the cost of their maintenance and upkeep in the infectious diseases hospital, or do they maintain the patients themselves at their own cost?—The arrangement that is generally recommended (because the law is in a somewhat uncertain condition) is that there should be a definite agreement between the two bodies; and under a definite agreement the town council, having the hospital, would be paid by the board of guardians so much per head.

Powers of guardians as to land purchase.

738. (*Mr. Booth.*) Will you, turn please, to question 151, which refers to the purchase of land being allowed or disallowed. Does the Act of 1867 disallow the purchase of land except for the enlargement of buildings, and does it allow the hiring of land for a five year's term?—The Act of 1867 does not prevent the hiring of land.

739. I read your answer as meaning that, but I must have misread it. The restrictions on the use of provisions relating to compulsory purchase are, I understand, that these provisions are only to be put in force for the enlargement of workhouses, that is, the buying of land for that purpose, is it not?—Yes, but the Act would not interfere with the hiring of land for that or any other purpose.

740. But you cannot buy land except for the purpose of enlarging the building?—You cannot buy land under the Lands Clause Acts—that is the point. The Lands Clauses Acts do not apply to the purchase of land for Poor Law purposes generally, but they do apply in this particular instance and they apply in this limited way.

741. Are there other provisions with regard to the purchase of land for other purposes?—There are other provisions. There are provisions in the general Poor Law Acts. The Act, 5 & 6 William IV. c. 69, is one.

742. In your reply to question 160, you say, "The workhouse is to be considered as situated in the parish or in the union where an inmate resided last previously to his removal to the workhouse"; how is the workhouse to be considered as situated in any union where it is not?—That is a matter of construction. It is for the purposes of burial.

Date of second report of Poor Law Commission.

743. Can you tell me the date of the second Report of the Poor Law Commissioners?—1836.

Definition of non-resident relief.

744. At page 196 the phrase "non-resident relief" is used; does that mean relief to non-residents?—That is relief to persons who are not resident in the union the guardians of which pay the relief ultimately.

Power to revise General Consolidated Order of 1847.

745. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) At Question 174 you are asked "Is the General Consolidated Order periodically revised and issued by the Local Government Board"? and you reply "No, the General Consolidated Order is a fixed code." Do I understand that the power of the President of the Local Government Board does not extend to an absolute alteration of that, but only to such changes as are necessitated by fresh legislation—in other words, is it a statutory power?—His power is absolute as regards alteration; it could be altered as often as he chose to alter it. As a matter of fact it is not treated like the code of the Board of Education, that is to say, there is not an annual revision of it; it is revised only when occasion requires.

746. The power of the President then, is the same over that order as over any other?—Entirely so.

"Neglect" under the Vagrancy and Prevention of Cruelty to Children Acts.

747. Then at Question 253 Mr. Loch asks you "It says that a parent who neglects may get relief on loan for his child; what is the definition of 'neglect' there;" and your answer is "I think that the expression 'habitual neglect' as used in the order, was intended to include such neglect as is within the contemplation of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904." May I take it that that is the usual definition of neglect with regard to Poor Law relief generally adopted here?—No. I think neglect within the meaning of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act has a more limited signification than under the Vagrancy Act, 1824.

748. Neglect under the Vagrancy Act need not be such an extensive and in a sense cruel a thing as under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act?—I think that is so.

749. Did the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act supersede the other?—No. The Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act superseded a provision which was in the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1868 and had reference to wilful neglect to provide adequate food, clothing, medical aid or lodging for a child. That was repealed and the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act was substituted; but the Vagrancy Act was not repealed, and that still remains.

Special rate for emigratio

750. Then at Question 286 Mr. Loch says, "I thought that was valid still?"—he is referring there to the power of the parish meeting to raise a rate specially for emigration purposes; and you seem to imply in your answer that it may be in existence, but it has hardly ever been made use of?—It has not been actually repealed; that is all I meant. The enactment relating to the owners and ratepayers raising emigration expenses has not been actually struck off the Statute Book; it remains there, but it is a dead letter; it is not workable nowadays.

Disposition of pauper property.

751. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I want to put one or two questions to you now about the reimbursement of relief. When money is or other valuables are found in the possession of the pauper on his entrance to the workhouse before it falls into the treasurer's hands, have the guardians the power of dealing with it according to their discretion, and either giving it back to the relatives or retaining it?—Yes.

752. Supposing it has passed into the hands of the treasurer, have they then lost that power?—In a sense they have: that is to say they could not hand over the actual cash, or whatever it might be, to the relatives. But in all those instances they could themselves by an order upon the treasurer make the repayment. It would be a question whether they were acting strictly within their powers if they did it.

753. It is a question?—Of course there would be the question whether they were right in doing it.

754. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Must you then not grant outdoor relief to that man?—Not necessarily: this is a case of repayment to relatives I understand.

Relief on loan.

755. (*Mr. Nunn.*) My next question refers to the declaration of relief by loan; is it necessary that the pauper should be in full possession of his senses when such a declaration is made?—He should be certainly.

756. Must he be?—He ought to be.

757. They cannot do it to a person who comes into the house drunk?—I do not think they should.

Relieving officers' d on refusal indoor rel

758.—With regard to discharge by the relieving officer, and the responsibility with regard to outdoor relief, supposing the guardians have offered to house the applicant, and the applicant refuses to avail himself of that offer, and applies to the relieving officer again, to what extent is it necessary that the relieving officer if he considers the applicant really destitute, should relieve him?—He should relieve him in necessaries, treating the case as one of sudden or urgent necessity.

759. Could he give him at least enough for one meal?—Yes.

760. I was wondering to what extent it was necessary for him to regard the applicant after he had furnished him with the immediate necessities?—He should treat it as a case of sudden or urgent necessity, and give such relief as would be necessary to relieve that sudden or urgent necessity.

761. Then has he discharged his responsibility until application is made to him again?—That should be so ordinarily.

Powers of overseers grant reli

762 (*Mr. Bentham.*) Will you go to Question 190, which gives the sections showing the powers of overseers to grant relief. This question has been asked several times, but I do not feel quite clear about it yet. In case of sudden and urgent necessity are the guardians bound to honour whatever the overseers have given?—The relief given by the overseers in the case of sudden and urgent necessity would be a subject of charge in the accounts of the overseers. It is a parochial charge.

763. Is it not part of the duty of a relieving officer to enter in his Application Report Book all applications for relief whether they might be made by the overseers or by the magistrates, or by any other person; and in that case would that relief be legal if it did not appear in the relieving officer's book?—I do not think that the question of the legality of the relief would be affected by its appearing only in the overseer's accounts. It would be a legal charge supposing that the case was one of sudden and urgent necessity, and it was given under circumstances that brought it within the powers of the overseers.

764. With regard to the powers of justices to grant relief, is their power somewhat narrower than the power which is given to overseers; is it limited to the casual poor, and to medical relief only in the case of sudden and dangerous illness?—Sec. 27 deals with the powers of the justices in other cases. Restriction was put upon the exercise of the justices' powers in those cases by the decisions of the Courts. It was held that the justices who dealt with the cases had to follow a regular procedure, including the summoning of the persons to be relieved.

765. Sec. 54 says: "Provided always that any justice of the peace shall be empowered to give a similar order for medical relief (only) to any parishioner, as well as out parishioners where any case of sudden and dangerous illness may require it." Am I to understand the word "only" to mean that they could not give relief to persons other than medical relief?—Sec. 27 is additional to that, and Sec. 27 is to this effect: "In any union which may be formed under this Act it shall be lawful for any two . . . . justices of the peace usually acting for the district wherein such union may be situated, at their just and proper discretion to direct by order under their hands and seals that relief shall be given to any adult person who shall from old age or infirmity of body be wholly unable to work without requiring that such person shall be received in the workhouse." That is additional to the power under Sec. 54.

766. According to your answer to Question 255 under the Friendly Societies Acts guardians have "not to take into consideration any sum received from a Friendly Society as sick pay, except in so far as the sum exceeds 5s. a week"; if the guardians ignore this in practice what redress has the applicant?—I do not know.

767. Then really it could become a dead letter?—I ought not to say that because, technically, the case might be one in which the pauper might be heard, if application were made for a mandamus to a board of guardians to give relief. As a matter of fact there is no authentic report of the actual end of the only case of application on behalf of a pauper for a mandumus (Queen *v.* Guardians of Newtown, 28 J.P. 725); but so far as the case is reported it showed a disposition on the part of the Court of Queen's Bench to entertain the application for the mandamus.

768. Referring now to question 273, as the system of apprenticeship described in your answer there is now considered to be out of date, and is seldom acted upon, is there anything in the orders or statutes to prevent a board of guardians with the sanction of the Local Government Board apprenticing a boy to be taught a trade, the guardians providing the difference between the wages paid and the cost of the boy's maintenance in lodgings, and the guardians exercising the necessary oversight until the boy has reached the age at which he is capable of looking after himself, that is, at the termination of the agreement?—I am afraid that is rather an elaborate case. I think all that I can say upon that subject is that, if there were any general desire to control apprenticeship on those lines, it might be within the powers of the Board; but certainly a special order would be needed to deal with the matter. It could not be dealt with under the existing provisions of the General Consolidated Order; if it could be done it would have to be done under amended provisions.

769. Apprenticeship of that kind is already done, but the difference is paid as outdoor relief?—Quite so, but your notion would be to put it on the footing of a legalised apprenticeship, would it not?

770. A legalised apprenticeship, but non-maintenance?—For that you would certainly need a special order even if it were within the powers of a special order.

771. Referring now to question 281 are the powers of emigration under the Unemployed Workmen Act intended to supersede the powers of guardians to emigrate persons who are not actually chargeable?—I do not think there is any such intention: certainly not. The act is not intended to supersede those powers; the two are to work side by side, I should rather say.

772. Then there are three authorities now with power to emigrate, namely, county councils, board of guardians, and distress committee?—Distress committees having the powers of central bodies, yes. But I think you must eliminate county councils for the present; technically there is that power of borrowing under the Local Government Act, 1888, but the power is one that has never yet been exercised.

773. There is nothing to prevent its being exercised, is there?—I am not at all sure. It is a peculiarly worded section. There are agreements contemplated. It is essential that there should be a guarantee for repayment from the local authority in the county, if it were a county scheme, that is if it were an internal scheme, or from the Government of any Colony, if it were an external scheme. You must have that *ab initio*, as it were.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

774. (*Professor Smart.*) I understand that when a person applies for relief he must give up everything?—Not necessarily. Destitution as the condition of relief.

775. He gives up money I suppose?—Yes.

776. And valuables?—Not necessarily; some valuables he would not, or he might not.

777. That is not the theory of the case, because that is that he becomes entirely destitute before he gets relief?—His destitution should, no doubt, be established; but you are not taking now the case of indoor relief—you are taking the case of relief in general. He would not absolutely strip his cottage of everything that could be classed as a valuable in order to entitle him to get relief.

778. But a person cannot come into the poor-house without breaking up his home for example?—No, perhaps not.

779. Then practically it comes so this, that as a theory a person is dispoiled of everything before he gets poor relief?—As to what constitutes destitution no doubt the theory goes very far.

780. Would you make a difference there between income and capital, and say that a man must have no income but still may have some capital—goods?—Yes; in certain circumstances.

781. If a pauper afterwards falls heir to a legacy there is a certain amount of claim on the part of the State—to a year's maintenance, is there not?—There is also a common-law power, which in some cases has been exercised, and which enables guardians to recover more than one year's maintenance. Reimbursement of relief.

782. It enables them to recover six years, does it not?—Yes.

783. Does that give any sort of countenance for the theory that all our relief is of the nature of a loan by the State?—No, I should think not.

784. Otherwise, how do you claim for a year's maintenance at all?—By Statute.

785. Simply by Statute?—That is all for the one year. The other kind of action is for money paid on behalf of, or expenses necessarily incurred for the benefit of the pauper. The body who have expended money on the pauper's maintenance during a certain period ask to be recouped, and, with that object, bring an ordinary action.

786. When a person applies for relief, the first thing the guardians do is to apply to the blood relations to see if they are able to support the claimant, is it not?—I ought not to speak as to the practice. There is no doubt they do look about for relatives, or they should do so.

787. To what extent—to the parents, grandparents, and children?—Yes.

788. And an order, in that case, may be passed upon those blood relations?—Yes.

789. To what amount—the full amount of the maintenance?—That is determined by the justices.

790. Is there any principle in the matter?—I do not think I can answer that question; so much would depend upon practice.

791. But they might claim for the full amount of the relief given?—Yes.

792. Is there any claim on brothers and sisters?—No.

793. Only on parents, grandparents, and children?—That is so; and in the case of the grandchild, it is not reciprocal.

794. Generally speaking, the non-payment of Poor Rates is a disqualification for the franchise?—Speaking very generally, yes. Disfranchisement.

795. You note that the excusal from payment is not poor relief?—It is not. That was decided by the High Court.

796. And does not disqualify?—It does not disqualify.

797. That means that a person must be formally excused?—Yes; under 54 George III., c. 170, Sec. 11.

798. But you cannot tell us anything positively about the position of the man who does not pay his poor

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

rates and yet has not been excused?—Speaking generally, a man who does not pay his rates would be disqualified.

799. Am I to understand that when any municipality establishes temporary relief work, such employment is poor relief and disqualification for the franchise?—No, certainly not.

800. I rather gathered that from answer to question 118 where you take the case of breaking stones?—The work was provided by the guardians in that case.

801. Could you give me the date of that case?—I am sorry I have not a note of it with me, but I will supply the date.

Disposal of unclaimed corpses of paupers.

802. You make a reference to the disposal of corpses to anatomical schools, and you say that payment cannot be given to an official for that; are there any special regulations as to the disposal of unclaimed corpses to schools of Anatomy and schools of that sort?—There are no Poor Law regulations.

803. What regulations are there?—That would come under the Anatomy Act.

804. And so would be beyond our scope altogether?—Quite so.

Revision of General Consolidated Order.

805. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In regard to the General Consolidated Order of 1847, are new orders attached to it; does it steadily grow?—I believe it does steadily grow on the whole, but the process would be ordinarily to rescind portions of it or vary portions and issue a fresh order dealing with the subject matter of that portion.

806. Is it within your knowledge that in many quarters it is thought that a new edition of the General Consolidated Order would be a great convenience to officials?—I have heard that said, certainly.

807. It has been brought under my notice a great many times lately in connection with this inquiry. Has the Local Government Board ever contemplated a revised edition?—Certainly.

808. Is it likely to be propounded?—That is rather outside my scope.

Powers of Justices to order relief.

809. With regard to Question 189 and the powers of the justices, am I to understand you to say that, as the law stands, if the justices of a borough or of a district thought that the board of guardians were acting very harshly in the matter of relief, they would have it in their power to reverse their decision practically in the case of applicants who have been offered the workhouse?—Provided they came within that particular section. That was in fact suggested by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn in the particular case in which I mentioned that an application for a mandamus had been made.

810. Do you know whether such cases often occur?—I should think they would be exceedingly rare.

811. I speak from knowledge, because in my own union there was such a case. An attempt was made to override the decision of the guardians by applying to the justices, and the justices ordered relief; through some informality it fell through in the end. Do you think it would be possible or legal for the justices, now deliberately and consistently to over-ride the action of the guardians?—Speaking from that one particular case which was before the High Court, I should say that the High Court would recognise the power of the justices to over-ride the decision of the guardians, provided of course, that the circumstances were favourable to their excercising their jurisdiction.

Topographical application of prohibitory order.

812. With regard to the prohibitory order, I did not quite understand from your answer to Question 197 whether there is any principle with regard to its application. You said in general terms that the prohibitory order and the regulation order were applied, the one to the rural districts and the other to more populous centres; is there any principle of distinction between the two, numerical or other?—Originally in the one case the Poor Law Commissioners adopted what they called preparatory rules, and those they issued to the rural areas, and to the less populous towns. Following those has come the outdoor relief prohibitory order, which they settled before they went out of office.

813. Is there any definition of "less populous"?—No.

814. Is there any numerical distinction?—The distinction arises from the selection of unions to which the order is addressed.

815. And that is almost arbitrary?—Certainly in that sense.

Discharge of pauper without dependant.

816. In regard to question 200 I am afraid I am not quite clear in my own mind yet, in spite of all that has been said, about the responsibility of parents; if I might give a case it would perhaps put the question best. I was at a board of guardians the other day and a proposal was made with regard to a man and his wife and four children who were in the workhouse. It was proposed to let the man and his wife and two children go out and to maintain the other two children in the workhouse at the cost of the ratepayers. Would that be legal?—What order was in force; was it the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order?

817. I could not say: it was at Lewes?—It might not be absolutely illegal, but it might be defective administration.

818. Would they have to report it to the Local Government Board?—If the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order were in force they would.

819. And has the Local Government Board power to allow it?—Yes.

820. It has been done under the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order. Would it be the duty of the auditor to surcharge them in a case of that sort?—No, I do not think he could surcharge in that case.

Payment of paupers' re by guardia

821. What is the position of the law with regard to the payment of rent?—The payment of rent is within the prohibitions of the two orders, except rent for a night's shelter or temporary lodgings. In article 5 of the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order the provision runs thus—"It shall not be lawful for the guardians or any of their officers, or for the overseer or overseers of any parish in the union to pay, wholly or in part, the rent of the house or lodging of any pauper, or to apply any portion of the relief ordered to be given to any pauper in payment of any such rent, or to retain any portion of such relief for the purpose of directly or indirectly discharging such rent, in full or in part, for any such pauper; provided always that nothing in this article contained shall apply to any shelter or temporary lodging procured in any case of sudden and urgent necessity or mental imbecility or shall be taken to prevent the said guardians in regulating the amount of relief to be afforded to any particular person from considering the expense to be incurred by such person in providing lodging."

822. (*Mr. Nunn.*) That is directed to payment of rent by the officer, and not by the pauper?—As regards the pauper, the guardians may take into account in the amount of relief which they give the possible demands upon him for rent.

Presentati of orders t Parliament

823 (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the general orders, are they still presented to Parliament every year?—A certain number of orders are always presented to Parliament.

824. Are those general orders?—When an order is general it has to be presented, and there is a routine arrangement with regard to presentation. An order is general when it is issued to more than two unions.

General orders impugned Law Court

825. As regards the validity of the general orders, have they been questioned in the Law Courts; have you had a *certiorari* against a general order?—The applications by way of *certiorari*, I think, were as a rule against single orders—that is special orders—but it is just conceivable that one of those orders may have been issued to two unions, which would make it a general order. I do not, however, recall a case.

Difference between special and general orders.

826. I do not quite understand the distinction between special and general orders; is it simply the issue of the same order at different dates to different unions which constitutes it a special order as distinguished from a general order?—The old distinction was that if one order was issued to more than two unions it became a general order.

827. Supposing you issued the order at different dates to different unions would not that still be a special order?—That would certainly be a special order and not a general order.

828. So that you could make it not a general order if you chose?—Yes; but of course there were reasons for issuing general orders in the early days.

829. Do they still obtain?—Yes. General orders now are in a somewhat different position from what they were when the Poor Law Commissioners were acting. General orders now apply not merely to Poor Law matters, but to other powers that the Board possess; so that very frequently a general order is, one might say,

almost the only way in which certain regulations can be applied.

830. On questions with regard to the relief of distress, like different forms of diet and outdoor relief—for instance the Whitechapel Order—is it now the practice of the Local Government Board to issue a new policy in the form of special orders which will be repeated to different unions?—As regards diet the last order was a general order.

831. Take the special order for the Chorlton Union which enabled the Chorlton Union not to weigh the bread; that was a most important order; if that was issued to a great many unions, one after the other, that would really be a change in the law under which the boards of guardians acted, would it not?—That would be so.

832. Is part of the difficulty of consolidating the general orders that you have been changing your policy by special orders?—I do not think that change of policy would be a practical difficulty in the way of consolidation.

833. You have a great many important special orders; there is for instance the special order with regard to Whitechapel, allowing outdoor relief to the family of a man if he himself comes into the workhouse; I do not know whether that has been issued to a good many unions?—It hardly deserves the name of an important order, I think; it is merely an explanatory order, showing what could practically be done under the Out-Door Relief Regulation Order.

834. Turning back to the Chorlton order with regard to bread, that enabled the Chorlton Board of Guardians not to weigh the bread to the paupers?—I am afraid I do not know anything of the genesis of the Chorlton order.

835. Where do we find these general orders since 1834; how could we obtain them so as to see what they consist of?—I am afraid that could only come from the records of the Local Government Board.

836. Would it be possible for us to obtain a set of those general orders?—I should hardly think it is possible.

837. I notice that up to the year 1859 or about that time, you had official circulars which gave all these documents?—The Poor Law Commissioners and Poor Law Board issued such circulars, but even they did not give all the general orders.

838. You do not think they did?—I am sure they did not.

839. Could we extract those general orders from your reports?—It would have to be done from the records; but the labour of compiling such a list would be so enormous that I do not know when it would finish.

840. How many general orders on a rough guess do you suppose there have been since 1834?—I could not hazard a guess. Within the definition every order issued to two unions would count. The orders were issued and then rescinded in the days of the Poor Law Commission. The trouble that I am thinking of would be in their time.

841. Would it not be possible to find them in the Poor Law Commission Reports?—No. It would be possible to find them in the registers of the Local Government Board and they could be traced with a considerable amount of labour.

842. Could anyone having access to those registers trace them?—I should think so, but I do not know whether the registers in the days of the Poor Law Commissioners were kept with sufficient nicety to answer this particular purpose.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

15 Jan. 1906.

Accessibility of general orders issued since 1874.

FOURTH DAY.

Tuesday, 16th January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. ALFRED DOUGLAS ADRIAN,* C.B., K.C., recalled; and further Examined.

843. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I am sorry to be troublesome, but I want to come back to the question of the general orders. I understood from you that they are laid before Parliament from year to year; are they issued to members as Parliamentary papers?—I do not know what the procedure is with regard to particular orders which are in fact laid upon the table.

844. Should we find them in the proceedings of the House?—The department concerned with laying them before the House would be able to answer. I have no personal knowledge of the procedure.

845. Has the Local Government Board no complete set of these general orders?—There are volumes which may contain a complete collection.

846. I am told there is a row of volumes of general orders bound, numbered, and indexed; is that so?—Yes.

847. How far back do those go?—I could not tell you.

848. Would it be possible for us to have the loan of those volumes?—On that I think a question must be put to the department.

849. With regard to the special orders, have they the force of law equally with general orders?—Yes, so far as the particular locality is concerned.

850. Has their validity been questioned in the law courts? I gather from your evidence that there have been two cases?—I think there were more than two cases. In the past, especially in the Metropolis, the Poor Law Commissioners had, I should think, at least half-a-dozen of their orders questioned.

851. Those were generally, I think, in the case of unions under local Acts, were they not?—Almost, I think, without exception,—they were all under local Acts.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

Special Orders impugned in Law Courts.

* N.B.—It should be borne in mind that, since the dates at which this witness appeared before the Royal Commission, various Statutory enactments and judicial decisions have, in several respects, affected the legal position as described in his evidence.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

Relief Committees.

852. Could we have a list of the cases in which the validity of special orders has been questioned ?—I daresay a list could be compiled in the department.

853. I notice that the policy of the central authority as regards relief committees is entirely dependent on special orders, that is to say, it is by a special order that a union is permitted to have a relief committee instead of sitting as a whole in the relief of cases ?—There are district relief committees, no doubt.

854. And only district relief committees ?—"District relief committee," I think, is the usual phrase adopted to describe the committee set up under special orders.

855. Could a board of guardians, without a special order, divide into committees for the relief of distress ?—For the relief of destitution, yes.

856. What is the distinction ?—In the one case the district committee is set up under an express statutory enactment giving the Board power to start such an organisation. In the other case, the power of the guardians is derived from the Local Government Act, 1894, which incorporates provisions of the Public Health Act, 1875, with respect to meetings and the transaction of business.

857. So that a meeting of a board of guardians could break up into committees and take cases separately without a special order ?—Provided that the regulations of the board of guardians were made to meet the particular case.

858. Would those regulations be given in a special order ?—No, the regulations would be made by the board of guardians.

859. I notice that there was a special order of the Local Government Board insisting that the district relief committees should be composed only of the guardians of the district ; is that still in force ?—There are so many of them that one would like the name of the particular committee.

860. Glen gives it, but of course he does not give the date ; he says it was issued to fourteen unions between 1843 and 1882 ?—I daresay that is right.

861. That is a very important point in policy, because the whole question of whether the guardians of a particular district give relief or not is mixed up with corruption. Can we ascertain whether those orders are still in force ?—No doubt.

Alcoholic Liquors, &c. : Wirral Order.

862. Then that information could be provided. Now with regard to the special order of the Wirral Union in Cheshire which is noticed in Glen, allowing guardians to supply food and alcoholic liquors to poor persons during harvest time ; is that still in force ?—I really do not know.

863. How can we judge of the policy of the central authority with regard to alcoholic liquor without knowing that ?—I am afraid I can hardly answer that question. I am not here to discuss policy.

864. We are now discussing law under which boards of guardians work ; that would be part of the law, would it not ?—A district relief committee order ?

865. No, the question of alcoholic liquor. You see there is a special order under which one union has work or is working, which enables them to give alcoholic drink to poor persons under certain circumstances ; that would be part of the law under which that union acted, would it not ?—Certainly.

866. Then we could not understand the law laid down by the Local Government Board without having that and similar orders ?—Quite so.

Meeting of Guardians at public-house.

867. There is also (in connection with the temperance question) an order which you yourself referred to—which was a special order, I understood—which prohibited guardians from meeting in a public-house ?—That is statutory. It was not an order.

868. I beg your pardon, but I understood it was an order. At question 35 you say, the Local Government Board were advised that they had power to make an order as to the place of meeting of a board of guardians so as to prevent their meeting at a public-house ?—That is the case.

869. Was that order issued ?—I think not.

870. That was merely an expression of opinion by the lawyers then ?—By the law officers of the Crown.

Accessibility of Special Orders.

871. In view of the importance of these special orders as embodying policy, how can we get at them ?—I am afraid that that question must be addressed to the Local Government Board.

872. Would it not be necessary for the auditor of a district to have a complete set of these special orders with a view to surcharges ?—Certainly.

873. Then the auditors could give us those ?—I should think that the application might well be made to head quarters rather than to auditors.

874. A sympathetic Local Government Board could give us those orders, or, at any rate, such of those orders as made new departures or experiments, whether they failed or succeeded. Then you referred to a famous circular issued by Mr. Goschen ; that was a very important document as a declaration of policy, was it not ?—Yes, it was the minute of the 20th of November, 1869.

Accessibility of Circulars of Local Government Board.

875. I suppose there are other important circulars by the Local Government Board determining the policy ?—On that particular question ?

876. No, on other questions ?—Yes.

877. There is, for instance, the Workhouse Infirmary Circular of 1897, and there are the Unemployed Circulars of 1886 and 1892. Would it be possible for us to have any opinion about the administration of relief in England without knowing about those circulars ?—I am afraid I can hardly answer that question. The circulars have, from time to time, been issued to accompany orders dealing with various questions relating to relief.

878. They have sometimes been issued without orders have they not ?—Occasionally.

879. Does the Local Government Board keep files of these circulars ?—Certainly.

880. I assume that these might be supplied if the Local Government Board desired to supply them ?—If they are still in print.

881. But you would have a copy and you could lend them ?—I daresay the copies are complete, but I have no personal knowledge as to that.

Destitution as a condition of relief.

882. About destitution, I did not quite understand whether, assuming that a widow asked for out-door relief and she happened to have a Chippendale chair value £5, that would disqualify her from getting relief ?—I think not.

883. If she had a bag of old gold coins value £20, in her possession, would that disqualify her—I mean old coins which could not be immediately used ; of course, she could not have £200 of current coin in her possession without being disqualified ?—I believe there is a decision (Moss *v.* Hancock ; Law Reports 1899, 2 Queen's Bench, 111 ; 68 Law Journal, Queen's Bench, 657) which might support an argument that the old coins would be equivalent to money for the purposes of Sec. 16 of the 12 and 13 Vic., c. 103.

884. Would personal ornament come under that ?—I think not.

885. The point is this that for indoor relief you would, more or less, have to part with those things, would you not, or would it hold the same with indoor as with outdoor relief ?—Some personal possession would certainly be retained by the pauper—the widow's wedding ring, for example ; I have never seen any suggestion that she should be made to part with that.

886. Would there be any distinction with regard to property between a person who went into the House and a person who accepted relief outside ?—In the case of the person who accepted relief outside, anything in the nature of money or valuable security for money might be taken by the guardians.

887. And that would be the same in the case of a person going indoors ?—The person going indoors could hardly take furniture and other possessions with him or her.

888. Therefore, they would have to be disposed of ?—In some sort of way.

889. (*Dr. Downes.*) On the general question of relief has there been any attempt to define what destitution means ?—There is no absolute statutory definition

Such definition as exists must be gathered rather from pronouncements on particular cases, I think.

890. Would the same answer apply to the words, "sudden and urgent necessity" which appear in various statutes and orders?—In a way, yes. But those words have had a development. I believe that the Poor Law Commissioners at one time—quite in the early days—treated them as applicable only to cases where a house had been burnt down or some calamity of that sort had befallen the man; but the meaning has been very much widened.

891. Taking the question of relief in the broad sense, I think the securities for the relief of the really destitute are very ample, setting aside the question of the overseers, and taking the case of the relieving officer or of the master of the workhouse?—Quite so.

892. If a really destitute person applies for relief to one of those two officers—there are, I think, very ample securities that that relief will be given?—Quite so.

893. There is, first of all, the authority of the guardians?—Yes.

894. Then, I think, there is the authority of the central body who have power to dismiss those officers?—Yes.

895. And behind all that lies an appeal to the law?—Yes.

896. Would an indictment lie against an officer who allowed a person to suffer or to perish from neglect?—An officer might be indicted for negligence of a serious kind.

897. Then, there is the more cumbrous machinery of a mandamus, I suppose?—Yes, as against the guardians. As regards the mandamus, we have only the solitary case which I referred to the other day and the final issue of which is in some uncertainty.

898. If we turn to the manner in which the relief is given, what would be the checks against illegal or extravagant expenditure?—Illegal expenditure would be a subject of disallowance or surcharge by the auditor. He also has a power of dealing with unreasonable expenditure; but the question of unreasonable expenditure in the matter of relief is often a difficult one. The distributors of the relief have a discretion which of course goes some way as an authority, where it is a question of amount.

899. I take it that it is easier for an auditor to deal with an illegal payment than it is for him to deal with an extravagant payment?—It is so where relief is in question.

900. Take for example, the case of medical relief on which I touched yesterday, as I was not aware then that your subjects were being taken in sections. What is the control over the very extensive powers of the guardians to send persons for curative treatment; would that power enable them to send a man out of England for treatment?—No, I think not.

901. I can understand that in most cases it would be clearly unreasonable; but let me put a concrete instance which is, at the same time, an actual instance. Guardians have under their charge a leper for whom they can find no accommodation in England, but may possibly find accommodation abroad; would their powers be sufficiently extensive to deal with a case of that sort?—No.

902. Behind the auditor comes the central authority as a check on extravagant expenditure?—Yes.

903. I think it may be realised that in dealing with a popularly elected body on a democratic franchise, the powers of the central authority are not so easy in practice as they may be on paper and in law?—Of course there are difficulties.

904. It is a fact, I think, that for the last half century or so, the original scheme of the Commissioners for keeping the central authority clear of politics, has been abandoned?—Since 1847, there has been a political head of the Local Government Board.

905. I suggest that the good sense of the guardians and their responsibility to their constituents, as matters stand now, should be securities for the proper expenditure of the money entrusted to them?—Quite so.

906. I think in the course of your evidence you have said that the question of medical relief has grown up rather by practice than by Statute?—That was the view of the Poor Law Commissioners.

907. You have mentioned to us the case of persons being sent to Bath and Buxton in the old days; that is an old illustration, is it not?—It is an old illustration of non-resident relief.

908. Now, with regard to the attendance on the sick poor; the ordinary course is by an order given by the relieving officer, is it not?—Yes.

909. But there are provisions, I think, for attendance without an order?—There are cases of permanently disabled paupers who are put on a permanent list; and the exhibition to the district medical officer of a ticket entitles them to his attendance.

Payment of Medical Officers.

910. The payment of medical officers under the present system, I think, is by a fixed salary supplemented by fees for certain surgical operations?—That is so.

911. The Commissioners, I believe, at one time favoured payment by salary on the permanent list of sick, with additional payments for extra cases; was that power given to the guardians by order?—I do not remember that the particular arrangement actually commended itself to the Commissioners, but it has been proposed from time to time.

912. I was under the impression there was something of that sort, and that the ground was that it would encourage independent poor to provide for themselves through sick clubs and friendly societies?—I think also that payment by a fee for each case has been proposed, in order to facilitate the recovery of relief by way of loan.

Recovery of loan relief.

913. How would relief by loan be recovered; would it be in the County Court?—Either in the County Court or, in certain cases, before the justices.

Medical relief by ordinary practitioner.

914. In addition to the cases on the permanent sick list, I think under an Act of 1828, some boards of guardians have made arrangements for attendance on a sick person, and in certain cases of emergency by any medical practitioner; I do not know whether you are acquainted with those?—They have that power under Sec. 2 of 11 and 12 Vic., c. 110.

915. Would that be available in midwifery cases, if the guardians chose to put it in force?—It is hardly intended to meet cases of that description. The Act was really devised to meet cases analogous to those of persons who, in the old law, were called the casual poor, that is, where accident befell a man away from home and he needed assistance.

916. Do you think it would be straining the original application of the Act?—I think so. The original intention certainly was not to meet such cases,—that is, as a matter of ordinary procedure.

Metropolitan dispensaries.

917. In the Metropolis there is an elaborate system of dispensaries under the Acts of 1867 and 1869, I think?—That is so.

918. Is there any equivalent provision in the provinces?—None.

919. In the Metropolis, in fact, the provision for medical relief is rather more extensive than it is in the provinces?—I think so.

Varying of appointments of officers.

920. Is there not a section for varying the appointments of officers in one of the old Metropolitan Acts where it is desirable for the purposes of classification or for certain improvements of administration?—Yes.

921. Is there anything equivalent to that in the provinces?—No. It may be pointed out that Section 41 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, extended the power to "the contract with or appointment of any officer appointed by a board of guardians."

922. And that does not apply to the provinces, then?—No, that only applies to the Metropolis.

923. May I take it that there has been no extension of that to the provinces?—On changes of area there might be a provision for compensation to officers whose emoluments would be affected by the changes. That is in force in the provinces.

924. Since the date of that Statute the superannuation Act has been passed, has it not?—Yes; but there was a Superannuation Act in force before that date.

925. But not of the same character?—No.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

926. Under the Superannuation Act is there any limitation as to compensation?—Two-thirds is the actual limit in the case of superannuation.

Limits of Superannuation allowance.

927. But in the event of the termination of an office is there any limitation?—It would be under the provisions of other Statutes that the question of compensation would arise—especially under the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1867.

Effect of Superannuation Act.

928. I suggest that it may occasionally happen that a change in the appointment of an officer may be desirable, but that officer may have contributed for a number of years to a superannuation fund which would render the change more difficult?—Section 8 of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act 1896 is intended to provide for that case; whether it does actually provide for it satisfactorily in all instances I am not prepared to say, but it is intended to meet that case.

929. With regard to the question of the payment of medical officers, I should have asked you whether the orders were ever suspended as to fees?—Yes.

Paupers in non-poor law hospitals.

930. In the Metropolis I think the guardians can contract with the hospitals for reception of patients?—Yes.

931. Is there any equivalent provision in the provinces?—The power to subscribe extends to the provinces, and they would get presumably something for their subscription in the way of the reception of the paupers.

Subscriptions to hospitals.

932. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is that power the power of subscription to infectious hospitals or to non-infectious hospitals?—To all hospitals.

Relief in cases of delirium tremens.

933. (*Dr. Downes.*) Take the case of relief given to persons suffering from delirium tremens; are you aware of any case in the courts where it has been endeavoured to bring them within the Vagrancy Act?—There is a case on the notes; I mentioned one and that is the only case I know.

934. I think the case failed, did it not?—Yes.

935. (*Chairman.*) May I ask what was the object of the case—was it to reimburse the guardians?—That was the object in another case, namely, the Guardians of the West Ham Union *v.* Pearson (62 Law Times, New Series, 638). There the object was attained, for it was held that at common law the Guardians could recover the expenses incurred.

Liability of Relieving Officer for neglect.

936. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I should like to ask a question on the liability of the officers. Supposing an applicant for relief suffered through the neglect of a relieving officer to report his case or to attend to it, would the relieving officer be liable, and could the applicant sue him for neglect?—The officer might be subject to indictment according to two decisions, namely, Clark *v.* Joslin (15 Cox, Criminal Cases, 746) and Queen *v.* Curtis (27 Law Times, New Series, 762). Those cases show that an indictment will lie against a relieving officer for negligence in relieving the poor.

Position of Guardians and Relieving Officer when pauper refuses indoor relief.

937. Supposing there was what is known as a starvation case which ensued because the pauper had refused indoor relief, and had been refused outdoor relief, would he have any cause of action against the guardians or the officials?—A question of that sort would depend so very much upon the actual facts that I do not think I could give a general answer.

938. So that the mere fact that indoor relief had been offered and refused would not necessarily exonerate the guardians?—I think not.

939. (*Mr. Loch.*) Why should it not be so under the law? It is an offer of relief and the person is destitute, is it not in the discretion of the guardians to offer what they think desirable?—Certainly they may make the offer, but the man must not starve because he does not accept the offer. If they have cognisance of a case of destitution it would be their duty or the duty of their officer to watch that case.

940. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) So that he would have a right not only to relief, but to relief of the kind he preferred?—I do not know that one could go quite so far as that. He would be entitled to some relief—to relief sufficient to keep him from starvation.

941. And he might practically choose whether it should be in the house or out?—In that sense he might.

942. (*Mr. Loch.*) Might I ask a similar question in regard to an old woman who was offered to be moved into an infirmary, and she says, "No, I won't go in"; are the guardians not quit of their responsibility in any sense when they have offered exactly what their medical officer advised and what is best for the woman?—I think they are not quit of their responsibility in any sense—that is, of their whole responsibility.

943. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) These cases arise pretty often, and I was hearing of one only yesterday?—No doubt they do; and very difficult cases they are.

944. I understand that under the out-door relief orders it is illegal to give out-door relief to men who are in employment and who are earning wages?—If you are referring to the Out-Door Relief Regulation Order, yes.

Relief to women earning wages.

945. But it does not apply to women earning wages—I mean it is not illegal to give out-relief to women who are earning money?—I think it is illegal in certain circumstances.

946. I think according to the wording of the order it only applies to males?—It applies to the able-bodied.

947. The words are that relief is prohibited "to able-bodied males while in employment?—Yes, I see that in the case of the women also you are referring to a Poor Law Union in which the Out-Door Relief Regulation Order is in force.

948. So that in giving out-relief to women who are actually earning wages—as guardians do very largely—the guardians are within their rights, because, as I understand, it is legal?—Yes.

949. It could be made illegal, I suppose, by a change in the order?—Yes.

Relief to persons casually employed.

950. I believe that last winter there were men who were alternating between working for the borough council and receiving relief from the guardians, that is, they were earning wages from the council, say, on two days in the week, and then going to the guardians for relief; would that be legal?—It would depend upon their position at the time when they made the application. Presumably they had exhausted their resources when they made their application to the guardians, or professed that they had.

951. So that the occasional employment would not disqualify them for relief?—I think not in certain circumstances.

Relief in sudden or urgent necessity.

952. Is there any provision to prevent emergency relief being continually given to the same people?—That is to say, is there any provision which puts a limit on the time during which relief in a case of sudden or urgent necessity may be given?

953. If it is given say one week, can it be given again the next week, and so on?—It should not be given without special investigation of the circumstances of the case so as to establish the recurrence of the necessity.

954. Practically, I believe that is done very largely; it is repeatedly given and there appears to be nothing to prohibit it if the guardians choose to do it?—I have heard of it as a bad practice.

Duty of Relieving Officer in cases of sudden or urgent necessity.

955. (*Mr. Nunn.*) When I asked yesterday on the same point about the discharge by the relieving officer of his responsibility in regard to a case that had been rejected for out-door relief, but had had the House offered, I understood you to say that the relieving officer would deal with any further application on the part of the applicant as one of sudden or urgent necessity, and that when he had relieved it to the extent the sudden or urgent necessity demanded he would have discharged his responsibility; but I see in the notes in reply to Q. 761 you say "That should be so ordinarily." A very important point, I think, in connection with the administration of out-door relief is to what extent the relieving officer has discharged his responsibility when he has dealt with a case in that manner. Supposing he gives enough to satisfy the immediate wants of an applicant, can he legally await a further application from the applicant or must he watch the case?—He should watch the case.

956. Might I ask exactly what watching the case means in those circumstances; because it seems laying a very heavy responsibility upon the relieving officer and one which one is hardly justified in laying upon him?—The

relieving officer with his local knowledge should, by visits and inquiries, ascertain the condition of the case from day to day.

957. (*Mr. Loch.*) Do the orders give definite instructions to the relieving officer to watch a case from day to day where the man has been offered one thing and asks for another ?—It is not laid down in those words, but it has been an official rule for a great many years.

958. It occurs in no order of the Board, does it ?—It hardly could.

959. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is the officer to go and give this relief in a case of urgent necessity ?—So long as the urgent necessity continues or recurs it would be his duty, subject to the exercise of his discretion, to give the relief.

960. In taking the case Mr. Loch mentioned just now of a woman refusing to go into an infirmary, she goes on being ill, that is, she is steadily ill ; is she to be watched and to be relieved, day by day, when she goes on refusing the infirmary ?—In such a case I should think she should be.

961. (*Mr. Nunn.*) May I ask if a relieving officer has ever been charged with manslaughter when a case such as we have been describing has died ?—I do not think that either of the cases which have been before the court involved precisely the same set of circumstances.

962. But a relieving officer has been charged with manslaughter, I believe ?—Yes.

963. In the case of someone whom he has failed to relieve in that manner, and who has died ?—I think it was in the case of the Queen *v.* Curtis that a death occurred. That was the case where the relieving officer declined to act upon an application because it was not that of the head of the family.

964. Do you regard the state of the law from that point with regard to the relieving officer's watching a family as unsatisfactory ?—In the sense, do you mean, that it is not sufficiently defined ?

965. In the sense that it does not enable the guardians to carry out their decision. The guardians, say, have arrived at a certain decision upon a case as to what is the best form of relief that a man should receive, but their decision is upset by the applicant who practically, in the case we have been describing, decides for himself ? —Then the relieving officer's responsibility comes in, because the case becomes presumably one of sudden or urgent necessity. You would, as I understand, require a stricter definition of what the duty of the relieving officer should be under the circumstances ?

966. I think it is only fair to him that it should be more strictly defined. ?—That of course could be done by regulation, but up to the present time I do not think that the necessity for it has been shown to arise.

967. Has there been no case where a person who refused indoor relief and applied for outdoor relief, and was relieved only as a case of sudden and urgent necessity, has afterwards died, having failed to make a second application ?—Not that I am aware of. I have certainly no note of any leading case.

968. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is the relieving officer responsible if a case is simply notified to him as being in want, and no application is made to him ?—I do not understand the question.

969. It may be notified to the relieving officer that Mr. or Mrs. So-and-So is in want ; is he bound to make an inquiry if it is said to be a case of urgent necessity, or, so far as the law and the orders are concerned, is he in a position to wait until they make their application ?—The answer would depend upon the sense in which you use the word "want."

970. I mean such want as would come under the Poor Law destitution ?—If by want you mean actual destitution, then, assuming that in his discretion he judged the notification to be one founded on a basis of fact, it would be his duty to look after that case. He has not to wait for an application from the head of the family. Any application that appears to him to be well authenticated and well founded should be considered, and followed by his inquiry into the case.

971. Would that be irrespective of any application being made to him ?—The notification would be the application, I take it.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

972. Notification by a third party ?—Yes, a third party's notification would be equivalent to an application for those purposes.

Definition of "destitution"

973. I want to ask you one or two questions about the definitions that come in the Act of Queen Elizabeth. I understand that the obligation of relief at the present time may be defined thus—that the guardians and their officers are concerned only with the relief of destitution ; now, how do you define destitution from the legal point of view ?—I suggest the following definition :—Destitution when used to describe the condition of a person as a subject for relief, implies that he is for the time being without material resources (i) directly available and (ii) appropriate for satisfying his physical needs, (*a*) whether actually existing or (*b*) likely to arise immediately. By physical needs in this definition are meant such needs as must be satisfied (i) in order to maintain life or (i) in order to obviate, mitigate, or remove causes endangering life or likely to endanger life or impair health or bodily fitness for self-support.

974. If you were asked what was the legal basis of that, to what Acts or Orders would you refer ?—I should refer to the 43rd of Elizabeth, and I should refer to the various pronouncements of the Central Authority, to various judicial decisions, and especially to the case which was under review the other day (The Attorney-General *v.* Merthyr Tydvil Guardians).

Present validity of Act of 1601.

975. Do you hold that the Act of Queen Elizabeth is in practice and intent valid at the present moment in regard to its definitions ?—So far as regards relief, I apprehend that we are to understand the Statute of Elizabeth according to the interpretation put upon it by the Master of the Rolls in that last case.

976. Suppose we take the Act of Elizabeth ; the first point is, "Setting to work the children ;" is that not practically out of date ?—That is not a definition.

977. Nay, I work up to that ; is that not out of date, practically ?—It is out of date in one sense, no doubt.

978. Is it of any practical validity in law ?—I hardly like to say that it is obsolete after the opinion of the law officers to which I have already drawn attention.

979. That is a point rather exceptional, is it not ?—Generally speaking one would say it was not of any special validity at present ?—I should have thought not.

980. The next point would be to employ people with a convenient stock to set the poor on work ; do you consider that is valid now, bearing in mind the conditions under which the modern organisation of the Poor Law has developed ?—There again, I must refer to the opinion of the law officers.

981. Would you say that that, for the moment, covers the ground ?—It is the opinion of a high authority, of course.

Relief by wages.

982. Apart from the Orders, is there anything to prevent persons working for a wage, we will say under these words, "Setting the poor on work" ?—According to the earlier cases there was nothing to prevent it.

983. It is only the Out-door Relief Regulation Order and its clauses as to employment, and the appended Order—the Prohibitory Relief Order—which prevents wages being given for work ?—And the practice of modern administration.

984. Putting aside practice and taking it simply as the law, it would be so, would it not ?—I think so.

985. Therefore so far as the Statute law goes you might have wages given for work ?—Certainly,—under the 43rd Elizabeth—that would be my contention.

Meaning of "impotent."

986. Then there is the relief of "the lame, impotent, old, blind, and such other among them being poor and not able to work ;" that "necessary relief" is really equivalent to what you may call relief to meet destitution, is it not, that is to say, that relief is necessary which removes destitution ?—Yes.

987. So that in that phrase one has something like a definition of destitution?—But, then, if one is considering only the Statute of Elizabeth, and the actual decisions on the Statute of Elizabeth, there are those cases to which

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

I drew attention the other day in which the word "impotent" is enlarged to a degree that would hardly be limited to actual destitution in the sense as we now understand it. There was the case of a man with more than two children.

988. But those cases are, by modern interpretation of the trend of this clause, out of date and obsolete, are they not?—I am afraid I do not follow that question.

989. By the modern decisions, the later decisions, the cases to which you refer, and which give a very large meaning to the word "impotent" are practically obsolete, are they not?—I should hesitate to say that.

990. Would you actually hold that those cases which you submitted in your evidence on the first day might even be valid at the present moment, giving as they do to the word "impotent" a meaning by which a man with two children unable to work would come under the term "impotent"?—I know of no statutory alteration of the expression which would absolutely get rid of the effect of those cases.

Change in position of Churchwardens and Overseers.

991. That is a very important point. Perhaps I might ask you just one more question about the Act of Queen Elizabeth. With regard to the churchwardens and overseers, may we say that the whole position of the churchwardens and the overseers has been altered by recent legislation?—Yes. The overseer nowadays is in very many instances not at all the overseer of the Statute of Elizabeth.

992. So that it would not take much to repeal that part of the Statute of Elizabeth without much injury being done to our modern organisation for the overseers?—I drew attention to the Statute, because I thought it was one that possibly might need some very considerable review.

993. It was that point which I had before me. With regard to rating questions, too, it is superseded very largely by later legislation, is it not?—Rating is outside my province, I think.

Scope of Orders as to outdoor relief of able-bodied.

994. With regard to the Act of 1834, you mentioned two sections under which orders are made, I think?—Yes. If you are on the subject of outdoor relief, Section 52 is that which relates to relief of that kind.

995. Would it be consistent with that section for the Board to alter their present policy and propose an order by which able-bodied men should be capable of receiving outdoor relief?—Hardly, I think, without qualification.

996. Is there anything in the law to prevent such an order?—The Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order allows an able-bodied man to have outdoor relief on account of sudden and urgent necessity. I do not think there is anything in the statute to prevent that.

997. But is there anything in the statute to prevent their accepting any principle with regard to the able-bodied?—I am afraid I do not follow that.

998. Is there anything in this section which binds the Local Government Board to adopt a certain policy with regard to the able-bodied?—There is the intention of the section.

999. I know there is the intention of the section, but is the intention valid so as to oblige orders to be always in accordance with that intention?—I should say in the case of a Public Department, with an enactment such as Section 52 before them, they would have to obtain fresh legislation before they could go entirely counter to what they gather from the section to be the intention.

1000. Apart from the intention the words are not laid down that such and such a policy should be adopted with regard to the able-bodied, are they?—By intention, I do not understand you necessarily to mean the intention as described by the Poor Law Commissioners, namely, that Parliament intended that the whole of the relief to the able-bodied should cease within a certain period.

1001. By intention I would refer you to this preamble—"And whereas a practice has obtained of giving relief to persons or their families who at the time of applying for or receiving such relief were wholly or partially in the employment of individuals and the relief of the able-bodied and their families is in many places administered in modes productive of evil in other respects; and whereas difficulty may arise in case any immediate and universal remedy is attempted," etc. Does that preamble not actually hold the whole question of the authority as to able-bodied relief?—I think that the preamble is entitled to much weight in the interpretation of the Section.

1002. Therefore, what lies outside those words is of no validity except so far as it is built upon the presumption that the policy of that phrase is in-door relief of the able-bodied?—I am afraid that is going rather too far; I could not go so far as that.

1003. Practically it is rather the suggestion of a possible policy that is at the basis of this, but I think there are no binding words to say that these orders shall be in a certain form?—That is so.

1004. Therefore it would be possible, would it not, if there were a belief that the intention here might be carried out in some different form, to substitute for our present order another type of order?—Yes.

Subscriptions by Guardians to Institutions.

1005. With regard to hospitals and alms-houses, you have noted that originally by the Act of Queen Elizabeth money could be given towards hospitals and alms-houses, and I should like to ask a question or two about the relation of the Poor Law to charities. The guardians can subscribe to institutions now, can they not?—Yes.

1006. Is that in the nature of an annual subscription?—Yes.

1007. If they believe that the institution is of service to them?—Yes.

1008. With regard to other payments they are payments on the case, are they not? That is to say, in cases of non-resident relief people are placed in certain institutions and paid for by the guardians?—They may be so.

Power of Guardians to act as agents for dispensing private charity.

1009. Apart from those two things, is it open to a board of guardians to receive money for the relief of a case from a charitable source; for instance, could I send 10s. to a Board of Guardians to help to pay for the assistance or the out-relief of so and so?—Earmarking the money so that it should be applied to that particular purpose?

1010. Certainly?—No, I think not. You would be using them as your agent for dispensing your own private charity, and I do not think that is any part of their function.

1011. They have already given a pension, we will say, or a sum as out-door relief to somebody, and I propose to send this money to the guardians in order that they may give it in addition?—I do not think it could be applied to the particular purpose. The money would have to go into the Common Fund.

1012. Is the relief money kept separate?—The money would be applied towards the expenses which are chargeable on the Common Fund.

Applicants for relief in possession of funds.

1013. Take another case: Suppose the relieving officer finds on his enquiry that the poor person is in receipt of money from charitable sources; is that reported to the board of guardians, and, if so, is it taken into account in the amount they give?—That is a matter of administration. I hardly like to go into what they actually do.

1014. Would the guardians be legally justified in taking it into account if the case arose?—Certainly.

1015. Supposing a case arose in regard to a woman, say, could they plead that to their knowledge certain moneys were coming to her from a charitable source?—Yes.

Guardians, power to receive gifts.

1016. (*Mr. Nunn.*) It was quite clear I think from what you said that it is legal for the guardians to accept money although they could not earmark it to a particular case?—I think it is legal.

1017. They would receive it in respect of a case, although they would not actually apply it to that case?—I think they would be open to receive subscriptions from any source.

Co-operation with charities.

1018. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would it be open to a Board of Guardians co-operating with an endowed charity to try and arrange that an applicant who comes to them for out-door relief might instead be dealt with by the charity?—I should think so; I know nothing to prevent it.

Auditor's report as to extravagant expenditure.

1019. With regard to the audit, I will just ask you one or two questions. Is the auditor in a position to report if he thinks that quite unnecessarily expensive furniture, for instance, is being provided by a board of guardians?—Yes.

1020. That would be within his functions?—*Prima facie* he may give a decision on the reasonableness of the expenditure.

1021. Do the instructions to the auditor refer to a point like that?—It would be under the statutory provisions describing his functions.

1022. Definitely?—"Furniture" is not mentioned, of course. The words are general words.

Auditor's statutory duties and powers.

1023. I meant is there any instructional order which would bring him to consider special points like that?—I think I had better refer to the statute, because the statute makes it clear what he has to do. He "shall have full powers to examine, audit, allow or disallow of accounts and of items therein relating to moneys assessed for and applicable to the relief of the poor of all parishes and unions within his district, and to all other moneys applicable to such relief; and such auditor shall charge in every account audited by him the amount of any deficiency or loss incurred by the negligence or misconduct of any person accounting or of any sum for which any such person is accountable, but not brought by him into account against such person and shall certify on the face of every account audited by him any money found by him to be due from any person."

1024. Of course that is very general. With regard to another point, are the data in regard to the cases submitted to the auditor; that is, does he see, for instance, the application and report book?—Yes.

1025. Suppose he sees on the face of the document that the inquiry is very insufficient, is he in a position to notify that to headquarters in order that the guardians may be surcharged relief which they have given without sufficient investigation?—Of course the facts might point either to the guardians or to the relieving officer as liable.

1026. Taking both cases, would he be in a position to notify it?—He might be in a position to surcharge or disallow.

1027. On the basis that the inquiry was insufficient?—Yes; but it would be a difficult case to investigate and also to support.

Local Government Board's powers of investigation.

1028. Granted; but the control which the Local Government Board has over the investigation and the work of the guardians from that point of view is only general; that is to say, the inspectors would define so-and-so, but when it comes to a particular case in which there is, so to speak, a wrong doing, if the auditor does not intervene nobody intervenes?—A case might be so bad that a formal investigation could be ordered.

1029. That would be a very bad case notified in some way specially to the board?—Yes.

1030. Suppose the whole tenor of the work of the board was below the standard of efficiency, still from the point of view of investigation it might pass muster, and the auditor would never in such a case say, "Here are twenty or thirty cases all of which have obviously been uninvestigated, and therefore the relief is not properly given?—If the auditor were of opinion that the relief was not properly given, it would be open to him to take action under the statute.

1031. The statute which you quoted?—Yes.

Auditor's functions.

1032. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is it not the auditor's business to allow or disallow a sum upon a question of fact that an applicant is or is not destitute; and is it not the inpector's business to ascertain whether the Board of Guardians is conducting its inquiries in such a way as would lead to the ascertainment of the facts?—The auditor must make allowance for the exercise of a reasonable discretion either by the guardians or by the relieving officer, according as the case is one relieved by the order of the guardians or one relieved by the relieving officer on his own discretion.

1033. My point was that the auditor had not to do with the functions of the relieving officer, but with the actual facts which the relieving officer's inquiries disclosed. If he had not the facts at his hand could he make an allowance or disallowance?—He has to deal with the functions of the relieving officer to this extent—that he would have to judge in a particular case whether those functions had been properly exercised or whether there was negligence or misconduct.

1034. Could he do that except on a matter of fact which had come under his notice?—No; of course fact must be the basis of his action.

1035. That is my point,—that he must arrive at a fact with regard to the destitution of the applicant?—Yes, he must.

Ratepayer's objections to expenditure.

1036. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Has not any ratepayer the power to object?—A ratepayer can object at the audit, but then presumably what the ratepayer says would come into the domain of fact.

Notice of Audit.

1037. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is there a public notice of the audit?—Certainly.

1038. So that the ratepayer who thinks the inquiry insufficient with regard to these cases may attend?—Certainly.

Local Government Board's power to sanction expenses.

1039. Further, on the point of the audit the Local Government Board has a large power to pass over otherwise unauthorised expenditure, has it not, under a Special Act?—Yes.

1040. That Act, as is well known, was referred to in a circular of Mr. Long's with regard to the unemployed, it being there used, as it were, prospectively, that is to say, the guardians were there told that if they incurred certain expenditure it would be passed over by reason of that Act. Was that, if I may say so, a legitimate use of that Act?—It is an example of its contemplated use in exceptional cases, of which there are a fair number of instances.

1041. I have not the Act before me, but I know it. The tenor of the Act is rather retrospective than prospective, is it not?—Not necessarily.

1042. Then may it come to this, that the Local Government Board has a dispensing power in regard to a policy by which it may say to the guardians: If you spend money in this direction we will not take it into account though it would otherwise be illegal?—The extent of the power of the Local Government Board is limited to the saving of the particular item of expenditure from disallowance by the auditor; but it does not convert into legal that which is in itself illegal.

1043. But the saving is the important point, and by the use of that Act large and important expenditures were saved, as it were?—Yes, under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act 1887 expenditure subject to disallowance is not infrequently exempted.

1044. So far as that went there was a distinct power of dispensation and that was used prospectively?—It has been used prospectively, certainly.

Power to place Relieving Officers at disposal of other bodies.

1045. What limitations are there upon the board to place their relieving officers at the disposal of other bodies, for instance, in making enquiries, we will say, for Borough Council Distress Committees, or any other bodies?—Is not this relating to unemployment?

1046. Nay, I wanted to put it as a thoroughly general question, whether or not the relieving officer could be placed at the disposal of other bodies?—The point is hardly general. The point is special, because the cases in which the services of the relieving officer might be placed at the disposal of a Distress Committee are cases which arise under the special provision in Article XX. of the Regulations (Organisation for Unemployed) 1905.

1047. I am thinking of a period before the Act came into existence. One winter prior to the Act the proposal was made, and what I wanted to know was whether there was any precedent for the relieving officers being employed on duties other than lying strictly within the compass of a Board of Guardians?—No; except under statutory provisions, such as, for example, the Lunacy Acts.

Officers' securities.

1048. Referring now to your answer to Question 94, is there a scale of security as to officers?—No.

1049. Who fixes the securities?—The guardians.

1050. And that as they think well?—Yes.

1051. Is it usual for every relieving officer to give security?—I should think so.

Qualifications and tenure of Relieving Officers.

1052. With regard to the qualifications of a relieving officer, is there any order or instruction or anything of that kind showing what the qualifications of a relieving officer should be?—There are only the orders which define qualifications and duties. There are, for example, Articles 162, 164 and 215 of the General Consolidated Order.

1053. Is there nothing beyond that?—Nothing.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

1054. Not any sort of instruction?—I do not know what may have been said in circulars from time to time. I could not trust my memory on that.

1055. So far as the orders go there is no statement that the relieving officer should be competent to fulfil this or that position and should bring certain evidence that he is competent to do that, before he is entitled to appear before a board of guardians to be elected relieving officer?—Not in so many words, certainly.

1056. The order itself only defines what a relieving officer should be by stating what his duties ought to be?—No doubt.

1057. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What is his tenure?—Under the General Consolidated Order, his tenure would be until he dies or resigns or is removed from office.

1058. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Do you mean removed by the Local Government Board?—Yes.

Constructive pauperism: Effect of Relief to (School Children) Order, 1905.

1059. (*Mr. Loch.*) At Question 101 you refer to the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, by Section 56 of which it is enacted that all relief given to or on account of the wife or to or on account of any child or children under the age of sixteen not being blind or deaf and dumb shall be considered as given to the husband or to the father as the case may be. That is what we might call constructive pauperism. But in the Relief to Children Order, 1905, Article 6, it is said that the guardians "shall take proceedings for the recovery of any relief or the cost price of any relief which by virtue of any provision of this order or any determination in pursuance of this order is given or is considered as given by way of a loan except in any case in which the guardians report the circumstances to us and we approve of their abstaining from any such proceedings." In that case the Local Government Board take the position of dispensing practically with the effect of Section 56 of the Act of 1834, at least, so I conclude?—I do not think so. The relief there is given to the children.

1060. True, and the man has to pay for it by a loan?—Yes.

1061. He is responsible for that relief?—Possibly.

1062. And by the fact that a loan is required he is able to pay for it?—*Primâ facie*—quite so.

1063. Under those circumstances, however, the loan is not pressed?—That is so.

1064. Therefore he gets rid of his responsibility of paying for his children?—Undoubtedly.

1065. It stands therefore as a dispensing power?—Dispensing with the statute, do you mean?

1066. Dispensing with the responsibility of the parent for the relief given to his child?—That is a question of policy, not of law. I do not follow that.

1067. Does not that clause act as a limitation of the law?—It acts as a limitation of the operation of Section 56 and those other sections, but within strictly legal limits.

1068. What are the legal limits then if the law by itself as set down in that section is not absolute and complete?—This is a case of relief given to children; certain consequences attach to relief given to children under that order, and this is one of the consequences which the Board acting fully within their powers prescribe. It is within the legal limits of definition.

1069. Then, so far, the Board claims the position of modifying the statute, does it not?—That is policy; but it is not modifying the statute.

1070. Is it not modifying the normal effect of the statute?—I do not think so.

Relief to children of strikers.

1071. I suppose that in the case of the Merthyr Tydvil strikers it was held that the relief was suspended in the case of the children?—The relief to the children was upheld as good.

1072. That comes under the same clause, I take it, as this Act of 1834, that is to say, the parents were responsible otherwise for the relief of the children?—Yes.

1073. Is it now possible for strikers to throw the relief of their children on the rates even though they themselves cannot be helped by the rates?—Certainly. It was held so in the Merthyr Tydvil case.

1074. I only want to bring out it quite clearly?—That is so

1075. Therefore that Merthyr Tydvil case is clearly a departure from Section 56?—I do not think so. I am afraid I do not follow you at all.

1076. By this Act all relief given to the children is given to the head of the family; by the Merthyr Tydvil decision the relief given to the able-bodied head of the family was considered wrong, but relief given to the children of the able-bodied was considered right?—Quite so.

1077. It does not at all appear that the whole family went into the poorhouse?—No.

1078. Therefore the able-bodied law so far breaks down because the family does not go into the workhouse, and on a strike arising the children are taken care of, though the head of the family does not bear the brunt of it?—Yes.

1079. That seems to me at any rate against the tenor of that section?—I think not. That section was introduced for one special purpose. It was introduced in order to make the parent removable with his family and for that purpose to establish a constructive chargeability.

1080. Has that section to be considered only in relation to chargeability?—It has to be considered in relation to chargeability, and so considered it has a very wide scope.

1081. Has it not to be considered as a principle of the English Poor Law, that is to say, that all relief given to a child is given to the father?—It involves the constructive chargeability of the father, certainly.

Relief on loan

1082. (*Mr. Booth.*) May I ask a question as regards relief on loan: where it is done is it necessary that the person so relieved should accept the liability?—Under this particular order,—the Relief (School Children) Order, 1905—no express acceptance in the form of an engagement to repay is required; but there is a provision that the father should receive notice of what is intended in order that he may be in a position to repudiate the whole transaction by himself making the provision which otherwise the guardians would make.

1083. (*Mr. Nunn.*) In the case of a man suffering from delirium tremens it is quite impossible that he could make any other arrangements?—I cannot myself consider that any case of relief by way of loan could be established there. He might have a lucid interval—I do not know.

1084. (*Mr. Loch.*) Why should not the relief given under such circumstances be considered as operative after the man's inability to say anything, and from that moment be considered as relief given on loan because of his physical disqualification before the moment?—There are no orders authorising relief to be declared on loan in cases of that type, and it may perhaps be argued that matters may very well be left to the operation of the law as explained in the Guardians of West Ham Union *v.* Pearson (62 Law Times, New Series, 638.) Before relief can be treated as relief on loan under Section 58 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, it must be declared by a regulation of the Local Government Board to be relief on loan.

1085. The point is an important one, and it is not provided for is it?—I do not think it is provided for practically.

Recovery of loan relief.

1086. With regard to the recovery of these loans they are now civil debts, are they not?—There is a double mode of recovery—an application to the justices or a proceeding in the County Court.

1087. Would it not be better if the procedure under the Bastardy Act were adopted; is that not very much more quick and effective?—I do not know that either procedure is quite up to the most recent date.

1088. Then it would be open to improvement as a matter of procedure if loans are given largely?—I should think so.

1089. Have you any suggestions to make on that subject?—No.

1090. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Just now you said that recovery of amounts on loan might be brought before the justices; is that so under the Relief (School Children) Order?—Yes.

1091. I thought it was only the County Court you could go to in that case?—No—either.

1092. (*Mr. Loch.*) The phrase in the instruction under that Order is this: "Recovery of relief given on loan: relief given to a child in pursuance of special application will be relief to the father under Section 8 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1848. The relief for a child or the

cost price of it can be recovered from the father in the County Court" ?—Yes, "can be," but it does not exclude the other mode of procedure, although that other mode of procedure, I should think, would be very rarely adopted.

elief by ork on land.

1093. With regard to your answer to Question 145, which deals with the areas of fifty acres and so on, that I understand is operative law at the present time ?—That is so according to the opinion of the law officers to which I have previously referred.

1094. Is that not somewhat inconsistent with the policy of the Commissioners of 1834, and therefore more or less with that section of 4 & 5 Will. IV. which we have been discussing ?—It is not contrary to any provision that we have been discussing. It is contrary to the policy of the Poor Law Commissioners undoubtedly.

1095. Therefore Section 52 of 4 & 5 Will. IV. would at any rate not exclude that policy, and you could have a system of farms exactly like that which preceded the Act of 1834 ?—I am afraid I do not know what that system was.

1096. There is a reference made here to two farms in Kent, of which we have full particulars later on ?—The farm in Kent was a farm established by private individuals.

1097. There were others in the Isle of Wight, indeed there were several large farms. That policy was given up after 1834. Does not this decision really amount to a reversion to the older policy before 1834 ?—I think that if a policy was inaugurated on the lines of the opinion of the law officers, undoubtedly it would involve the reversal of a great deal of procedure.

rvices ndered by eBoard of uardians to other.

1098. Can you say how far one board of guardians may act as an agent for another board; for instance, is a board of guardians obliged to make an enquiry with regard to an applicant for another board ?—It is not obliged to do so.

1099. Is there any order about it ?—No.

1100. Therefore there is no instructional order or any other order by which a saving of time is made by a piece of business which has to be done in Liverpool about a case belonging to London being saved to the London Board and being entrusted to the Liverpool Board ?—No.

1101. There is no order in regard to making enquiries through boards of guardians about persons resident in other districts, is there ?—There is no order that I am aware of.

1102. And no instruction ?—I cannot say as to that, as instructions have been so numerous.

1103. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is not the case of children who are out in service in another union a case in point ?—That is statutory, not under an order.

1104. But it is obligatory ?—Yes, but it is by statute.

1105. The guardians of one union are obliged to look after the paupers of another ?—If they are within that union.

1106. (*Mr. Loch.*) May we say that where it has been desired it has been specially required, but generally it is left entirely vague as to the mutual help of board and board ?—I think so.

1107. (*Mr. Nunn.*) The statutory provision relates to the relief and not to enquiries, does it not ?—I think the question had reference to the case where young persons placed out from a workhouse are within one union other than that from which they were sent into service. Under the 14 & 15 Vic., c. 11, and the 24 and 25 Vic., c. 100, the guardians of the union in which they are placed have a certain protective power over them.

1108. My point is that that is the administration of an actual decision of a board of guardians, and not anything in preparation for a decision which making enquiries would be ?—I do not know whether the Commission would wish me to read section 5 of 14 and 15 Vic., c.11: It is as follows: "Where any young person under the age of sixteen shall hereafter be hired or taken as a servant from the workhouse of any union or parish, or shall be bound out as apprentice by the guardians of any union or by the guardians or overseers of any parish, and the residence of the master or mistress shall be more than five miles from any part of such union or parish, then a written notice of such hiring, taking or binding specifyng the name and age of the apprentice or servant and the name and description and residence of such master or mistress shall be forthwith sent from such guardians or overseers to the guardians or overseers of the union or parish in which such master or mistress shall reside: and thereupon it shall become the duty of such last-mentioned guardians or overseers to cause the particulars contained in such notice to be registered in some book or books to be provided by them for the purpose, together with the name of the union or parish from which such notice shall have been received, and such last mentioned guardians or overseers shall cause such young person to be visited as frequently and in the same manner in all respects as if such young person had been hired or taken from their own workhouse or had been bound out as an apprentice by themselves."

Definition of "adequate relief."

1109. (*Mr. Loch.*) In a later circular headed "Poor Law Administration (Deserving Poor)," great stress is laid on "Adequate relief." Is "adequate relief" different from "necessary relief"? Necessary relief of course is defined to a certain extent at any rate by the Act of Queen Elizabeth and by your own statement now; but what is adequate relief from the point of view of the Poor Law ?—Adequate relief, I suggest, means such assistance from sources supplied by compulsory local taxation as may suffice to meet the requirements of any particular case of destitution. The assistance is subject to the condition that, as regards the necessaries of life, the recipient must not thereby be placed in a position of superiority to the average standard of living of the lowest class of independent labourers in the same locality. But in certain cases superiority to that standard is permissible as compensation for restrictions which are necessary incidents of collective management and discipline, and from which the independent labourer is free. That definition is collected from various pronouncements from time to time.

1110. Is there any status, so to speak, for a definition of "adequate relief" as against the definition of the law as to "necessary relief" ?—Only in pronouncements on the policy of administration. I think the expression "adequate relief" was once used in Sturges Bourne's Act (59 Geo. III., c. 12, s. 2), and the expression "proper relief" will be found in Gilbert's Act.

1111. Does it amount really to more than this—that the relief which is necessary has not been given, and that it should be enough under the existing law, and adequate therefore to the necessity ?—Adequate to the necessity, certainly.

1112. Therefore is it anything different from merely necessary relief ?—Perhaps not in that sense.

1113. (*Mr. Booth.*) Does not the question of time come in; might not "necessary" mean something shorter in the pressure of time than "adequate ?" The definition that you have given involves a considerable lapse of time I thought ?—It might extend over a considerable period.

1114. (*Chairman.*) Is "adequate" in any order of the Board ?—No.

1115. (*Mr. Loch.*) It is in a circular, is it not ?—Yes.

1116. And "necessary" occurs in the Act of Queen Elizabeth, in the phrase "the necessary relief of the lame, impotent," etc. ?—Yes. "Adequate" is also in a statute, but then that is a repealed statute.

1117. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) May we take it that "adequate" is the term to be used from the point of view of the applicant for the relief and "necessary" is the term to be used from the point of view of the guardians who are giving the relief; I mention that because we have petitions for adequate relief ?—I think that is arguable at least.

Relief to members of Friendly Societies.

1118. (*Mr. Loch.*) I have one more point about Friendly Societies and the relief given by their members. Friendly Societies have certain rules to their benefit, have they not: that is to say a member of a Friendly Society if his wife becomes insane has not to pay for her keep ?—That is so.

1119. Therefore a principle has been adopted there, has it not, that in the case of thrifty people the obligation should not fall upon them which would fall upon an ordinary able-bodied person ?—It is open to that criticism no doubt.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

"Necessary relief" as affected by Outdoor Relief Friendly Societies Acts.

1120. With regard to the short Act of 1894 relating to members of Friendly Societies, it is there said: "Notwithstanding any orders or regulations of the Poor Law Commissioners (or of the Local Government Board) under and by virtue of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834 or of any Act amending the said Act it shall be lawful for any board of guardians if they think fit to grant relief out of the poor rates to any person otherwise entitled to such relief notwithstanding the said person shall by reason of the membership of his Friendly Society be in receipt of any sum, and in estimating the amount of relief that shall be granted to such person being a member of a Friendly Society as aforesaid it shall be at the discretion of the board of guardians whether they will or will not take into consideration the amount which may be received by him from such Friendly Society." Does not that Act contemplate relief over and above what is necessary because by the law the guardians are bound to give necessary relief, and if this pension money of a member of a Friendly Society is not to be taken into account then it is in excess of the necessary relief?—It is open to that criticism of course.

1121. Is it not therefore contrary to the Act of Queen Elizabeth if the term "necessary relief" in that Act be construed strictly?—That is to say a statute passed in 1894 departs in particulars from the express limitations of the statute of Elizabeth. I think it would be open to that remark.

1122. In that case should not the Act of Queen Elizabeth be to that extent repealed?—I do not say that.

Local Government Board's Orders impugned in Law Courts.

1123. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) I think you have told us that some of the orders of the Board under Sec. 15 have been questioned in the courts of law. Am I right in assuming that we have those cases on the notes, and that in none of those cases has any order been held to be invalid or *ultra vires*?—They are not on the notes because the orders were chiefly those of the Poor Law Commissioners and they had reference rather to the special circumstances of their day. In several instances, the orders were quashed on Certiorari, but they were experimental orders dealing with circumstances that do not arise at the present time. One or two were connected with attempts to force upon the Metropolitan parishes the general system of the constitution of a board of guardians, and those failed. The court held practically that the Commissioners must utilise the existing machinery for the purposes of relief.

1124. Is there any recent case then in which an order has been questioned and where it has been held to be *ultra vires*?—Yes, there is one recent case.

1125. Can you give us that?—I have given that in my answer to Question 50; that is the Willesden and Hendon case.

1126. In any of these cases has any question been raised as to the right to relieve the able-bodied? I mean does the question of the able-bodied come up in any shape or form?—In no case involving the validity of an order.

Able-bodied not entitled to relief in Scotland.

1127. I ask that question because the right to relieve the able-bodied with us in Scotland was the subject of litigation which ultimately went to the House of Lords, and it was in respect of a decision of the House of Lords, following upon the practice to a certain extent, that the right to relieve the able-bodied does not exist in Scotland?—Quite so.

Appeal when relief refused or inadequate.

1128. In your answer to Question 86 it is stated that "Sec. 15 concludes with a proviso that nothing in it shall be construed as enabling the Local Government Board to interfere in any individual case for the purpose of ordering relief." I understand from that that in England it is not possible for any applicant for relief who has been refused relief to appeal against such refusal?—That is so; he has no appeal to the Local Government Board.

1129. Nor is it possible for any applicant who has been offered only in-door relief to prefer to the Local Government Board a complaint of which is called inadequate relief?—He might make a complaint, but no action in the sense of a direction to any local body could ensue upon the complaint.

1130. As a matter of practice are there such complaints or appeals?—I really do not know to what extent the paupers write to complain of the amount or nature of their relief.

1131. There is no statutory provision for such appeals?—There is no statutory provision at all for them.

Relieving Officer's d on applica refusal of relief.

1132. You told Mr. Loch, I think, that as regards the duty of a relieving officer where an applicant refuses the relief offered,—that is to say, where the applicant refuses the particular kind of relief offered to him, he must provide sufficient sustenance for that applicant so as to prevent him from starving?—Quite so.

1133. That I imagine is a Common Law duty which lies upon him?—And it devolves upon him also by virtue of the particular provisions in the General Consolidated Order relating to his duties.

1134. Are there general instructions by the Board to all relieving officers that where an applicant refuses the relief offered, the relieving officer must take care that the applicant shall not starve?—That is the official description of the effect of the relieving officer's duties as defined by the General Consolidated Order.

Relieving Officer's tenure.

1135. But it is not in the order itself?—Not in so many words.

1136. The relieving officer is appointed by the board of guardians, is he not?—Yes.

1137. And his tenure is an *ad vitam aut culpam* tenure, and he cannot be dismissed except by the Local Government Board if he is unfit or incompetent, am I correct in assuming that?—That is essentially so as regards certain relieving officers, but I am not quite sure as to whether there is not a dispensing order as regards relieving officers appointed after a certain date.

1138. I mean by that that the board of guardians have no right of dismissal themselves?—That was so under the old regulations, but whether that has been slightly varied by an order of 1879 I could not say without referring to the order.

1139. (*Miss Hill.*) Is it not the fact that the assistant relieving officers may be dismissed by the board of guardians?—Yes.

1140. The chief relieving officers cannot, at any rate I think that is so in London?—I think it is very likely it is so, but I am not familiar with the later developments of those orders.

Relieving Officer's d towards non-settle poor.

1141. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) I should like to ask you further as regards the duty of a relieving officer towards a pauper of another parish but residing in his. He has no duty towards that pauper, as I understand it, except in the cases to which you alluded in answer to Mr. Loch where you have servants or others out in service in a parish other than that to which they are chargeable?—Your question is rather a difficult one to answer, because there might be such urgency in the case of the non-resident or non-settled pauper as to require the relieving officer to act under the general provision defining his duty in cases of sudden or urgent necessity.

1142. In the case of boarded-out pauper children out of the parish to which they are chargeable, has the relieving officer of the parish in which they are resident and in which they are boarded-out no duty towards them—I am thinking of the duty of supervision?—It does not seem to me that the relieving officer would ordinarily come in there at all. It would be the Boarding-out Committee who would look after the child.

1143. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Touching that point, if a case of destitution is brought under the notice of the relieving officer and he knows the case is one belonging to another union, he is bound to act, is he not, as if it were a case belonging to his union?—I think so.

1144. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) And then he must also look after paupers belonging to another parish who are receiving out-door relief, must he not, or has he no responsibilities as regards them?—Do you mean in cases where his Board of Guardians act as agent of another union for the administration of out-door relief—non-resident relief in fact?

1145. I am alluding to non-resident relief?—To that extent he would have that function.

1146. So that he would relieve the relieving officer of the parish to which they are chargeable of the duty of going to see whether the paupers in this parish where they are getting non-resident relief were being properly attended to?—If his Board of Guardians have undertaken the administration of non-resident relief to a particular pauper they would employ him in the matter.

pointment Relieving cer.

1147. (*Miss Hill.*) May I ask whether the appointment of a relieving officer requires the approval of the Local Government Board or not?—Technically the appointment does not, but the salary does, except in London, and there the appointment also requires approval in order to obtain repayment from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

sponsi- ty for quacy of settled ef.

1148. (*Mr. Nunn.*) With regard to non-settled relief it is quite clear, is it not, that it is the Board of Guardians where the pauper resides, and not the Board of Guardians of origin which is responsible for the adequacy of the pauper's relief? Say a Board of Guardians writes to another Board of Guardians "Will you give 4s. a week to this case?" Then the Board of Guardians which actually dispenses the relief is responsible for seeing that it is adequate or not, and for applying if necessary to the Board of Guardians of origin for anything further; is that not so?—Only if, as regards the application to the latter board of guardians, you use the word responsible in the same way as you would if you were speaking of a voluntary agent.

1149. Are they not legally liable?—Their legal liability arises from the presence of the pauper actually in their union.

1150. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Are they responsible for the adequacy of the relief?—The condition of the pauper within their union is that which must first determine what the nature of their legal responsibility is. If they, by arrangement with another Board of Guardians say, "Here is—whatever the amount agreed upon may be—so much a week," and that is insufficient, I should imagine that in their voluntary capacity, they would apply for more.

1151. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Supposing the relief that is offered by the other Board of Guardians is inadequate, is it not their legal duty to recommend more?—It is not a legal duty.

1152. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) And they could not enforce that?—No. The position as regards non-resident relief is exceedingly awkward. A decision given a good many years ago has rather led to the view that non-resident relief, in order to put it absolutely on a strictly legal footing, would require special authorisation by orders that have never been issued, so that the arrangements as regards non-resident relief are, to a very considerable extent, voluntary arrangements, and not the subject of definition by order, and certainly not by Statute.

1153. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Their remedy would be to throw up the case altogether, would it not?—That would be the practical remedy so far as regards the relations of the two boards of guardians.

1154. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Might I give a case on this point? One union has a family requiring relief, and they grant a certain sum, which is 15s. per week, to relieve the family; the Board of Guardians to whom the case belongs refuses to pay 15s., and say they will only allow 11s., and the guardians who are dispensing the relief do not agree to 11s. per week and say it is not adequate?—Then the board of guardians who desire the 15s. a week in such a case as that would clearly have no remedy against the other board of guardians.

1155. They have no remedy, yet they are not responsible for the adequacy of the relief which is limited by the board to whom the paupers belong to 11s. per week?—I beg your pardon, but I understood you to say that they were allowing 15s. per week.

1156. One Board of Guardians were, but the Board of Guardians to whom the paupers belong refuse to pay that and limited it to 11s.?—Then the extra 4s. would fall upon the guardians who have made the allowance of 15s; clearly that would be so.

1157. They refuse to give the 15s. any longer and reduce the relief to 11s., and they are no longer responsible really for the adequacy of the relief of the family, are they?—I do not think that.

1158. You would not say that?—No, I would not go so far as to say that.

1159. The responsibility really might rest with the board that refuses to give the adequate amount?—I think where guardians have formed the opinion that paupers in their union require a weekly allowance of 15s., there is a responsibility attaching to them

1160. Even though they could not get it from the other union?—I think so.

1161. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is that anything more than a general conclusion; is it anywhere a written law or order?—Do you mean this non-resident relief that we are talking about?

1162. Yes?—It is in an old case to which I think there is a reference in the notes. The decision in the King *v.* the Inhabitants of Eastbourne (4 East 103) I think, discussed and reviewed all the older decisions. At one time the view taken, or said to be taken, was that the overseers of a parish in which a non-settled pauper had taken up his residence were not liable for his relief, but this view was afterwards repudiated by the Courts of law.

1163. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) Where there is a difference between two Boards of Guardians such as was figured just now, as to whether the proper relief is 11s. or 15s., is there any means in England of settling what is the adequate relief?—By the Central Authority?— no, I do not think so.

1164. The relief which the Board of Guardians to whom the pauper is chargeable propose to give is the relief which is the legal relief?—In the case put by the Commissioner I should say that the Board of Guardians who formed the opinion that the adequate relief to the pauper residing within their union, although not settled on their union, must be 15s. per week, would be responsible for the difference between the amount that they receive and the amount that they thought to be adequate.

1165. So they could only recover the 11s.?—It is hardly recoverable in the circumstances by reason of that case to which I have referred. It is the case of Wycombe *v.* Eton (26 Law Journal, Magistrates Cases, 97: 21 Justice of the Peace, 70).

Appointment and payment of Auditors.

1166. I only want to ask one question about the audit; who appoints the auditors in England?—The Local Government Board.

1167. Are the auditors' fees defrayed locally or by imperial grant?—A contribution in the form of a stamp duty is made to the imperial exchequer from the local authorities.

Relieving Officer's tenure.

1168. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the appointment of the relieving officers, shall we clear up the exact tenure of their office? Is not the case this, that a relieving officer who was appointed before 28th February, 1879, can only be removed by the Local Government Board?—I have no doubt that you are referring to the order which I was trying to find.

1169. I think that relieving officers appointed after that date can be removed by the Board of Guardians with the consent of the Local Government Board or by the Local Government Board?—Quite so.

Duties of Auditors as to excessive expenditure.

1170. Taking another point that has been raised, namely with regard to the audit, there is no doubt, is there, that it is the duty of the auditor of the accounts of Boards of Guardians to disallow any excessive expenditure or exorbitant expenditure which may be incurred by the guardians? If I remember rightly the order for accounts expressly makes that his duty?—No doubt it is within his powers, and it should be his duty.

Regulations of Central Authority under Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

1171. Taking the subject of relief generally, is it right to say that one of the main objects of the Act of 1834 was the purpose of preventing the abuses that there were then existing, and to give large powers to the central authority with a view to their making such orders as would prevent those abuses?—Yes, certainly.

Enforcement of Regulations.

1172. Then there comes the question as to how those orders could be enforced; are there not two or three ways in which they might be enforced?—Yes.

1173. First of all, a penalty attaches, does it not, to disobedience to an order made under the Act of 1834?—Quite so. It is recoverable before the justices under Section 98 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

1174. What is the amount of the penalty?—Perhaps I had better read the section:—"In case any person shall wilfully neglect or disobey any of the rules, orders or regulations of the said Commissioners or assistant Commissioners, or be guilty of any contempt of the said Commissioners sitting as a board, such person shall

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

upon conviction before any two justices forfeit and pay for the first offence any sum not exceeding five pounds; for the second offence any sum not exceeding twenty pounds, nor less than five pounds; and in the event of such person being convicted a third time, such third and every subsequent offence shall be deemed a misdemeanour and such offender shall be liable to be indicted for the same offence, and shall on conviction pay such fine, not being less than twenty pounds, and suffer such imprisonment with or without hard labour, as may be awarded against him by the Court by or before which he shall be tried and convicted."

1175. The second remedy, I suppose, would be by a mandamus for disobedience of the order, would it not?—Yes.

1176. But that remedy, I presume, would only lie where there was a distinct and definite duty imposed upon the guardians by either the statute or the order?—Yes.

1177. And there is no other remedy applicable to the case which is equally available?—That would be so.

1178. Then there would be, I think, also the remedy which you referred to the other day, namely, that the union might be broken up?—Yes.

1179. That is, supposing it was found to be necessary, the union might be dissolved and the parishes might be allocated to other unions?—Yes.

1180. There would be, would there not, a good deal of practical difficulty in doing that in a great many cases?—Certainly, that would be so.

1181. For instance, you would have cases of a separate parish and a separate board of guardians which could not be conveniently added to any other union?—That is so.

1182. Another remedy is through the audit, is it not, namely, that the auditor may and should disallow expenditure which appears to him to be illegal?—That is so.

Force of Special and General Orders.

1183. With regard to the orders, there is no difference in the validity of an order is there, whether it is a special order or whether it is a general order?—No; they are equally liable to be questioned on an application for a writ of *certiorari*.

1184. And they have the same efficacy, except that a general order applies to more than one union and a special order applies to a particular union?—Yes, that is the distinction.

1185. Usually, the only reason for making a general order rather than a special one is that it is evidently more convenient to make an order which applies (if you have got the same state of facts before you) to a number of unions, than to make a number of separate orders?—Certainly.

Officers' Superannuation.

1186. You told us with regard to the Superannuation Act, 1896, that there was a provision subsisting before that Act under which Poor Law officers could be superannuated?—Yes; that was in the 27 and 28 Vic., c. 42. That Act was amended by subsequent statutes, and the Act of 1896 reserves the continued operation of the Act of 1864 in cases where particular officers did not care to come under the provisions of the Act of 1896; so in relation to those cases the Act of 1864, though repealed, may be said to be still in force.

1187. The great difference between the two is, that it is optional under the old Act, is it not?—It was optional on the part of the guardians, and also there was no contribution from the officer.

1188. But under the new Act it is compulsory, and there must be a contribution by the officer?—Yes.

Property of paupers.

1189. Then at question 110 you gave evidence with reference to the property of a pauper which could be made available for the repayment of relief. The Act refers to the money or valuable security for money which may be taken by the guardians in repayment of relief; can you assist us as to what is meant by "valuable security?"—There was a case in the High Court which decided that the words "valuable security for money" were wide enough to include a judgment obtained in favour of a pauper on his bringing an action for damages (West Ham Union *v.* Ovens; Law Reports, 8, Exchequer 37; 42, Law Journal, Magistrates' Cases, 29).

1190. Those words would not include chattels, I suppose, would they?—No.

1191. So that if a pauper was taken into the workhouse with a watch, for instance, the guardians would not take the watch?—The guardians ought not to do so—certainly not under this statutory provision (12 and 13, Vic., c. 103, s. 16).

Overseers' duties as to Voters' Lists.

1192. Passing now to Question 130, which related to the voters' lists and the duties of the overseers in relation to voters' lists, a precept, if I remember rightly, is issued by the clerk of the peace (or by the town clerk in the case of boroughs) to the overseers directing them what they are to do in the preparation of the lists?—Yes.

1193. I think that that precept directs the overseers to omit the names of persons who are disqualified by receipt of relief; is that not so?—That is so.

1194. Then supposing that an overseer wilfully neglected that duty, would he be liable to a penalty?—He would be liable to be fined by the revising barrister, if the proceeding were wilful.

1195. The penalty is not very large, if I remember rightly?—No, it is not.

1196. I have an impression that it must not be less than £1 or more than £5?—That is so.

Erection of New Workhouses.

1197. Then may we go on to Question 140, which relates to the erection of new workhouses. The Local Government Board have no power at their own initiative to require a new workhouse to be built unless certain consents are given; is that not so?—That is so.

1198. The consents would be, would they not, the consents of the owners and ratepayers, or of a majority of the board of guardians, or of the guardians by a resolution passed after certain notices?—That is so.

1199. That last provision, I think, is in sec. 12 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1882, is it not?—Yes.

1200. Does not the law seem to you a little weak in that particular?—It does. The position is inherited from that of 1834, when, if one may judge from the Report of the Commission of Inquiry, it was rather feared that there would be almost too many workhouses.

1201. It was a fear of the expense, I imagine?—No doubt that was so.

Alteration of Workhouses.

1202. But the law is different, is it not, with regard to the alteration of workhouses?—Yes.

1203. There, the consents are not necessary, but the workhouse must be altered in accordance with a plan approved by the Local Government Board, if the Board so require?—Yes.

Incorporation of Boards of Guardians.

1204. With regard to the taking of land by a board of guardians, is a board of guardians incorporated?—A board of guardians is incorporated, but the incorporation is not perfect—it is an incomplete corporation.

1205. Would it be desirable that they should be made a complete corporation?—I think certainly so, and perhaps even more so, or equally so, the boards of management of school districts. The position of a board of management of a school district is that they have a common seal, but that they have never been expressly incorporated.

1206. So that there are legal difficulties in consequence of their somewhat imperfect incorporation?—Certainly, that would be so.

Acquisition of land by Guardians.

1207. Supposing the power were given to a board of guardians, might the Lands Clauses Acts be made applicable?—The Lands Clauses Acts could be made applicable, but only for limited purposes under the existing law.

1208. I am afraid I have not quite gathered the effect of your answer?—The Lands Clauses Acts could be made applicable under the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, but only in very exceptional circumstances.

1209. That Act only applies to the Metropolis, does it?—Certainly.

1210. The point would therefore be whether it would be desirable that the Lands Clauses Acts should be made applicable outside London?—Yes.

1211. In London there is a power of taking land compulsorily, is there not?—Yes, in special circumstances.

1212. For the extension of existing workhouses?—That is so.

1213. But there is no such power outside, is there?—No.

1214. Would it be desirable, in your view, that there should be a power of that kind?—I think it would be desirable, but probably some modification of a few provisions of the Lands Clauses Acts might be required in the application of the code to Poor Law authorities and purposes.

usal
n rates.

1215. Following upon question 179, which related to exclusal from rates, I think the point was raised as to whether there would be any actual payment of the rate in a case of that kind. There would not be any payment of the rate in a case of that kind, would there, because sec. 11 of the 54 George III., c. 170, expressly says that in that case the rate shall not be collected?—There would be no payment of rate by the overseers in an ordinary case of exclusal on the ground of poverty. The only case of possible, though improbable, payment that I can suggest is that of non-resident relief to cover a rate.

et of
rthyr
lvil case.

1216. Question 205 related to the Merthyr Tydvil case. A point in the Merthyr Tydvil case that you described in your answer was, that the order provided, not who should be relieved, but as to the mode in which they should be relieved?—That is so.

1217. Consequently, the point in that case was whether able-bodied men, able to work and to get work, could be relieved at all?—Yes.

1218. And that question turned, not upon the words of the order, but upon the law as laid down in the statute?—The order was considered and found to contain nothing at variance with the Statute.

1219. The effect of the decision was, I think, that the Court said that able-bodied men would not be relieved if they were able to get work, unless they became so weak that they could not work, and then in that case they must be relieved?—Yes.

1220. But that any wife or child must be relieved if destitute?—That was so.

ect of
isal of
oor relief.

1221. (*Chairman.*) I understand from your answers that in case of urgent necessity a pauper has a legal right to demand out-door relief, and the relieving officer has no legal right to refuse it?—The effect of the pauper's attitude is to confer on him the privilege of choosing the form of relief, that is to say, if he refuses relief within the workhouse, it is the duty of the relieving officer to see that he has relief—and that would be outside the workhouse.

1222. If he refused, and any untoward consequence occurred, he would be responsible for being guilty of an illegal inaction, if I may call it so?—For having been guilty of negligence.

r Law
endment
, 1834,
2.

1223. You have stated very clearly to the Commission the powers which the President of the Local Government Board has to issue orders from time to time; he has a certain latitude as to what shall be in those orders, but they of course are controlled and regulated by the general statute, to which Mr. Loch called our attention, which is, perhaps, somewhat ambiguous in its terms. Assuming that it is our duty, when we have done our inquiry, to make certain proposals for the improvement of the administration of the existing Poor Law, would it be any use if there were some declaratory Act making clear any parts of the Act of 1834 the intention of which is not perfectly clear?—I should say that it would be almost a necessity that the Commission should consider that point, and either in their report, or in suggestions for statutory amendment, lay down what view is to be taken in the future about matters as to which they find ambiguity.

1224. There has been no statute passed since 1834 which is merely declaratory as regards interpretation, has there?—No statute which, in so many words, affects the declaratory recital of Sec. 52 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834.

lers of
intenance.

1225. (*Mr. Loch*). With regard to relations, is it under case law that the grandchild is not bound to support his grandfather?—Yes.

1226. Is that a matter now of settled policy requiring statutes expressly to alter it, if it were to be altered?—Clearly so, I think.

1227. With regard to the justices, is their position, from the point of view of valid law, more or less out of date, or do justices at the present moment use their powers for giving orders in the case of paupers that should have relief?—Orders on relations, do you mean?

Justices' powers to order relief.

1228. No; I was taking another point?—I could not say to what extent the power under Sec. 27 or the power under Sec. 54 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, is acted upon.

1129. In the main, has not the relation of the justices to the Poor Law been entirely altered in practice since the Act of 1834?—In practice, I should certainly think so.

1230. So that, again, is another point in which the law may fairly be re-considered?—I should think so, certainly.

1231. (*Chairman.*) It is a relic of old law which is in operation?—Yes, it is the case of a relic.

1232. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) At Question 301 I think you dealt with the contribution made by a board of guardians to the common fund of the union?—Yes.

Contribution to Common Fund.

1233. That is based, is it not, on the rateable value of the parishes, as ascertained under the Union Assessment Committee Acts where those Acts are in force?—Yes.

1234. There are few places, are there not, where those Acts are still not in force?—I believe so.

1235. But I think they are very few now?—I do not know the exact number, but they are undoubtedly few.

1236. Going on to your answer to question 305, there you deal with the grants made to boards of guardians or the payments in substitution for grants made by the county councils?—Quite so.

Lunatic Grant.

1237. One of these is 4s. a week, which is paid, subject to certain conditions, in respect of any lunatic sent to an asylum?—Yes.

1238. That does not apply, I think, to a lunatic who is detained in the workhouse?—No.

1239. I do not know whether it has come before you, but I think some representations have been made by boards of guardians urging that it should be extended to cases where a chronic lunatic is detained in the workhouse?—That is so.

1240. Have you any opinion upon that?—What I should like to say about it is, that the subject must, I take it, to a certain extent, depend for its final consideration upon the Report of the Royal Commission on the Care of the Feeble-minded.

1241. Then there is an officers' grant, is there not; that is to say, a payment made by a county council under Sec. 26 of the Local Government Act, 1888, based upon the amount of the salaries and remuneration of the officers during the year ending the 25th March, 1888?—Yes, except in London.

Officers' Grant.

1242. There have been representations, I think, to the effect that that ought now to be revised and brought up to a later date?—Yes.

1243. The section, if I remember rightly, says that, until Parliament otherwise directs, this is to be the state of the case?—Quite so.

1244. Boards of guardians have urged, have they not, that this provision is somewhat out of date, because the numbers of officers are very much altered in different unions since that time?—Yes.

1245. Going on to the answer to Question 309, there you deal with the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board; that expenditure is defrayed in two ways, I think you told us?—Yes.

Method of paying Metropolitan Asylums Board expenditure.

1246. That is to say, that as regards a certain class of expenditure, it is charged to the various Boards of Guardians according to rateable value?—Yes.

1247. And that as regards the charge for the maintenance of cases in an asylum, it is charged to the particular Board of Guardians sending the cases?—That is so.

1248. But then, on the other hand, do not the guardians get back that sum which they have paid for maintenance, out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—Yes.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

1249. So that, in the end, the whole of the expenditure incurred by the Metropolitan Asylums Board is a Metropolitan charge?—That is so.

1250. Is not that second plan of the guardians—first of all being charged by the Asylums Board for the maintenance of the cases which they send and then in turn making a claim upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund for repayment—a little cumbrous?—It would seem so.

Salaries of London Officers.

1251. Going on to question 312, as you said just now, the officers' grant does not apply to London, and the reason for that is, I presume, that in London the salaries of the officers are a Metropolitan charge?—Yes.

1252. Therefore, the guardians are already repaid the salaries of the officers?—Yes.

1253. And could not properly receive an additional grant in respect of those salaries from the county council?—I think that is so.

London Indoor Relief Grant.

1254. But in lieu of that, they got a grant, did they not in respect of the in-door poor?—Yes, a special grant.

1255. Which is 4d. a day, is it not?—Yes, 4d. a day.

1256. The guardians in London, do, in effect, get 9d. a day repaid by the Metropolis in respect of every in-door pauper?—Yes, subject to certain conditions, of course.

1257. These conditions only apply, I think, in the case of the 5d. a day, which is repaid by the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—Yes; the other is an absolute payment.

1258. The object of the conditions was, I think, twofold—first of all, to prevent over-crowding; that is to say, you only repay from the Common Poor Fund in respect of the number for which the workhouse is certified, or rather, you do not repay 5d. a day in respect of a larger amount than the workhouse is certified for?—That is so.

1259. And secondly, you do not pay in respect of children under sixteen?—That is so.

1260. The object of that, I suppose, was to get the children out of the workhouses?—No doubt.

Guardians' borrowing power.

1261. Then going on to question 316, which deals with borrowing, I think the general power of a Board of Guardians to borrow is derived from the Poor Law Act 1889, now?—That is so.

1262. Does there not still remain a power to borrow for the purposes of the Assessment Committee Acts under those Acts?—Yes; but I have regarded the subject of Assessment Committees as rather outside the scope of my evidence

1263. I was only on the point that there is that power of borrowing?—There is that power, no doubt.

Payment of Guardians' debts.

1264. Then we come to Question 319; this is only a small matter, dealing with the payment of debts. A Board of Guardians can only pay their debts within the half year in which they are incurred, or within three months afterwards, unless the Local Government Board extends the time?—Yes.

1265. That time can only be extended for a period of one year from the date at which the debt was incurred, and there must be an order authorising the payment; is that not so?—Yes.

1266. Might the order be got rid of?—Certainly, I think.

Relieving Officer as collector of rates.

1267. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) At Question 303 Sir Samuel Provis asked, "There would be the salaries of the collectors of the poor rate, would there not"; perhaps it is a matter of administration—I do not know—but can you say whether, in England, a relieving officer is ever a collector of the poor rate?—I do not think so. I do not recall any instances in which he is collector of the poor rate. There is, however, one case of a very small union in which at one time nearly every office was filled by one man. That was the Welwyn Union.

1268. Can you say what is the general salary of the relieving officer?—No, I could not tell you that.

1269. Nor of the collector of rates?—No, I could not.

Boarded-out children.

1270. In reply to Question 306, you refer to the definition of the term "indoor pauper"; I see that "in-door pauper," according to Sec. 43 of the Local Government Act, 1888, includes children boarded out within or without the limits of the union; I gather from that that boarded-out pauper children in England are regarded as paupers, and are upon the list of paupers?—Yes, they are upon the list of paupers.

1271. There is no separate list of boarded-out children, is there?—No.

1272. Then so far as regards the lists which are kept by the Board of Guardians, there is nothing in any way to remove from these boarded-out children the taint of pauperism which must attach to them if they are held to be in-door paupers?—They are subject to regulation only because they are paupers.

1273. If they were not on the list of in-door paupers, but were kept on a separate list, that would so far remove from them the taint of pauperism which must otherwise attach, must it not?—They are, of course, paupers.

Union a rateable

1274. (*Mr. Loch.*) Going back to Question 301, is there any reason now why the union rather than the parish should not for all purposes be treated as the rateable area? So much having left the parish and fallen on the union in the way of expenditure, would it not be desirable that the union should become the rateable area for all purposes instead of the parish?—I should have thought not. The tendency of the present day is, I suppose, in the direction of simplification, and simplification would involve one rating area or should involve one rating area for all local purposes. You could not possibly have such a rating area as a union for public health purposes. You must have your separate local division such as the parish as a place to be separately charged with expenses of various kinds.

1275. The decision of cases and all matters of business that affect that use of the money which is levied parish by parish is carried out by the Board of Guardians, is it not?—You are speaking now of the Poor Law only. When such an alteration as that of the substitution of the union for the parish as a rating area is in contemplation, you must think of other branches of local taxation.

1276. Which practically prevent the alteration, though on the ground of the Poor Law it might be more satisfactory?—I think so. I think it certainly would prevent it.

Period fo repayme of loans.

1277. With regard to loans which are dealt with at question 316, the phrase is "a loan raised after the passing of the Poor Law Act, 1897, must be repaid within such period not exceeding sixty years as the guardians or the managers with the consent of the Local Government Board may determine"; is sixty years the time usually allowed?—That I could not say; it is more or less a question of administration.

1278. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is it not the case that since the 4s. a week grant for lunatics was made, the statistics of lunacy have risen very greatly?—I would rather you put that question to some other witness who will come after me. I am not familiar with the statistical side of the question; it is only the legal side with which I have to deal.

1279. I simply wanted to suggest that the increase is only an apparent increase?—That may be so, but another witness, I think, will give you the figures.

Definitio of "ind pauper."

1280. (*Dr. Downes.*) With reference to the definition of "in-door pauper" in the Act of 1888, paupers in hospitals for infectious diseases are included, I take it, but the definition would not include persons who are admitted otherwise than as paupers?—That is so. It would only include paupers.

Repaym from Metropo Commor Poor Fu

1281. Is the whole expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board charged to the relief of the poor?—I think that also is rather a question for those who will give evidence on the statistics.

1282. With regard to the application of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, amongst other things repayments are made on the salaries of officers, I think?—Yes.

1283. Is it necessary that each officer should be considered individually, and that the repayment must be made in the case of Tom Smith, say, by name?—Each officer, in respect of whom repayment is made from the fund must, in some form or other, be the subject of a sanction so far as regards his appointment, but the appointments may be sanctioned collectively as well as individually, that is to say, a group of officers may be the subject of a sanction as well as an individual officer.

1284. But in one form or another he has to come individually under the consideration of the central authority?—The appointment must.

1285. Taking again the repayment of the expenses on medical and surgical appliances, does that involve that schedules should be presented in which each item must be entered separately?—I have no very definite recollection of the actual practice. I should have thought the separate enumeration and description of particular instruments to be unnecessary.

1286. Is there any power to allocate the repayments from the Common Poor Fund *en bloc* according to any settled system of division between the several parishes and unions?—There is a provision in the section following Sec. 69 to carry out the method of repayment. Sec. 70 is in these terms: "After each half-yearly audit the auditors shall, within such time and in such manner as the Poor Law Board"—now the Local Government Board—"from time to time direct, certify to the Poor Law Board the amount actually expended by each union or parish in respect of expenses which are to be repaid out of the Common Poor Fund; and the Poor Law Board shall, by precept under the seal of the Board, direct the Receiver to repay out of that fund to the guardians of the unions and parishes the several sums so expended, and the amount repaid shall be applied by them in aid of the fund chargeable with the relief of the poor." The system of allocation would depend upon the procedure under that section.

1287. (*Miss Hill.*) With reference to your answer to Question 316, may I ask whether you think that the borrowing powers of the guardians are sufficiently held in check by the present provisions of the law, so that the money is really only spent on permanent work and is not extravagantly spent?—I should think that the existing check is about the utmost that would be conceded at the present time by Parliament.

1288. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the grants referred to at Question 305, am I to understand that the basis upon which these grants were made was the expenditure for the one year ending the 25th March, 1888?—Yes, one year was taken.

1289. Simply the expenditure in one year?—Certainly; that was the basis on which the allocation was to proceed.

1290. And it has remained at that figure ever since, I presume?—Yes, that was the Parliamentary bargain as it were.

1291. Would it require an Act of Parliament to alter that?—Yes.

1292. (*Mr. Phelps.*) On your answer to Question 316, I want to ask whether it is competent for Boards of Guardians to accumulate a balance. There may be works which require a loan, there may be works which fall obviously on annual expenditure, and there may be works which may be half way between the two; is it competent for the guardians to accumulate a balance for those?—They ought not to do so.

1293. Ought the auditor to note it, if he comes across it?—I think so.

1294. Is there any penalty?—No, except that the individual parishes which are affected by that proceeding might have their remedy.

1295. That is to say, you are not justified in raising more than you may reasonably expect the expenditure of the year will run to?—That is the principle.

1296. What is the legal position of a Board of Guardians with regard to an over-draft at a bank?—That is altogether irregular.

1297. Would the Local Government Board call attention to it if it was reported to them?—An over-draft at the bank, if by arrangement with the bank, interest were paid on it, would probably subject individual guardians to surcharge.

1298. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is there not a system by which you can have loans for a short period?—Certainly.

1299. Sometimes even for six years?—Yes.

1300. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In your reply to Question 321, you say, "for the purposes of my summary of the statutory provisions I leave out of consideration the case of a lunatic who is not a pauper and is not wandering at large, but is not under proper care and control or is cruelly treated or neglected." Does that mean that the relieving officer has no responsibility whatever with regard to a case of a lunatic which might be brought under his notice?—No. I left that case out only because I considered that my evidence should be limited to cases of lunatics who were actually paupers *ab initio*.

1301. Would he not become a pauper lunatic if the notice of the relieving officer was brought to the case?—In the answer to Question 321, I have already drawn attention to the circumstances under which he becomes a pauper lunatic. The simple intervention of the relieving officer under the Lunacy Acts does not make the man a pauper.

1302. Do you say that he is to be dealt with first, and then the question of whether he is a pauper or not should be decided afterwards?—Yes.

1303. I cannot reconcile the two statements, because the relieving officer must take charge in the first instance?—Not necessarily; a constable might take charge.

1304. I mean if a relieving officer's attention is drawn to the case and not a constable's, he must take charge of it; and the question must be decided afterwards whether the case is that of a pauper lunatic or not?—I do not think so—not necessarily.

1305. Can he refuse to take charge?—It would depend actually upon the circumstances as in the case of a man man wandering at large. If the lunatic in such a case were found by a police officer, the police officer would have a statutory duty in relation to him.

1306. But supposing it is a case of not wandering at large?—The position is similar in the case of a lunatic who is not under proper care and control, or who is cruelly treated or neglected.

1307. I want to know whether the relieving officer would have any responsibility if a case were brought to his notice of a lunatic who was not wandering at large but was cruelly treated?—Although the man is not a pauper?

1308. Although at that moment it is not known whether he is a pauper or not?—The relieving officer, no doubt, has the responsibility attaching to him under the Lunacy Acts in such a case; but the case I wanted to exclude was the case of the man who, at the time of his being not under proper care and control, was clearly not a pauper.

1309. It is not always known until the case is afterwards inquired into?—I excluded from my summary the case of the lunatic not under proper care and control mainly to avoid reference to decisions of the High Court which would be of little practical value in relation to cases of ordinary pauper lunatics.

Provision for lunatics in Workhouse.

1310. You are asked at Question 342, "Are the guardians under statutory obligation to make special provision for lunatics in a workhouse?" and your answer is "No;" are the guardians not under some legal obligation to provide a place of reception for those who are summarily declared to be certified as lunatics?—The statute does not in terms require that they should make structural alterations or structural provisions; and it was those which I had in my mind specially. I concluded that the reference was to special accommodation for these lunatics.

1311. For dealing permanently with lunatics, do you mean?—Yes, on a somewhat more elaborate scale than would be applicable to the case of the ordinary pauper in a case of emergency.

1312. Then Boards of Guardians have to make provision for cases under a magistrate's summary detention order?—Certain pauper lunatics may be taken to a workhouse pending their ultimate removal to an asylum; and for their reception an ordinary workhouse, I should think, would suffice in the majority of cases.

1313. It might require a padded room?—Yes, it might.

1314. That would be a special provision?—No doubt.

1315. Really, they are bound to make special provision for those cases, are they not?—I do not know that, and I would not go so far as to say that. The statute rather proceeds on the assumption that they are to go to the workhouse, if the workhouse has the requisite accommodation for their reception.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

1316. (*Dr. Downes.*) They are not to remain in the workhouse, I think, if the medical officer does not certify that there is proper accommodation for them, apart from the other inmates?—That relates to the imbeciles rather than to the particular lunatics to which I understood the question to apply.

1317. I thought that applied to cases brought in by a relieving officer under the ordinary procedure for a wandering lunatic?—The ordinary procedure for lunatics brought there in the first instance would hardly contemplate their remaining beyond the very limited period to which the statute applies—fourteen days, or whatever the additional time may be.

Special Asylums for weak minded children.

1318. At Question 349, Sir Henry Robinson asked you, "Are there any institutions supported entirely out of the rates for the maintenance of weak-minded and idiot children under age?" and your reply was that you thought there were, but the Commission on the Feeble-minded apparently thought there were not. I suggest that the Commission had forgotten the case of the Asylums Board's institutions—Darenth, for example—also the institutions for idiot children, and also the later institution set up under the order of the Local Government Board of 2nd April, 1897?—No, I am afraid that is not quite so. This particular question I understood to have reference to a statutory expression which referred to these establishments as supported out of the county rate; and therefore I think that to that extent what I was told before that other Commission was probably right.

1319. In London there are institutions supported out of the poor rates?—Yes, there are, certainly. The doubt I have still in my mind is whether I was rightly told in relation to some of the institutions of the London County Council—whether they have not a special asylum for idiots.

Separation of harmless lunatics from sane paupers.

1320. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I understand that harmless lunatics may be permanently provided for in the workhouse?—Subject to certification by the medical officer of the workhouse, or to a justice's order for detention.

1321. Is there no provision by which they are to be kept apart from the sane paupers?—There is no statutory provision requiring separation, where the medical officer does not think it necessary.

Certification of lunatics.

1322. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I suppose we may assume in the case of those who are suffering from temporary aberration, and who are paupers, that the object of the guardians, as representing the ratepayers, is that they shall not be certified until it is seen whether there is likely to be any permanent illness or not; is that not so?—I should think it would be fair to say that the scheme of the Lunacy Acts is on those lines.

1323. Because if they are certified and confined in an asylum or otherwise, of course in the event of recovery, there is less chance of their getting employment. I say that, because I want to ask whether there is any provision in the workhouses for the reception of such people temporarily before certification, for observation in observation wards or probationary wards?—That I think is hardly a subject that I should have any useful knowledge about. I think that the statutes contemplate that the workhouses will, as a rule, have some adequate accommodation for the purpose, but they do not lay down any requirements as to providing it.

1324. Where such people might remain for a certain specified short term, until it is seen whether there is any need or medical necessity for their being treated elsewhere?—Quite so. The Lunacy Acts contemplate that workhouses may provide that accommodation, but they do not make it absolutely compulsory.

1325. That is a matter of administration, and you are not aware whether *de facto* there is such accommodation?—It is a matter of administration, of which I should have no knowledge.

Separate Institutions for imbeciles.

1326. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You said just now that permanent imbeciles and chronic lunatics might be detained in a workhouse, subject to certain conditions; have there not been proposals that those lunatics should be taken out of the workhouses and be put into separate institutions provided by the county councils?—That has been one proposal; there have also been proposals that in some instances Sec. 8 of the Poor Law Act, 1879, should be used for dealing with them.

1327. In one or two cases there have been combinations under Sec. 8 for providing for certain classes of imbeciles, have there not?—Yes.

1328. Supposing that county councils were required to undertake the management and maintenance of chronic imbeciles, should there be some legislation on the subject?—I should think legislation would be absolutely essential.

1329. The arrangements under the existing laws do not contemplate cases of that kind, do they?—They are too costly, I think, for the provision that is needed; but there, again, the whole question is still before that other Commission.

Boarding of lunatics.

1330. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Would it be legal to board them out, as in Scotland?—There is a provision in Section 57 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, for boarding out.

1331. Could we proceed to board them out in England, as they are boarded out in Scotland?—I do not know what the Scottish system is.

Loss of settlement alteration area.

1332. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In your answer to Question 378, you dealt with the Dorking case; that was a case, was it not, where the parish had been abolished under the Act of 1894?—Yes.

1333. The Act of 1894 provided, did it not, that where a parish was partly within and partly without a rural sanitary district, the two parts should be constituted separate parishes?—That is so.

1334. The consequence was that a very large number of such parishes disappeared, and separate parishes were formed out of them?—Yes.

1335. The point of the Dorking case was, was it not, that the parish having been got rid of, a man who had a settlement in the parish lost his settlement there, and did not acquire a settlement in either of the parishes formed out of the parish which had been abolished?—That was so.

1336. The evil arising from those cases of a number of people having thus lost their settlement must be very rapidly diminishing, must it not?—I should think so.

1337. Because the people would have acquired settlements elsewhere, in a great number of cases?—I should think so.

1338. The Dorking case did not touch the case where the boundaries of a parish had been altered, but the parish itself had been left, did it?—No.

1339. A man would not lose his settlement, I take it, if he had got a settlement in parish A, because the boundaries of parish A were altered?—No, he would not. That is the effect of the latest decision.

1340. With regard to cases like the Dorking case, suppose a parish was got rid of by means of alterations of parishes made by a county council (as could be done under Sec. 57 of the Local Government Act, or one of the other sections of that Act) might not the order of the County Council, or the confirming order, make provision which would prevent a man losing his settlement in the parish which was altered?—I think so. That would be an illustration of what might be done by the clauses which I propose to put in for consideration by the Commissioners.

Decision of settlement by Local Government Board.

1341. In your reply to Question 405, you dealt with the power there is for guardians to agree to submit to the Local Government Board questions of settlement. The actual number of cases, I think, has not been large, but I am under the impression that the board have, in their annual reports, sometimes recommended guardians to avail themselves of this permission, with a view of diminishing the expense which arises if questions of that sort are referred to courts of law?—That would be so.

1342. Would you be prepared to express any opinion on the point whether it might be desirable to make it compulsory that questions of that kind should be referred to the Board?—There is a very great deal to be said in favour of it, but the objection that occurs to me—it is only an administrative objection—is that the staff needed for the investigation of these cases properly is rather foreign to the usual staff of a Government department. You would require someone in the nature of a settlement officer—a sort of private inquiry officer.

1343. Would it be proper, in a case of that kind, that some charge should be made to the boards of guardians?—Clearly so, I think.

1344. And it should be optional with the Board whether they should entertain the reference to them, because they might consider the question raised was of so much importance that it ought to go to a court of law?—Yes, unless they themselves had power of their own motion to obtain the decision of a court of law on a case as put by them.

1345. You are aware, perhaps, that a number of representations were made a few years ago to the effect that something of that kind should be done?—Yes.

ints
ecting
tlement
sing out of
rking case.

1346. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) As regards the Dorking case you are aware, I daresay, that that decision and its results have been the cause of a certain amount of dissatisfaction, not only in regard to cases from Scotland, but also in regard to English cases?—We have heard a great deal about it from boards of guardians.

1347. I am not quite sure, but I think those cases which have arisen from the chargeability or supposed chargeability to a parish have been cases of birth settlement as well as cases of settlement by residence; I mean, where, owing to the operation of the Act under which the boundaries of a parish were altered, it has been held that a pauper who was born in that parish, and who would otherwise have been removable had it not been for the alteration in boundaries, is not so removable?—Yes, that is so.

1348. Does that not appear to be a very considerable hardship on the parish which has to relieve this pauper, simply because of an alteration in boundaries which has practically resulted in this—that the pauper has been born, as I may say, nowhere, owing to that alteration of boundaries?—In those cases as to which the cry of hardship has been raised, the real answer is that time can supply the only remedy.

1349. I rather think, from the questions which Sir Samuel Provis has put to you, that if this alteration had taken place, not under the Divided Parishes Act, but under the County Council Act, 1888, this difficulty would not have arisen?—It should not have arisen. At that time, I do not know that the difficulty actually had occurred, either to the Board or to any local authority; but since attention has been drawn to the difficulty, it is seen that it is distinctly removable, either by clauses in the order of the county council or by the introduction of modifications in a confirming order.

1350. There being, I suppose, a provision in the Act of 1888 that any alteration of boundaries shall not affect settlement?—There is no such provision actually, but there is a very wide enactment in Section 59 of the Local Government Act, 1888, which enables county councils to introduce into their orders a number of provisions with regard to all necessary matters incidental to or consequential upon parochial changes.

cision of
tlement
Local
vernment
ard.

1351. One question now about the powers of arbitration which the Local Government Board have. I understand that these powers of arbitration which you possess in regard to cases of settlement are not confined to cases where the two disputing unions or parishes—I do not know which is the proper term—are agreed upon the facts?—The powers of the Board apply only to such cases.

1352. I mean where they themselves present a petition or an application or a statement to you, in which they are agreed upon the facts as regards the settlement, and they come to you to ask you to decide the point of law?—That is the present position.

1353. That has not been largely taken advantage of, I think you told us?—Originally I think it was very freely used, but of late years, for various reasons, probably the annual crop of cases does not amount to twenty.

1354. What may be the reason for that, can you say?—Partly perhaps because the points of difficulty are gradually diminishing.

1355. It is not because they are being litigated outside then?—I really could not say as to that; it is just conceivable that it may be so.

1356. That there is sometimes a desire on the part of the people to litigate, if they possibly can?—Possibly there is that motive at work.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

1357. I press this because just now there is a movement in favour not only on questions where they agree upon the facts, but on all questions where they are not agreed upon the facts, of the Local Government Board in Scotland being asked to undertake the whole thing?—Quite so; and suggestions to the like effect have been made to the English Local Government Board.

Relative importance of different kinds of settlement.

1358. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to your reply to Question 353 about the various sorts of settlement and removability, does it appear from your knowledge of the cases that occur that these various modes of obtaining a settlement are of equal importance at the present time, so that all should be retained?—No, I do not think they are of equal importance, but they are not absolutely defunct. The chief method now is by residence—I mean that that is the most frequent which comes under our notice.

1359. That being so, would not several of the others so far slip out of observation that practically they might be passed over and set aside by further legislation? Take for instance, apprenticeship; is it necessary to keep apprenticeship still on those lines as one of the modes of obtaining settlement?—Is this your point, That by legislation you would affect the people (they must be very few, I should imagine) who have already acquired a settlement in that way, and you would sweep away that existing mode of settlement, as well as prevent the acquisition of such a settlement in the future?

1360. That is my point?—I do not think there would be much harm in that; but a saving of existing settlements would be better.

1361. Now take the renting of the tenement; that is one year's settlement, is it not?—Yes.

1362. And that is inconsistent with the three years' residence?—It is a different settlement altogether.

1363. And so far as the time goes, at any rate, inconsistent; would there be any great objection to making the three years' residence suffice?—Curiously enough we had a case of settlement by renting a tenement before us within the last month or so. Of course, the suggestion is open to the observation that in that particular case considerable hardship might have been worked to individual paupers by the abolition of what was actually found to be a right.

1364. Presumably, that might apply to almost any of the modes?—Yes; hence saving of acquired settlements seems to be a necessity.

1365. Then with regard to estate, it is forty days' residence in the case of estate, is it not?—Yes.

1366. You have therefore a different time limit there; is it desirable to keep up such a mode as that?—I cannot say that it is clearly undesirable. Settlement by estate is supposed to be coeval with Magna Charta. I am not quite prepared to sweep away these old landmarks.

1367. There is one more mode called hire and service; is that not really obsolete?—That has gone.

1368. But it still remains on the Statute Book?—It has gone.

1369. Has it absolutely disappeared?—It has absolutely gone.

Relief of irremovable non-settled poor.

1370. If a man becomes chargeable, but has a settlement in a union other than that in which he resides, and nevertheless is not removable to it, and the board of guardians of the union in which he is resident relieve him, do they get paid from the common fund?—Irremovable paupers are chargeable to the common fund.

1371. That is to say, the common fund comes in to deal with a case which is betwixt and between, as it were?—All cases of relief are chargeable to the common fund.

Parish "Stock."

1372. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) At Question 351 you refer to the Act of Settlement under Charles II. The preamble of that speaks of the great discouragement of parishes in providing stocks "where it is liable to be devoured by strangers;" would that stock be the stock for providing employment for the poor? I have thought that these words probably referred to their obligation to set the poor to work?—The whole of this subject was investigated by Mr. Coode in 1851. There is a great deal of learning in his report. It is an official document, and it is known as Coode's Report on the Law of Settlement and Removal. The history of the Act is given there at

Mr. Coode's report.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

great length. I am not sure whether there is a reference to the particular question of the stocks.

1373. I ask because it seems to me that the worst form of settlement has arisen out of the attempt to provide employment-relief, and I thought that these words had reference to that?—I think Coode's story of the matter is that the 13 and 14 Charles II., c. 12, was really an amalgamation of several Bills that were then before the House.

1374. (*Chairman.*) The word "stock" occurs constantly in the Poor Law Acts; is it capable of more than one interpretation, do you think?—The words which have been quoted are, I find, noticed in Coode's Report. His comment is rather by way of sarcasm—"as if any parish had ever encountered the discouragement by trying to provide a stock."

1375. Then the word is probably used in rather a different sense in that Act?—Apparently it is used in the sense suggested, namely, that of means by which the poor could be set to work.

1376. In other Acts it seems to me to mean property which could be rated for the relief of the poor?—That is to say, stock-in-trade. As an example of a Statutory reference to stock-in-trade, the Poor Rate Exemption Act, 1840, may be mentioned.

1377. (*Mr. Loch.*) A statement put forward by a recent historian is that the provision of stock was one form of attraction, and that people in the time under that Act removed from the north, which was ill-provided with stocks, to the south, which was well-provided with stocks?—Indeed.

1378. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) How did the poor people manage who were not restrained from going from one parish to another; where they had no claim on the ordinary capital of the parish, I take it they could only use up the stock that was specially provided for the poor?—According to the old common law doctrine they would have a claim where their necessities arose; and, according to some versions, alms and oblations provided part of the funds for meeting those necessities before the levy of the poor rate began.

The right to relief.

1379. One often hears it said (referring to settlement by payment of rates) by people who have paid rates for so many years, "I have a right to relief"; apparently that is literally true under the doctrine of settlement by rates?—Provided that the conditions by which this settlement is hedged round are satisfied.

1380. They must also be destitute, of course?—Yes.

1381. (*Dr. Downes.*) Take the case of a pauper of unknown settlement discharged from an institution; I will assume that the institution is in a parish on which there is no claim whatever, and no suspicion of a settlement; another parish declines to receive him; what would be the temporary remedy for that pauper—should he go to the workhouse of the parish in which the institution is?—Yes; he would seek relief there.

1382. Would he have a claim for temporary relief there?—Yes.

1383. That is to say, the settlement would have to be inquired into afterwards?—Yes.

1384. In the event of a reluctance on the part of that parish to receive him, is there any power on the part of the central authority to direct where he shall remain, pending the settlement?—No.

Appeals against removal of paupers.

1385. (*Professor Smart*). In your reply to Question 395 you say: "in the case of Irish paupers, the Irish Local Government Board may appeal against the order of removal"; is there any parallel appeal on the part of the Scottish Local Government Board?—No, it is peculiar to Ireland.

1386. I understand that the pauper often goes back as quickly as the warrant?—Perhaps so.

Procedure of removal.

1387. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Under what law is it that the pauper removed, say, from England to Ireland must be accompanied by an officer—even supposing that he is an adult pauper?—I am not aware that there is any statutory provision identifying any particular officer. But I see that the person to whom a warrant of removal is delivered under the 8 & 9 Vic., c. 117, sec. 3, "shall detain and hold in safe custody every poor person mentioned therein, until such poor person have arrived at the place to which he is ordered to be removed."

1388. Practically that hampers removal very much, because it adds enormously to the expense?—That may be so.

1389. And therefore the guardians do not take advantage of this provision?—Perhaps not.

1390. In a case that I know of, an able-bodied pauper, whom I should think any board of guardians would have been very glad to lose, had to be taken over to Ireland lest he should be lost?—That was before the Act of 1900, I take it.

Penalty for removing persons not chargeable.

1391. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is there not a penalty against any person sending to his place of settlement one who is likely to become pauper, but who is not at the time chargeable?—Yes.

1392. Does that penalty devolve upon both those guardians and officers alike who happen to incur any expense in the matter?—The penalty is imposed by the 9 & 10 Vict., c. 66, Sec. 6: "If any officer of any parish or union do, contrary to law, with intent to cause any poor person to become chargeable to any parish to which such person was not then chargeable, convey any poor person out of the parish for which such officer acts, or cause or procure any poor person to be so conveyed, or give directly or indirectly any money, relief, or assistance, or afford or procure to be afforded any facility for such conveyance, or make any offer or promise, or use any threat to induce any poor person to depart from such parish, and if, in consequence of such conveyance or departure, any poor person become chargeable to any parish to which he was not then chargeable, such officer, on conviction thereof before any two justices, shall forfeit and pay for every such offence any sum not exceeding five pounds nor less than forty shillings."

1393. Then clearly their duty is to relieve a person first, and to inquire into the settlement afterwards?—Yes.

Object of law of settlement.

1394. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Have you any view as to the object or intention of the legislature in its enactments with regard to settlement; in other words, what do you take to be the purpose of settlement, or of the legislation upon it?—The purpose of settlement, so far as the 13 and 14 Charles II. is concerned, I think was to restrain those who would otherwise have been vagrants to particular parishes.

1395. I have asked the question, because it was very strongly held by a Judge quite recently that the original object of settlement was to prevent the breaking up of the family; would you accept that at all?—I have never seen a definition of that sort. The judicial definitions of settlement, and of the objects of settlement, have varied from time to time in a remarkable manner.

Question of abolition of settlement.

1396. Accepting what you say with regard to the object of the laws on the subject of settlement, do you think that that object is better attained by making settlement difficult or by making it easy to obtain?—The question is rather complicated nowadays by what I take to be the economic aspect of the matter. I should say that nowadays there would be no great harm, from that point of view, in abolishing settlement altogether.

1397. Assuming that settlement is still maintained, do you think that it is to the interest of the public at large (that is, both of the paupers and of the parish), to see that it should be made more difficult or more easy?—That it should be made more easy, I think.

1398. More easy to acquire settlement?—I think so

Procedure of Local Government Board in deciding settlement.

1399. In the cases with regard to settlement which are brought before the Local Government Board instead of going before the Courts, what is the procedure of the Local Government Board: for instance, are the unions heard by counsel?—No. The preliminary instruction is that the guardians should prepare a joint statement which sets out all the facts, and also may contain, if they wish, a summary of their arguments for and against; that is submitted under their seals, and the Local Government Board examine it. If the Local Government Board find that there is another union that ought to be joined, or if the facts are not sufficiently stated, the statement is returned with a request for amendment or for the

joining of the other union; and then, when completed, it is disposed of without hearing counsel.

1400. I can quite understand that the system would work admirably in the cases you describe, but I do not think the system capable of application to contested cases?—Those are contested cases.

1401. I mean cases where the two unions are not agreed as to the facts and decline to put in a joint statement?—Those cases as I have already said would involve an investigation by the Board on lines that are at present quite unfamiliar to them and therefore would be essentially experimental.

1402. At present that investigation would be conducted by the unions interested.—That is so. They agree upon their facts and then submit those facts to the Board and ask the Board to decide a point of law arising out of them.

1403. Your opinion would not be that the two boards should appear before the Local Government Board and state their case in the way that they do now before a court?—No.

ttlement idence.

1404. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield*). Referring to your answer to Question 387, which relates to the law respecting the status of irremovability, do I rightly understand that Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's judgment there, with regard to people who sleep under dry arches and any temporary shelter of that kind, means that they are gradually acquiring a settlement if they go on long enough?—Yes. That is still good law.

1405. Supposing, for instance, I slept in a park long enough, should I be acquiring a settlement?—I think so. It is an extreme case, of course.

1406. How would that fit in with what you quote from Mr. Justice Blackburn, namely, "There must be both a place which he has a right to return to and an intention to return, to constitute a constructive residence; and where a man has gone away and left no residence though he means to return at a future time, the *animus revertendi* is immaterial." How could he have a constructive residence with regard to an archway or anything of that sort?—The difficulty would consist in the application of the first decision. The first decision was the case of a pauper who slept on the steps after losing her house or being turned out of her lodgings.

1407. It is rather difficult to reconcile the two rulings, is it not?—Yes; but it is not inconceivable that a particular case might disclose circumstances in which Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's decision would supply an exception to the rule laid down by Mr. Justice Blackburn.

1408. Supposing a man were sent to a labour colony or a farm colony of any kind, his wife and children remaining behind, and at the end of a certain period which was sufficiently long to reasonably acquire settlement, he left, and his people became chargeable, would the parish in which the colony was situated be the one in which he would have his settlement?—Would he have a status of irremovability from that parish, you mean?—I think he would if he were there for a year.

1409. His wife and family would become chargeable to that place?—I suppose them to be so chargeable.

harges on ommon and.

1410. (*Mr. Booth.*) You have spoken of the common fund; does the common fund cover all the charges that are not specifically provided for?—That would be so in the case of the common fund of the union.

emoval to her than nions of ttlement.

1411. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall*). I daresay you are familiar with the provisions of the Poor Removal Act, 1862, by which, under Sec. 2, it is provided that "where the justices or magistrate, or sheriff (as the case may be) shall not be able to ascertain, upon the evidence before them, the place of birth or of such continued residence as aforesaid, they shall order the pauper to be removed to the port or union or parish in England or Ireland (as the case may be), or port or parish in Scotland, which shall, in the judgment of the justices or magistrate, or sheriff (as the case may be), under the circumstances of the case be most expedient." Have you known of cases where that has operated a very considerable hardship, from the fact that paupers have been removed, I daresay to England, but certainly to Scotland and probably also to Ireland?—Yes.

1412. To places which are nowhere near the parish of settlement?—Yes; that complaint has been made. *Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.*

1413. It has been made, and accordingly would you suggest that the Commission should take that section into view in order to have it reconsidered?—I think so. The complaints have come chiefly from Ireland. 16 Jan. 1906.

1414 (*Mr. Loch.*) Is it your opinion that the Bastardy Acts, as they stand now, are working satisfactorily, as compared with the Bastardy Acts as they used to be, and which had been so largely reformed before 1832?—I have not any data on which to form an opinion. I have heard it stated that they are not. Bastardy Acts.

1415. That would be rather a question of administration, you think, than for an opinion from a legal point of view?—Yes. I do not know what actual representations have been made to the Local Government Board, but one has seen in the public press and elsewhere that an allegation of unsatisfactory results from the working of the Acts has been made.

1416. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I should like to ask whether the object of the Bastardy Acts is this: that where the mother of an illegitimate child applies for relief, it is the duty of the guardians then to inquire as to who the father of the child may be?—There is a power to do it.

1417. A power only?—Yes.

1418. Would you say a power which is very often put into operation at the expense of the rates?—Yes, since 1873. That was an amendment of the law introduced by a private member.

1419. (*Mr. Loch.*) I should like, if possible, that you should submit to the Commission what was the franchise for the election of guardians before the present franchise?—It was very different in the past, and the change of franchise has, by common consent, made great difference in the whole administration of the law, so far as the people to administer it are concerned. It seems to me very desirable that we should have before us, if possible, the older law—that is the law previous to the Local Government Act, 1894—with its obligations and conditions?—The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, by Sec. 40, provided that, "In all cases of the election of guardians under this Act, or wherever the consent of the owners of property or ratepayers in any parish or union shall be required for any of the purposes of this Act, except when otherwise expressly provided for in this Act, the votes of such owners and ratepayers shall be given or taken in writing, collected and returned in such a manner as the said Commissioners shall direct; and in every such case the owner, as well as the ratepayer, in respect of any property in such parish or union, shall be entitled to vote, and the owner shall have the same number and proportion of votes respectively as is provided for inhabitants and other persons in and by an Act made and passed in the fifty-eighth year of the reign of his said late Majesty King George III, intituled, "an Act for the Regulation of Parish Vestries," and in and by an Act to amend the same, made and passed in the fifty-ninth year of his said late Majesty, and the ratepayers under two hundred pounds shall each have a single vote, and the ratepayers rated at two hundred pounds or more, but under four hundred pounds shall each have two votes; and the ratepayers rated at four hundred pounds or more shall each have three votes; and the majority of the votes of such owners and ratepayers which shall be actually collected and returned shall in every such case be binding on such parish." That was modified in a certain sense by Sec. 14 of the 7 and 8 Vic., c. 101. That section is in these terms: "In all cases in which by the said Act," that is the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, "or by any act amending or extending the same, owners of property and ratepayers are entitled to vote, every owner of property and ratepayer shall have respectively the same number and proportion of votes, according to the scale following (that is to say), if the property in respect of which he is entitled to vote be rated upon a rateable value of less than fifty pounds, he shall have one vote; if such rateable value amount to fifty pounds and be less than one hundred pounds, he shall have two votes; if it amount to one hundred pounds and be less than one hundred and fifty pounds, he shall have three votes; if it Early franchise for election of Guardians.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

amount to one hundred and fifty pounds and be less than two hundred pounds, he shall have four votes; if it amount to two hundred pounds and be less than two hundred and fifty pounds, he shall have five votes; and if it amount to or exceed two hundred and fifty pounds, he shall have six votes." In that same statute there were elaborate provisions as to the voting of the owners and their proxies.

1420. May one say practically that the parochial elector now takes the place of the ratepayer?—Yes.

1421. And the property qualifications have all been swept away, so that the owner no longer stands as a voter *qua* owner?—And plural voting also has gone.

Change in qualifications of Guardians.

1422. With regard to the candidate for the office of guardian, is his qualification altered from what it was before the Local Government Act, 1894?—Certainly.

1423. One further question, which is historical: was not a very careful inquiry made prior to this former arrangement as to how the vestries had acted, and was it not after experience of the method of election that preceded it that this proposal of giving a larger number of votes to the property owner was adopted? I thought Mr. Goode, for instance, had made an inquiry, and that his Report was published in the Report of 1834 or before that?—I do not remember that.

Medical Relief.

Kirkhouse v. *Blakeway.*

1424. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, 1885, the judgment you have quoted of Kirkhouse *v.* Blakeway was decided upon a question of fact, was it not?—Yes.

1425. It did not cover, I think, medical relief which might be given in a workhouse hospital as distinct from a case where a patient might be admitted direct to the hospital and discharged from the hospital, having received nothing but attention to an acute ailment; would such a case come under the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act?—It would be left to the revising barrister in each case to decide whether the man did or did not come within it.

Relieving Officers' duty *re* Voters' Lists.

1426. I take it that it is the duty of the relieving officer to send to the overseers the names of all those who have been in receipt of relief?—Yes.

1427. If the relieving officer fails to do that is he under any penalty?—I think attention has already been drawn to that to-day.

1428. That was the case of the overseers, not the case of the relieving officer?—The relieving officer is also subject to a penalty in certain cases; but I do not think that the power to fine him extends to this particular matter.

1429. With regard to the personal effects of an applicant, I understood you to say, in answer to a question by Mrs. Webb, that the furniture and other effects of the person who is given an order for the workhouse would have to be disposed of in some way?—Yes.

Storing of paupers' property.

1430. I believe it is the practice in some unions to incur expense by storing such things until the pauper is discharged?—I have heard so.

1431. Is such a practice legal?—The question of legality would arise, I suppose, in the event of expense being incurred in consequence of the practice; otherwise if there were vacant store room and no one spent a penny over housing the furniture, and it incommoded no one, the question of the legality would not practically arise.

1432. If the guardians made special provision for storing, would that be legal?—No, that would be *ultra vires*, certainly.

Reimbursement of relief

1433. With regard to repayments by the relatives of persons who are in receipt of relief or who are inmates of a workhouse, such repayments cannot be enforced after the persons cease to be chargeable, can they?—No.

1434. Then it must be done during the time of the chargeability?—Yes.

Power of detention in Workhouse.

1435. (*Mr. Loch.*) In regard to the detention of paupers in a workhouse, Sec. 22 of the 30 and 31 Vic., cap. 106, is in these words:—"When there shall be in any workhouse a poor person suffering from mental disease, or from bodily disease of an infectious or contagious character, and the medical officer of such workhouse shall upon examination report in writing that such person is not in a proper state to leave the workhouse without danger to himself or others, the guardians may direct the master to detain such person therein." Does that phrase "mental disease" refer to the insane only? In other words, is mental disease construed to mean a certified lunatic only?—No, not necessarily; it certainly is not limited to a certified lunatic.

1436. Is there no limitation?—I think such limitation as there is arises from the amendment of the Section by the Lunacy Act of 1890. That Act, as I have already pointed out in my evidence, does affect the section in a certain way. That is, Sec. 22 is repealed by the Lunacy Act 1890 except as regards persons suffering from delirium tremens or from bodily disease of a contagious or infectious character. That appears from Section 342 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, and the fifth Schedule to that Act.

1437. Therefore that term "mental disease" goes out from here now?—Except that it refers to people suffering from delirium tremens.

Owners' franchise.

1438. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In reference to the voting of owners at an election of guardians, owners of course can vote now at such an election where they have got the Parliamentary franchise?—Yes, but not on the old scale of voting.

1439. They do vote, but they have only one vote?—The main point that was put to me just now as I understood was the scale of voting; that is the plural voting.

1440. The scale of course has gone entirely, but as regards the class they do still vote?—Yes.

Women as Voters.

1441. (*Miss Hill.*) Can women who own property vote?—The question, of course, is whether they are included in the separate list of parochial electors.

1442. I thought it was only when they resided within the area that they could vote?—I am not at all familiar with the details of recent decisions on this branch of law.

1443. (*Mr. Loch.*) The register under which the voting is taken now is called the Register of Parochial Electors, is it not?—Yes.

1444. And the Parliamentary register is considered first of all as part of that Register of Parochial Electors?—Yes.

1445. Under that Parliamentary register comes the owner if he is the owner of a freehold of 40s. and so on?—Yes.

1446. The next section would be the local government or county register, with its extended burgess franchise?—Yes.

1447. And thirdly, there would be the £10 occupation qualification?—Yes.

1448. The owner is on the register of parochial electors on the basis of the Parliamentary register, and not on the basis of the extended burgess franchise nor on the basis of the £10 occupation qualification: that being so, how is it that a woman who cannot vote for Parliament can be a voter under the Parliamentary register as included in the register of parochial electors?—I could not answer that question off-hand.

1449. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there not an analogous provision in the English Act to that contained in the similar Act for Scotland which was passed at the same time, namely, that a woman who otherwise possesses the qualification for being registered on any county council register of electors shall not be disqualified by marriage from being registered on the county council or parish council register provided that the husband and the wife shall not both be registered?—That is in the Local Government Act, 1894.

1450. (*Chairman.*) A note I have before me on page 2186 of Brook-Little's "Poor Law Statutes" confirms Miss Hill:—"A married woman is not qualified as a parochial elector to vote at an election by reason of her ownership of property, there being no ownership qualification for Local Government Electors" Perhaps you would like to look that up?—I now see that the Court of Appeal in the case of Drax *v.* Ffooks (Law Reports, 1896; 1, Queen's Bench Division, 238) held that a woman whether married or single is not qualified by reason of ownership of property to be a parochial elector.

1451. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is it legal for guardians to pay for the conveyance of furniture to a stores in the workhouse if they have proper accommodation?—I should think not.

1452. The guardians have to publish an annual balance sheet, and a statement of accounts; is that compulsory?—I hardly think it is in the sense I suppose you to mean. The financial statement which is now required by statute would be such an account, and there is no obligation actually to publish that. I think the answer should be no.

1453. That they are not bound to do so?—That they are not bound.

1454. But they have a legal right to do so, of course?—They may do so if they wish, but I do not remember any obligation upon them to do so.

1455. With regard to the publication of any report, would it be their report, or would it be the report of the clerk to them; the guardians habitually do publish annual reports and pay for them, do they not?—Yes. I think they do that entirely under the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876. I think they base their authority on that Act.

Mr. Alfred Douglas Adrian, C.B., K.C.

16 Jan. 1906.

FIFTH DAY.

Monday, 22nd January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. T. PITTS, C.B., called; and Examined.

1456. (*Chairman.*) Will you state what your post at the Local Government Board has been?—At present, I am one of the assistant secretaries, and I have held that office since the latter part of the year 1897.

1457. One of the departments of the Board which has been under your supervision for a considerable period, I believe, performs, amongst other business, that of collecting and preparing for publication certain statistics as to the number of paupers and the expenditure on Poor Law Relief in England and Wales?—That is so. During the time that I have been an assistant secretary the work of that department has been partly under my supervision.

1458. I understand that you have prepared for the information of the Commission a memorandum respecting the statistics on these subjects?—A memorandum has been prepared in the department referred to; it is being printed and I believe that a rough unrevised proof has been circulated to members of the Commission. It is only the first part of the memorandum, I may say, that has been circulated; and there is much more to follow. The part that has been circulated deals with the statistics of pauperism only, and not with the statistics of expenditure. (For Memorandum, *see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II.

1459. But to-day, as I understand, you propose to give evidence not only on that part of the memorandum which is in our hands but also on parts which are not in our hands?—Yes; I can give some figures as to the expenditure, although the memorandum has not been circulated in complete form.

1460. Perhaps you will very briefly state what the memorandum contains?—I think I need say very little about the first part, seeing that proofs are in the hands of members of the Commission; I will only say that it requires considerable revision and some correction. Perhaps I ought to say that the statistics referred to are based mainly upon two half-yearly returns as to the number of paupers on a certain day. There is very little information as to the number of paupers relieved during any period; and there is no information as to the number of permanent paupers, nor any information to show how long recipients of relief have remained chargeable. In view of possible questions, I may also say that these statistics do not extend to such matters as the death-rate or the birth-rate in workhouses or other poor law institutions. With regard to the expenditure part of the memorandum, I may say that the statistics that we have on that subject cover a longer period than those relating to the numbers of paupers; information will be found extending as far back as the middle of the eighteenth century. Since the year 1857 the expenditure on poor law relief has been sub-divided, being shown under six principal sub-heads. At the present time, rather fuller details are given as to the total expenditure, though not as to the expenditure of individual boards of guardians. I must also mention some of the limitations in these statistics. The cost of providing and administering particular institutions is not dealt with in the annual returns upon which the statements have been based. There is some information on this subject in half-yearly returns which distinguish between the cost of in maintenance in establishments provided by the guardians, and the cost of maintenance in certain other establishments in which indoor paupers are maintained. For the convenience of the Commission a complete list has been prepared of all returns bearing on the subject of the memorandum, which have been presented to Parliament since the year 1834 (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II.; a few of these returns will be referred to in the memorandum.

Mr. T. Pitts, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

Mr. T. Pitts, C.B.
22 Jan. 1906.

1461. You have just stated that there is no calculation in your memorandum of the number of permanent paupers; is that information available?—I think not, and I think it would be very difficult to obtain it—at any rate, the Local Government Board have not got it.

1462. The cost of administering certain institutions is also omitted; is that information available?—No, it is not available, but we could get out information as to certain groups of institutions from the half-yearly returns. At present, the only information that has been published on this subject is that which I have mentioned.

Local Government Board's power to call for returns.

1463. Have the Local Government Board the power of asking for any returns that they may wish to demand from the local authorities?—They have practically power to call upon the clerks to the guardians to furnish any information relating to the business of the guardians that they may require.

1464. Their powers are not confined to obtaining certain specified returns, but they have, practically, the power of asking for any return they may wish, is that it?—I think so.

Variations in numbers of paupers since 1849.

1465. Can you give us some figures now, showing how the numbers of persons in receipt of Poor Law relief have varied during the period to which your tables relate?—Table No. 1 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B) gives for each year from 1849 (when the returns were first obtained) to 1905, the total number of paupers of all classes in England and Wales on the 1st January. It will be seen that the number on January 1, 1905, was 932,000. It had been as high as 1,142,000 in the year 1863; but that was an exceptional year on account of the distress in the cotton manufacturing districts; and I may say with regard to that year that the figures are not complete as they do not relate to the whole country. The returns then were not obtained from the whole country, as a certain part of the country had not been formed into unions under the Poor Law Amendment Act, and returns were not obtained from those places which were not unions formed under that Act.

1466. But was an estimate made for the districts which were not included on the average of the districts which were included?—Yes, but that estimate has not been used in the memorandum; the actual figures furnished in the returns received have been taken.

1467. So that it is less than the actual in that case?—Yes, it is.

1468. Do these figures include pauper lunatics?—Yes, they include paupers of all classes.

The lowest number in the table is that for the year 1877, when the number fell to 732,000. The actual lowest number that we have in any of the returns, is the number on the 1st July in the year 1876—that is six months earlier—when the number was 707,000. That figure is not given in the table; the table relates only to the numbers on the 1st January. There is also a half-yearly statement relating to the 1st July in each year, and according to that return the numbers are nearly always smaller than according to the return relating to the 1st January in each year.

Proportion of paupers to population.

I should not leave this subject perhaps without mentioning the proportion of paupers to population. In 1849 the number of paupers, which was 933,000, was in proportion to the population as 63 to 1,000, that is to say, 63 per 1,000 of the population were paupers according to the returns relating to the year 1849. In 1863, the year which I have already mentioned, and the year for which the figures were incomplete—a point which is not so important when one is taking the proportion to population because the population of the incomplete area is used—the proportion was 56·6 per 1,000 of population. The lowest proportion to population was reached in the year 1901 when it was 24·8 per 1,000. The number has not been above 30 per 1,000 since the year 1883, and on 1st January, 1905, it was 27·6 per 1,000. I have given the proportions based upon the numbers on the 1st January and the estimated population in each year. The tables in the annual reports of the Local Government Board containing similar figures, have been based upon what have been called mean numbers, that is to say, the average of the numbers on the two days in the year to which the returns relate, namely, the 1st January and the 1st July. We have not been able to have all those figures recalculated, but the difference is not very material in the case of those examples which I have given.

1469. (*Mr. Lock.*) Those figures for the 1st January and the 1st July which you published in your serial statements at the Local Government Board, are actual figures are they not?—Yes, they are; they give the numbers for each of those days, the 1st January and the 1st July. I was for the moment referring to the mean numbers in another table.

Explanation of "mean" number of paupers.

1470. (*Professor Smart.*) Would you explain what is the mean average number which you take?—The number on the 1st January and the number on the 1st July are added together and the total is divided by two. The mean number has been calculated in this way for many years.

Variation in figures during year 1904–5.

1471–2. (*Chairman.*) Can you show how the number of persons in receipt of relief varies in the course of a year?—That is shown by the Tables Nos. 4 to 7 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B), relating to the two years, 1904 and 1905. These figures, it will be observed, relate to the calendar year from January to December, and they exclude the insane in county and borough asylums and private asylums, and also the casual paupers. In 1904, taking the figures for England and Wales, the lowest number was 726,000 in July, and the highest 828,000 in December. The numbers varied by about 101,000 during the year, that is to say, the difference between the figures for July and December is about 101,000. Taking 1905 for England and Wales also, the lowest number was 749,000 in the middle of July, and the highest 823,000 at the end of January; the difference between the two numbers being 74,000. The numbers were above 800,000 in January, February, March and December, and they were between 749,000 and 800,000 during the remainder of the year. Averages might be worked out on these figures, but it has not been the practice to calculate such averages.

1473. (*Chairman.*) Are those fluctuations which you have brought to our notice abnormally large?—I think they were in the year 1904. I have not had the calculations made for previous years, but speaking without the figures, I should say that they were abnormally large in that year.

Paupers relieved in the course of a given period.

1474. Do you make any use of the returns as to the total number of persons relieved in the course of a year or half-year?—In answering that question I will first mention what returns of this nature have been obtained. There is some reference to the matter in the memorandum, but I will give the details now. There was a return relating to a whole year—the year ended Lady Day, 1892—a return obtained on the motion of the late Lord Ritchie, who was then President of the Local Government Board. That is the only one that I can find which related to a whole year. Then there was a return of the kind for the half-year ended Lady Day, 1881.

Mr. Ritchie's return.

Mr. Holland's return.

1475. (*Mr. Lock.*) Which return is that?—It was a returned obtained on the motion of Mr. Holland. There were also three or four returns for certain half-years from 1850 to 1857. There had been returns relating to quarters (the quarters in each case ending at Lady Day) for a period of eight or nine years preceding the year 1848. Practically, no use has been made of these returns in any recent statistics of the Local Government Board as to the number of paupers. The series relating to quarters of the year were only useful, if they were of any use at all, in showing how the rate of pauperism to population varied from year to year. They were the first returns obtained by the Poor Law Commissioners; they preceded the returns relating to two days in the year, to which I have already referred, and they were practically dropped in favour of those returns. The Commissioners said that these quarterly returns were of little value, except to the extent that I mentioned just now; for one reason they included vagrants, and consequently if a vagrant happened to walk from one workhouse to another every day, he would be counted perhaps 90 times in the quarter. Moreover, it was admitted that any person becoming chargeable more than once in

the quarter was probably counted as many times as he or she became chargeable; no attempt seems to have been made to exclude people who were entered more than once in the books.

Unreliability of quarterly returns.

1476. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Was the quarterly return based on an average?—No, I think the actual numbers were given in it. I have here a table (*see* remarks in paragraph 21 of memorandum) which shows that there was a total number giving in 1840 a rate of 77 per 1,000 of population; and in 1848 a rate of 108 per 1,000 of population. We find that on January 1st, 1849, when the first return for that day of the year was obtained, the proportion to the population of the number of paupers was 63 per 1,000, and that the proportion fell in the next year and in succeeding years, so, although the quarterly returns showed that pauperism was increasing, directly the half-yearly day returns were obtained, it was shown that pauperism was decreasing. I am afraid that the figures in those quarterly returns are of very little use.

1477. (*Mr. Loch.*) But the figures in the day returns are of use?—Certainly

Number of in-door paupers over series of years.

1478. (*Chairman.*) Will you give particulars with respect to the different classes of paupers; for instance, persons receiving in-door and persons receiving out-door relief, respectively?—Yes. The figures that I will now give are mean numbers, mean numbers being, as I explained just now, the average for two days in the year. In the year ended Lady Day, 1905, the mean number of in-door paupers (excluding lunatics in asylums) was 253,000; that is the highest number shown by the returns obtained since the year 1848–49.

1479. (*Mr. Loch.*) That, as I understand, excludes the insane but not the casuals?—It only excludes the insane in county and borough asylums and in private asylums.

In the year 1873–74, that is, the year ended Lady Day, 1874, that being a year in which the figures were complete, the number was 143,000. The number was about the same in the year 1875–76. These are the lowest figures that have been reached; since then, there has been an almost continuous rise. In 1871–72, the first year for which the figures are complete, the number was 149,000. In 1904–05 the mean number of out-door paupers, excluding casual paupers and the insane, was 542,000. In 1848–49, the first year for which these figures can be given, but for which, as I have before mentioned, the figures are incomplete, the number was 777,000. It was considerably higher in the year 1862–63 when, as I have already mentioned, there was distress in the cotton manufacturing districts of Lancashire and other counties. In 1900–01 the number of out-door paupers reached its lowest limit namely, 489,000. In the year 1871–72 the number was 791,000.

Number of out-door paupers over a series of years.

1480. (*Mr. Phelps.*) I do not think you gave the figure for 1862–63, what was it?—It was 871,000.

1481. (*Miss Hill.*) Is that the figure for the in-door poor or for the out-door poor?—It is for the out-door poor.

Proportion of in-door paupers to population.

Taking the proportion to population it appears that in 1904-05 the in-door paupers were 7·5 per 1,000 of population—about the same as the proportion of the same class in the year 1848–49 for which the figures are incomplete; but the proportion in that year is worked on the population of the area to which the figures related.

1482. (*Chairman.*) Then it is not an estimate?—I think it is not. The number given in the table is the actual number in the area to which the returns related; and that number, compared with the actual population of the same area, gives a proportion of 7·4 per 1,000, of population.

1483. (*Miss Hill.*) Then that last percentage does not relate to the whole of England and Wales?—Neither the total number nor the calculation on the population relates to the whole of England and Wales.

1484. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is it a very substantial part of England and Wales that was left out?—In 1849 it represented 16 per cent. of the population.

In 1858–59 the proportion of in-door paupers to population was 6·1 per 1,000.

Proportion of out-door paupers to population.

1485. (*Miss Hill.*) Does that figure relate to the whole of England and Wales?—No; the complete figures are not reached until 1872.

From 1882–83 to 1894–95 inclusive, the proportion varied from 6·4 to 6·9 per 1,000. In the case of the out-door paupers the proportion to population was highest in 1848–49, the first year, when it was 52·7 per 1,000.

1486. (*Chairman.*) That will be upon the same basis as the indoor figures for the year?—Yes, it is calculated on the mean number and the estimated population. In the four years from 1900–01 to 1903–04, the figures reached their lowest point, namely, 15·3 per 1,000 of population. The proportion to population of the out-door paupers has not been above 30 per 1,000 since 1872–73, and it has not been above 20 per 1,000 since 1886–87. I perhaps should mention that the figures which I have given include all members of the paupers' families; and that may possibly affect the comparisons slightly.

1487. Are you not sure whether the figures of earlier dates did include all the members of the family?—I think they did, but we do not know whether the proportion of children per family was the same in the earlier years as it is now.

1488. I do not think you gave us the figure of out-door relief for 1904–05?—The figure is 16·1 per 1,000: that is the proportion to the estimated population in England and Wales of the out-door paupers, excluding casual paupers and the insane.

1489. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I do not think I quite understand your answer about the proportion of children in the earlier tables?—I meant that the average number of children in a family might not have been the same then as now.

Dependants included in figures of pauperism.

1490. (*Mr. Booth.*) But the figures you have been able to give us are actual and not imaginary?—They are actual, that is to say, if a man who has only one child depending upon him seeks relief the entry in the returns is of the man and his child, counting two; and if a man with a wife and six children seeks relief then the returns show eight persons as receiving relief, namely, the man, his wife, and the six children. One case in the one instance counts eight and in the other it counts two.

1491. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Apparently the returns do not discriminate between the pauper who is head of the family, that is the father, and his dependants, who would be his wife and children?—As I shall explain presently, they have not done so until within the last few years

Able-bodied paupers.

1492. (*Chairman.*) The returns on which the tables are based distinguish the paupers classed as "able-bodied" from those who are not, I think?—That is so. The able-bodied as a class have been distinguished in the half-yearly returns since those returns were first started in the year 1848. On 1st January, 1905, the total number of able-bodied was 132,000, representing 3·9 per 1,000 of the population. This number was 20,000 larger than the number of the same class on the preceding 1st January. Taking the incomplete figures for 1st January, 1849 (that being the first year) the number was 199,000, representing 13·5 per 1,000 of population. This is the highest figure on record with the exception of that for the year 1863, when the number reached 253,000, representing a proportion of 12·4 per 1,000 of population, which it will be observed was lower than the proportion in the year 1849. The lowest number of this class of pauper on any 1st of January to which the returns relate was reached in 1877, when the proportion to population was 3·8 per 1,000. I have already mentioned when the proportion to population was highest, namely, in 1849; it was lowest in 1901 when it was 3·0 per 1,000 of the population. The proportion has not been above 4 per 1,000 on any 1st of January since the year 1882.

Meaning of able-bodied.

1493. (*Mr. Loch.*) By "able-bodied" do you mean able-bodied men with their wives and children?—No, the term "able-bodied" does not include children.

1494. Does it include the wife?—Yes. Some of the figures given in the returns include the wife, even when she is not herself "able-bodied."

1495. Then at present we are not dealing solely with males who are able-bodied?—No; I am about to tell you the number of men. On 1st January, 1905, the number which I have given included 51,000 men; on 1st January, 1849, the number of men was 65,000; in 1863 it was 82,000; and in 1877, when the lowest figure for any 1st of January was reached, it was 20,000. A table on page xix of the Return of Pauperism on 1st January, 1905,

Number of able-bodied men.

Mr. T. Pitts, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

shows how many of the able-bodied men relieved were relieved for causes other than their own sickness, accident or infirmity. It will be observed that the proportion of these on 1st January, 1905, was 9 per 1,000. According to the return to which I have just referred, the number of not able-bodied adults, exclusive of the insane, was 428,000 on 1st January, 1905. On that day the able-bodied adults, men and women, together formed 6 per 1,000 of the adult male and female population; and the not able-bodied adults, men and women, together formed 19·3 per 1,000 of the adult male and female population.

Proportion of able-bodied adults.

Definition of able-bodied.

1456. (*Chairman.*) Has the definition "able-bodied" during this period been the same, or has it been altered?—I think on that point I cannot do better than refer to what is said in the memorandum. In paragraph 43 it is stated that "The term 'able-bodied' has never, so far as can be ascertained, been officially defined in the Orders of the Poor Law Commissioners or the Poor Law Board or in the forms of the returns issued by them." Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (A) contains an extract from the twenty-second annual report of the Poor Law Board; and it is understood that in the preparation of the returns the clerks to the guardians have had regard to the observations in that report. There is no further information on the subject.

1497. Then you would take the returns made by the clerks to the Poor Law Guardians?—Certainly.

1498. Have you anything to make you believe that there is much difference in the interpretation or the application of the interpretation of "able-bodied" in the different unions?—Dealing only with the returns, I am afraid I cannot say.

1499. Nothing has come to your knowledge that would make you think that there is any considerable discrepancy in the different unions?—Officially, in connection with the returns I know of nothing of the kind.

1500. Now, I think you wish to deal with the children?—Yes.

Number of children.

1501. Are these the children of the able-bodied?—No, they are all the children; and "children" according to the returns are all persons under sixteen. On 1st January, 1905, there were 247,000 of these; that number was higher than on the corresponding day in any other recent year since 1894, when it was about the same. The number includes 59,000 classed as in-door paupers, and 188,000 classed as out-door paupers. These numbers, I should say, exclude insane and casual paupers. On 1st January, 1849, the total number, according to the incomplete returns, was 378,000, of whom 328,000 were receiving out-door relief. On 1st January 1902, the number was as low as 212,000, including 159,000 in receipt of out-door relief.

1502. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Where do the boarded-out children come in?—They are included under the head of out-door relief. There is a table on page xvii of the Parliamentary Return relating to 1st January, 1905, which gives information that I think may be of value with regard to the proportion of children to other paupers on 1st January in certain years from 1877 to 1905. It will be observed that the proportion has been falling. The Commission may also like to have particulars as to the distribution of the children in different establishments, and as to the numbers boarded out, and I will hand in statements giving those particulars. (*See* Tables Nos. 15 and 16 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).) I think there are some tables as to the education of the children showing the numbers in district schools and otherwise educated in earlier years, but they were not prepared in the department from which my figures have been supplied.

Proportion of children to other paupers

Fluctuations in number of children in the year.

1503. (*Chairman.*) You have pointed out to the Commission the fluctuations in the numbers of paupers in the year; are the fluctuations in the numbers of children similar?—We have no information on that. The weekly returns on which Tables Nos. 4–7 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B) have been prepared relate only to the two main classes of paupers—in-door and out-door paupers; and in them neither women nor children are distinguished.

1504. Assuming there were a considerable number of heads of families with children receiving out-door relief, then the children would form a proportion of the reduction shown in paupers?—Yes. I think that copies of the forms on which the weekly returns are obtained have been circulated to the members of the Commission. They do not provide for the number of children being shown except in the case of London.

Statistics to pau lunatics.

1505. Is any other principal class of paupers distinguished in the returns?—There are the insane in county and borough asylums and in private asylums; of these there were on 1st January, 1905, 83,000, which is the highest figure that has been reached. The numbers have continually grown from year to year. In the last twenty years this class has increased from 46,000 to the number that I just now gave. On 1st January, 1905, 18,000 insane were classed as in-door paupers, that is to say, they were either in workhouses or in the asylums of the Metropolitan Asylums Board. The number of lunatics so classed has only very slightly varied during the past thirty years, that is to say, the number in the county and borough asylums has continually grown, whilst the number retained in the institutions of the guardians has remained almost stationary. I should also mention the casual paupers, who are not a very numerous class. On 1st January, 1905, the number was 17,000 which was the highest number that has been reached. On 1st January, 1859, according to the incomplete returns, the number was 2,100; and on 1st July, 1853 (another incomplete return), the number was 1,300. This is the lowest number that we have on record.

Statistics to "casu paupers.

1506. (*Mr. Loch.*) Can the word "casual" be taken as equivalent to the word "vagrant"?—Yes.

1507. It is the modern equivalent for vagrant, is it?—I think it has always been the term used in the Regulations of the Department.

1508. In the earlier returns the word vagrant is used—Yes, but that did not agree with the official name.

1509. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Have you the return for July, 1905?—I have not one with me, but the return has been issued.

1510. Would the figure be greater in the summer?—I think the numbers are nearly always smaller in the summer.

Statistics to ages paupers.

1511. (*Chairman.*) Now, I think we come to the ages; will you state briefly the general result of the returns which you have obtained showing the ages of the persons who are in receipt of relief?—Generally the returns have not distinguished paupers of different ages except to the extent that I have already mentioned, that is that the children under sixteen have been separately shown. In recent years some returns as to the numbers of paupers over sixty or over sixty-five years of age have been obtained; and particulars of these will be found in one of the tables prepared for the Commission. The last return of the kind was return No. 113 of session 1904; that was a return presented to the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. Burt. It showed the numbers on the 1st September, 1903. On that date, according to this return, out of the total number of paupers over sixteen years of age, exclusive of paupers only constructively relieved, 58 per cent. were sixty-five years of age or upwards, and 69 per cent. were sixty years of age or upwards.

Mr. Burt's return.

1512. Is that taking in-door and out-door relief together?—Yes. A table printed with the return to which I have referred shows that, taking the five years to which the returns on this subject related, or rather the five days—for the returns relate to a particular day in each year—from 18 per cent. to 19 per cent. of the population of sixty-five years of age and upwards were paupers.

1513. You have not any figures of the same kind for an earlier date, have you, because it would be interesting to see whether the proportion of old paupers has increased?—The earliest return was obtained in the year 1890, and we have no figures of this kind for any previous year. There was a Parliamentary return in the year 1892—the late Lord Ritchie's return, to which I have already referred—and that related to the numbers who were sixty-five years of age and upwards. The proportion of those paupers to the total number of paupers of sixteen years of age and upwards according to that return was 56·9 per cent. That return related to 1st January, 1892, and it excluded casual paupers. I have already given the number for 1st September, 1903, which was 58 per cent. It must be borne in mind that the two returns relate to different periods of the year.

Mr. Ritch return.

1514. Would the figure be a higher one in January than in September?—I am not quite sure that it would be so, because most of the old people may be permanent paupers: at any rate the number is actually lower according to the returns, being 56·9 as against 58·0 per cent. There will be a table in the appendix to the memorandum giving some further details on this subject. (*See* Table No. 17 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).)

1515. Does that finish what you wish to say to us on that subject?—I think that is all I need say now, because there will be attached to the memorandum a table on the subject.

tribution pauperism ween ropolitan, an and al Unions

1516. You have now given us the figures relating to the whole country; I think you wish also to give us some separate statistics relating to London?—There will be tables relating to London separately. (*See* Tables Nos. 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).)

1517. You also propose, I think, to give particulars in a separate return as regards the urban unions outside London?—Yes, as regards a group of urban districts and a group of rural districts. (*See* Table No. 13 of Appendix Vol. I. (A). No. II. (B).)

1518. The urban unions outside London as to which you are going to give us particulars would be not merely those contiguous to London, but all outside London, I take it?—The grouping is this: We take all the London unions as one group; then as another group all the other unions in England and Wales that are wholly urban, that is to say, unions which have no part that forms a rural district, but consist entirely of urban districts; there are fifty-nine of those. Then there are 114 unions that are wholly rural, that is to say, no part of the union is included in an urban district. The figures that I have before me have been based upon those groups of unions.

1519. Is there not another group?—There is an intermediate one containing unions partly urban and partly rural.

1520. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) How many unions are there which are partly rural and partly urban?—There are 441. With regard to the particulars relating to London, I think I need hardly give the figures, as they will be set out in a table appended to the memorandum. (*See* Table No. 3 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).) I will merely give the proportions. During the past twelve years the proportion of paupers to population in London has been higher than it has been in the rest of the country. Previously to that period the proportion had always been lower in London than it was in the rest of the country except in the years from 1867 to 1871. There will be tables showing how the proportions of in-door to out-door paupers have differed in London and in England and Wales, in a series of years. (*See* Tables Nos. 10 and 13 of Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).)

centage of perism to ulation in ndon and of the ntry.

1521. (*Chairman.*) The figures that you propose to hand in are, I understand, averages of groups of Poor Law unions; can you tell us what is the highest and the lowest proportion of paupers to population in individual unions?—I have before me a statement which has been taken from the return relating to January 1st, 1902. (*See* Table No. 14 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).) The proportions were worked out for that year because the return was the first one issued after the publication of the results of the census of 1901. The percentage of pauperism to population in England and Wales was 2·5 on January 1st, 1902, and in London it was 2·8. There were several unions in which the percentage was 5 and upwards, and there were some in which it was over 6; on the other hand there were several below 2·5 per cent. I think these figures may be sufficient to show that the proportion varies largely in different unions.

1522. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Will those figures be given in the returns separately?—Yes.

1523. (*Chairman.*) Do you propose to hand those returns in?—Yes. (*See* Table No. 14 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).

1524 Are they classified according to the percentage?—Yes.

1525. Have you any general remarks to add with regard to the statistics respecting the number of paupers?—I think that for further details I had better refer to the return for January 1st, 1905, which contains figures on a number of matters that I have not mentioned. An index has been prepared to that return for the convenience of the Commission, and I believe it will be circulated with copies of the return. I hope to be able to let the Commission have a statement with regard to the number of paupers who have received medical relief; that will be prepared from some special returns that have been obtained from time to time. (*See* Table No. 19 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).)

Mr. T. Pitts, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906

Numbers in receipt of medical relief.

1526. In paragraph 27 of your memorandum you say it is estimated that 2,000,000 persons have received relief in the course of the year 1905; are you there including medical relief?—That estimate is not put forward with any confidence, but I can tell you how the figure was arried at.

Estimated numbers receiving relief during 1905.

1527. It is such a very big figure that I think it would interest the Commission to know how you have arrived at it?—The total number of paupers relieved on January 1, 1905, according to the Parliamentary return, was 932,000; from that we deduct the casual paupers and the lunatics in county and borough asylums and private asylums, and thus get the number 830,900. On January 1, 1892, the number of paupers, exclusive of casual paupers and lunatics, was 700,700. According to the return relating to the year ended Lady Day, 1892, the total number of persons relieved in that year was 1,573,000; the number of the same class of paupers on January 1, 1892, being 700,700 and the number on January 1, 1905, being 830,900, it is calculated that during the year ended Lady Day, 1905, the number relieved was 1,865,000. It has been assumed that the proportion to the number on one day was the same in 1904–5 as it was in 1891–92; but whether it was so or not I am unable to say. Then we add to the 1,865,000 the number of lunatics and casual paupers on January 1, 1905, which has already been deducted from the 932,000, and the result is a total number of 1,966,000. That, in the memorandum, is referred to as "something not far short of 2,000,000 persons."

1528. A large proportion of those would be paupers only in the sense of receiving medical relief?—Quite so.

1529. And they would not therefore be subject to disqualifications, assuming their names were on the register as voters?—That is so.

Returns as to number of persons receiving relief in a given period.

1530. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Are we to take it that the return for 1892 was a special return?—Yes, it was.

1531. And it gave the number of distinct and separate persons actually relieved during the course of the year?—Yes, this is during the year ended Lady Day, 1892.

1532. Are there many returns of that kind for other years?—There was one, as I mentioned just now, in 1881, which related to the half year. There has been only one such return relating to a whole year.

1533. Are there no returns made of the actual number of persons who have received relief during the course of a year?—No return of the kind has been obtained since that of 1892.

1534. (*Mr. Booth.*) Were those relieved medically out-doors included in the return?—There was no direction that they should be excluded.

1535. (*Mr. Loch.*) Then the presumption is that they are included?—Yes, except that we found, as mentioned in the memorandum, that some of the clerks to the guardians had excluded these medical relief cases from the weekly returns. I think it is more likely that all such cases were included in the special return for the year ended Lady Day, 1892.

1536. Taking the medical relief by itself, I think the difference comes to an item of about 200,000 persons as the number relieved in the period?—I have not the figures before me.

1537. (*Chairman.*) Assuming that your calculation is correct, then the number of persons in receipt of relief during the year largely exceeds the total number of persons returned as out-door and in-door paupers?—Yes. There are no doubt a number who receive relief for a short period, perhaps for a week only. We cannot distinguish the number who were in receipt of relief throughout the whole year from those who received relief during parts of the year.

Estimated numbers receiving relief during 1905.

Mr. T. Pitts, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

1538. What strikes me is the very large figure of 2,000,000. We have here the total number of paupers, which in 1905 comes to 932,000; the difference between that and the 2,000,000 I assume may consist of persons who have received medical relief and no other form of relief?—I am not prepared to say that.

1539. (*Mr. Bentham.*) A person who has been in receipt of relief, say in January, and is off the books in February, and is on again in March and off again the following month, may be on half a dozen times during the year?—Quite so.

1540. That person of course ought to count once only?—Yes.

1541. But if he were put down separately each time he would be counted six times?—Yes, but the instructions given to the clerks to the guardians when this return was prepared were that in such a case the same person should be counted only once. Whether that instruction was fully carried out by the clerks to the guardians is another matter. That was the instruction given to them, but we have some reason to think that it was not fully carried out in all cases.

1542. (*Chairman.*) That, I think, finishes your evidence as regards the statistics relating to the number of paupers; and now therefore we come to the statistics relating to the expenditure on the relief of the poor. Would you state the total cost according to the latest returns, and show how it compares with the total cost in previous years?—The total expenditure in the year 1903-04 (being the latest year for which the figures can be given) was £13,369,000. That is the highest figure that has been reached. There has been a continuous rise each year since 1888-89, when the amount was £8,366,000. From 1879-80 to 1889-90 the expenditure varied from £8,000,000 to £8,500,000 per annum. It was £8,000,000 in the first of these years, 1879-80. In 1871-72 the amount was £8,000,000; and in all other years from 1867-68 to 1878-79 the amount varied from £7,300,000 to rather less than £7,900,000 a year. From 1842-43 to 1866-67 the annual expenditure ranged from £4,900,000 to £6,900,000, the highest figure being in the last mentioned year. The increase in the year 1903-4 as compared with the other years that I have mentioned was greater than the figures I have given would indicate, because the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board on fever and small-pox hospitals is included in the figures for the years from 1870-71 to 1899-1900 inclusive, while it has been excluded from the figures for later years. Besides, it is possible that the figures given for the years preceding 1882-83 include a certain amount of expenditure out of loans; all such expenditure has been expressly excluded since 1882-83 from the figures I have given you. I may say that the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board on the fever and small-pox hospitals in the year 1900-01 was estimated to be £570,600; the exclusion of these figures has made a material difference in the comparisons between that year 1900-01 and earlier years. (*See* Table No. 1 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).

Variations in expenditure between 1842-3 and 1903-4.

1543. Since what year did you say the loans were excluded altogether?—Since 1882-83.

1544. The first date you gave us was, I think, 1888-89? The first you mentioned was 1903-04, 1888-89, was the next.—There have been other breaks in the continuity of these figures, and where those breaks have occurred spaces will be left in the printed tables so as to draw attention to the fact that the figures for the last year before the space are not strictly comparable with the figures for the first year after the space.

Expenditure classified.

1545. Now will you classify this expenditure?—Since the year 1856-57 the expenditure on the relief of the poor has been classified under six principal headings, and all the published returns since that period have so separated the expenditure. These headings are, firstly, in-maintenance, which I may say is not the same thing as in-door relief; in-maintenance represents only a small part of the cost of in-door relief. The second principal sub-heading is out-relief; the third, maintenance of lunatics in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals and licensed houses; the fourth, salaries and superannuation allowances of union officers; the fifth, principal of loans repaid and interest on loans; and the sixth, other expenses of, or immediately connected with, relief. In 1903-04, the last year for which we have received all the figures, the amount under the first head, in-maintenance, was £3,050,000; under the second head, out-relief £2,990,000; under the third head, maintenance of lunatics in county and borough asylums and private asylums £2,286,000; under the fourth head, salaries and pensions, £2,358,000; under the fifth head, loan charges, £1,098,000; and under the sixth and final head, other expenses £1,580,000. (*See* Tables Nos. 2 and 5 of Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

Expenditure on in-door and out-door relief.

1546. Can you show the Commission how the expenditure on in-door relief has been ascertained?—I have just mentioned that the classification according to the returns has been between in-maintenance and out-relief, and not between in-door relief and out-relief. The cost of in-door relief cannot be given for years before 1899-1900; since then the clerks to the guardians, in furnishing the returns, have been required to give particulars from which the amount actually charged to in-door relief and out-relief, respectively, may as far as possible be obtained. We find that in 1903-4 the cost of in-door relief was £6,900,000, being 52 per cent. of the whole expenditure, on the relief of the poor and that the expenditure on out-relief was £3,500,000, being 26 per cent. of the whole expenditure. The relief of the insane in county and borough asylums and private asylums accounted for another 17 per cent. The remainder unaccounted for, which probably consists largely of establishment charges which cannot be apportioned between the in-door and out relief and cost of the insane, is under 5 per cent. (*See* Table No. 6 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

1547. (*Miss Hill.*) Where do the loans come in?—The loan charges are distributed, those for in-door relief being apportioned to in-door relief. They are mostly for in-door relief, a very small proportion being for out relief.

1548. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Does the last item, the 5 per cent., include salaries?—The salaries are distributed as far as possible, but I think the salary of the clerk to the guardians would be in the last item, because he is not an out-relief officer nor an in-door relief officer exclusively. The salaries of the relieving officers would be out-relief expenditure and the salaries of the masters of workhouses in-door relief expenditure.

1549. (*Mr. Loch.*) The practical result of it is to distribute your columns 4, 5 and 6 in your statement, the statement referred to being that in the Annual Report of the Local Government Board of the principal items over columns 1 and 2?—That is so.

1550. (*Chairman.*) Does that finish what you have to say about classification?—That is all I think I need say as to in-door and out-relief expenditure. I proposed to say something as to the growth of expenditure on in-maintenance and other items.

Fluctuation in expenditure on out-relief.

1551. Perhaps you will give us some information as to that?—I will deal first with out-relief, because that is an item in which there has been a decrease in the expenditure. In the year 1841-42 the expenditure on this item was £3,090,000; in 1856-57, that being the first year in which the classification under six principal headings was adopted, the amount was £3,152,000. (*See* Table No. 2 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

1552. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Does that include the cost of the children boarded out?—I do not think there were any such in those days.

1553. Does any figure of total out-door relief expenditure include the cost of the children boarded out?—The figures I gave just now for 1903-04 include the cost of the boarded-out children, but I do not know that there were any boarded-out children in 1841 or in 1856.

In 1868-69 the highest point was reached in the expenditure on out-relief. In that year it was £3,677,000. From 1856-57 until 1874-75 the expenditure on out-relief only fell below £3,000,000 (and then only slightly) in the years 1858-59 and 1859-60; in 1892-93 it fell to £2,370,000, but in 1903-04 (I have already given you the figure), the amount was £620,000 more than it was in 1892-93. (*See* Table No. 2 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

Increased cost of in-maintenance.

1554. (*Chairman.*) What have you to tell us about the expenditure under the other sub-heads?—The expenditure under each of the other five sub-heads has increased largely in the period from 1856-57 to 1903-4, the item of in-maintenance showing the largest increase. The increase in that item during the whole period amounts to £1,962,000. At the beginning of the period it was £1,088,000, and up to 1890-91 the total did not reach £2,000,000; there was an

increase of £863,000 in thirty-four years. In the last thirteen years the increase has amounted to £1,100,000, or an average of £84,000 a year. (*See* Table No. 2 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

inition of nainten-e.

1555. Would you give as a definition of in-maintenance ?—I will quote the definition as given in the last annual report of the local government board :—" 'In-maintenance' comprises all the expenses incurred by boards of guardians, by the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District and of other asylum and school districts, and by Poor Law joint committees, in and about the maintenance, treatment and relief of paupers in workhouses and other Poor Law institutions, exclusive of the cost of buildings and repairs thereto, and furniture, and the salaries or other remuneration, rations and superannuation allowances of officers and servants, but inclusive of charges for apprentice fees, outfits, burials, and the necessary expenses incurred in warming, cleansing and lighting the institutions, and otherwise keeping them fit for daily use. The cost of maintenance of the casual paupers in casual wards is also included under this head." That definition will be set out in the memorandum which is being printed. (*See* paragraph 92 of Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II.)

1556. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Would that include the cost of infirmaries ?—Certainly ; it includes the cost in all Poor Law institutions.

reased of main-ance of atics in lums.

1557. (*Chairman.*) And it is on this series of charges that there has been this annual increase of £84,000 during the last thirteen years ?—Yes. I will now go on to give some figures with regard to the maintenance of lunatics in county and borough asylums and private asylums. There has been a very large increase in this item also, but that has been accompanied by a large increase in the number of lunatics. Since 1856–57 the increase has been £1,900,000. In that year the total expenditure was only £377,000, the average increase during that period being over £40,000 a year. During the past thirteen years the total increase has been rather over a million pounds, being at the rate of £77,000 a year. That increase is not wholly accounted for by the increase in the number of lunatics. (*See* Table No. 2 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B).) The expenditure per lunatic in the year 1889–90 was £23 11s, and in the year 1904–5 it was £27 17s. Since 1860 the cost has increased 456 per cent. and the number has increased 383 per cent.

1558. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) May I ask whether the increase in lunatics is spread over the whole country or whether it is confined to certain districts ?—I should not like to answer that question without further investigation.

1559. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is not the increase partly a change from their having been treated in workhouses ? Are there not a certain number of lunatics who have always been taken care of, not in separate asylums, whereas this return, I take it, refers to separate asylums ?—The figures that I have given relate only to the cost of maintaining the lunatics in asylums.

1560. Therefore the increase in the numbers is not entirely due to increase of lunacy, but is partly due to their being dealt with in a different way ?—I think not. As I said in replying to a previous question, the number of lunatics in workhouses has scarcely varied during the period to which these figures relate.

natics in-ded in fig-s as to ss pauper-

1561. (*Mr. Loch.*) When we take the gross numbers of paupers do we not include really a very large number who are outside the workhouses and who very much affect our totals—this large increase of lunatics for instance ?—Yes, the total number of paupers on the 1st January, 1905, includes 83,800 lunatics in asylums.

1562. All those that you were mentioning just now ?—Quite so ; and in 1860 the number was 17,000.

1563. And that is an enormous factor in the gross total of pauperism ?—It is a considerable factor. We endeavour as far as possible to distinguish the number of these lunatics from all other classes of paupers. Formerly they were grouped with out-door paupers, but during the last few years the Local Government Board have discontinued that grouping, which was rather misleading. I have now to deal with the salaries. The increase in salaries since 1856-57 amounts to £1,721,000, the total being in the first year £637,000, and that having grown to the figure I gave before, namely, £2,358,000. (*See* Table No. 2 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

reased of aries.

ct of erannua-Act.

1564. That is largely due to the Superannuation Act, is it not, because the superannuation is under the salaries column ?—The salaries column includes superannuation, but I am not sure which Superannuation Act you mean.

1565. I mean the Act of 1896 ?—If you will put a question to me on that point afterwards I shall be better prepared for it ; I must have the figures analysed. The greater part of this increase has taken place since 1888–89. In the fifteen years since that period it has grown to just under £1,000,000, showing an average of £66,000 a year. The Loan Charges (item No. 5) have increased since the same date, 1856–57, by £881,000. They were £217,000 in the first year, and the average increase per year has been £19,000. During the last fifteen years the increase has been over half a million, and the average has been £34,000 per year. (*See* Table No. 2 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

Increased cost of loan charges.

1566. (*Chairman.*) Now can you give us some information as to the average cost of relieving each pauper, taking the total expenditure first ?—Taking the year 1904, that is to say, the year ended at Lady Day in that year, the cost per pauper in England and Wales calculated on the mean number of paupers of all classes and the total expenditure on relief, was £15. 19s. 2d. I am quoting from a table on page xcix. of the last Annual Report of the Local Government Board which gives corresponding figures for 1870–71, 1880–81, and each year since the year 1890–91. The table shows that there has been practically a continuous rise in the cost per pauper. I can give figures for some earlier years. In 1849 the cost per pauper seems to have been £5 6s. 5d. ; in 1859 it was £6 8s. 6d. ; and in 1869 it was £7 10s. 9d. Taking England and Wales exclusive of London, the cost per pauper in the latest year was £13 11s 10d. Corresponding figures for 1870–71, 1880–81, and each year from 1890–91 are given on page 101 of the last Annual Report of the Local Government Board. I have also been furnished with figures showing the cost of the total expenditure on relief per head of population, and it may be convenient that I should add some information on this subject in answering the present question. In 1903–4 the cost was 8s. per head of population, and in 1833–34 the corresponding cost seems to have been 8s. 9d. In 1893–94 the amount was 6s. 6d. (*See* Table No. 4 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. III.) That is, perhaps, all I need say as to the total expenditure.

Average cost per pauper in London and in the country.

1567. Now can you give us the result if you apply a similar calculation to the expenditure on in-maintenance ?—In regard to in-maintenance the calculation is based on the number of in-door paupers. In 1903–04 the cost per head of in-door pauperism was £12 13s. 3d.

Average cost of in-maintenance per pauper.

1568. (*Miss Hill.*) Do those figures include salaries ?—No, they are for in-maintenance only. In 1848–49 the cost per head was £7 17s. 8d. and in 1878–79 it had risen to £10 6s. 3d. There was a fall in 1888–89 when the cost per head was £9 13s. 1d., but in 1898–99 the cost per head rose again, and was then £11 1s. 0d. I should have said that the figures which I have given as to in-maintenance relate to England and Wales as a whole. (*See* Table No. 8 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

1569. (*Mr. Booth.*) Are these figures irrespective of the time that the paupers remained in the House, or are they per head per annum ?—It is merely the total expenditure of the year divided by the mean number of paupers in the year.

1570. (*Mr. Patten-Dougall.*) Irrespective of whether they may have been there more than once or not ?—Quite so. The mean number is arrived at by adding together the numbers on 1st January and the 1st July and dividing the total by two. It is a rough average of the number in receipt of relief on each day during the year.

1571. (*Chairman.*) Now will you apply the same test to out-door relief ?—Taking the figures for England and Wales in 1903–04, the cost per head of out-door pauperism was £5 16s. 0d. Between 1849 and 1899 the cost per head varied from £3 11s. 2d. to £5 1s. 10d., with an upward tendency, the £5 1s. 10d. being in the year 1898–99. (*See* Table No. 8 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

Average cost per outdoor pauper.

1572. Is the average cost greater in London than in the rest of the country, and greater in urban unions outside London then in rural unions ?—Generally the cost is higher in both cases. In London in the year 1903-04 the cost per pauper calculated on the mean number of paupers of all classes, and the total expenditure on

Average cost per pauper in London and elsewhere.

Mr. T. Pitts, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

relief was £28 16s. 1d. (*See* Table No. 8 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).)

1573. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is that on in-door and out-relief both?—It is on all relief. It compares with £13 11s. 10d. in the rest of England and Wales. I will not give the figures for earlier years, as they will be found in the table which is to be circulated, but I may say that during the whole period from 1871 the cost in London has been greater than it has been in the rest of the country (*See* Table No. 8 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C).) Comparing the extra-metropolitan wholly urban unions, of which there are 59, with the wholly rural unions, of which there are 114, it appears that in the wholly urban unions the cost per head, taking all classes of paupers and the total expenditure on relief, was £15 14s. 7d.; and in the wholly rural unions the corresponding average was £12 10s. 2d. These figures relate to the year 1903–04. In connection with these figures it must be borne in mind that the ratio of paupers to population is not the same in the two sets of areas. In the wholly urban unions the proportion of paupers to estimated population in 1903–04 was 22·4 per 1,000, and in the wholly rural unions the corresponding proportion was 31·5. The table which is to be circulated will show the proportion of paupers to population in London (*See* Table No. 3 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (B) to memorandum.)

Loan expenditure.

1574. (*Chairman.*) You have given particulars as to the amounts paid for interest on loans and the repayment of principal; will you now state briefly what has been the expenditure out of borrowed money?—In 1903–04 the total expenditure on the relief of the poor out of borrowed money in England and Wales was £1,281,447. There is a table in the last annual report of the Local Government Board giving the corresponding figure for each year since 1894–95. I have a table going back to the year 1884–5; in that year the total expenditure out of loans in England and Wales was £553,800. The figures for London and the rest of England are shown separately in the table which is now being printed. (*See* Table No. 4 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C) to memorandum.)

Increase in outstanding loans.

1575. Has the unpaid balance of loans increased largely in recent years?—The total outstanding balance at Lady Day, 1904, was £12,700,000. That is a large increase upon the outstanding balance on Lady Day, 1895, when the amount was £6,900,000. In 1885 the amount was £6,360,000 and in 1870 it was £1,780,000. I might add that this bears a very small proportion to the total debt of the local authorities in England and Wales. (*See* Table No. 4 in Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. II. (C) to memorandum.)

1576. The rate of repayment remains the same during the whole of the period with which we are dealing, does it not?—I think so.

1577. Therefore the outstanding balance is merely the result of increased borrowing?—Yes.

Extension of guardians' borrowing powers.

1578. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Was there not an extension of power given to boards of guardians to borrow?—Yes; I think some of the recent loans may have been sanctioned for longer periods than the older ones. There is that to be borne in mind.

1579. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) May I ask whether the bulk of that money was borrowed from the Public Works Loans Commissioners or from private lenders?—I have no information on that point.

1580. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I thought the tendency of the last few years was for shorter loans and not for longer loans?—I have nothing to do with that part of the work of the Local Government Board.

1581. I was referring to an answer which you have just given to a question by Sir Samuel Provis?—The law has been altered so as to enable money to be borrowed for longer periods, but how far the periods have been actually altered I cannot say.

1582. (*Chairman.*) Do you wish to make any general statement respecting the statistics as regards expenditure?—I may mention what no doubt will have been remarked, that nothing has been said about the funds from which the guardians defray this expenditure.

Cost of lunatic asylums.

1583. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You mean the receipts?—Yes, the receipts of the guardians and the sources from which they are derived. There will be a separate memorandum on that part of the subject. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. III.) I have also said nothing about the cost of lunatic asylums. These asylums are very largely used for the accommodation of pauper lunatics, but they are not provided by the Poor Law authorities, and consequently the cost of building the asylums does not appear in the returns of the expenditure of the Poor Law authorities. I have not the figures before me, but I hope that the memorandum when it is finally circulated will show how much the county and borough authorities spend on the asylums in which the pauper lunatics are maintained. I do not think I need add anything more; there will be a great deal more in the memorandum when it is finally circulated.

1584. (*Chairman.*) You will put in all those memoranda to which you have alluded to-day?—Yes, the tables will be added to the memorandum; many of them, I think, are being printed at the present time.

Proportion "permanent" paupers.

1585. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) You say there is no information at the Local Government Board to enable you to form an opinion as to the proportion of paupers who are a permanent charge on the rates as compared with those who are not a permanent charge on the rates?—I am not aware of any; there certainly is not any in the department by which these statements have been prepared.

1586. It may be important for the purposes of our inquiry that we should get that information. Would it be very inaccurate if, as representing more or less the permanent or chronic pauperism, we took the aged and infirm classes and the imbecile and idiots in workhouses?—I think very likely the paupers over sixty-five years of age are mainly in the chronic class, and naturally the imbeciles and idiots would be; but I am afraid I have no figures upon which I can base any reliable estimate of the kind desired.

1587. Dealing with those classes which may be regarded as more or less permanent, do you think it would be possible for us to get through the clerks of the unions information, classified under certain heads, as to the previous occupations of those persons and as to the causes of their pauperism?—I should not like to undertake to promise that such a return should be obtained by the Department. I think the better course with regard to any proposed returns would be that the Commission should consider whether it is worth while to ask the Local Government Board to assist in obtaining statistics and then to address the Board on the matter.

Possibility of obtaining returns as to "permanent" paupers.

1588. I suppose that the officials of the local authorities would resent being asked to furnish voluminous returns?—I am sure they would.

1589. But still, as it is a very important point on a question of national importance, I presume they would strain a point to give what information we might ask for?—Yes, but my difficulty is that if I commence to promise returns I shall find that the department will have on its hands very much more than it can undertake. If the Commission will consider what further information it would like, after the tables that are being put in have been considered, and let the Local Government Board know, then I have no doubt that the question of obtaining further returns would be carefully gone into.

Basis of statistics as to children.

1590. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Referring to your statement with regard to the number of children relieved, do the figures include the children who are relieved under the head of their parents' relief and who are relieved with their parents? I presume the figures do not necessarily relate only to children such as orphans who are relieved independently of the parents?—The total figures that I gave you include all children. You will find the classification of them in the Parliamentary Return relating to the 1st January.

1591. That is to say, if a man is relieved who has a wife and five children, all the five children would come into the figures of children relieved?—Yes, but there is an exception which is explained in the memorandum. If one child in a family is taken ill and the parent receives relief on account of that child only, one child only is counted with the parent as a pauper and the rest of the children are not counted.

Orphan and deserted children.

1592. Then children are not necessarily a separate class in any sense?—No, except the orphan and deserted children.

1593. Are there any figures with regard to those?—You will find those mentioned separately, either in the ordinary returns or in the special tables that have been prepared.

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., called; and Examined.

1594. (*Chairman.*) Will you kindly state to the Commission your present post at the Local Government Board, and your past experience?—I have been a general inspector of the Board for about thirty years; I am now an assistant secretary and the chief general inspector.

Scope of evidence.

1595. As you are aware, Mr. Adrian, on behalf of the Local Government Board, gave us exhaustive evidence as to the legal side of the question which we are appointed to investigate; you, I understand, are prepared to give evidence as to the administrative side, but the evidence that you will give, I believe, will necessarily be voluminous, so perhaps you will state to the Commission how you propose to divide your evidence?—I propose in the first instance to describe from the administrative point of view the position of the central authority and the constitution and position of the local authorities; then, to deal with the question of in-door relief and the question of out-door relief; then to make some general observations as to the growth of expenditure and the present position of the Poor Law administration of the country; then to say something about children and about London. Lunatics will be dealt with on the question of indoor relief.

Functions of Local Government Board.

1596. Going, then, to the central authority, will you describe briefly the Poor Law functions of the Local Government Board?—They consist in the general supervision of the proceedings of the local Poor Law authorities, as, for instance, the sanctioning of plans for workhouse buildings, the sanctioning of loans for buildings and other poor law purposes; the systematic inspection of workhouses and other Poor Law establishments; the issue of regulations and orders as to the administration of boards of guardians, and in some instances the sanctioning of departures from those regulations; the issuing of the circulars to guardians informing them of changes in the law and other matters, and occasionally embodying recommendations. Then there is the audit of poor law accounts; the decision of appeals against surcharges, and the administration of the Local Authorities Expenses Act; the protection of union and parish property; and many other matters which are set out in detail in the office circulars.

Number of Poor Law letters received by Local Government Board.

1597. The discharge of these duties necessitates a very large correspondence, I presume?—During the year 1905 the two departments of the Board for which I am more directly responsible received 30,700 communications; and besides that, there were a great many other communications on legal points, on points of audit appeal, and on statistical points which are not counted in that enumeration.

Duties of General Inspectors.

1598. The Local Government Board, as we know, are assisted by an outside staff; perhaps you would state shortly who are the chief of those officials?—The country is divided for the purposes of Local Government inspection into fourteen districts, and to each of those districts is assigned an officer who is called a general inspector. Their duties are, generally speaking, to attend a meeting of every board of guardians in their district at least once a year; to inspect and report upon workhouses and all other Poor Law institutions, such as certified homes, infirmaries and schools; to advise as to any communication bearing on the current Poor Law work which may be received from their district, that is to say, a paper bearing on a Poor Law point in any inspector's district is as a rule referred to him for his advice and opinion; to hold enquiries as to the conduct of officers, parish property, and so on; and generally to act as agents of the Board. Under the statute our inspectors have the power to hold enquiries on oath, to administer the oath, and to ensure the production of any documents relating to any Poor Law questions. Their duty also is to give information to guardians in their own districts by statistical and other annual returns. I have some specimens with me of the documents the inspectors sent round. They also have to write an annual report.

1599. May we assume that the inspectors have power to counsel and even to override a board of guardians if they find that they are doing something which, in their judgment, is contrary to their instructions or is contrary to law?—It is their duty to advise a board of guardians, and they are allowed to take part in any debates of a board of guardians, but they are not to vote and they have no actual executive power beyond that which follows from the fact that they can administer an oath. I mean to say, they cannot order relief to anybody or take any administrative action except through the board of guardians.

1600. I used perhaps the wrong word in saying "override;" I assume that they have no power to veto any proceedings of a board of guardians?—They have none.

1601. But they can report to the Local Government Board?—Yes.

The model inspector.

1602. And that I take it would be the outside of their powers. Do you wish to add anything more about it?—I should like to say that an efficient inspector should be looked upon by the guardians as their confidential adviser and friend. He should so direct his conduct that they should turn to him in case of any emergency, and if he does that he is able as a matter of fact to settle a great many questions on his own initiative without troubling the board. My view of the best inspector is that he is the man who represents the views of the local authorities at Whitehall as much as he does the views of the Whitehall authorities in his district.

Relations between inspectors and guardians.

1603. Speaking generally, are the relations of the inspectors with the boards of guardians friendly?—To myself personally they have always been most friendly. It is only recently that I have been in a position to see what the other inspectors actually were doing, and I may say, generally speaking, that all over the country the position of the general inspectors in regard to the boards of guardians is most satisfactory.

Assistant inspectors.

1604. If you have nothing more to say about the general inspectors, perhaps you will inform us whom they are assisted by; are there not officers called assistant inspectors?—There are two assistant inspectors in London and one in Lancashire. There is also a lady inspector for London for the inspection of certain Poor Law institutions.

Lady inspectors.

1605. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is she the only lady on the staff?—There are three lady inspectors who inspect children boarded-out outside the union.

Poor Law medical inspectors.

1606. (*Chairman.*) Are the lady inspectors' duties specific, that is are they confined to a particular purpose?—The duties of those three inspectors are confined to inspecting boarded-out children. There are also two medical inspectors for Poor Law purposes, one of whom, Dr. Downes, is attached to the metropolis; he also advises generally on Poor Law questions. The other medical inspector, Dr. Fuller, has to inspect workhouses and to attend meetings of boards of guardians on medical points when the board think it desirable; he also has to inspect six workhouses in each inspector's district every year. I should like to say that the medical inspectors are of the greatest assistance to the general inspectors, and that the arrangement which has now prevailed for some years works with perfect smoothness; I think my colleagues who may be called to give evidence before you will agree with me, at all events in that. I will hand in the instructions to the medical inspectors.*

Instructions to general inspectors.

1607. Are there any instructions to the general inspectors that you wish to hand in?—The general inspectors of recent years have had no general instructions. I should like to say that they have seldom met for conference, and that their communications, apart from their current work, with the central authority have been somewhat rare. There is a good deal to be said for that method of working the system, although I myself do not approve of it, and am doing something to bring the inspectors more into line with one another. What I should like to point out to the Commission is this: they have fourteen men all over the country in the closest touch with the current Poor Law administration, who have no common instructions, who are men of all sorts and conditions, varying in the age at which they join and their previous business in every possible way, and who have no common understanding as to what evidence they shall give. I submit that possibly the evidence of some of them at least will be useful to this Commission.

* Printed as part of Dr. Fuller's Statement of Evidence. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXI (B.)

J.S.Davy, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

and that if they are in substantial agreement on any particular points there are fair grounds for believing that their evidence is correct.

Qualifications of inspectors.

1608. You state that the inspectors are taken from different classes of society and have had different experience; I understand there is no special qualification which they have to pass before they can be appointed and that they are appointed by the President of the Local Government Board?—That is so.

1609. I gather from what you say that a good many of them, previous to their appointment, had not necessarily been experienced in Poor Law administration, that is to say, they have occasionally been in rather a different branch of life?—Most of them have had different occupations not connected with the Poor Law Some of them have been chairmen of boards of guardians and some of them have known of Poor Law administration in other ways; but at all events there is no written qualification.

1610. Therefore, in your opinion, as they are taken from different classes of life, and their experience varies, their evidence on that account would be all the more valuable?—So it occurred to me.

Age limit for inspectors.

1611. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Is there an age limit in the appointment of inspectors?—No.

1612. (*Chairman.*) Neither as regards the period at which they can be appointed or at which they retire?—There is a limit as to the age at which they retire; there is the age limit which is common to the whole Civil Service.

1613. Then they are, I suppose, on the tenure of the ordinary Civil Servant?—Yes.

Auditors.

1614. If you have said all you have to say as regards inspectors, the next portion of the staff we come to is that of the auditors, is it not?—Yes. There are sixty auditors who are also local officers, that is to say, they each have their own district. Where my department comes across them is in the question of the remission of certain surcharges on Poor Law matters. They audit the accounts of all local authorities, such as county and district councils and so on.

Instructions to auditors.

1615. I suppose the auditors have a definite and uniform set of instructions as to what they shall pass or not?—They are much more under instruction than the general inspectors are, but they judge independently of the legality of items in the accounts.

1616. (*Mr. Booth.*) Have they separate instructions for Poor Law work other than what may be called work outside the Poor Law?—I think not. I think their duty is to inspect the accounts, and in the matter of surcharge to use their judgment as to what is legal and what is not legal, what is reasonable and what is not reasonable.

1617. (*Mrs. Webb.*) There is sometimes an instructional letter sent to them, is there not?—Yes, and sometimes an instructional letter is sent to the General Inspector, but not of recent years. Such a letter would refer mostly to one particular point.

Inspectors and auditors debarred from outside work.

1618. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Have they to give up their whole time to the work of the Local Government Board?—Yes, both inspectors and auditors.

1619. Are the auditors in the position of Civil Servants, too?—Yes.

1620 Have they to go at sixty-five?—Yes.

1621. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Between what ages are they appointed?—There is no definite instruction on that.

Efficiency of audit.

1622. (*Chairman.*) Is their work effectively done, do you think; can you speak from any experience?—Yes; I can fairly say it is. In some ways it is admirably done. But they are not exactly in my department, and I only see some of their work; all I see of the auditors' work is the remission of certain Poor Law surcharges.

Vagrant inspectors in London.

1623. Then there are certain inspectors appointed in connection with the vagrant wards, I think?—Yes.

1624. Can you describe what their duties are?—We have a small staff of officers who inspect the metropolitan vagrant wards mainly for the purpose of identifying the vagrants.

1625. Are they appointed by the Local Government Board?—Yes.

1626. (*Mr. Loch.*) That holds simply for the metropolitan area?—Yes.

1627. (*Mr. Nunn.*) How many are there of them?—I think there are four. All London is treated as one vagrant ward for the purposes of detention. The law as to vagrants says that if a vagrant presents himself more than once in a month at a ward for relief he is subject to greater detention, and as all London, which has twenty-eight vagrant wards, is one union for that purpose, these officers go round to identify the vagrants who apply more often than once a month for relief. It is a comparatively small matter.

Architect's Department

1628. (*Chairman.*) Then I understand there is an architect's department at the Local Government Board?—There is an architect's department attached to the Local Government Board whose poor law duties—they have other duties—are to pass plans which are submitted for Poor Law buildings.

Functions of architect.

1629. Have all buildings of any size in connection with the Poor Law to be submitted to the architect?—All plans have to be submitted to the architect which involve a structural alteration, and all plans for which a loan is asked.

1630. Do the architect's duties go beyond passing such structural alterations or enlargements as he considers necessary?—They have to advise my department as to the reasonableness of the cost and as to the length of the loan which should be allowed for buildings for which a loan is raised.

1631. By reasonableness of cost, I suppose you mean the amount of expenditure on a building per head of those whom it is proposed to accommodate?—Something like that.

1632. Is there any rule at the Local Government Board to guide the architect in coming to a decision on this point?—No, he must be guided by the facts in each case. The question of the cost of Poor Law buildings is one of great difficulty which, with the permission of the Commission, I should like to dwell on for a short time.

Cost of poor law buildings.

1633. Certainly?—First it is often alleged that the expenditure on workhouses is very extravagant. There are two points about that. It is rather an old question to begin with. In the year 1870, when Mr. Goschen was President of the Local Government Board, he wrote (this is in the Annual Report): "The extreme parsimony developed by some Boards of Guardians has given way to a desire to conduct all the duties which devolve upon guardians on somewhat more than a liberal scale. The Board are compelled to check expenditure in the more ornamental parts of workhouses, as for instance granite columns, terra-cotta mouldings, encaustic tile pavements, Portland stone decorations, and so on." That difficulty has been felt ever since, sometimes in a very acute form; and some years ago, when Mr. Chaplin was President of the Board, there was a memorandum as to the cost of Poor Law buildings, in which he says he has observed "with much concern the large and continuing increase in the cost of buildings erected in connection with Poor Law administration"; and exhorts the officers of the Board to check that excessive expenditure as far as they can. My experience in my present post has not been very long, but I can honestly say that we do make every effort to check the expenditure, though the results are, I think, a little startling. For instance I have here a list of workhouses, cottage homes and infirmaries, and their cost. The maximum cost given for a Poor Law infirmary here was a case at Hendon, where for a building with 331 beds an expenditure of £377 per bed was incurred. You will understand that that would not be altogether for the infirmary, but would include administrative blocks, receiving wards, and so on.

1634. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Were there any administration buildings in that?—There would be the receiving and a nurses' home, and I suppose there would be an administration block there, but I do not know. Then you have a case at West Ham where a steward's house and nurses' home and infirmary of 672 beds cost at the rate of £372

per bed. Then you have Willesden with a cost of £346 per bed, and Islington with a cost of £325 10s. per bed. You will notice that all those infirmaries are in the neighbourhood of London, but there are none that I have given in London itself except Islington, and I think there are none except Islington that are subject to the requirements of the Metropolitan Buildings Act, which our architect would tell you, if you called him, materially increases the cost. On the other hand if you go into the country you find a very much lower scale of expenditure. For instance at Dartford, which is some little distance from London, they built some pavilions for £45 per bed. At Great Ouseburn they built a small infirmary for £94 per bed; at Woodstock they built one for £84 per bed; and so on. This curious generalisation emerges from all these figures, that the larger the infirmary the greater the cost per bed. I think that is almost uniform, the reason being I suppose that in a large union the guardians are very anxious to have the best of everything; they feel that they can afford it, and indulge in, I might say, ornaments that the poor country unions do not wish to indulge in. In the return of cottage homes on which an enormous sum has been spent in recent years you will find the same sort of difference. You will find, for instance, that at Chorlton for 400 children in cottage homes the cost was £213 per bed, and at Liverpool for 288 children it is £202 10s. Going down the list to Barrow-in-Furness you will find that for eighty-five children the cost was £52, and at Haverfordwest for forty children it was £42 10s., showing much the same tendency to greater expenditure in urban unions, and showing much the same rule that the larger the building the greater the cost per bed. I put this to the Commission as rather suggesting a line for further investigation. I must say I am surprised at the figures myself. I have similar figures for workhouses for the past twenty years.

1635. Is the result the same?—Very much the same.

1636. (*Miss Hill.*) Do the London ones include the price of land?—None of them includes the cost of the site. I have excluded the cost of the site from the whole calculation.

1637. (*Chairman.*) I understand that you will put all these returns in?—I will do so with pleasure. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (2 to 5).) Taking the workhouses, roughly speaking, the average for a London or neighbouring union is about £250 per bed, and for a country union £150 per bed. That is a very rough sort of estimate.

ct of ropolitan lding Act.

1638. What are the particular provisions of the Metropolitan Building Act which in your judgment run up the cost?—That is rather a technical matter which would be better dealt with by our architect.

1639. Under the Metropolitan Building Act certain powers are given to local surveyors, I believe?—Yes. I am told the surveyor is autocratic.

1640. And the exercise of those powers, you think, runs up the cost?—I am informed that it makes a material difference. I have here a return of the Poor Law expenditure on buildings during the last twenty years. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (1).) We start in the year 1885–86 when the number of in-door paupers was 186,000. In that year we sanctioned (this is not expenditure within the year, but the amount sanctioned) the sum of £440,000, and that figure remains without any very rapid change until the year 1896–97 when the sum amounted to £998,000. There were then 214,000 paupers. In the next year the sum was £1,142,000; in the next year £1,768,000; in the next year £1,238,000; and in each of the next two years no less than £1,700,000 were spent on workhouse buildings, £1,776,000 in 1900–1 being the maximum, and that was when the in-door paupers of the country were 213,500. The gentleman who drew up this table has put a little note below in which he says, "The Architects' Fees in this year amounted to about £88,000." Since then, that is to say in the last three years, the sum spent has fallen again to £975,000, £1,184,000, and £941,000 respectively. I should add that in the two big years, that is to say in 1900 and 1901, the Forest Gate and South Metropolitan school districts were broken up and other buildings had to be provided to meet that emergency. That would reduce the amount by some £700,000, which would still leave it at a very heavy sum.

of Poor build- over a s of s.

ment of l itect.

1641. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) The architect is paid by a percentage on the cost, is he not?—The local architect is paid by a percentage on the cost; our architect has to criticise and, if possible, keep the cost down. I have here a bird's-eye picture of the last sanctioned building, which is the one at Hammersmith.

Mr. J. S. Davy, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

1642. (*Chairman.*) Have you got sufficient powers at the Local Government Board, do you think, for checking or supervising this class of expenditure?—We have powers to refuse buildings, and we have powers to refuse loans, but it is quite evident that with the best will in the world we find it a matter of very great difficulty to bring down the cost of workhouse buildings. In the first place there is a tendency for experts always to try and get the best of everything. If you have got the best of everything, obviously you have less responsibility than if you agree to a small compromise and thus run a small amount of danger. Anyone who has had administrative work to do has been subjected to the same temptation. Here comes in a point that I shall, with your permission, dwell upon at some length later on in my evidence. There is a tendency to lessened financial responsibility in the urban Unions. I mean to say you have a man who pays very little rates and who lives probably in a house that would not cost £10 per head, and you hear him come with proposals to spend £300 per head, or we will say £200 per head, in actually housing a pauper child. Then there is another difficulty in checking this expenditure—it is not paid out of immediate revenue, but it is paid out of loans to a great extent. A board of guardians will find it very much against the grain to spend a big lump sum, but they do not in the least mind a loan. An inspector—I myself have done it scores of times—will want the guardians to improve their workhouse; the guardians will say, we cannot spend £10,000 on this, as there is not £10,000 in the union. Ah! says the inspector, you must not look at it from that point of view; what you have got to do is to borrow the money for thirty years; you are not asked to spend £10,000, you are only asked to spend the interest on the loan of £10,000, which is, at the rate of 3½ per cent., about £5 8s. per cent. for interest and sinking fund; all you are asked to do is to find the sum of £500 a year out of the rates. Then we go a step further, and we say £500 out of the rates is after all only a 2d. or 3d. rate—a mere trifle. The guardians naturally wish to do well for their poor people; and they naturally wish to have a handsome building. They are persuaded, and they come up with these plans. Once the local authority has set their minds on the plans, it is extremely difficult for my department to check them. The only way of checking them is by saying No, and No is not an easy thing to say. Then there is another point that tends to extravagance, and that is that as buildings are in progress the architect or the building committee of the guardians suggest that something better might be done, just one more pavilion or just one more building; then when it is done, they come to us and say this is excess expenditure. Then it goes to the architect's department and the architect says, this is very right and proper expenditure, and it is a great improvement; we suggest the guardians should have a loan for so many years. Then it comes to me and my department usually gives sanction.

Difficulties of Local Government Board in checking expenditure on buildings.

1643. Have you any power of stopping expenditure of this kind other than refusing the loan?—Only by exhortation. Then there is another point of view: Some people say that this expenditure is not excessive, and they point to the fact that the expenditure on lunatic asylums is very largely in excess of our most exalted efforts—right beyond us; also that the expenditure of district councils on isolation hospitals in some cases amounts to over £600 per bed. They say, after all this is not too much. But I venture to think that it is too much, and I hope that the Commission will be able to give us administratively some help in dealing with what I find a most troublesome problem, and one which has excited a good deal of attention all over the country.

1644. What suggestion do you make in that direction; what extra power or authority would you like in addition to that which you have already got in order to check this evil?—I think we have plenty of authority to check it by simply saying, no, you must be more reasonable. I think that what we have to do is to revise the requirements of the medical and architectural professions with

Suggested remedies.

Mr. J. S. Davy, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

regard to the housing of persons in workhouses, and I think we have to fight against the tendency which I have seen for so many years of requiring for the class that we will say is able-bodied exactly the same provisions as the requirements for the sick, that is to say, I think we want a better classification of demands. All that will be discussed, and must be discussed and considered by the Commission with regard to the whole question of the housing of the in-door poor. It is very largely a question of classification.

Practice and policy of Local Government Board as to cost of Poor Law buildings.

1645. Under the authority you have got, have the Local Government Board ever refused to pass plans, or have they been successful in inducing local authorities to put forward less expensive schemes?—I think we are very much better than we used to be, and I think the returns show it; I mean that I think we spend less. I should like to say that nothing can exceed the care that is now being exercised to check what we think is unnecessary expenditure; but the matter is so difficult that I thought it right to dwell upon it at some length before the Commission.

1646. You will subsequently, perhaps, come to what is germane to this, namely, the qualifications of the local authorities who administer this expenditure?—Yes.

1647. That you would rather postpone now, I suppose?—Yes. It is one indication of the sort of wave of excessive expenditure which seems to have swept over the country since, I will put it, the last fifteen or twenty years.

1648. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) You said that increased care is shown in revising plans; is that by the local people or by the central people?—By the central authority. I may say that only recently—it was no part of his duty—our architect has been to the trouble of drawing rough plans for himself in order to assist the local authority to get a cheaper scheme. Of course, that is taking great responsibility, and I do not say it is right, but so anxious are we to cut this expenditure down if we can, that that is the line we have taken.

1649. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Have you full statutory powers to deal with it?—We have full statutory powers to refuse any building or any loan. No board of guardians can make structural alterations without our consent.

1650. (*Chairman.*) Could they not, for instance, commence a building out of ordinary revenue?—They would be subject to surcharge if they did.

1651. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) If you reduce the period of a loan you really would reduce the cost of the building, would you not?—We should reduce the annual cost. But our inspector may think, and we may agree with him, that it is really very desirable that the building should be built. It becomes rather a matter of negotiation sometimes with the local authority, and there is a sort of pressure brought to bear upon us, and a suggestion that if we are too hard on the matter of loans, the local authority will not build at all. Perhaps undue notice is taken of that, but that is one of the difficulties.

1652. (*Mr. Booth.*) Can the Local Government Board alter the period for the repayment of a loan?—Yes.

1653. Can it shorten the term?—Yes. We are limited by statute as to the maximum that we may allow; but we may allow as little as from one year to nothing.

1654. So that you can push a larger portion forward year by year?—Yes.

1655. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) The present system which is commonly adopted, of equal instalments of capital and interest, extended over thirty years, tends, as I understand, to extravagance in building?—I think all loans tend to extravagance; but that is, of course, another question.

1656. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) You approve the plans of each building, I suppose; but then after you have approved the plans, do you see the design as proposed by the local architect?—We see practically all the plans.

1657. You see the original plans, but are you told what the estimate is, or how the architect proposes to carry out the design?—We have all the specifications.

1658. Then the plan comes in a second time?—Yes. It may be that this is in your mind—that, we do not visit the buildings when they are in the process of erection. You see, a good many changes might be made without our knowledge. I do not think, however, that they are made, and now we certainly have got a rule that if there is a large excess the place shall be visited by one of our architects, and we shall see what has actually been done so as to check the possibility of a local authority having followed plans other than those which we sanctioned.

Auditor's powers over expenditure on building.

1659. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would an auditor surcharge anything extra which was spent over and above the specification that was given in to you?—He would, but then the local authority would write for sanction, and we can either give that sanction or we can refer the authority to the auditor; then if the auditor surcharges them there would be some correspondence, and there would probably be remission of the surcharge.

Details omitted from plans.

1660. (*Dr. Downes.*) With regard to the plans, I think I am right in saying that a great many expensive details of fittings and so on are not shown in the specifications and plans that come to the Local Government Board?—That is very much so.

Effect of cost of non-Poor Law buildings.

1661. (*Mr. Loch.*) Besides this expenditure on Poor Law institutions, is there not a large local expenditure on not very dissimilar institutions, the loans in regard to which are passed by other central authorities?—That would be so.

1662. So that the scale on which you are asked here to sanction expenditure is a scale rather settled by the general movement for expensive institutions?—I think now I am right in saying that we have to sanction the loans for all those buildings, although we do not sanction the plans.

1663. In those cases you sanction the loan, but the control over the plans is nil—is that it?—We always see the plans.

Tenure of guardians' officers.

1664. (*Chairman.*) I think now you wish to say something about the tenure of officers of a certain class?—That is another point of difficulty which I personally feel requires consideration. The Select Committee of 1864 is, I think, the convenient starting point. They gave conclusive reasons why the tenure of certain principal officers of a board of guardians should be permanent. I do not think anybody questions that to this day. It evidently is right that officers who are doing their duty should be protected against capricious dismissal. In practice, however, there is this point of difficulty that, an officer may from age or some physical change become inefficient,—to put it mildly; yet unless he commits some overt act on which a charge can be brought against him, you practically cannot get rid of him.

Superannuation of officers.

1665. (*Miss Hill.*) Are you speaking of officers of the guardians?—I am speaking of officers of the local authority, namely, the clerk, the workhouse master, the workhouse matron, the chaplain, and the relieving officers. Up to 1896, as I dare say Mr. Adrian has explained, superannuations of officers of the local authorities were at the option of the local authority employing them—the boards of guardians, we will say; but now, under the Act of 1896, there is a compulsory deduction from the salaries of all Poor Law officers and they get in return pensions on a fixed scale on their retirement—pensions which are in essentials similar to those which are given to members of the ordinary Civil Service. There are two things to be considered about that Act. The question is whether it does not make it more difficult to get rid of those incompetent officers. That has often been said. To my mind, it makes it rather easier, because you can make terms with a man to go. But the whole matter seems to me to be worth careful consideration.

Dismissal of officers.

1666. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are there any rules about the standard of competency; how would a board of guardians act if they wanted to get rid of a servant? Would they come to the Local Government Board?—Those officers cannot be dismissed or got rid of without the sanction of the board.

1667. (*Chairman.*) What do you suggest?—I merely put the case forward as a matter for consideration, because I have no doubt that you will get a great deal of evidence, perhaps from the officers themselves, with regard to the whole question of superannuation and their position.

Increasing cost of salaries.

1668. Will you say anything you wish in connection with those officers now?—The cost of the officers of the Poor Law is a steadily increasing proportion of the whole; for instance, out of the total cost of Poor Law relief in the

years 1857 to 1860 the salaries were 11·2 per cent. of the whole; and in the five years before the Superannuation Act was passed, that is, from 1891 to 1895, they were 16·9 per cent. of the whole. That proportion has steadily risen till now 18·1 per cent. of the whole expenditure goes in the salaries of officers. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (16).) Apparently the rate of increase has been greater since the passing of the Superannuation Act, that is to say, salaries are better.

Type of officers.

1669. Has the type of officers improved?—That is a matter of opinion, but in my judgment the type of the officers has steadily improved, and I should say we have got a much better sort of officer now than we got at the time of my first connection with the Poor Law. Certainly fewer officers come under our censure than formerly; for instance, in the year 1869 out of 6,489 officers sixty were called upon to resign or were dismissed, whereas, in the year 1904 out of 7,893 officers only twelve were called upon to resign or were dismissed. I have a return (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (6).) of officers here, the officers to which it applies being clerks, medical officers, masters of workhouses, stewards or superintendents of infirmaries, and relieving officers. But in criticising boards of guardians, one should never forget that they are the only local authority that has not complete control over their officers.

Numbers dismissed.

Tenure of medical officer of health.

1670. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is not the medical officer of health a case in point?—No, he has nothing to do with the board of guardians.

1671. Is he not under the control of the central authority, so that the local authority cannot dismiss him?—There is only permanency of tenure in London, I think.

Appointment of collector of poor rates.

1672. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is the collector of the poor rate an officer of the board of guardians?—Some are.

1673. Do those fall within the category with which you have been dealing?—They are not in my return; but they get pensions, and we have in some cases to assent to their dismissal.

1674. As regards them, can you say what you have said as regards the others, they have very much improved from what they were?—I think I should say they are much the same.

Type of officer improving.

1675. (*Chairman.*) The general conclusion you arrive at is, I think, that the stamp of officer is improving?—He has very much improved, but he costs more; and when he does misbehave himself, he is perhaps a little more trouble now than he used to be.

Guardians complete control of officers.

1676. I take it that you have no particular suggestions to make as regards the officers, as you think their position is now fairly satisfactory?—That is so; I have no absolute suggestions to make. The real point is, that the Commission must remember all the way through that the guardians have not entire command over their officers, whether for good or for ill.

1677. That is an essential feature of the centralised system of administration which is concentrated in the Local Government Board, and that you would not alter?—That is so. I think the only alterations you could make would be, perhaps, alterations of departmental practice.

Tendency to apathy in officers.

1678. (*Miss Hill.*) I presume the difficulty which arises is not when there is any real breach of duty, but when there is a want of energy and because there is no stimulus to an officer to do better or to work up to any higher standard; I am afraid now that there is a good deal of possibility of going to sleep?—That is so.

Pluralists.

1679. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do all these officers give up their whole time to the duties of their office?—All those that I have named do, except the medical officers and the chaplains.

1680. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) What about the clerks?—Some clerks do and some clerks do not—I should say a great many clerks do not; most of the relieving officers do, and most of the medical officers do not.

Statutory powers of assistant inspectors.

1681. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Have the assistant inspectors the same right to be present at meetings of the boards of guardians, or are their rights curtailed in any degree as compared with the rights of the general inspectors?—The statutory powers of assistant inspectors are the same as the statutory powers of the general inspectors.

Architect's staff.

1682. You have spoken of the architect of the central authority; I suppose you have one architect and a staff?—That is so.

1683. There is no local organisation, such as a county council would have?—No.

1684. So far as Poor Law surcharges are concerned, do you find that the staff is adequate to all its duties?—I can only answer that the work of auditing is continually increasing.

Auditorial staff.

1685. I take it that the number of auditors, which you gave as sixty, is not a fixed number?—That is the present number.

Effect of Metropolitan Building Act in increasing expenditure.

1686. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to buildings, you mentioned that the Chorlton cottage homes were very expensive; I happen to have seen them, so I agree with you. There would be no difficult building Act there because it is in the country; is that not so?—Perhaps there would not be even bye-laws there.

1687. I was reflecting on what you said as to the Metropolitan bye-laws with regard to other expensive buildings?—I should like to say about this point that it was put very strongly to the Vagrancy Committee by Mr. Kitchin, architect to the Board, that the Metropolitan Building Act did considerably increase the cost of building; but my return here shows that the suburban workhouses outside the Metropolitan Building Act are just as expensive as those in London.

Effect of environment of inmates.

1688. I wanted to bring out that point, because I am interested in the Metropolitan Building Act. As regards the cost of building, before we determine whether the cost is desirable, it would be well to find out the results; take, for instance, the cottage homes; Chorlton is very expensive, but supposing the result was that fewer children came back on the Poor Law, even that expense might be justified, might it not?—If the greater success was due to the greater expenditure of pounds, shillings and pence, no doubt it would be justified.

1689. Therefore, before we could back you up in any way in making the cost of these buildings less extravagant, we should have to get accurate statistics as to the effect which was produced on the inmates?—Yes.

1690. You would, therefore, advise us to get accurate statistics as to the results on the children, for instance, would you not?—I have no doubt whatever that that would be one of the duties of this Commission.

1691. Also with regard to the infirmaries, we could not judge whether the £450 per bed in the one case was justified as against the £40 per bed in the other case, unless we discover accurately how many cases were turned out cured?—That is so.

1692. Can we get that information from the unions, or should we ask the local inspectors for it, or how could we get at the results?—I think in the first instance I should ask the local inspectors, Do you think the people are more comfortable in union A, which cost £400 per bed, than in union B, which only cost £200 per bed? As to the number of cases being cured, that is a point that I should have brought out. You must remember that in a great many of these institutions there is no question of cure, as they are mainly places where the chronic old and infirm go to pass the remainder of their lives.

1693. The character of the cases would largely tell us whether the cost was justified or not, would it not?—It might.

1694. Therefore, the character of the cases would be a most important point to bring out?—That would have to be considered; for instance, to put it in a large sort of way, you might say that the difference in character of the urban cases from the rural cases is essentially a point for consideration on a large and broad scale.

London hospitals and workhouse infirmaries.

1695. I am told that at certain times of the year, about July, say, when the general hospitals in London clean their wards, they send the whole of the patients in their wards to the workhouse infirmaries; it would be rather important to find out whether that is so, would it not?—Certainly.

Sources of information as to cost of Poor Law buildings.

1696. Before we pass from that point, would it be possible to ask the inspectors who come up to give evidence before us, to bring the cost of the institutions of every union within their jurisdiction, and to give us some sort of notion as to the results which were achieved by that cost?—I do not think they could do it for all their unions, as I do not think they would have time, but they would do it for certain unions selected by you.

Mr. J.S. Davy, C.B.

22 Jan. 1906.

1697. Is it not rather important for us to get a survey of all the unions before we select the ones which we want, because otherwise we might find a mere coincidence, that is we might find an instance where you had a very expensive building and perhaps very low-paid officers and a very bad result; and that would be a question to inquire into, would it not?—Yes.

1698. Therefore, would it not be desirable if we could, from your evidence, pick out certain points and tabulate them with the view of giving them to the inspectors to bring us up information on those points?—All I can say is, that if I can give you any possible help in that matter I shall be only too glad; but if you are to do anything of that sort, for instance, with regard to buildings, I think you might take certain selected unions—take those unions, say, that have made a name for themselves either by giving very heavy relief or by giving very light relief, and let us see what their workhouses are like. In that way I think you might do quite a useful thing.

1699. It will be very difficult to us to get out the sort of facts we want, unless we get the whole thing more or less before us?—It seems to me that you will have to investigate the question step by step.

1700. I understand that each inspector has only forty-five unions?—Forty-five or fifty—it is something like that.

1701. So it would be comparatively easy for him to bring us that information, if he was given notice to do so?—It will depend upon how much detail you will want. A good deal of it would be statistical information which would be inside the office, so that there would be no trouble about that.

1702. He could get it straight out of the office in that case?—Yes.

Procedure on default to erect proper buildings.

1703. You told us something about extravagant buildings, but is there not this other point that you may have a union which refuses to put up proper buildings?—We have had such cases.

1704. I understand that about six or seven years ago, there was a case of that sort at Stockport; I happened to be up there. That was a case in which you had unsuccessfully asked them to put up buildings, and your architect had said that the guardians ought to be indicted for manslaughter; but, nevertheless, Stockport went on resisting you. What could you do in such a case, where there is deficiency and not excess?—One of the points upon which I shall have to give evidence will be as to the limits of the control of the Local Government Board. We can close, but we cannot order to build.

Stockport case.

1705. What happens in a case where a board of guardians is recalcitrant about a workhouse, and refuses to make the necessary alterations; you cannot surcharge them, so what can you do?—What we do is this—we exhort, and we write, and we go on exhorting and writing, and we confer and receive deputations. We put pressure of that kind on for a considerable time, and then we have an *ultima ratio*, and that *ultima ratio* is breaking up the union.

1706. But you cannot in practice do that, can you?—No.

Newcastle case.

1707. I have another case—at Newcastle this time—where, about 1887, they dismissed the whole of their trained staff at the infirmary against their medical officer's advice, and there were deaths of paupers and there were coroner's inquests; after seven or eight years they backed down. Is it possible for you to take steps in a case of that sort of bad behaviour?—If that sort of behaviour came before me I should first of all find out whether it was bad behaviour. We should do as we have done once in the last week with a union and ask the local inspector to go down there at once and if it involved the case of nurses and so on, we should probably ask Dr. Fuller to go down with him and report to us as to the facts. If the Board thought the guardians were to blame they would, by preference, send an inspector down to talk to them; but if we did not do that an official letter would be written to them. Then, if nothing happened, and there was a dispute about the facts we might even order an inquiry, that is to say, we might send a man down, who would have power to summon anybody he liked from within ten miles to give evidence on oath, and in that way we would find out the facts. By that time probably some solution would be found.

1708. Supposing they still were recalcitrant, what then—you see at Newcastle they were seven years over this business?—That would be a dreadful thing to contemplate; but I admit the possibility of it. But then what must be remembered is this—I am now anticipating my evidence a good deal; this is one of the inconveniencies of taking it by sections—if the thing went on for seven years, there would be two or three, perhaps even seven, elections of guardians.

1709. But the ratepayers might back them up?—If the ratepayers back them up, then there you have a freely-elected board of guardians, backed up by the ratepayers, which would then be a very formidable body for the central authority to deal with.

1710. I believe one of the functions of the Local Government Board is to protect the pauper; supposing paupers died, for instance?—You will have plenty of chances later in my evidence of dealing with that point.

Insufficient expenditure on Poor Law buildings.

1711. I only want to bring out the point that, besides excessive and extravagant expenditure on buildings by boards of guardians, there might be a deficiency of expenditure?—There is a deficiency at times. Our inspectors, I do not say often, but occasionally, report that they cannot get guardians to do what they think is right and proper. In that case the procedure used to be that we sent that report to the guardians and we got their observations upon it and so on; but now if there is such a case, I should go down and see it myself.

1712. May we not have to ascertain the cases in which there has been a deficiency of building, as well as the cases in which there has perhaps been extravagance?—You could ultimately find that out, if you got a man to go round and see. What I can find out for you, and easily find out for you, is, in how many cases in the course of the year each inspector has reported that such and such a building was inadequate and required additions.

1713. We should get that really from the annual reports on workhouses by the inspectors, should we not?—Yes.

1714 Are those reports published?—No.

1715. We could look at them, presumably?—I should have to consult my official chiefs on that.

Effect of increased salaries on officers' efficiency.

1716. As regards the salaries of officers which you have referred to, I rather gathered that, on the whole, you think it is a good thing to increase the salaries?—An underpaid officer is a very bad thing.

1717. Would not the sort of salaries that they pay be another question which would concern us in classifying the unions for more special inquiry?—Yes.

1718. Take for instance, Manchester; Manchester had an excellent method of relief—which I happen to have witnessed—because it had a superintendent at about £400 a year?—How long ago was that?

1719. That was about six years ago?—It does not follow that a man is efficient because he gets £400 a year.

1720. But he happened to have a sort of judicial position; he sat with one guardian and distributed the relief, so he was in fact like a judicial officer. Would it not be possible that we could be supplied with that sort of information under the heads of the different unions?—Do you want information as to the salaries of every workhouse master in the country?

Cross visitors and their salaries.

1721. No; I am rather considering the sort of person who decides practically all relief that is given—the relieving officer or the cross visitors?—We could give you a return of the number of cross visitors and their salaries without difficulty They are not very many; and at all events in theory, the relief is not given by the relieving officer

Accessibility of minutes, &c., of Local Government Board.

1722. I know it is not in theory, but it is often in practice. You have mentioned the minutes and memoranda, some of which were important; would it be possible for us to see those minutes? Mr. Adrian, for instance, mentioned a minute defining the limits of the Poor Law authorities in 1869; then there was another minute disapproving of a distinguishing dress in workhouses as a mark of disgrace—of course that cut at the root of a very

old Poor Law principle, and that is the sort of thing which really means a change of principle ?—I think all those minutes are published in the annual reports.

1723. Then there was a memorandum as to the duties of visiting committees at workhouses ?—That certainly is published.

rkhouse tary ler.

1724. Then there was Dr. Downes's Model Dietary of 1893, and another report of his on Nursing in Workhouses, 1892; are those published ?—I can see if they are.

1725. (*Dr. Downes.*) There has been an order on dietary published in recent years which supersedes anything published in 1893, has there not ?—Yes.

pectors as nesses.

1726. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I rather gathered from your suggestions that you would advise the Commission to call all the inspectors, because of their difference of opinions ?—That is entirely for the Commission to say.

1727. But you say they are men of different class, and with a different experience ?—They vary very much.

1728. Would they be able to give us what Mr. Adrian called the codes of regulations having the force of law, and often varying in effect in order to meet the circumstances of particular localities; in other words, would the individual inspectors be able to give us a review of the general and special orders which each union works under ?—Certainly.

1729. That information would be valuable as a matter of classification, would it not ?—Yes. But they all work under one order, practically; but that you would find in the books.

1730. There are other orders about dietary, are there not, and are there not different orders about relief committees ?—No, the orders are the same, but they are applied to some unions and not to others. The general inspectors would be able to tell you about that. That is a matter I shall deal with later on in my evidence.

1731. To keep to the point of the inspectors about which you have given us evidence so far, would they be able to tell us the practice with regard to relief committees ? I notice that in your evidence in 1888 you gave a very interesting account of Leeds, which you said was broken up into Committees, formed of the members of particular districts, who gave the relief for their own districts; and that you said was a very bad thing ?—I have no doubt the general inspectors would be able to tell you the methods of giving relief in all their unions.

1732. You would regard that as rather an important matter, would you not ?—Yes, certainly.

1733. And that is a thing that we ought to inquire into, is it not ?—That is for the Commission. My point is that the inspectors, if you warn them and give them a bit of time, will tell you anything relating to their own districts.

1734. Would you suggest that we should give them some heads about which they could bring us evidence ?—I will tell the Commission what I have done. There are six of the inspectors who, I believe, are going to give evidence, and who must be called, either because they are seniors, or because they are territorial. I met them the other day, and I told them the points I was going to suggest, and specially pointed out the subjects that I thought the Commission should investigate, and I advised them to make up their minds on what points they would specialise. That was all that we did, but that we did do.

1735. Would it not be important for us, as we are on the question of inspectors, to get more or less identical information, that is to say, information on the same points from each inspector; because if they tell us one thing about one district and another thing about another district we shall not get any kind of survey of the differences of administration between one district and another ?—That would be a method of examining them; but then, you see, some inspectors know some things which none of the others know; for instance, it is not every inspector who has had any experience as to the relief of able-bodied men in times of strike. I just mention that as the first thing that comes into my head. I think there are only two people in England who have had that experience.

1736. Therefore the evidence of the inspectors would resolve itself into two divisions—these points upon which we want evidence in regard to the whole country and his special knowledge ?—That is it.

1737. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You say there are fourteen inspectors' districts, I think ?—Yes.

1738. On what plan are they arranged—is it geographical ?—It is geographically, that is to say, they are planned for the purpose of the saving of travelling expenses and the saving of time. Then also, we like to get certain industries in one man's district as far as we can, that is to say, we like to have one man for Yorkshire and one man for Lancashire. Arrangement of inspectors' districts.

1739. Are some of the districts entirely rural ?—Practically so, with only one or two big towns in them—as for instance, Cornwall and Devon.

1740. In your opinion should the inspectors have more power over local administration than they have at present ?—I should have to consider that. Power in what direction ? I do not think without a complete reversal of the present system he could very well have more power. Inspectors' powers over local administration.

1741. I mean power in the direction that would ensure more uniformity of administration within his own districts ?—I think if there is any compulsory power to be enforced, the central authority is the authority to do it. I mean to say, if it was locally considered desirable that there should be no uniformity in a district, I do not think that the local inspector should be left to decide on that point himself, or to take measures. All that I think he could do would be to report to the Board, and then it would be for the Board (supposing it were considered desirable to get more uniformity by force, so to speak) to apply the force. I look upon the inspector's relations with the guardians as purely friendly, and that is what they ought to be.

1742. And you think they ought to continue only as such ?—I think so.

1743. If more power was given in order to ensure greater uniformity of administration do you think that ought to be vested in the central authority ?—Yes.

1744. And not in the inspectors ?—No.

1745. Have they any common uniform method of making returns to the Local Government Board other than what appears in the annual report ?—No; but in inspecting institutions they have to fill up certain forms. Inspectors' returns.

1746. The inspector makes a return of his own yearly, does he not ?—Yes, but that is purely voluntary.

1747. And those returns are not uniform ?—No. I have brought two of them with me which are the last ones issued.

1748. What is the object of their issuing a voluntary return ?—You need not issue a return at all, but if you do issue a return, you issue that form of it which you think is most suitable to your board of guardians.

1749. Or to show the discrepancies in the administration ?—Yes.

1750. If these be useful returns to make, why should not those returns be collected and published in the annual report of the Local Government Board ?—I think there is a great deal of information in the inspector's reports which might be very well published in the annual report; but then you must remember that the inspector also makes an annual report.

1751. Which appears in the published report ?—That appears in the book, but I take it that what you have in your mind is the inspectors' reports, like these sort of statistical reports of which there is an extremely good one from Yorkshire.

1752. When he has made that return, I suppose the central department will get a copy of it on every occasion ?—I think so, but I think that is rather as the inspector likes.

1753. Upon this return would it not be possible to see almost at a glance the discrepancies in administration, and to ascertain by some means or other why a certain union in an inspector's district is gradually increasing the amount of both in-door and of out-door relief, and a certain other union is gradually decreasing both ?—I am afraid that the differences in Poor Law administration and the increase or decrease in pauperism are dependent upon so many factors that you cannot very well sum them up in one return. For instance, the age of the people may be changing, the local industries may be altering and so on.

SIXTH DAY.

Tuesday, 23rd January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled; and further examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

Procedure as to general inspectors' Reports.

1754. (*Mr. Bentham.*) When we adjourned yesterday I was asking you with regard to the reports of the inspectors, and in your last answer you said that the changes made in the districts, so far as industry and age were concerned, might materially alter the Poor Law conditions of the districts. What I am wanting more particularly to ask you about is with reference to the various unions within one inspector's district, and the difference in the administration of the various unions in one inspector's district. For instance, a report of this kind is sent in by one of the inspectors:—"In many instances the relief books are unsatisfactorily kept, and the full information required by them is not supplied in writing, and often the date of the last visit to the pauper does not appear. The quarterly revision of permanent cases is too generally slurred over, and is too often considered a tedious and uninteresting duty to which little attention is paid." Are matters of that kind reported to the central authority from time to time other than what appear in this annual report?—No, except that in the workhouse report there are columns showing the amount of in-door relief actually given.

1755. When these reports were received by the central authority what action would they take on a report of this kind—nothing?—They would leave it to the inspector.

1756. Then, outside the inspector's influence in the unions in his district, there is really no central control over the administration?—In exceptional cases we should write a letter of remonstrance or advice. I take it that your point is, what steps are taken to get uniform administration within each district? For that purpose the matter is generally left to the inspectors. The difficulty always is, as you know, that each union as a rule thinks it is a model union; and the only way that you can get unions more into line is by the publication of the figures, which is a duty that is undertaken by nearly all the inspectors within their own districts.

Area of general inspectors' districts.

1757. In order that the inspector may give efficient supervision over the various unions in his district, are the areas too large, do you think?—No, I think not. It is very essential that every public officer should be very fully employed, and I think, limiting the supervision to what it is now, the inspector's districts are very fairly arranged. There may be exceptional cases, but these are dealt with as they arise.

Frequency of general inspectors' visits.

1758. How often would they visit a union?—The inspector's duty is to visit each board of guardians once a year, and to inspect each workhouse once a year; but, of course, that is a very small part of his duties with regard to the guardians. He has to visit committees, to confer with the chairman, and to confer with the clerk, and in large unions I think you will find that the visiting is more often than once a year.

1759. Are records made of those visits?—Yes.

1760. And of the consultations with the guardians?—Yes. Every inspector has to send in every week a diary in which he states what he has been doing each day. Those diaries are examined in the office, and come before me.

General inspectors' weekly diaries.

1761. Are there any general instructions given to the inspectors in writing—are there any laid down, I mean to say?—No.

Instructions to general inspectors.

1762. None whatever?—None, beyond the instruction that he has to do all routine duty.

1763. Then very widely different policies might obtain in different unions, without any interference from the central authority?—Yes, certainly.

1764. With regard to the qualification of an inspector, I think you said there were no qualifications laid down?—The appointment is made on the president's own responsibility. But I must say this, that nearly all the inspectors have had some training as assistants before they are appointed to a district; nearly all the present men, for instance, had some training as assistant-inspector before they got their district.

Qualifications of general inspectors.

1765. Do you think it advisable that inspectors should have had considerable experience in Poor Law administration before appointment?—I think they should have had some.

1766. They are not consulted so much by boards of guardians as you would consider advisable, are they?—A great deal depends on the inspector, and a great deal on the board of guardians; I mean, you cannot lay down any general rule in that way.

Relations of general inspectors with Guardians.

1767. I was not asking for a rule, but what are the facts: are they consulted?—I will tell you one fact which is taken from my own experience: When I had a district, I never attended a routine meeting of a board of guardians at all unless under exceptional circumstances, and I waited till I was sent for. I found that by the end of the year I had been sent for by most of them; so that in my experience I was very widely consulted. I think most of my colleagues will tell you the same.

1768. In some districts the visits of the inspector are not particularly welcomed, I suppose?—I should think that is rare, but I know that some guardians do not welcome the inspectors in the same way that other guardians do.

1769. They look upon their visits as interference from the central authority, do they?—A great deal depends upon the tact of the inspector. We do not have much trouble—I do not say we have had no trouble—at any rate, we have had astonishingly little, considering how much the inspector has occasionally to criticise the action of individual boards of guardians.

1770. Then there are not many cases of that kind ?—There are very few.

1771. I think you said that it might be within the power of the inspectors to settle matters of detail between boards of guardians and themselves, instead of sending them on to the central authority ?—They do settle a great many matters of detail, and papers are frequently referred to the inspector, referred with the direction, "Settle this matter according to your own judgment."

1772. Would structural alterations come within the purview of the inspectors ?—Yes.

1773. But they must not involve borrowing powers, I suppose ?—The guardians have to get sanction under the law, but if the inspector says it is all right, and no loan is asked for, then the Board would in nearly every case consent.

1774. It would require sanction, then ?—It would require sanction legally.

1775. Did you find that that method had any effect upon the policy of the boards with regard to relief ?—I am talking now of workhouse inspections.

1776. But you would consult with them, or they would consult with you, on questions of policy occasionally, would they not ?—Yes.

1777. Was your advice acceptable, and did it have the effect that you desired of changing their policy or of directing their policy ?—If the advice was not well received I thought it was my own fault rather. I mean to say, it depends a great deal on the way it is put.

uence of eral ectors on rdians' cy.

1778. You did give them advice on policy, did you ?—Frequently.

1779. Is that the only method that the central authority has when dealing with boards of guardians and trying to get uniformity of treatment ?—When cases come before the central authority the central authority, as I have said, write letters—doctrinal or hortatory letters; but these matters of detail I think are better left to verbal communication with the board's agent.

1780. But this is not a matter of detail; I think this is rather an important point, or I would not pursue it so far Another inspector reports: "The contrasts of administration in various unions are very conspicuous, and it often happens that, of two communities living side by side in apparently identical circumstances, one administers the poor law as if the spread of pauperism were advantageous, while the other is careful to act on strict principles"—and then follow two instances. That is the kind of policy that I am thinking of; an inspector might be of great service to a board of guardians, and I want to know if you were often of service to them in directing their policy in the right direction ?—I hope I was, in calling their attention to the more excellent way of giving relief.

pectors of rded-out ldren.

1781. You said there were three inspectors for boarded-out children; how often do they visit the children in their districts ?—As a rule once a year.

1782. Do they inspect children who are boarded out within the unions ?—No.

1783. Who inspects those ?—Those children are inspected by the relieving officer and the medical officer, who have to make written reports upon them. In a great many cases the guardians delegate their powers to a committee, mostly of ladies, to look after the children within the union.

1784. Is it not the duty of the general inspector to visit those ?—Not the individual children, though questions as to the efficiency of the inspection would come before him.

1785. Why are they not visited by the visitors for boarded-out children ?—I suppose for the same reason that other pauper children are not visited, namely, that the responsibility rests with the guardians. Where children are boarded outside the union, the guardians cannot inspect them conveniently; that is to say, it would be a great expense and trouble for a London board of guardians to go to Windermere or to any other place in the North of England to inspect their children boarded out there.

1786. But there are special boarding-out committees in both cases, both within the union and without the union, are there not; and it is the duty of those committees to visit and report, is it not ?—The committee inside the union would be under the direct control of the board of guardians.

1787. Not necessarily, I suppose ?—Yes. They appoint these committees, in the first instance; outside the union, the committees would be committees sanctioned by the Local Government Board. In the case of the children boarded out without the union that was paying for them, it would be difficult for the guardians to inspect these children; and I think historically I am right in saying that it was for that reason that the board found it convenient to appoint officers of their own to inspect those children who are boarded outside their union.

Poor Law Medical Inspectors.

1788. There are two medical inspectors, one for London I think you said, and one for the provinces; is that so ?—Yes.

Duties of Poor Law Medical Inspectors.

1789. What are the duties of these inspectors ?—I have handed in the minute of appointment showing their duties (*See* A. 1603)? Shall I say them again ?

1790. If you please ?—The London inspector is one of the general inspectors for London, and he deals specially with medical questions arising in London; he also advises the Board generally on medical questions. The duty of the other inspector is to inspect any workhouse as directed by the Board, or to attend any meeting of a board of guardians as directed by the Board. He has also as part of his routine duty, in every year to inspect six workhouses in each inspector's district, and at the beginning of the year the inspector has to send up a list of these workhouses for his inspection. He also has to advise on any general question arising in the provinces that specially concerns him.

1791. Can you tell us whether the control of the Local Government Board does upon the whole sufficiently retard or accelerate, as the case may require, the action of boards of guardians in dealing with the poor ?—That is a very large question; and I think, if you will allow me to say so, you will have the opportunities of referring to it again when I come to deal with the powers and duties of the local authorities and their functions.

Functions of Board's Architect.

1792. With regard to the Architect's Department, I think you stated that it was extremely difficult to check the local expenditure of the guardians after they once get their minds fixed ?—That is so.

1793. Does the question of the expenditure come before the architect ?—Yes. He advises us whether the expenditure is excessive, and he makes as minute an examination as he can of the specifications, to see whether the sum charged is excessive.

1794. When plans for a large scheme are sent in, at times at very great cost to boards of guardians, is it not rather difficult then to commence suggesting to the boards what alterations ought to be made; and, much expense having been incurred, if alterations are made, is not that expense partly wasted ?—I do not quite follow you.

1795. For instance, in one scheme that I have in mind where the plans cost something like £500, they were sent to the architect for his approval; he returned the plans, and the scheme was not sanctioned; then correspondence commenced with the Department with regard to those plans; the local architect stuck to his plans and the guardians backed their architect, and there was a considerable amount of friction and time wasted in getting the plans finally settled. What I wanted to get at was, whether you could suggest some better means of communicating with boards of guardians on any general scheme that is contemplated, prior to the plans having been decided upon by the guardians ?—We often suggest to boards of guardians that they should send a deputation to the board with their architect to confer with our architect. That is useful; but occasionally the two architects and the board of guardians cannot agree, and then the administrative part of the board is rather helpless.

1796. Does that arise in the first place through the inspector of the board; would he know of the schemes ?—He is always consulted.

Central Authority's printed instructions as to workhouse buildings.

1797. He does that work as a matter of general policy, does he ?—Yes. I ought to say what I have not said yet—that from time to time we have issued a memorandum of "Points to be attended to in the construction of work-

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

house buildings." I will hand in a copy of those, for the information of the Commission. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (28).) They are revised from time to time. You will find that one cause of any increase in expenditure has been, and is, that under these points the number of different classes to be provided for is greater than it used to be. In very early times the Poor Law Commissioners published their own plans, according to which nothing was allowed to stand in the way of simplicity of construction, except the separation of the sexes and of adults from children—that was all. As time goes on, you have to provide not only for the able-bodied, but for the old and infirm, the sick of various kinds, and so on; the gradual growth of that idea of classification can be seen in the several editions of these revised Points.

Effect of classification on cost of buildings.

Cause of increased loan expenditure.

1798. With regard to the very great increase in the borrowing powers of the boards of guardians in recent times for alterations and extensions, has that not been caused somewhat by the desire to treat the sick much better, and also to get children out of the workhouse, and by other things which are held to be desirable by the central authority?—The main cause of the borrowing is the desire of boards of guardians to provide better accommodation for the indoor poor.

1799. From what period does this policy date?—I shall come to that again later. You will see—not to anticipate my future evidence too much—that the real beginning of it was somewhere in the seventies, just after the scandal with regard to the condition of the London workhouses which led to the passing of Mr. Gathorne-Hardy's Act.

Relieving Officers' tenure.

1800. With regard to the tenure of office, I think you said the relieving officer had a permanent tenure?—Yes.

1801. I thought that those appointed since 1879 had not the same tenure as medical officers and clerks to the guardians?—I think that relieving officers, medical officers and masters of workhouses can be dismissed by the guardians in the first twelve months of their appointment without any cause being assigned; but after that they have permanent tenure.

Superintendent Nurse's tenure.

1802. You did not put the superintendent nurse into that category?—She too has a permanent tenure of office, with the additional advantage that she cannot be suspended by a board of guardians.

1803. You can suspend a master, but not a superintendent nurse?—That is so.

1804. Is there any reason for that?—None that I can see.

1805. Is it within the power of the board to alter that?—Yes.

Number and duties of lady inspectors of Local Government Board.

1806. (*Professor Smart.*) With regard to the lady inspectors, what is their *status*; do they rank with assistant inspectors?—Yes, they do.

1807. What are their duties?—The duty of Miss Stansfeld, who is the inspector in London, is to inspect certain buildings and certain parts of buildings, as, for instance, lying-in-wards, homes and so on.

1808. How many lady inspectors do you say there are?—We have one for poor law purposes and three for boarding-out purposes.

1809. One of them is confined to London?—Yes.

1810. And three are for the provinces?—Yes.

Effect of permanency of local officers' tenure.

1811. (*Miss Hill.*) Do you think that on the whole the permanent tenure of office has been beneficial? One can see that it has both advantages and disadvantages; can you say whether in your opinion the advantages of permanent tenure preponderate?—In my opinion they certainly preponderate.

Returns required from Local Authorities by Central Authority.

1812. (*Mr. Phelps.*) You spoke of the correspondence of the Local Government Board; could you put in a list of the returns which the officers in the country are compelled to make?—Do you mean those returns which the Local Government Board write to the clerks and ask them to prepare, for Parliamentary and other purposes?

1813. Those are the returns I am thinking of?—I am afraid this could not well be done.

1814. The object of my question is this: Is it within your knowledge that the officers complain very much of the immense amount of time which is taken up by preparing returns, and what not, for the central office?—They complain very much.

1815. Is it in the mind of the office to deal with that question?—We have dealt with it sometimes, I mean we have given the clerks payment for certain elaborate returns, but how far that principle can be extended, I am not in a position to say—that is a matter for my chief.

Multiplicity of accounts.

1816. Is the same true with regard to the number of accounts which have to be kept?—There is very great complaint as to the number of accounts which have to be kept.

1817. Do you think yourself, from your experience, that there is a waste of time in those two departments of the work?—So far as the accounts are concerned, I think there is certainly a waste of time.

Comparison of cost of Poor Law hospitals and Poor Law infirmaries.

1818. You gave us details as to the expense per bed of certain infirmaries; have you compared those figures with similar figures from other hospitals?—No, I have not. I throw out the suggestion that it would be well for the Commission to investigate that point further.

Extravagance on buildings.

1819. Do you in your experience find it more common to have to complain of extravagance, or to have to complain of cheese-paring?—The whole situation has changed since my early days. I used to have to complain of cheese-paring; I now have got the matter of extravagance very much in my mind—perhaps too much.

1820. Is it a question between more or less spending, or between spending wisely or unwisely?—It is certainly a question of the latter.

1821. The question with regard to extravagance is a question purely relative to the object?—Certainly.

Scale of comfort in Poor Law infirmaries.

1822. Do you think that the modern infirmaries are fitted up as a rule on a greater scale of comfort than is desirable?—A great deal depends on the union and a great deal depends on a point which I shall hope to put at greater length before the Commission later on, namely, whether the increased comforts in infirmaries are wholly altering the character of the in-door poor law administration, that is to say, whether they are not tapping a new stratum, which used to be far above the stratum which yielded pauperism, and if so, whether that is inevitable or whether it is not inevitable.

1823. You gave some figures comparing the outlay per bed in different unions; is the class of case in those unions different?—Naturally in urban unions, where the greater expense is, you have a larger proportion of what I may call curable cases; and therefore, I suppose, there would be a greater justification for getting absolutely first-rate medical wards there.

Officers' tenure: Age limit.

1824. Now with regard to the tenure of office; you think that the present system of irremoveability is good; but is an office terminable at any point in age? Take a master, for instance, or a chaplain?—At sixty the guardians may retire an officer if they like.

1825. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) At sixty-five is it not?—Yes.

1826. (*Mr. Phelps.*) That is to say, it is terminable at a point in a man's life?—Yes.

Effect of Superannuation Act.

1827. Could you put in a statement which would show the Commission what the effect of the Superannuation Act has been? It would be interesting to know what is the position under that Act of a man when he retires at sixty-five, having enjoyed a salary, let us say, of £100 a year as master of a workhouse?—Do you mean as to the amount of pension he would get?

1828. How far the pension is really adequate to act as a temptation to a man to retire, or how far it would act as a deterrent?—Usually the officer stays as long as he can. But there is another complication which perhaps I should mention; and that is the matter of added years. Boards of guardians can under exceptional circumstances add a certain number of years to the service of an officer. That is under "special circumstances" and the board have to decide what "special circumstances" are. The board started by being very careful, but it is almost impossible to refuse a board of guardians permission to add years. The first difficulty came in by boards of guardians saying

"Unless we add these years to the officer the officer will not have enough to live upon, and we want to give him enough to live upon, so we must add these years," and that was held to be a "special circumstance."

Increased expenditure on salaries.

1829. We spoke just now of the difference between expenditure on buildings which was sometimes extravagant, and expenditure on buildings which was sometimes the reverse; do you find a similar change has taken place with regard to the salaries of officers?—The salaries of officers have very largely increased. As I pointed out yesterday, formerly the salaries of officers used to be 11·2 per cent. of the whole expenditure on relief by the guardians; but the salaries of officers now amount to a sum of 18·1 per cent. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (16).)

1830. Is that because there are more officers, or because their salaries have been raised?—It is due to both causes.

Effect of grants in aid.

1831. Do you think that the system of giving grants in aid of salaries has increased extravagance?—Personally I am against that system; whether it has increased expenditure or not is a matter of opinion.

Relation between guardians and their officers.

1832. On the whole, would you think, from your experience, that board of guardians deal fairly and justly with their officers?—I think they deal very fairly and justly with their officers; and I should like to say that I think that on the whole the officers deal very fairly and justly with them. I should like to say this now, lest I forget it—nothing strikes a man who is accustomed to inspect workhouses more than the goodness of the master and the matron. Of course, I know there are exceptions, and there must be exceptions, but the kindness and consideration which the ordinary matron shows to the children and the old women is remarkable. That is my impression.

Complaints against officers.

1833. You have told us that the complaints against officers have become very much smaller in number?—That is so, they are very much smaller.

1834. Has the quality of the offences altered?—That I do not know. The usual offence for which a man is dismissed is either fraud or drink.

1835. Not cruelty, for instance, or misconduct of that sort?—No, that is very rare.

1836. That is extinct almost now, is it not?—I think that is extinct; it is so very unpopular with boards of guardians.

1837. But you do sometimes find fraud?—Yes.

1838. On a large scale, would you say?—Not on a large scale, but there is fraud sometimes, and there is drunkenness—that is the usual cause.

Returns asked for from guardians.

1839. (*Dr. Downes.*) On the question of the returns that are obtained for the central authority, I think the guardians' officers are very often asked for returns not only by the board but by the inspectors also?—Yes.

1840. And also by other boards of guardians?—That is continually being done.

1841. So that altogether a great deal of useful information is accumulated by the returns asked for by one or another?—It is the only way in which you can get information of that description.

Central Authority as an "Intelligence Department"

1842. Do you think it would be advantageous if the central authority developed itself rather more into what I may call an intelligence department?—That is rather a matter of internal organization, but it is certainly receiving consideration.

1843. If such returns as have been referred to were collected and published from time to time they might prove of great utility, might they not, and be preserved?—I think so. Often a valuable return is got, but it is never summarised, and the results are never printed, so that it becomes practically inaccessible. I think a good deal might be done to remedy that.

Effect of comparative statistics on local administration.

1844. I think you said in your evidence this morning that the publication of figures was one effectual way of bringing local administration into line; if one board of guardians knows what the cost of an institution is elsewhere, that is a guide to them in regulating their own expenditure, is it not?—It is; and it is often a matter of very great surprise to a Board of Guardians when they find that other people are doing the work for less money than they are.

1845. Up to that time possibly they were not aware of anything of the kind?—That is so.

1846. On the question of inspection, inspection may have its disadvantages as well as its advantages; for instance, there may be a danger of over-inspection?—There is a very great danger of over-inspection.

Dangers of over-inspection.

1847. May not the responsibilities of the guardians and of the officers be possibly weakened by over-inspection?—They not only may be, but are in some instances.

1848. The case in fact is rather different now-a-days to what it was in the early days of the Poor Law, is it not?—The whole character of boards of guardians has changed; there is no doubt about that.

Effect of Local Government Act 1894.

1849. The Act of 1894 has brought about a considerable difference?—It has brought about an immense difference.

Lady guardians.

1850. We have lady guardians now?—And ladies' committees.

Increased powers of individual guardians.

1851. There is also, I think, Sir Henry Fowler's order, which gave very free access to institutions in the case of individual guardians?—Yes. Any individual guardian can now go into a workhouse and inspect it; he occasionally is a great nuisance, but on the whole he is a check.

Functions of Poor Law Medical Inspector for the provinces.

1852. With regard to the services of the medical inspector for the provinces, I think there is no difficulty in any inspector obtaining his services at any time?—Never; so far as I have found it, he seems to be ubiquitous.

1853. His services are by no means limited to the routine inspection of six workhouses?—They are not. Among other things, he has to sit as assessor with an inspector who holds an inquiry which involves any medical question.

1854. In the case of any emergency any inspector could I take it, wire for his services?—Twice in the last ten days we have had unfortunately to trouble Dr. Fuller.

Cost of Poor Law infirmaries.

1855. On the cost of modern Poor Law buildings, especially infirmaries, I am not sure whether the instances you gave us were in all cases separate infirmaries. The infirmary at Hendon I believe is a separate infirmary, and so are those at West Ham, Willesden and Islington; but is the infirmary at Dartford a separate infirmary?—It is not, if you mean by a separate infirmary what I may call a self-administered infirmary.

See Appendix No. III.

1856. I mean a self-administered, separate institution?—That of course makes a great difference in the cost, because you have to provide for the medical officer's house, for separate nurses' quarters, for separate stores, and so on.

1857. Very often a laundry and sometimes electric plant have been provided?—Yes, all of which to my mind are occasionally extravagances; I think they could do without them in many cases.

1858. In comparing the very wide differences of cost shown in the figures you put before us, those circumstances would have to be taken into account?—Certainly. You will find that, on the list I have handed in, the separately administered infirmaries are marked.

London Cubic Space Committee: Cubic space per bed as affecting cost.

1859. There is another possible cause of difference of cost between London and the districts outside London which I think you did not refer to, so perhaps I may remind you of it; namely, that in London the cubic space per bed is regulated by the report of a committee which sat in 1867?—Yes, there was the Cubic Space Committee. In London the space is 850 cubic feet, and in the provinces it is 600 cubic feet, is it not?

1860. Yes; so that a bed in the London infirmaries is not quite the same as a bed in the country infirmaries. There is a further difference, I think, in some infirmaries which will have to be taken into consideration, namely, that some provide more day room accommodation than others?—Yes.

Submission of pencil sketch plans to Central Authority.

1861. It is therefore to be noted that your figures are all per bed, which is not necessarily the same as per cubic space. One question that was put to you related to some plans that cost £500; I believe the board have frequently suggested that pencil plans should be sent up in the first instance, in order to save expense in the preparation of plans?—Yes; that is now almost a universal suggestion.

1862. So that there is no occasion for guardians to go to very great expense in the preparation of plans before receiving sanction?—That is so.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

Appendix No. III (3). Differences in cost of Cottage Homes.

1863. Can you explain the great difference in the cost of the cottage homes that were mentioned? You gave us Chorlton, Liverpool, Barrow and Haverfordwest. Were the Chorlton homes separate institutions?—Yes, I think so.

1864. And Liverpool also?—Yes.

1865. What about Barrow?—That probably was not. This is a point that rather illustrates the building question. When cottage homes were introduced, which was a great many years ago, the idea was that cottage homes would be cheaper than block buildings. The original idea of a cottage home was a real cottage, but the cottage has now become a villa I often think that the real criterion between a cottage home as it was intended and a cottage home as it is now, is that in the old cottage home the children were tubbed in a bath in the kitchen, and now they have got a bath that probably cost a great many pounds, with hot and cold water laid on and all the rest of it. That change illustrates the process which is going on. I remember my original idea of a cottage home was just a cottage.

1866. You will find cottages now with forty children in them, I believe?—Yes, you will find cottage homes with forty children in them, costing £200 per bed.

Building requirements of Central Authority.

Appendix No. III., H.

1867. As to the general question of cost, you have referred to the Points that were drawn up by the Local Government Board, as laying down their requirements for the provision of poor law buildings; are you aware of any material alteration of late years in those Points which would increase expenditure?—None, I think, except the additional classifications. But then, of course, one must remember that the cost of building has very much gone up in the last few years; I have a return of the number of pence per hour paid to masons, plumbers and so on, which was given to me by our architect. Then there is the additional question whether the men do as much work as they used to do.

Clerks to guardians as "whole-timers."

1868. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In some unions I understand the clerk to the boards of guardians gives the whole of his time to the duties of his office, and in some unions he gives part of his time; have you any experience which you could give us showing the relative advantage of the two systems?—It all depends on the size of the union. In a very large union the duties of the clerk would hardly allow him time to do anything else; but in unions of a moderate size there are some advantages in having a practising solicitor as clerk. He has a certain influence; for instance, he is very often clerk to the justices, and holds other offices which give him a position which is useful to the administration of the union. Of course, in some unions it would be impracticable for the clerk to do anything else but his own work.

1869. Is not the tendency among boards of guardians rather to appoint a man to give his whole time, seeing how much the clerk's work has increased, owing to the Act of 1894, and so forth?—I do not see much difference.

Appointment and qualifications of auditors.

1870. The auditors, I understand, are appointed by the President of the Local Government Board?—Yes.

1871. Have they to possess any special qualifications?—I would rather not answer that question, as it is not immediately in my department. I know that the auditors have to undergo a certain training, but exactly what it is I do not know. You had better get that from somebody who is more familiar with the subject than I am.

Qualifications of relieving officers.

1872. As to the qualifications of the relieving officer, have the Central authority laid down any rules on that subject?—No.

1873. None whatever?—No.

1874. So that the old system might obtain that a guardian who had failed in private business might be appointed relieving officer by his colleagues out of sympathy?—The appointment has to be sanctioned by us, and certain questions come up and have to be answered, such as the size of the district, and so on; and there, as in the case of the nurses, we can remonstrate. We could refuse to appoint an obviously unfit man, and I think we should; but between fitness and special qualifications there is a good deal of difference.

1875. I think you said just now that no general instructions are issued to your inspectors similar to those which have been issued for many years by the Board of Education to their inspectors?—No. There are instructions, but they date from very early times.

General instructions by Central Authority to Inspectors.

1876. I was going to ask whether, supposing those instructions exist, they would not be of great value in teaching the guardians their duties? What I have noticed very much myself—and I have suffered from it a great deal—is their ignorance. If we had some code of that kind which was called a Code of Instructions for inspectors, then a new guardian, if he cares for his work, could study it and so start knowing something, instead of having to buy all his experience and knowledge at the expense of the ratepayers?—Would the object of that be to keep the inspector up to his work?

1877. No, the object in my view would be to instruct a guardian as to his duties. I consider that a great many things which are criticised now in the administration of workhouses are the direct result of ignorance on the part of the guardians; and I want to know whether any code of instructions exists which might be put into the hands of a well-intentioned newly-elected guardian, which would give him some teaching other than what he would get out of Glen or Archbold or some enormous tome of that kind?—You mean something, for instance, showing the points on which the guardians are entirely responsible and the points on which they have not complete power?

Need for instructions to guardians.

1878. Also the general principles of out-door and in-door relief, and so on. It seems to me that all over the country every board of guardians is buying the same experience; at least, I have served on three boards of guardians and that has been my experience?—There is something to be said for your suggestion.

Position of general inspectors subsequent to 1894.

1879. Since 1894 should you say that the inspectors have been more or less generally consulted, and more, may I say, courteously consulted and generously consulted?—I think they have been more consulted.

1880. Their advice has been more generally followed, I think?—I think they are much more considered than they used to be.

Number of inspectors of boarded-out children.

1881. As regards the number of inspectors of boarded-out children, would it be wrong to say that one of the reasons which may have led to the failure of the boarding-out system in many parts of the country has been that there has not been a sufficient number of inspectors?—I should not say so.

1882. My point is that it is just likely that if the guardians saw more of your inspectors, and if your inspectors shewed guardians more what their duties as guardians were, you would get much better work done; but that is only my idea?—We shall have to talk about boarding-out later.

Departmental arrangements of Central Authority.

1883. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) You have spoken of the different departments of the central authority, can you tell us what those departments are?—There are the engineering departments, which have to deal with loans for public drainage, water-supply and so on; then there is the medical department, which deals with medical inspection, vaccination and so on; then there is the Poor Law department; then there is the audit department; and then there is the legal department.

1884. Within the Poor Law department are there various sub-departments?—There are two sub-departments within the Poor Law department; there is one which deals with general correspondence, workhouse inspection and the proceedings of boards of guardians generally, and there is another which deals more especially with the officers.

Indoor staff of Poor Law department.

1885. Is there a large staff in connection with the Poor Law department?—The Poor Law administration sub-department has a principal clerk, 3 upper division clerks, 4 staff officer and higher grade clerks, and eleven other clerks.

1886. How are these appointed; are they all appointed by the president?—No, those come in by public competition; they pass a competitive examination under different scales.

General inspectors' influence on guardians' policy.

1887. To pass to the question of the inspectors, I understand that it is part of their duty to influence the policy of their unions; would you say that the inspectors in general have a policy of their own?—I think so. I think you will find that the ones you will have before you will have a very definite policy.

1888. Would it on the whole be the same policy?—It would differ in details no doubt.

1889. Do you think that their districts would reflect their policy on the whole?—They would reflect their efficiency, I think. Of course they do influence policy to a certain extent.

olicy Central uthority.

1890. Would you say that the central authority itself has a policy?—I hope so, but that is a matter with which I hope to deal later on. I hope to show historically the difference in the point of view, as I take it, speaking entirely for myself, that has happened in my time.

1891. Should we find that policy reflected in recent circulars?—Yes.

1892. So that you will be able to tell us roughly what the policy of the central authority is?—I shall be able to point to the circulars, and I shall leave you to form your own judgment as to what is the policy behind them.

andard cost for ildings.

1893. I was wondering whether in reference to the cost of the buildings, it might be possible to have some standard plans and rules as to the maximum cost per bed, leaving the local authorities to show good reason for any deviation from those?—Or possibly to leave the deviation or excess out of any loan. That is a point for consideration.

1894. (*Mr. Loch.*) That is to say, to charge it to the year's accounts?—Yes.

1895. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) So that the burden of the change in the plans would rest on the local authorities and not on the central office?—Yes, or rather the board would be assisted in being somewhat stiffer in the matter of loans. Of course there are great objections to that, owing to the varying needs of the varying districts, and owing to the difference in the cost of building in the various districts.

1896. But then they could show good reason for any deviation?—Yes. We rather endeavour to work on those lines now.

dditional alifications r relying icers.

1897. You spoke about the type of officers; would it not be possible to insist upon some training for relieving officers? Nurses now must be trained, but, as I understand, there is no training for relieving officers?—That is so, and it is very difficult to see what the training should be.

1898. Do you think some form of examination would be possible?—Personally, I have a deep distrust of examinations; but that may be merely personal.

1899. Some form of probation under other experienced relieving officers in good districts might be possible?—That seems to me more practicable. I have often advised boards of guardians to ask a newly-appointed relieving officer to go and spend a week or two with an experienced officer in the neighbourhood.

parate blication general spectors' orts

1900. Would it not be well if the Local Government Board were to publish the Poor Law reports separately, and if the inspectors were asked to report a little more fully about their districts?—Yes; but sometimes we get complaints that inspectors report too fully. I am very much struck, reading up the inspectors' old reports, or looking through them as I have been doing lately, with the excellent stuff that some of them are. It is almost a pity that they should be entirely buried in a Blue-book.

1901. They really are buried, for it is very difficult to dig out anything from them?—They are, and that of course is a point; but still the different inspectors' reports are of very unequal value.

dditional alifications relying icers.

1902. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to what Mrs. Bosanquet has just asked as to the relieving officers, do not the relieving officers divide themselves into two groups—a good many of them being young men taking up the work professionally, and a certain number being older men appointed sometimes very casually?—That is so.

1903. With regard to the younger men, would it not be possible to lay down, at any rate for them, certain qualifications, seeing that the standard of work done by the relieving officers varies immensely even in the same union?—As far as I know that is the case, and we do get very unequal work in the same union. I am disposed to say that a relieving officer *nascitur non fit*.

1904. True, in a measure that is so, but the search for the exceptional man which your motto suggests is left without any kind of instructional order to the boards of guardians, so that if a man does not fulfil certain conditions he is not thereby put out of the running?—That is so. He must be able to keep his books; that is about the present qualification

1905. Take a point which is very important in the formation of a judgment upon the man; he ought to know something about the Poor Law, ought he not, and what the aims of the orders have been, why they are, what they are, and so on?—Yes, he should. A great many people ought to know more about the Poor Law than they do. But if a man is keen, he will learn; if he is not keen, you cannot make him learn.

1906. I think that in some quarters it is agreed that the changes in the last ten years have thrown more responsibility on the relieving officer, particularly when he has a new board, which naturally finds itself confronted with many difficulties; and therefore that knowledge, if he can use it, is doubly important to him and to them?—All that you say I agree with. I would add this, that of all the Poor Law officers, the relieving officer is the most difficult to supervise. He only has to attend the meeting of the guardians once a fortnight, say, and of his proceedings in the meantime you know nothing, except by that very imperfect book which is called the Application and Report Book. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (24).) He may be doing anything; he may be even engaging in another trade or profession without your knowing it.

Difficulty of supervising relieving officers.

1907. What I suggest is, that possibly the clauses in the order bearing on relieving officers might be revised in some measure, in view of the great change in poor law administration to which you yourself have referred?—That is a point for consideration, and I will look into the matter as carefully as I can.

1908. I will just refer to one point in relation to the architect: Could it not be made a rule that only sketch plans should be considered by the board, because in that way the very large initial expenditure on plans would be avoided as a matter of course?—I think we might do something in that direction; but I should think, speaking off-hand, that nearly always in the case of large building operations, the plans that come to us now are sketch plans.

Expediency of sketch plans being submitted to Central Authority.

1909. Going to the question of loan expenditure, is it possible to take the line that no more than a certain proportion of the assessment rate should be borrowed by a board, whatever its demands might be?—There is a limit already; they have no borrowing powers beyond a proportion of their rateable value. With regard to the loan expenditure, I may say this—I think this is what you want to get at: In the triennial period from 1857 to 1860, 3·5 per cent of the total expenditure on poor law matters is represented by loans repaid and interest. That mounted pretty evenly to the year 1900, when it was 7·8 per cent.; it has now got in the year 1904 to 9·3 per cent., so that 9·3 per cent. of the total expenditure on relief may be charged to the loan account. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (16).)

Loan expenditure: Limit to guardians' borrowing powers.

1910. Roughly, the percentage has trebled in the period you have taken?—It has grown, but it has not quite trebled.

1911. So far as there is a ratio of limitation, that is, a sum in relation to the assessment which they must not exceed, may it be said that the law as it at present stands restricts expenditure by way of loan?—It does restrict it to a certain extent. The growth of the loan account is a matter for serious consideration. I should like it to be understood that I express no opinion as to whether loans should be restricted to a great extent or not, nor do I express any strong opinion as to whether the expenditure on buildings can be restricted beyond a certain extent. My point is that the expenditure appears very large indeed, and the loan account appears to be growing ominously; and that those are questions which I think deserve consideration.

1912. Is there any official, apart from the general office, who is specially acquainted with the loan movement and has to specially report upon loans?—We have full information as to loans in the department, some of which I will put before you later on when I come to deal with expenditure.

1913. Would it be out of question for the Local Government to require boards of guardians to report annually on certain specific points; at least so that on those points

Powers of Central Authority to obtain reports from guardians.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

there might be information in regard to every board in England, those points being of vital importance in regard to administration?—As, for instance?

1914. As, for instance, the amount of out-door relief and in-door relief, and the reasons for an increase; also, the amount of the medical out-door relief (which is not in the reports now), and other points, such as whether there is already in the place sufficient hospital and dispensary accommodation, we will say, for dealing with a certain amount of medical relief? A list of points might be suggested which would be all more or less important, at any rate in the urban communities?—You will observe that we have very full statistics from the boards of guardians. Whether those statistics are just what we want is a question, but that we have very full statistics is a fact. What you are asking for now is explanatory comments on the statistics of each union to be made by the boards of guardians themselves.

1915. My desire would be that a board of guardians should form a judgment on its own work annually in reference to certain specific points?—Some boards of guardians do, and they make very interesting reports. If all boards of guardians did it, I think it would be useful, provided the reports were summarised and made use of. There is no use in sending up a mass of reports which lie in a corner undigested; nor, I think, would it be of any use to ask boards of guardians to undertake such a duty, which would depend to a great extent on the competence of the clerk and the chairman. Some of the Yorkshire unions for instance, I might say, make most interesting reports.

1916. I myself have had great difficulty sometimes in obtaining informaton about one union on points of importance, through there being no report; whereas in another union, as you yourself say, the information is to be had at once. It seems to me that a local appendix to what we might call the Poor Law part of the Annual Report, if it were formed in such a manner as that, would be of very great service?—Yes, it would.

Publication of statistics by general inspectors.

1917. One other point in regard to the details of the administration to which Mr. Bentham referred. Would it be possible for the inspectors, instead of a general statement, such as has been made by Mr. Preston-Thomas in his report which Mr. Bentham quoted, to put down the facts in regard to each particular union in an official document, so that the whole of the unions in the county might know how they stand on points of importance?—Do you mean that they should have to fill up a form?

1918. I mean that the inspector should not merely say some unions are bad and some unions are good, but should state simply the facts with regard to each of them, and that that information should be put before the country?—That might be all very well for us who are living in London, but the inspector has got to live among his boards of guardians, and it may be an indiscreet thing for an inspector to be too frank.

1919. I admit that difficulty; but the point remains that the influence of one man in trying to change a multitude of details must very often be comparatively small, whereas the tendency to imitation as between board and board may be a very strong force; and if it is thought that a certain board is doing well and it is known as taking the lead, there may be a movement by way of copying that board?—You will find that a great many of the inspectors have anticipated your suggestion by making these returns; for instance, I put upon the table yesterday a return which I made for the guardians in my district. Mr. Fagenal, who is the Yorkshire inspector, and Mr. Bircham, who is the inspector for Wales, have each sent me a return which is practically an analysis of the pauperism in his district, written so plainly that almost any board of guardians could understand it. I have not seen such returns before, but they are obviously useful.

1920. It seemed to me that the method might be pushed further, and that they might form part of what I have called the local appendix to the Poor Law section of the Annual Report?—You mean to say that those reports might be printed?

1921. I think they would be of very great value to the general onlooker and promoter of good administration?—That point will be considered, I may say, when the question of the inspectors' reports generally is under consideration.

Friction between Local and Central Authorities.

1922. One point as to the cases of controversy to which Mrs. Webb referred. Are the cases where there is an actual opposition of opinion as between a board of guardians and the Department, which lasts for a long time, very numerous?—They are not very numerous. There are some old cases where the board says one thing and the guardians say another, and there is an interchange of letters that leads to nothing. I confess that in those cases it might be often possible and better for the board to give way.

1923. Does it form a very large part of the friction of the board?—I should say an infinitesimal part, because these questions, even when they are at their acutest, are very often settled by a single interview between a sensible man and the board of guardians, who probably have misunderstood the point a little.

Additional years under Superannuation Act.

1924. I should like to ask one more question, and that has to do with the subject of superannuation. Is there any kind of scale showing what number of years is added; say, for instance, that a man who is fifty wants to come in for superannuation, what years would be added in his case?—He cannot get superannuation then, unless he has got a medical certificate.

1925. But supposing he gets a medical certificate?—Then it would be within the option of the guardians. The board never suggest that years should be added.

1926. If there is no scale for the addition of years, is there any control over it, so that the guardians may not do what is merely equitable, but what is rather a matter of favouritism in regard to their servants?—As I think I pointed out just now, it is very difficult for the board to check boards of guardians in that matter.

1927. In that view should the Statute be reconsidered from the point of view of the added years. Is it acting really unjustly by leading to undue expenditure of the public money at the present moment?—I do not think the present administration is quite in accordance with the exact wording of the Statute; that is to say, the Statute said that these years should be added for special reasons, and I think there is a little straining in order to bring in "special reasons."

Effect of Superannuation Act on cost of salaries.

1928. May we take it that the Superannuation Act is the source of the largest increase in the item of salaries since 1896?—No, I should think not; I should think it is the increase in the number of officers. When we get to the nursing question, you will see how very large an increase there has been in the number of nurses, for instance. Then you must remember that the population of the country is growing very fast, and that what I may call the tendency to classify by different institutions entails the hiring of a great many more officers. Take a cottage home for instance. You have got to have a foster-mother for each cottage, and so on.

1929. Does the Act really lead to a man who has done comparatively small service becoming entitled to proportionately too high retiring pay?—I think not. The condition of superannuation is that you only receive one-sixtieth, I think it is, of your salary and emoluments per year's service. I think the pension is not excessively large; you have to serve a very long time before you get two-thirds of your salary.

1930. Have you ever considered whether there should be what you might call a public service in the matter of officials, so that you could treat this question of superannuation as if they were in the service, the relieving officers being placed here or there, as might be thought fit?—Speaking entirely for myself, I think the financial part of the Superannuation Act will have to be reconsidered. There is a general fund formed by compulsory deduction from the salaries of the officers in which each union shares, but the actual pension is paid out of the funds of the union in which the man last served; and there is a complaint, and an increasing complaint, of which no doubt the Commission will hear a good deal hereafter, that boards of guardians are too apt to appoint young officers, so that they may not be burdened with the cost of their superannuation later on. I do not say I have not known cases of that, because I have known some glaring cases; but whether it is a common practice I think is doubtful. I think that, *cæteris paribus*, a board of guardians will always choose a younger man, and sometimes do so having before their eyes the fear of having to pay a superannuation. That could only be remedied

probably by forming a central fund out of which the superannuation shall be paid; but that would open large questions as to the possibility of making the whole poor law service a national service, against which there is a very great deal to be said.

icacy of eving ers' ies.

1931. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) The relieving officer's duties are very delicate and difficult, are they not, in the way of giving relief when applicants come, as they must come in some cases, very frequently?—Yes, they are very difficult. If the relieving officer is too strict, he may get a bad name; the parson may complain of him or the good lady of the village may complain of him. If, on the other hand, he is lax, he does an infinity of mischief. He is the most important officer you can imagine.

aries and spects elieving ers.

1932. Can you give us any indication generally of what is the salary of a relieving officer?—The salary of a relieving officer in London, I think, is limited to £160 a year; I think that is his maximum. In the country a man would get from £90 to £120 or £130. But there is this to be considered, that the relieving officer has very often other duties; he used to be school attendance officer; he very often is vaccination officer, and he has other small duties to perform, such as registrar of births and deaths, and so on, which increase his salary to a fair living wage.

1933. But it is not in a sense a service which a man enters with the intention of remaining in it and making it his life work, and getting promotion from one place to another?—It is an out-door occupation, and it does not take a man's whole time in a great many instances. A great many men have a fancy for it. Sometimes I have known a workhouse master give up a much better berth, in order to get the out-door life, in which I sincerely sympathised with him. There is some interest about it too. But it is not of course a position in which a man can make a fortune, or in which there is any great *avenir*—any great chance of promotion.

1934. I am endeavouring to compare it with the somewhat analogous position in Scotland of an inspector of poor; there the service is one which has a very considerable *status*, for an inspector of poor in a large parish is a person of position; but that, I understand, is scarcely what you would say of the relieving officer in England?—No. Does not the inspector of poor do the clerk's work as well?

1935. He may or he may not be clerk as well; that depends?—He never is in England.

culation elieving cers ween ons.

1936. In most cases with us there is a clerk in addition to the relieving officer. Are the English relieving officers promoted as a rule from one union to another?—No. A union in appointing another relieving officer would be well advised perhaps to take an experienced man; but as a rule they do not. The difference in salary between one union and another is not so large as to make it worth a man's while to move.

1937. Then there is no promotion from a union in one part of England to a union in another part, because of the better position and the increased salary?—No.

arate or Law rmaries.

1938. In the majority of your rural workhouses, the infirmary buildings, I suppose, are part of the workhouse?—Yes, that is so. The infirmary buildings form a separate block, but they are administered from the workhouse.

1939. I do not know whether it has ever been proposed that the infirmary buildings should be entirely separated, and that the workhouses should be used specially not for cases which are sick and infirm but for test cases, and that the sick and infirm cases should all be placed in the infirmary building?—That is very largely done in urban unions, and the process is going on, but in the country unions the reply is that in an English country workhouse there are no test cases practically—there are hardly any able-bodied of any sort.

le-bodied country rkhouses.

1940. You gave us an instance of a cottage home housing forty children and costing £200 per bed; that, I suppose, is a system that has grown up side by side with that of boarding-out pauper children?—Yes, it has grown up side by side with the various systems which are now all on their trial in England for the care and treatment of children.

1941. I rather gather from what has been said that the system of boarding-out is not altogether a success in England?—I would rather deal with that when we come to the question of the children.

1942. I was merely going to ask you, with reference to a question that has already been put—namely, whether the non-success, if it be non-success, was not due to the want of inspection—whether it has not been suggested that there is too much inspection, too much of an inquisitorial system, which has brought complaints from the people with whom the children are boarded?—That suggestion has been freely made.

Inspectors of boarded-out children.

1943. How are the rates collected; is there a separate officer in a union who collects the rates?—Yes.

Relieving officers as collectors of rates.

1944. Is he separate from all those of whom you have been speaking?—Yes.

1945. That work, then, is never done by the r lieving officer?—It is never done by the relieving officer. We object to his holding that office.

1946. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) What are your powers where a board of guardians decline to carry out your suggestion? If, after the exhortations and blandishments of the inspectors, the guardians still hold out and refuse to carry out your recommendations, you have no power, I understand, to supersede the board of guardians?—There is no power of that kind at all.

Central Authority's powers when guardians contumacious

1947. Unless there is a statutory enactment or a regulation of the board which you can enforce by mandamus, you can do nothing if the guardians stand out against you?—That is so.

1948. Are there many cases of the kind where you have required additional powers, and where you think they would be of service to you?—Here and there there have been cases, but they occur very seldom. I know of no current cases now.

1949. Do you know of cases, such as we have had in Ireland, where the contractors have refused to supply any more food for the inmates, and we have been at a deadlock with the union on that point?—We have not got quite to that in any case yet.

Attendance of guardians at meetings.

1950. I think with you the attendance is very much better than with us; I suppose there are not in your recollection any cases where a board of guardians as a body have failed to attend the meetings?—No; they always attend.

Appointment and tenure of general inspectors and assistant inspectors.

1951. With regard to the appointment of inspectors, I understand you attach great importance to the efficiency of the inspectors?—I do.

1952. And to the influence which they exercise?—I do not think it would be practicable to work a centralised system like ours without local agents.

1953. That points to the necessity of getting efficient men; as I understand, you get assistant inspectors first and they are promoted to inspectorships?—That is now the usual procedure.

1954. Are the assistant inspectors permanent officers?—Yes.

1955. So if an assistant inspector was appointed, and if he was found not to be a man who took a very great interest in his work, still he would have a permanent tenure of office, and, short of any fault, you could not very well put him out?—What would happen to him would be that he would continue to be an assistant inspector; he would not get a district.

1956. So if an assistant inspector is not considered an energetic and very efficient officer, some other man, his junior, would be put over his head?—Yes.

1957. And he might remain an assistant inspector all his life?—He might.

1958. But you have no power absolutely of removing him, short of any fault on his part?—No, he is a permanent civil servant.

Central Authority's knowledge of proceedings of guardians.

1959. The central authority here does not receive copies of the minutes of proceedings of the boards of guardians, do they?—No.

1960. How do they know exactly what is going on?—The inspector receives every week a form, which is known as Form A, in which the statistics of the union as to indoor relief and out-door relief are set out; and on the outside of that the clerk has to notify any exceptional circumstance.

1961. But the information given is only in regard to relief?—Yes. I may say that some of the larger unions

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.P.

23 Jan. 1906.

print their agenda papers, and as a matter of courtesy send them to the inspectors. I have found that extremely useful.

Laboriousness of duties of guardians' officers.

1962. I think you said that a very good class of officer had been elected in recent years?—Yes, I think they are a very good class.

1963. A great many of them, I suppose, are hard-worked?—Most of them are, but that is just the difficulty. A half-employed officer, as you know perfectly well, is a great mischief. In the question of Poor Law administration, we always have that difficulty to face; for instance, an officer of a very small country workhouse has not very much to do, in fact he has too little to do.

1964. You stated that you considered there was rather a waste of time in regard to account-keeping?—Yes, I think there is.

Departmental Committee on Workhouse Accounts.

1965. Is that the opinion of the Local Government Board?—It was the opinion of a Departmental Committee that sat on the question a little time ago.

1966. Have they done anything now to rectify that?—The order is under consideration.

1967. So that that is only a temporary matter?—That, I hope, is only a temporary matter.

Frequency of inspectors' visits to boards of guardians.

1968. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the visits of an inspector to a particular union, you have told us that he is expected to attend a meeting of each board of guardians once a year and to inspect the workhouse?—That is so.

1969. Of course he would attend much more frequently in any particular case where there was some special reason for his so doing?—He does—that is the practice; and he attends committee meetings frequently.

1970. Supposing there were some special matter going on at the union that required his attendance, would he, as a matter of course, give special attention to that union, and visit it more frequently?—Yes, either on his own initiative or by the instructions of the board.

Separate publication of Central Authority's Annual Report on Poor Law.

1971. With regard to the annual report of the board, I do not know whether the point has come before you, but it has been suggested that the annual report should be divided into two parts, and that the poor law part should be separate from the rest; is it within your knowledge that that point is at the present time under some consideration?—Yes, I know it is. Further, the point is under consideration whether each inspector should not choose for himself a special subject to deal with in his report, which I think would be a considerable improvement.

Separate reprints of general inspectors' Reports.

1972. At the present time, with regard to the reports of the inspectors which are printed in the annual report, it is frequently the practice, is it not, to reprint separately the report of the inspector, so that he may circulate it in his district?—If the inspector thinks fit, the board reprint it for him without any trouble at all; and then he can send it round.

Nature of extravagance on workhouse buildings.

1973. Coming to the question of the buildings, would it be your view that, generally speaking, buildings which might be avoided are put up; or do you think the additional cost arises, not from unnecessary buildings, but from an expensive way of carrying out?—It arises almost entirely from an expensive way of carrying them out. Occasionally, you have an unnecessary building, but that is owing to a fault in judgment (which is quite pardonable) either by the board of guardians or by the Local Government Board; such cases will perhaps be brought before you.

1974. Would you not say that generally it is rather that the guardians are difficult to get to put up a new building at any time, say a new workhouse, than that they are anxious to put up a new workhouse, when one is not wanted?—Yes.

1975. And that sometimes the Local Government Board have a difficulty in persuading them, either by correspondence or by the action of the inspector, to provide a new workhouse or some additional building, such as an infirmary, where one is really needed?—There are many instances of that kind; and then when a board of guardians have once determined to put it up, they occasionally, according to my judgment, are prone to overspend.

Central Authority's check on extravagance

1976. Taking those latter cases, has not the action of the Local Government Board been in the way of advising them to avoid all unnecessary expense in the way of undue ornament, for instance?—We take a great deal of pains about that, and an increasing amount of pains. The Architect's Department are very anxious indeed to avoid expenditure. As I have pointed out, there are many other causes, and the question is an old one; I quoted Mr. Goschen's Minute in 1870 with reference to it.

1977. Within recent years I think that view has been re-affirmed?—It was re-affirmed by Mr. Chaplin.

Building requirements of Central Authority.

1978. Further than that, the architectural "Points" which you have put in, are drawn up with the view of showing what is really necessary for the proper accommodation of the poor, and in no way to encourage the guardians to do that which is unnecessarily expensive?—That is so. Of recent years, the board have not only drawn up "Points," but they have actually made scale plans* for cottage homes, with very careful calculations of the cost per cubic foot—a most useful work, and tending very much, as I think, in the direction of economy. I shall put those in too. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (29).)

Effect of classification on cost of buildings.

1979. It is the case, I think you told us, that a good deal of the increased expense in building has been caused by changes in the view which has been taken as to what is necessary for the accommodation of the poor, for getting the children out of workhouses, and for setting up separate infirmaries?—That is so.

Effect of abolition of barrack schools on cost.

1980. Take one instance, the abolition of barrack schools and the substitution for them of separate schools; that has necessarily involved considerable expense, has it not?—It involved an immense expenditure, amounting to hundreds of thousands of pounds.

Limit to guardians' borrowing powers.

1981. Coming to the borrowing powers of boards of guardians, is there not a distinct limit to the amount which they can borrow?—Yes.

1982. I think the limitation, which was altered by Sec. 2 of the Poor Law Act, 1889, is now one-quarter of the rateable value of the union, but may be extended by provisional order to one-half?—That is so.

Period for repayment of loans.

1983. With regard to the period for loans, the usual period which is allowed by statute to a local authority is a maximum term of sixty years I think?—It is a maximum of sixty years for land, is it not?

1984. I think it is the maximum allowed by statute, without saying for what purpose. The actual term to be granted depends, does it not, upon the circumstances of the particular case, and is to be fixed by the local authority and sanctioned by the Local Government Board?—That is so.

1985. I think in 1897, an Act was passed which made that law applicable to boards of guardians?—That was so.

1986. Consequently now, a board of guardians may borrow for sixty years as a maximum period, the actual term being settled by the board of guardians with the sanction of the board?—That is so? the Act fixed the maximum only.

1987. Then, as a matter of practice, sixty years are allowed, are they not, for land?—As a rule, I think only fifty.

1988. I think latterly it has been thought that the maximum term of sixty years might be granted for freehold land, has it not?—Yes.

1989. With regard to buildings, sixty years, I think, are never given?—I think never more than thirty years are given.

1990. The period also is less where alterations are proposed to existing buildings, is it not?—Yes, and also for such fittings as boilers and so on, where we only allow perhaps five, ten, or fifteen years.

1991. The term being made to depend upon the probable life of the work?—That is it.

Conferences as to proposed buildings between representatives of guardians and Central Authority.

1992. You told us that before new buildings are carried out, conferences frequently take place between the architect of the guardians and the architect of the Local Government Board; the inspector is usually present at those conferences, is he not?—I advise that he should always be present.

1993. And commonly he is?—Commonly he is. He is much more often present than he used to be; I may say now that he is always present.

* NOTE.—The blocks for the plans referred to have been destroyed. The Memorandum accompanying the plans is printed in the Appendix. (See App. Vol. I. (A), No. V. (29).)

1994. It is evidently desirable that he should be, so that questions of administration may be considered as well as mere building or architectural arrangements ?—Yes.

smissal of icers.

1995. With regard to the officers' tenure of their appointments, about which a good deal has been said, guardians can, in the case of the less important officers, remove them, can they not ? It is only with regard to the more important officers that the consent of the central authority is necessary ?—That is so.

1996. Since that order of the 12th February, 1879, to which you referred just now, the guardians can, even in the case of the more important officers, remove them with the consent of the Local Government Board ; and it is not the case, as it was formerly, that the board should, themselves, remove the officer ?—That is so. This has made a considerable change in practice.

1997. That is to say, the guardians have got more initiative in the matter of dealing with their officers than was the case prior to the issue of that order ?—Quite so.

smissal officers ring bation.

1998. Further than that, during the first twelve months of their employment—I am speaking now of the more important officers—the guardians may dismiss them, may they not, with the consent of the board, without fault shown, but simply because they do not consider such officers suitable for the post ?—I have already called attention to that point.

1999. That was done intentionally, was it not, with the view of preventing guardians being saddled with an officer who was unsuitable, but against whom no specific allegation could be made ?—That was evidently the intention ; and, so far as the Boards of Guardians go, it meets the difficulty to a considerable extent, and it puts the responsibility on them in a way that used not to be the case.

nure of itary cers and or Law icers npared.

2000. The question was raised as to the relative position of sanitary officers and Poor Law officers ; is there not some distinction between them in this way, that with regard to medical officers of health they have in London a permanent tenure of office, that is to say, they can only be removed with the consent of the Local Government Board ?—So I understand.

2001. And with regard to the sanitary inspectors in London, that is not so ?—I do not know ; I never had anything to do with them in London, but I believe it is as you say.

2002. I think the Act expressly enables borough councils to remove them themselves. Going outside London, is it not the case that the tenure of office of a sanitary officer depends on whether half the salary is re-paid or whether it is not ? Supposing half the salary is re-paid, then he can only be removed from office with the consent of the Local Government Board ?—That is so.

2003. It is, is it not, largely the practice amongst local authorities to appoint sanitary officers for temporary periods ?—Yes, for terms mostly not exceeding seven years.

2004. Consequently they can, if they please, at the expiration of the time for which a man is appointed, appoint somebody else ?—Yes.

2005. That would not apply of course to the case of a Poor Law officer who once appointed remains permanently in office until he is removed ?—The difference is essential.

ect of perannua- n Act on t of aries.

2006. Then coming to the question of the superannuation of the officers, that has no doubt largely added to the apparent cost of the officers ?—Yes.

2007. But when that cost is considered, there ought also to be taken into account, ought there not, the fact that the officers themselves contribute each year a sum towards their superannuation ?—Certainly.

2008. That sum, therefore, ought to be deducted ?—That was in my mind when I said that the main cause of the increase in the cost of officers was, probably, the increase in their number, and not the superannuation.

2009. With regard to grants in respect of Poor Law officers outside London, there is now, I believe, no grant in respect of the salary of a particular officer ?—There is none.

2010. The grant that is made in respect of officers under section 26 of the Local Government Act, 1888, is a grant which depends, not on the officers at the present time employed, but on the amount that was paid in respect of officers during the year ended March 25th, 1888 ?—That is so. The grant is fixed according to a criterion, and the criterion adopted was the cost of officers at that date. The grant has not varied since.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

Basis of officers' grant under Sec. 26 of Local Government Act, 1888.

2011. Consequently, the guardians have no inducement one way or the other to appoint or not to appoint an officer at the present time in consequence of that grant ?—That has nothing whatever to do with it. That is the root of the misunderstanding which so many guardians have. They say, the cost of our officers has increased by so much, and, therefore, we ought to have more out of the Treasury grant. They do not understand that the grant was fixed then and there on a criterion of that year.

Reports on foreign Poor Law systems.

2012. I think you have made some reference to something that has been done abroad with regard to matters of this kind ; have you had occasion to consider foreign systems of Poor Law ?—For a great many years all the foreign papers came to me, and I made what use I thought fit of them. I have now handed them over to a very competent officer who, I hope, will make a great deal more use of them than I was able to make. As you are aware, the Board have at various times sent inspectors abroad to investigate foreign systems.

2013. Do you remember at all what they are ?—I remember Mr. Henley going to America ; last year Mr. Preston-Thomas went to Switzerland ; I went to Germany, and I have also been to Denmark for the Board. Perhaps there have been some others whom I forget. We have endeavoured to keep as far as we can in touch with what is going on abroad.

2014. You made some report on the Elberfeld system, I think ?—I did.

Basis of officers' grant under Local Government Act, 1888.

2015. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) With regard to the operation of the Act of 1888 to which Sir Samuel has referred, as I understand it, the stereotyping of the conditions of distribution of the grant, and its subsequent operation is a grievance to many boards of guardians and their officers ?—It is a grievance due to misunderstanding. They are under the impression that the State at that time undertook to pay a certain proportion of the cost of the officers, and they say, The cost of the officers has now increased, and we ought to get more ; whereas the cost of the officers was merely a chance criterion taken for the then division of the money which there was to divide.

2016. Is that not a grievance that it would be desirable to get rid of ?—The difficulty is to find some other criterion. I suppose the day will come when the matter will have to be re-considered.

2017. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The Local Taxation Commission recommended that it should be altered, did they not ?—I think they did.

2018. (*Mr. Loch.*) Perhaps the day is passed for making grants for specific offices, and the question might be re-considered entirely *de novo* ?—I think there is no doubt it will be re-considered *de novo*, and very soon.

Adequacy of information as to foreign Poor Law systems

2019. (*Chairman.*) You have stated that various officers connected with the Local Government Board, including yourself, have made reports on foreign systems of Poor Law ; it will be the duty of this Commission to examine into those systems ; is the information that you have at the Local Government Board tolerably complete as regards the particular systems which have been investigated ?—No, it is not up to date, but we can tell you generally what it is. For instance, only last night I had handed in to me an interesting report of the recent change in the French Poor Law ; I merely had time to glance at it, but I can see it is useful. It was made by a member of the department.

2020. Therefore, in your judgment, we shall have to supplement the information which is in the department ?—I think that is quite probable.

Salaries of relieving officers.

2021. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to the pay of relieving officers, is it usually progressive according to service increasing from year to year or from five years to five years ?—No. If the relieving officer applies for an increase, he may get a small increase. Relieving officers

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

are not, as a rule, appointed, as a great many nurses are, with a salary rising progressively.

2022. Then when you speak of the various rates of pay, rising from £90 to £160, we are to understand that the salaries vary according to the nature of the duties, or the union?—Yes. I should say that some superintendent relieving officers get a great deal more than the £160; but those are exceptions.

Effect of Superannuation Act on cost of salaries.

2023. With regard to the deductions made from their pay towards superannuation, I understood you to say that the fact that they paid towards superannuation themselves must be taken into consideration when the total amount of the charge that falls in this way upon the unions or the rates is considered; but if it is deducted from their pay, surely what is deducted on the one hand is added on the other, so how does it make any alteration in the total?—My point is this; I was talking about the increase in the ratio of salaries to the total expenditure; the salaries are shown in the figures, but the superannuation deductions are not shown.

2024. Then it merely bears upon the method of keeping the accounts?—Yes.

Circulation of general inspectors.

2025. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) When an inspector is appointed to a district, does he remain for the whole of his life in that particular district?—No; from time to time he gets changed for one reason or another. When I was appointed first, I was in Wales, then I went to Lancashire, then I went to Yorkshire, and then I went to Sussex. The change comes about either through the man's own desire or for reasons of public convenience.

2026. But the shifting about does take place?—Yes.

Reasons for powers of Central Authority.

2027. (*Chairman.*) I think you would like now to explain why the central authority is very centralised?—Yes. The administration which I have endeavoured to describe, is evidently one of very great centralisation, and the question which occurs is, why it is more necessary to centralise the administration of the Poor Law than any other branch of local administration. I think myself the answer may be found in this—that the destitute man has, in this country, what is practically a right to relief, but his right is not a complete right, for the necessary sanctions are lacking, that is to say, he cannot sue for his relief or move the courts to compel the guardians to give him his relief; therefore, it is the duty of the State to see that he gets his rights. I should say that the position, so far as the Poor Law and the destitute person are concerned, is this—that the State may safely guarantee a maintenance to the destitute, provided the condition of the person so maintained shall be or shall appear to be inferior to that of the poorest independent labourer. Assuming that I am right in that statement of what I may call the political aspect of the case, you will observe that there is a guarantee on the part of the State. Now it seems to me that the department has to see that that guarantee is fulfilled.

2028. The only local authority who can fulfil that duty is the board of guardians?—Yes; and hence the Local Government Board have to interfere, apparently with great minuteness, in the local affairs which fall under the board of guardians.

2029. They have to do that in order to see that the destitute person's right is respected, and that the conditions under which he applies for it are not contravened or put on one side?—They have two things to do; they have to see that the machinery for carrying out what I believe to be the guarantee of the State is in working order, and they have to see, as far as they can, that the conditions of relief are not such as to be mischievous to the Commonwealth.

Effectiveness of audit.

2030. I think you have described the limits of the actual control of the Local Government Board over buildings and over the appointment of officers; and, I understand, you would like now to say something as regards audit surcharges?—I have already explained the limitations of the board. I should like to say now, that, so far as audit surcharges are concerned, the board are criticised very often, and perhaps a little unjustly, for remitting the surcharges. It has been held by some people, and pressed on us, that if the surcharges were more rigidly enforced we should have a better administration. There were last year over 1,600 surcharges; 800 items of those came before the Local Government Board, and in forty-four cases alone was the surcharge actually pressed to the repayment by the individual guardian or officer who was responsible. I would say that out of that 1,600 a great many were on purely technical points—perhaps merely money charged in a wrong account; and a great many were discharged without appeal. We hold that the very fact of surcharge in most cases fulfils its object in preventing a recurrence of the irregularity; and, except in cases of fraud or extreme negligence, we do not resort to the extreme step of making the individual who is responsible for the irregularity pay up out of his own pocket. That is, I think, what I have to say as to the audit surcharges.

2031. Are these charges ever of so great magnitude as to make it very difficult to enforce them?—I think that would be rarely the case in matters of Poor Law administration.

2032. Then really the only consideration that governs the Local Government Board is one of equity?—Yes, We have ample equity power.

Political influence Central Authority

2033. If the Local Government Board control boards of guardians, the Board in their turn are subject to constant control from Parliament?—Yes. A good many of the critics of the Local Government Board would seem to have it in their minds that the Local Government Board is an independent body carrying out a certain policy. Perhaps in the early days that might have been so. For fourteen years after the new Poor Law Act was passed, the Poor Law Commissioners were in a sense independent of Parliament, that is to say, they were not exactly independent of Parliament, but they were an independent Commission not directly represented in Parliament. Now the situation is changed, and the President of the Local Government Board is usually a member of the Cabinet. More and more, so I should judge (of course I give this entirely as a matter of opinion) the members of the House of Commons take an interest in the current administration of the Local Government Board. They continually ask questions with regard to points of Poor Law administration and they occasionally bring in and pass an Act of Parliament which is contrary to what would be generally considered the Poor Law principles as laid down by the original Commissioners. Of course I express absolutely no opinion—not a shade of opinion—as to whether those Acts are right or whether they are wrong. I merely call attention to the fact that Parliament does, from time to time, pass such Acts. I will instance the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, by which it is enacted that the man who is in receipt of purely medical relief shall not be disqualified from voting. I make this further point with regard to that Act—I suppose the intention of the framers was what appears on the face of the Act, namely, that the relief should be merely relief by advice or medicine; I am told—and this is a point which I think the Commissioners would do well to further consider—that some revising barristers now hold that inmates of workhouses or Poor Law infirmaries do not lose their vote, provided the first cause of their entrance into the workhouse was their sickness and not their destitution. That is an extension of the Act which would seem to imply that the framers of it did not quite see what the ultimate result of their action would be.

Medical Relief Disqualificati Removal Act.

Interpretation of Ac by revising barristers.

2034. Do you mean that the revising barrister rules that they are not paupers, even although they are permanent inmates?—Even although they are inmates of a workhouse or infirmary.

2035. And have been for a lengthened period?—Yes.

Out-door Relief Friendly Societies Acts.

2036. Are there any other Acts of that kind that you would wish to mention?—Another instance was the Friendly Societies Exemption Act 1894, which laid down that boards of guardians need not take into consideration any sums up to a certain sum—5s. I think—which were received from friendly societies by applicants for relief. That Act was passed in reversal of the old policy of the Poor Law Commissioners and of the Local Government Board. You will find the matter dealt with in several of the old reports—I am not quite sure whether it is dealt with in the Report of 1834—and you will find it very amply discussed and argued out in a letter which was written in the year 1870 by the then Poor Law Board (Mr. Goschen being President) to Sir Richard Paget. Then this Act was passed by Parliament in 1894.

2037. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Was there not a second Act?—Yes. A second Act, which was passed in 1904, went a step further, and enacted that the guardians were not to take into consideration sums received up to 5s. from a Friendly Society. That Act may have been right, or it may have been wrong, but it certainly was not in accordance with the Poor Law principles that had been worked on by the department; for these reasons—It is giving relief to people who are not necessarily destitute; it is ear-marking a certain sort of property for special treatment; and it is restricting and curtailing the powers of boards of guardians in dealing with individual cases of relief—all of which is entirely contrary to the principles of the early Commissioners. Then there is a growing habit on the part of the House of Commons—I do not say it is not a useful thing to do—of referring Poor Law Bills to a Select Committee. The Select Committee makes a report, and you will find that in some of those reports there are *obiter dicta*, which are not, as I should think, in accordance with Poor Law principles. Then again, the fact that the President of the Local Government Board changes with the Cabinet is not conducive to continuity of administration. I do not give any instances of that, because I do not think there are any, but still, as a matter of theory, it serves to illustrate my point, which is briefly this, that critics of the Local Government Board are very apt to forget how close the influence of Parliament is and must be on the current administration and on the actions of the board as illustrated in circulars and orders.

Influence of Select Committees. President of Local Government Board a Politician.

2038. (*Chairman.*) You have spoken of Select Committees to which Bills are referred; has your attention ever been directed to the composition of those committees?—Not further than must strike everybody who has given evidence before them.

Composition of Select Committees.

2039. In what particular?—I think I may say that, as would be natural, anyone who takes an interest in the subject would like to get on a committee of that description, and very often the interest is that of a man who has views which are not very generally held and which he wishes to push.

2040. Then would you arrive rather at the conclusion that the composition of the committee had been regulated more by the interest which individuals took in the Bill which was referred to them, than that the committee itself was representative of the whole House of Commons or of the community at large?—I do not know enough about the way in which Select Committees are constituted to be able to say that, but I should think it extremely probable.

Central Authority's Relations with Local Authorities.

2041. Then the Board has to deal with self-governing authorities?—Yes. While on the one hand Parliament is above, influencing and inevitably influencing the Department, it is too often forgotten that on the other hand below we have not got an absolutely free hand, and that we are dealing, and have always been dealing, with local communities, who inherit traditions of local self-government. Quite early—I think in their fifth report—the Commissioners say this: "We have ever sought to exercise our powers in such a manner as to avoid all unnecessary interference with boards of guardians and other local authorities, and we have abstained carefully from doing anything which might extinguish the spirit of local independence and self-government which, when guided by an enlightened discretion, we consider the characteristic excellence of the English people." That, I think, applies pretty well to the policy of the board throughout. The Commissioners—you may call them *doctrinaires*, you may call them what you will—at all events were men who had a very clear conception of what they wanted, and were prepared to do a good deal to get what they wanted in a matter which seemed to them vital to the welfare of the people; and from the very first you find they had to consider these questions of local government. Mr. Twisleton, one of the assistant Commissioners, points this out in 1839.—"There is, I conceive, no slight jealousy on the part of some country gentlemen at the idea of their being in any way controlled by an external power in managing the affairs of their own parishes." That feeling is strong to this day, and that is an essential factor in the whole administration of the board. We have to consider, and I for one believe that we have rightly to consider, what the views and wishes of the local self-governing bodies are.

2042. Have you anything further to say as regards the relations of the Board to the local self-governing bodies?—The very constitution of the boards of guardians also makes the work of the control of the central body rather more difficult. There are 645 boards of guardians in the country, and besides those, there are twelve out-door relief unions. Those unions vary in size, from places like West Derby or West Ham, with 529,000 and 580,000 inhabitants, to places like Welwyn, and Reeth in Yorkshire, with under 3,000. You have other contrasts as, for instance (Liverpool), with a population of 150,000 on 1,800 acres of ground, and Reeth with a population of 2,500 on 74,000 acres of ground. You have every variety of local self-governing bodies to deal with, but you must have common regulations which are more or less applicable to the whole, and that is another check on the power of the Local Government Board to carry out what they might, from tradition or from conviction, believe to be a right policy.

Variety in size and population of unions.

2043. I understand that uniformity of regulation and administration under conditions so very widely different is very difficult?—That is my point. It is not only difficult, but it is a real check to the administrative proceedings of the board, and a check which is very often forgotten by the critics of the Department.

Difficulties of uniformity in administration.

2044. Have you anything to say about the guardians who are selected in the various districts?—Taking the rural districts first, I would call the attention of the Commissioners to the fact that the original unions were formed by the Poor Law Commissioners on the principle of uniting a market town with the parishes conveniently situated around it. That principle was not always carried out, and it was very much modified by local Acts, by the demands of large urban centres, and sometimes by the necessity of squaring an adjoining landowner—it was tempered by jobbery, no doubt. You can see that in the formation of the unions. But, subject to these conditions, that was the underlying principle which was more or less carried out, and those unions, except for the changes which have been introduced owing to the difficulties of county boundaries, have remained pretty well till now. So in rural unions you had, and you have to this day, a real feeling of local self-government and local patriotism. There is a definite financial reponsibility on most of the individuals. There is an admixture of classes on the governing body. The folk know one another, and can get their best men. Then you must remember that now guardians in country districts are not elected *ad hoc*; they are elected as district councillors, and the district council has duties of a very varied character and of a very important character which give interest to their proceedings. For instance, the rural district council has to manage the public health administration of the neighbourhood and it has to manage the roads and various other matters which Parliament is always putting upon it. So I think, and I am glad to think, that in rural districts, at all events with certain exceptions, you have the real conditions of local self-government.

Origin of union areas.

Character of local government areas.

2045. Perhaps the simplest way to get your evidence on that point would be to ask you what is your experience of the Act of 1894, so far as the administration of the Poor Law is concerned?—The Act of 1894, as you may remember, put an end to all qualifications for the office of guardian, and did away with *ex officio* guardians among other changes; so that now a Board of Guardians is elected in the most direct way by the parochial electors. The effect of that Act was to put the local Poor Law administration of this country through the most searching ordeal. I doubt if any commission, sitting for any time, examining any number of witnesses, visiting any number of workhouses, could put the Poor Law of this country to such a searching examination as it was put to then. I have endeavoured to find out what the exact change in the *personnel* of the boards of guardians was, but I do not think there was any return on the subject. It may be enough to take some unions, and I take them by chance, because they happen to be reported on in the Inspectors' reports at that time. I have a group of ninety-three unions in Mr. Jenner-Fust's and Mr. Bircham's districts; that is to say, in Lancashire and in Wales. Out of 3,669 guardians, after the election you had boards on which 1,680 had not previously served as guardians; that is to say, nearly half the guardians were changed. In some districts the proportion was more than that. *Ex officio* guardians were swept away, many ladies took their places

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, on administration.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

on the boards, and many who were keen to put down what they supposed to be abuses in the working of the Poor Laws, came on as guardians. It was a complete revolution. In the result some boards of guardians, certainly for a time, made radical changes, and in some cases gave out-door relief in the most lavish way. I have one case in London which my colleague, Mr. Lockwood, reported on. In the first fortnight the stone-yards were opened, as the guardians had (as candidates) pledged themselves to dispense with what is known as the workhouse test. A deputation representing the unemployed came to the first meeting requiring the fulfilment of the pledges. At one time during that winter they had 3,000 able-bodied men out of work.

2046. Where was that?—That was in St. Olave's Union, now the parish of Bermondsey, in London. But on the whole, throughout England in a very short time the new guardians had fallen into line with the old, and there was no extraordinary change in the way in which Poor Law administration was conducted You do not see any great rise in pauperism anywhere; you do see a rise in expenditure, but that rise is merely the continuation of the upward curve which dated long before. If the Commission will forgive me, I will state the case in my district exactly as it appeared to me at that time; I do not say I should write exactly the same now: "Out of the 1,000 guardians who administer the Poor Law in this district nearly half were elected for the first time . . . . Under the old system of election many guardians filled the office . . [only] . . . as being the only available men in the parish or for some other accidental reason. This class has been largely replaced by others who either hoped to gain some municipal or political advantage, or who felt a genuine interest in Poor Law or other local administration. . . . A large proportion of the new members were convinced that large and easy reforms of the Poor Law administration lay ready to their hands . . . . In the result, while many sound and beneficial reforms of a minor character have been introduced, the instances where there has been any abrupt departure from the principles [of the old] administration have been extremely rare. The new guardians have in nearly every case fallen into line with the old, while a cautious advance has been made towards the settlement of many questions of workhouse management. So far as out-relief is concerned the changes have been somewhat greater. A few unions are more strict than they used to be, while in some others there has been a considerable increase of expenditure. Shortly, this has been due to a reasoned conviction of the mischief which results from inadequate doles, while in some few cases it can be traced either to definite socialistic opinions or to inexperience. . . . The fears . . that the electorate would return guardians pledged to distribute the money of the ratepayers have in this district at all events proved entirely groundless . . . There are many grounds for believing that so far as the honesty and capacity of the administration is concerned the future is full of promise of good. . . . It is to be regretted that more men of the artisan class have not been elected, for in some unions they have done much good and will do more." That was my opinion of the change at the time. What I submit to the Commission is, as I said before, that the Poor Law was then submitted to such an investigation, such an ordeal, such an enquiry, as it will never have to undergo again, and so far as the current administration or the current principles were concerned, it emerged almost unscathed.

2047. May I ask the date of that report?—My report was written in 1896, two years after the passing of the Act.

2048. Do you refer to it now, after the additional experience of ten years, as an accurate forecast of what has occurred?—I do not say that. I have read it to the Commission as being what my impression was at the time. There have been other developments since, but whether they were due to the change in the franchise or not, I cannot say. I may say that some of my colleagues—judging from their reports—were very much against the change, and some reported more or less unfavourably on it; but in no instance is there any statement that throughout the country, or throughout any particular district there was any radical change either in Poor Law administration, or in Poor Law principles as understood by the guardians.

2049. Would you apply that to the urban districts?—The urban districts are not so satisfactory, but I think there are other causes which may have led to results which in certain instances are, to say the least of it, disheartening. In dealing with the question of the new guardians you must remember that there was a considerable change made about that time in the amount of Exchequer grants made to local authorities. In the first place, there was a matter which concerned but few unions but which was of great importance to them; that was the Government grant in lieu of rates. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (20). I have here a list of unions, in which that grant is particularly high. The list is not a complete one, but I find, for instance, that at Devonport the percentage of Government property to the total valuation is 23 per cent., that is to say, 23 per cent. of the expenditure of the guardians is contributed by Government in respect of Government properties such as dockyards, arsenals, and so on. In the Alverstoke union the percentage of Government property is 20 per cent., and in the Sheppey union where the Sheerness dockyard is, 23 per cent. is the amount contributed. That amount is handed over to the boards of guardians to spend as they please, and the Government have no vote and no representation on the board of guardians. I say that if a locally elected body on that franchise can withstand that temptation they are fit to be trusted with almost anything.

Character of local government in urban districts.

Government property in unions; its effect on administration.

2050. In the particular cases to which you allude, the poor rate did not go up?—No. In one remarkable case which was then in my district—that is the Medway union, where they have the Chatham lines and the Arsenal, the Government contribution is 18 per cent, roughly speaking 4s. in the £; and there, so far from there being a more lax administration, the out-door relief went down in a most remarkable way. Out of the savings of about four years they have built new schools which cost £20,000. I think that is all to the credit of the boards of guardians. There is another point to be considered. The contributions of the Government since 1888 have come up to something like 5s. in the £ on the money locally raised, that is to say, the ordinary board of guardians now, when they spend a sovereign, are only spending 15s. of money raised by their own constituents. Then you have as another temptation to extravagance the heavy increase (which is a matter you will have further to investigate) of railway rating, and other contributions which are received by the guardians without any representation, that is to say, a railway company has to pay a large and ever increasing amount of rates without any voting power, and without the power of checking the extravagance of the boards of guardians. (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (21). And then there is another contribution, which is a small matter, namely, that under the Agricultural Rates Act. Then you have what is outside Parliament altogether, and that is the gradual extension by an automatic process of the rateable value of property other than land, I mean that by the growth of population house property becomes greater, in proportion, than landed property. The point of my evidence on this part of the subject is this—that it may be that the increase of expenditure which I shall have to show you by-and-by is due, not so much to the changed character of the boards of guardians—I think it can be demonstrated that it is not due to that—as to the temptations to extravagance which in my opinion arise, and must arise, from the increased contributions to the expenditure of the union from sources which do not have any effect on the election of boards of guardians. Those considerations are adverse to all unions alike.

Amount of contribution to guardians from Imperial sources.

Growth of railway valuations

2051. Now take the Agricultural Rates Act, and tell us what its effect has been; does that operate in the direction you suggest?—Not much, except that those members of boards of guardians who were most adverse to expenditure were farmers. They are a body of men who think of their rates as a whole, and who do not consider what the rate is going to, but now they feel better off in the matter of rates.

Effect of Agricultural Rates Act.

2052. Would you put it broadly in this way, that neither an Exchequer contribution nor a reduction in the rates is looked upon by boards of guardians as something which should effect a saving, but is rather looked upon as something which should be spent?—I would put it in this way—that they feel rather better off, and that there is not the same check on their expenditure

General effect of Imperial grants.

as there used to be. The question is, whether that is fair. I go so far as to say that to my mind the great danger to local government is the extension of grants which will destroy the financial responsibility of the local governing body. My main interest in that is because I look upon a free and strong local self-government as the best safeguard that we have against a demoralising Poor Law administration.

2053. Are you of opinion that the Exchequer contributions distinctly tend in that direction ?—I am.

2054. Therefore, speaking now with your great experience as a Poor Law inspector, you are averse to that form of contribution towards the local rates ?—Purely from the point of view, understand, of Poor Law administration, I answer, yes.

2055. (*Miss Hill.*) Does that apply also to the large number of contributions which now come from railway companies, limited liability companies and so on, without any power of participation in local work, without any votes or anything of that sort ?—That is one of the main sources of contribution.

2056. You are not confining your criticisms to the Government grants ?—I am not specially ear-marking as mischievous, Government grants. I am pointing out that the whole financial conditions at present existing tend, in my view, towards the destruction of our best safeguard against a demoralising Poor Law.

2057. (*Chairman.*) I think you have a list of the unions in which the Government pay large contributions to the rates in consequence of their property ?—Yes, and I hand that list in. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (20).)

2058. There is a difficulty arising out of the Act of 1894, that the Local Government Board has to face which I think you desire to bring before the Commission, is there not ?—Yes. I want to say that some boards of guardians are obviously too large. Some boards, I believe, are more than 100 in number ; the York Board I know is eighty. The Local Government Board used to have the power of dealing with those cases, and also the power of dealing with union areas. Under the Act of 1894, to put it very briefly, those powers have been shared by county councils, and the consequence is that the Board cannot find it expedient to carry out their own powers, because it might clash with the powers that are in the hands of county councils. I suggest whether it would not be well that the Local Government Board should have further and more direct powers for dealing with those boards of guardians where the conditions of local self-government are either not present, or else are under disadvantages owing to such details as the fact that the board of guardians is unwieldy or that the areas might be properly altered. We have powers—and I daresay that Mr. Adrian has explained to you exactly what they are—but they seem to me to be rather ineffective at the present moment ; and the matter is one of some importance from the point of view of local administration.

2059. Was there any alteration in the matter of outdoor relief shortly after the change in the law effected by the Act of 1894 ?—It does not do, I think, to blame, as some strict Poor Law administrators do, the constitution of boards of guardians for any increase of the relief in recent years. There are many influences at work. The very influences which led to the passing of the Act of 1894 are not spent by any means. They have influenced the policy of the boards themselves—I mean outside their own judgment ; and there has been a gradual weakening of the old Poor Law principles. I think there is no doubt about that, but it is a matter to which I will come later, and in rather more detail, when I have the curves of expenditure.

2060. Will you now give us your opinion as regards the conduct of the urban unions ?—I have given some illustrations of what I conceive to be adverse influences to the efficient administration of the rural boards. All those apply to urban boards as well, and there are others in addition. For instance, in large urban unions there is very little common interest in the locality. I am told by my friends who live in London that they have not the least idea, or had not unless they looked at their rate papers, in what borough they are ; and they do not know what union they are in. Therefore, there is no common interest in the locality. One of the results of that is that in urban unions there is very little voting at the elections. I would like to call attention to a short article which appeared in the *Charity Organisation Review* with respect to that. The writer points out that practically the people in a London election do not vote, and they do not know for whom to vote. I have been shown a number of election circulars by gentlemen who were seeking the office of guardian ; who they are, or where they come from or what you ought to do under the circumstances is very difficult to say. I do not think the ordinary elector takes the slightest notice of them, according to what is stated to me about London, and according to my experience in the large towns.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

Apathy of electors.

2061. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Does that apply to London only ?—I was going to say that my experience in the large towns also is that there is often no interest whatever taken in these elections unless there is some extraneous interest, as, for instance, politics. You get plenty of voting when the election agents want to see which way things are going at the next general election, and when they have a sort of dress rehearsal. Then you have lots of voting. But unless there is some such extraneous interest you very often in urban unions do not get the interest which you ought to have. You get the interest sometimes and the voting upon the question of vaccination, which has no more to do with the Poor Law than it has to do with anything else in the world, and should not, from the point of view of the Poor Law administrator be any part of the duty of the guardians, but should be part of the duty of the county council. But there, as I say, you do get an interest. Unless there is a very flaring question, say a question of building a new workhouse, or of some large expenditure, that catches people's eye, you do not get the slightest Poor Law interest in the election. All that is adverse to the constitution of urban guardians.

Type of urban guardians.

2062. (*Chairman*)—What is the position socially of the members of boards of guardians in the larger urban districts?—They are good enough men in themselves, but they are very apt to be all men of one class. My experience is that, to have really good Poor Law administration, you ought to have, as a rule, members of various classes. I know that about the best board of guardians I ever saw (it was the old Manchester Board) was composed of only thirteen men. No one cared enough about the election to vote, so that there was not an election for many years, and the members deliberately co-opted the best men they could get. For instance, when the Church of England minister on the board retired they elected another clergyman in his place, and when the Roman Catholic priest retired they elected another priest in his place, and so on. One of the dangers of urban administration is that you do not get an admixture of classes on the boards.

2063. What is the class they are all taken from now ?—They are very often people who have not much financial responsibility ; I mean, men who live in houses which have a low rateable value. You will find very often that some of the most extravagant boards are those that belong to unions where the bulk of the guardians live in £15 houses, £20 houses, and that sort of thing. That I have often seen.

2064. You mean the class just above the weekly payment class ?—I mean the small tradesman class. You get the most excellent administration in some of those unions, but these are adverse influences, to my mind. I am not complaining of the administration at all, but I do say that there are adverse influences which tell more against urban guardians than against rural guardians ; and these are the lessened financial responsibility, and the want of admixture of classes.

Influences affecting guardians' elections.

2065. I understand that the interest in Poor Law elections in urban districts is, under normal conditions, slight ; but that under certain circumstances a fictitious interest is given to these elections, and as a rule the interest so aroused is not for the purpose of improving the Poor Law, but rather for the purpose of breaking down some of the existing conditions ?—I should say that the interest is either very small, or else as a rule it is excited on subjects which have nothing to do with Poor Law administration at all, or occasionally by an outburst against some particular scheme, which is generally, I have found, based upon somebody's interest.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

2066. Under these conditions could you say there is a steady pressure to make the administration of out-door relief more lax?—I should not think so. You see, the strict in-door man is never a very popular person. But I should not put it that way; I should say that the Poor Law part of the duties of urban guardians is not watched with sufficient interest by the electorate; and I do not see why it should be, because the rates are of very small consequence to the bulk of the electors, so far as they know—and they do not know.

Effect of guardians' vaccination functions.

2067. As vaccination from time to time excites a good deal of interest, though it has nothing to do with Poor Law would you propose to transfer the functions connected with it to the county councils?—I myself never could see what vaccination had to do with boards of guardians, and I think, speaking for myself, that a sound Poor Law is far more important than sound vaccination. I am not speaking in the least disrespectfully of vaccination; I have no wish to do that. But my main interest in local government is the Poor Law administration, and I am sure that the fact that vaccination is tacked on, so to speak, to the duties of the boards of guardians, is adverse to sound Poor Law. I have seen a very good board of guardians ripped out entirely on the vaccination question, and when once they have been turned out then the whole administration comes into disorder.

Transfer of vaccination administration.

2068. Could the transfer of these functions be effected without much difficulty?—I think there would be great difficulty, because I think there is a certain class of misguided people who think more of vaccination than they do of poor law. I am thinking of poor law, and they would be thinking of vaccination.

2069. There would be no administrative difficulty as regards the transfer, would there?—No.

2070. The Poor Law authority is not possessed of any particular machinery for carrying out the vaccination law which the other authority could not equally easily perfect, I suppose?—The only reason why vaccination was thrown on to the boards of guardians was that, in those days they were the only authority working over a sufficiently large area. There is absolutely no reason why vaccination should be joined with the administration of the Poor Law.

Effect of compounding for rates.

2071 Now I think you would like to say something as to the effect of compounding?—Yes. Having stated the adverse influences according to my judgment which affect boards of guardians, I cannot possibly leave the compound householder out, although I confess the matter is one of very great difficulty. It has been alleged, and apparently with a good deal of truth, that compounding ruins the electorate by concealing the fact that the labouring classes pay any rates, and that it gives them no interest whatever in the fluctuations in the rates. It is also alleged—and I think this is a matter which should be carefully considered—that compounding does not really pay, and that it is more for the benefit of the small property owner than for the benefit of the parish, and that that tends to a certain jobbery in assessments; that is to say, that it is a mischief to the general government of the locality and more especially to the Poor Law government. That is a matter which seems to me excessively important and also extremely difficult. I have here a table which is taken from the London County Council's statistics of certain unions in London where they compound and where they do not. Where the compounding is optional, there does not appear to be any information as to how far advantage is taken of the option. This table is not complete, but it seems to me to afford a basis for further inquiries. Taking the year of this report, which is the year before last, I find that in Bermondsey 74 per cent. of the total assessments were under the compounding limit. There compounding is optional and we do not know how much advantage was taken of it; but there the pauperism was 47 per thousand at that time. In Poplar, where the compounding is compulsory, 80 per cent. of the ratepayers of that union compound, and the present rate of pauperism in Poplar is, I think, 66 per thousand, which is two and a half times that of London as a whole. I am told that in Whitechapel and Lewisham there is no compounding. The rate of pauperism in Whitechapel at that date was about 20 per thousand and Lewisham about 22 per thousand. Those are figures on which I do not place very much reliance, but as far as they go I think they are worth the attention of the Commission. They would seem to show that there is some relation between the Poor Law administration and the number of compound householders.

Compounding in London.

2072. Will you put that statement in?—Yes. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (32).

Difficulties raising rate for local purposes in certain districts.

2073. Then I think you wish to tell us something about the localities where they have had difficulty in raising the rates for rational local purposes?—It is hardly too much to say that in certain urban unions the very conditions of a rational local self-government raising local rates for the benefit of the locality are wanting, and the want is supplied usually by the public spirit of a few individuals.

West Ham and Edmonton.

2074. Has your attention been called to the great difficulties existing in certain suburban districts immediately contiguous to London in meeting their local expenditure? I am referring to localities where, owing to cheap transit, an enormous number of people have come out from London, and the population has increased very much in excess of the increase in rateable value?—You mean, of course, such places as West Ham and Edmonton—places with an enormous population, and a population of one class, and places without the assistance of the Metropolitan Poor Fund. The problem is most difficult, and I suppose something will have to be done with it some day. As to what is to be done now, I am quite sure that any guidance which the Commission could give as to the true policy in dealing with those places would be very acceptable. I think you will have, more or less, to consider the question in relation to the London evidence.

2075. As far as you know, are there any conditions similar to those existing in West Ham and Edmonton near any of the other great crowded centres of England and Scotland?—I think I can say there are not, I think in the north country big towns such places are either absorbed by the union or start industries of their own.

2076. This is an entirely new phenomenon which has sprung up in recent years, is it not?—It is a phenomenon due to the enormous increase of population, and the facilities of transit. There I think you have a good illustration of the enormous difficulties under the existing system of getting an efficient body of local administrators. I dwell upon the point because, when I am defending local government as a principle and as a safeguard, people answer me, "Look at such and such a place, and such and such a place." Well, those are the exceptions, and I have perhaps wearied the Commission by trying to point out why they are exceptions and where they differ from the ordinary local government which is going on all over the country quietly, usefully, beneficially.

Non-resident guardians.

2077. Coming to London, a practice prevails here, perhaps to a larger extent than anywhere else, of having non-resident guardians. What have you to say about that?—I should like to say that I know very little about London. A great many London unions, it is notorious, are very much indebted to the presence of guardians who are really not much concerned either by residence or occupation with the locality. I could give many instances of benevolent persons or well-meaning persons who have taken an interest in a particular union, and have joined the board of guardians of that union with the best results. To that extent I think London Poor Law government has been very much assisted. But of course that is not local government business; the qualifications are, so to speak, only nominal ones and sometimes those qualifications have been attacked.

Honesty of local administration.

2078. I think you would like to say something now about the honesty of local administration?—Yes, I should like to have this put in evidence. As far as my experience goes the Poor Law administration is generally honest; that means to say that a guardian gets very little money by it. There may be jobbery here and there, but of robbery I think there is very little. I think it is only due to the local authorities to say that, because with our audit we should probably know the worst cases. That is not a fault of English local government.

2079. (*Miss Hill.*) Would you say that with regard to the contracts for the supplies for the workhouses and so on?—That I should put rather as jobbery. There are some disquieting instances, I am bound to say, but those are confined to comparatively few unions. I think, perhaps, the guardians are condemned by the audit to a "lean and plunderless integrity."

ntral thority as arantors of ht to ief.

2080. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think the first matter you referred to under this head of your evidence was the duty of the State to see that relief was given to a person who was destitute?—Yes, as illustrating the necessity for a centralised administration.

2081. Of course that does not relate to individuals and there is no duty on the part of the State as regards individuals?—A destitute individual is entitled to relief.

2082. But not from the State—the central authority Your evidence related to the powers of the central authority, and the central authority are precluded from ordering any relief?—They are statute barred.

2083. Therefore there is no statutory or legal obligation upon them to order relief in any individual case?—That is so; we cannot do it.

umber of rcharges d of peals.

2084. Passing next to the subject of surcharges, the number of surcharges I think you told us made by the auditor is very much larger than the number of appeals made against his decision?—For the reason that many are purely technical points.

2085. Is it not further than that? In a great many cases are there not disallowances which, though not on technical points, are admitted by the person surcharged to be correctly made, and against which it is useless to appeal?—That is so; there is no defence, and they pay.

2086. I see from the last annual report of the Local Government Board that the number of cases in which the auditor made disallowances in the case of the Poor Law authorities and their officers in the particular year under report, was 1654, and that the number of appeals to the Local Government Board was 398?—Those would be the figures.

2087. The reasons for the large difference between the number of disallowances and the number of appeals were those which you have already mentioned, I think?—Yes.

rounds of mission of rcharge by entral uthority.

2088. With regard to the practice to remit in the exercise of an equitable jurisdiction, that is based, is it not, upon the ground, first of all, that the payment is made in good faith, and secondly, that the remission would not be continued if the illegal payment were persisted in after due warning and a due notice?—As I put it, in most cases the surcharge is sufficient to stop all irregularity.

2089. It has that effect?—That is the effect.

ffectiveness audit.

2090. Therefore you would say, would you not, that the system whereby the auditor is able to disallow and surcharge, is beneficial in its effect on poor law administration?—Poor law administration would be impossible without it, I think.

2091. In fact it is one of the chief safeguards?—It is the chief safeguard, although it is alleged against it that the surcharges are not enforced; and they are not enforced for the reasons I have stated.

d hoc and *ropter hoc* uardians.

2092. With regard to the election of guardians, members of a board of guardians, as you have told us, are largely not elected *ad hoc*?—In rural districts they are not.

2093. Because in rural parishes the person elected is elected as a rural district councillor, and by reason of his being a rural district councillor is *ex officio* a guardian?—Yes.

2094. Do you think there is any difference in quality between the rural district councillor who is elected as such and becomes a guardian, and the person who is elected as a guardian in an urban parish; or have you no opinion on that point?—I have none. The instances that occur to my mind are at once conflicting. I cannot generalise on the matter at all.

2095. The reason for making the rural district councillor a guardian was to prevent the multiplicity of elections, I presume?—A multiplicity of elections and a multiplicity of local governing authorities.

2096. And also perhaps the fact that in some small rural districts the rural district councillor has very little to do?—He has an increasing quantity to do; but that would be so in some districts.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, on onstitution of boards of uardians.

2097. Then you told us of the very large number of guardians who were elected for the first time after the passing of the Act of 1894; do you know if there is any information which shows generally what number of persons changed office at the election which at that time took place?—I have had the papers searched, but I cannot find that there was any return for all England. All I have been able to do is to take the unions which were specially reported on by the inspectors—they happen to be ninety-three, and I have given you the figures. I wish we had the total amount.

Contributions to rates in respect of Government property.

2098. Then you referred to the payment of contributions in respect of Government property; those payments, I think, are not made to the guardians, but to the overseers?—They are made to the overseers or to the treasurer, I forget which.

2099. They are made in respect of the property belonging to the Government in the particular parish, the occupier of which, if the Government were not the occupiers, would pay rates?—Yes.

2100. Would it be possible in your opinion that that property should go free from the payment of rates?—Absolutely impossible. Before these contributions were made it was a great injustice, because Government property contributed in some unions to a very large extent to the workhouse population.

2101. Therefore it is essential that a payment should be made by the Government in respect of their property in the particular parish, unless the property were rated in the ordinary way, as has sometimes been proposed?—It is inevitable.

2102. That system, I think, is older than the Act of 1894?—It is some ten years older, I think.

2103. You will, perhaps, remember that there was a Bill brought in in 1873 to rate Government property?—I remember there was one in Mr. Stansfeld's time.

2104. That Bill did not pass, but there was a Government contribution in lieu?—Yes. Government property was valued and there was an arrangement made as to the amount to be paid.

2105. The amount which the Government pays is the same amount as would be paid by an ordinary occupier, assuming that the property was properly valued?—That is the theory of the valuation.

Effect of Agricultural Rates Act on expenditure.

2106. Taking the Agricultural Rates Act, do you think that has had any material bearing upon the expenditure of boards of guardians?—It is so small a matter that I do not think it has. I merely mentioned it as an additional source of income, *ab extra*.

2107. Is there not also this point to be borne in mind, that there is no increased grant because the expenditure has increased?—That is so.

2108. The grant is based upon the expenditure in a fixed year, is it not?—It is absolutely fixed.

2109. Consequently there is no temptation to increase expenditure in the hope of getting increased grant, or I might rather put it, an increased grant is not an item which could be taken into consideration in determining whether the expense should be undertaken?—It is not, as some of the old grants were, a grant in aid of extravagance.

Reasons for system of compounding for rates.

2110. With regard to the compound householder, I do not know whether it is a matter that you have considered much, but do you think that it would be practicable to abolish him?—I have absolutely not been able to hit upon any scheme for abolishing him.

2111. The reason for the system is, is it not, that where the occupier of a property is constantly changing, unless you have a means of collecting the rate from some permanent person you would lose your rate altogether?—You would; and there is the additional reason of the extraordinary inconvenience of collecting an immense number of small assessments.

Temporary abolition of compound householder

2112. I daresay you remember that he was abolished at the time of the Reform Bill of 1867, and that it was found necessary to create him again, on account of the difficulty that arose?—So that he has a political origin?

2113. He has not a political origin, but his abolition was political.

Proposal to extend London area.

Then something was said about the difficulty with places immediately adjoining London; would not the more obvious remedy for that state of things be the inclusion of those places in London itself?—That is what would naturally occur, but then it is just possible that proposals may be made for a different form of administration

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

23 Jan. 1906.

within London, for instance, as to the government of the workhouses, and it might be that the addition of these large populations might make the working of any such scheme more difficult.

2114. Is there reason to think that some of the places, at all events, would object to coming into London ?—I do not know.

Transfer of vaccination administration to County Councils.

2115. I think the reason why boards of guardians were made the authority for vaccination purposes was no doubt the one you gave us, namely, that they were the only authority that extended all over the country for areas of a reasonable size ; would not the fact that they are that authority be a difficulty in the way of transferring these duties ?—It would not do to put vaccination under what would seem at first sight the proper authorities, namely, the district councils, because there are too many district councils ; the area would be too small, and unfortunately we apparently have no check on the multiplicity or multiplication of small urban authorities. It has always seemed to me that the right authority was the county council.

2116. Would there be any difficulty on account of the large area of some of the counties, do you think ?—I think the larger the area for vaccination purposes the better.

Proposed Imperial grant in aid of vaccination.

2117. How would you work it—by means of committees ?—I would leave that entirely to the county council. I would pay the county councils a definite grant on the ground that the vaccination was a benefit to their neighbours as well as to themselves. I should look upon vaccination as being more or less an Imperial matter carried out by the agency of the local authorities, namely, in that case the county councils.

Meaning of "compound-householder."

2118 (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Will you pardon a very elementary question ; what is a compound householder—we have not got him in Ireland ?—A compound householder is a man who does not pay his rates directly. We will take an instance. A parish compounds all houses say under £20, and the compounding may be optional or compulsory. If the compounding is compulsory, then the occupiers of all houses under £20 are exempt from paying the rates, but the landlords have to pay the rates ; if it is optional, then, if the landlord chooses, he can pay the rates. In consideration of that he gets a rebate of 15 or 20 per cent. we will say. The consequence is that the tenant has nothing to do with the fluctuation in the rates. The man who lives in a flat under ordinary conditions is in a sense a compound householder.

2119. I understand once you establish this system you cannot abolish it ?—I think we most of us wish to do something in the matter, but the matter is one of very great difficulty owing to the convenience of it in a way. Whether it pays is a moot point on which I suppose you will get evidence ; but the allegation is that it does not pay the local authority, that it only pays the owner of small property, and further that it has a great tendency to drive down the assessments of small property to just below the compounding point. I am told—and I suppose you will discover whether my information is correct—that if the compounding limit is £20 you will find an abnormal number of houses rated at £19 10s.

Auditors' powers as to extravagant relief.

2120. Is the influence of the auditor effective in the case of a loose or extravagant system of out-door relief which is not absolutely illegal, but which is really extravagant in a way ?—The auditors have an increasing habit of either reporting on it or, I am glad to say, communicating with the general inspector about it ; but there is obviously a very great difficulty in checking out-door relief which is on the face of it bad, but is not also on the face of it illegal.

2121. In the face of extravagance where the amount that is given is a great deal more than will be necessary for the maintenance of the family, would the auditor do anything ?—If it is unreasonable he can disallow it, but he has to state his reasons ; and there are always plausible reasons which might satisfy a court of justice, though they might not satisfy us, for saying that, as a matter of fact, the case was destitute.

2122. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) That must be a very laborious task for the auditor, because I suppose in order to ascertain whether there is any extravagance in out-door relief he has to see the books and ascertain from them what relief is really being given ?—That would be his duty.

2123. Would it be his duty to revise the amount of aliment given by the board of guardians in each case ?—What he has to see is whether the amount of aliment is unreasonably extravagant.

2124. In order to do that he must revise the books, and look at individual cases ?—He would have to look through the books.

Inspectors' examination of relief books.

2125. Do the inspectors of whom you were speaking previously undertake that duty at all ?—Yes. I do not say that it is a very frequent course, but a course that is taken is this—You send for the relieving officer and the Application and Report Book, and say : "Go through your book with me."

2126. Supposing that the inspector found that more out-relief was being given than he thought was right, or that out-relief was being given in a case in which he thought that indoor-relief should be given, would he report that to the Local Government Board, or what steps would he take ?—He would tell the board of guardians about it ; he would call their attention to the case.

Relief to relations of guardians.

2127. You said that the Poor Law administration in urban districts was generally quite honest ; have you any cases in your experience where members of boards of guardians have been inclined to give relief to relations which ought not to have been given ?—I have often heard that alleged in those large urban unions, but the cases are rare. That it sometimes happens I think is undoubted.

2128. Would it be brought under your notice if there were a case of that sort ?—It would be talked about most probably, and the inspector would know it, and no doubt he would report it either formally or informally. That is a case of great difficulty, because if a board of guardians will do a thing of that sort they can only be approached with a good deal of tact—they must be pretty bad.

2129. Remonstrance can be made, but not much more can be done ?—That is it. Then all you have to hope for is the publication of the facts, and that the ratepayers will do their duty.

Democratic influence on Poor Law principles.

2130. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I think you suggested that the same democratic influence which caused the passing of the Act of 1894 has tended to a general weakening of the Poor Law principles ?—I think historically that is obviously so.

2131. I should rather like to suggest that it is not perhaps so much the genuine democratic influence. I think you yourself said that the true artisan made a good guardian ?—He does.

2132. I think experience goes to show that where you get a high-class working man he is exceedingly sound and strong on questions of relief. I would suggest that it has been rather the socialistic influence that has tended to weaken the policy ?—When you spoke of the democratic influence I took that as including the socialistic influence.

2133. It might be well to distinguish ?—Yes, I quite agree. It seems to me that in that matter the really working-class electorate can be trusted.

2134. I think you agree with me that to get a genuine working-class man of a high class on a board of guardians is an excellent policy ?—I have always found it so.

2135. You say the Poor Law administration is generally honest ; would you say that in a sense guardians generally honestly try to carry out the Poor Law, and the spirit of the Poor Law ?—I was not thinking of that at all. I was thinking of the possibility of a board of guardians being bribed or getting money by defrauding the rates, in fact.

Attempts of guardians to override the law.

2136. May we take it in the other sense of the words ; are there instances where boards of guardians have definitely tried to break down the Poor Law by administering it badly ?—There are certainly such instances, and not in one case alone ; but only of recent years. The first men elected did not do that. Some of them committed all sorts of extravagances for a short time, but a definite desire to break down the Poor Law I do not think had occurred to any one at that date.

Powers of Central Authority.

2137. Have you any means of dealing with a board of guardians who are entering on a policy of that kind ?—We have none, and we shall have to consider it. They may try to do that, but long before they have got to th

point of breaking it down their clients will have broken them down. I am not myself alarmed. It is annoying, but I always think they will be beaten by force of circumstances. I am perfectly confident that if left to themselves they will come to an end. But it is as you say a matter for consideration as to whether we should take further means, such as the Irish means, for dealing with cases of that sort, by supersession, say.

2138. By putting them out?—Yes. You might have cases where it was quite clear that the local government had broken down. But I have never known of such a case. I have known of cases where there was a definite policy of breaking down the Poor Law, but they have failed.

fect of partite irement of ardians.

2139. Would you say, in reference to guardians going out by thirds, that that conduces to continuity of policy?—That procedure is rather disappointing. Some years ago it was held to be a first principle of a reformed Poor Law that a guardian would take the three years to learn his work, but it cuts both ways, and I have seen a board of guardians which the ratepayers and everybody else were very anxious to get rid of, and there they were for three years.

ntinuity policy.

2140. Would you agree that frequent changes of policy would have a bad effect on the district in respect of pauperism?—They have absolutely the worst effect on the labouring class.

2141. By always raising their expectations?—By what I think Mr. Pell calls inducing speculative applications for relief.

2142. Are there any means that you could suggest in order to secure more continuity of policy?—I have a large number of proposals on minor points, such as Case Papers and so on which I will make later on.

nsfer of cination.

2143. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Touching the transfer of vaccination to county councils, would you also recommend or suggest that the vaccination business should be transferred to the big borough councils?—I think it could be transferred to the county boroughs.

2144. Would you trust them to do it?—I do not think they could do it worse than some of the present folk do it, and I think they could be trusted.

ect of ities on ction of ardians.

2145. I think you mentioned the election of guardians by partisan political organisations among the adverse influences which have affected certain boards of guardians?—Yes.

2146. As far as your experience goes, is it true to say that in certain cases, although a particular organisation has been used, it does not at all follow that all the candidates belong to one political party?—I do not know that. I instanced it, not exactly as a mischief, but as showing that it required exceptional circumstances to excite interest in these elections in urban districts. I will add this—there is no reason why a board of guardians elected on political grounds should not be a very good board of guardians—I have seen that occur repeatedly; but then you are always open to the risk that that board of guardians, which was elected on political grounds, may also be discharged on political grounds, and that you may have the whole lot rejected in one election. I have seen a board of guardians in which there was only one man on the board who knew the ordinary procedure, and he would not tell the others. That was a great many years ago. *Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B* 23 Jan. 1906.

2147. Has any effort been made in recent years by the borough councils to abolish compounding in London?—I do not know. My knowledge of compounding in London is but small. I merely put the facts and figures before the Commission as a means of further investigation.

2148. (*Dr. Downes.*) I think it has been held to be a fundamental principle of Poor Law Relief that the condition of the person relieved should be less eligible than that of the poorest independent labourer?—Or, as Sir Francis Head put it, "That the hanger-on should be lower than him on whom he hangs." Deterrence of medical relief.

2149. Have you anything to say on the difficulty which guardians find in applying that principle to the case of the sick?—I should think they would have the greatest difficulty.

2150. It is a very difficult question, is it not?—It is a most difficult question.

2151. (*Mr. Phelps.*) When the central authority issues an order, from whom does it emanate?—From the Local Government Board, signed by the president, and countersigned by an assistant secretary. Signature of Orders of Central Authority.

2152. Are both those signatures legally necessary?—I should imagine they were, but I do not know.

2153-54. You say that boards of guardians are often too large; I suppose you would agree that they are often too small?—I cannot recall an instance, except that there is a difficulty now under the new regulations of forming a quorum. Size of boards of guardians.

2155. Is compounding as common in the country as in towns?—I think it is quite rare in the country. Compounding for rates in country.

SEVENTH DAY.

Monday, 29th January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.

Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

Inspectors' salaries, allowances, and clerks.

2156. (*Chairman.*) In your previous evidence, you have stated to us what the duties of the Poor Law inspectors are; now will you tell us what their emoluments are?—An inspector on appointment to a district gets £600 a year, and he serves for five years before he gets £900, which is his maximum. There are three districts which have an additional £100 for various reasons, the Lancashire inspector has £1,000, the Yorkshire inspector has £1,000 and the London inspector has £1,000.

2157. Are there any allowances besides?—He has his expenses of locomotion paid, and he has £1 for every night he sleeps away from home on necessary official business.

2158. Has he any staff?—He has a clerk found for him.

2159. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is there not a day allowance also?—There is now a day allowance; if he is absent from home for ten hours in a day, he is allowed the sum of 6s. 8d.

Inspectors' holidays.

2160. (*The O'Conor Don.*) What vacation does he get?—He gets so many days in the year, which practically amount to six weeks.

2161. Does he get that vacation all at once or at different periods of the year?—The inspector has to ask leave before he takes it and he generally takes it all at once. But I am afraid a great many of the inspectors do not take the full leave which is granted to them.

Effect of compounding for rates.

2162. (*Miss Hill.*) I think you have referred to compounding as having a tendency to diminish that intelligent interest in local affairs which should characterise the electors of guardians?—Yes, I have.

2163. One difficulty in abolishing the system of compounding is held to be the expense which would be involved by the collection of small sums, is it not?—That is alleged.

2164. The statutory allowance made to guardians who compound is, I believe, 15 per cent., exclusive of any further allowance if they agree to pay whether the tenements are full or empty?—That is so, I believe.

2165. Is it within your knowledge that the amount paid to collectors for collecting weekly rents is 5 per cent.?—I will take it so from you.

2166. Then presumably the local authorities could engage their collectors at about the same amount, for even though the instalments would be smaller, there would be a greater number of tenants residing near together; so that it does not seem to me that the financial question is really a difficulty—it seems to my mind to be rather more a question of reorganisation than of finance; what is your opinion on that?—Your experience is so very much greater than mine in these matters that I will accept what you say. It has always seemed to me to be a point for further inquiry, because it is alleged that compounding does not pay the parish.

2167. Yet, so far from anything having been done by the law to abolish compounding, Sec. 4 of the Act for amending the law with respect to the rating of occupiers for short terms (32 and 33 Vic. c. 41), gives power to local authorities to compel owners to pay rates direct for tenements under £20 annual value?—Yes; that is compulsory compounding.

2168. If that section has been acted on in some cases, so diminishing the interest in economy and the sense of responsibility in some hundreds of that class of tenants who form the bulk of the electors, that would appear to you to be rather a serious question, would it not?—Yes; but, of course, I do not presume to criticise an Act of Parliament.

2169. The influence on the electors has certainly not been helpful if any kind of interest either in the subject or in economy is to be desired?—The whole system seems to me to be mischievous to sound local government.

Effect of compounding on assessment.

2170. Also, I think you have pointed out that the system of compounding does not work quite fairly with regard to assessments?—The allegation is that where you have compounding you have a tendency to lower the assessment on certain classes of property, and whether this is so could be ascertained.

Anomalies of compounding in London.

2171. I take it you know that the London County Council issues a list of assessments which it recommends for weekly tenements; these assessments have no compulsory power behind them, but they are very generally adopted in the case of compounding householders, though they are not adopted where tenants pay their rates. There is, therefore, a very distinct inequality caused, and whereas the idea of an assessment is that it shall be determined by the annual value of the house assessed, you have, in London certainly, a row of houses of precisely the same character, some of which are assessed at one rate and some at another; and that appears certainly to introduce a great anomaly. You say it is alleged that compounding does not pay the parish?—So it is alleged to me. Of course I am in no sense an expert on such a matter as this, but I have consulted certain of our auditors and other people who know, and I may say I have found a great deal of information as to compounding in the Statistical Returns of the London County Council.

Poor Law loans and their repayment.

2172. (*Professor Smart.*) I want to refer to the subject of loans; is thirty years invariably the period of loans for the erection of workhouses?—For the erection of new workhouses, yes.

2173. Are the loans always obtained from one source, namely, the Public Works Loans Commissioners?—No; they are obtained from any source convenient to the guardians.

2174. Is the annuity system of repayment generally employed?—The repayment is generally made by equal annual instalments of capital and interest, I believe.

2175. That is what is known as the annuity system, is it not?—Yes.

2176. That means that one similar sum is paid yearly throughout all the thirty years of the loan?—I believe so.

2177. In reply to Question 1642, you mention £5 8s. per cent. or 3½ per cent. I take it you mean that £5 8s. is the annuity containing both principal and interest for thirty years, which is equal to a loan of 3½ per cent. for thirty years with a sinking fund of £1 18s.?—Yes.

Policy of Public Works Loan Board as to repayment of loans.

2178. Is it the case that the Public Works Loans Commissioners encourage shorter loans by offering lower interest?—Yes.

2179. For loans below twenty years?—I understand that that was so some years ago; I do not know whether they do that now.

2180. Do you know whether these temptations to short loans are ever accepted, in other words, have they ever any effect?—That is a difficult question to answer. As a rule, you will find that a local authority likes the longest loan it can get.

2181. Do you find a general desire for longer loans?—It is often urged upon us that the loans ought to be longer. I never have to extend the term of a loan, but I very often have to suggest the curtailment of the term of a loan.

Effect of reducing period of loan.

2182. In Question 1651 Mr. Gardiner asked you, "If you reduce the period of a loan you really would reduce the cost of the building, would you not?"—and you answer, "Yes, we should." I suppose you mean that if the period were shorter than thirty years, the heavier annual sum for repayment of the principal would make Guardians more careful of what they spent?—That would be about it, I think.

2183. Whereas, when the period is longer, the annual payment is small and the ratepayers do not feel the burden?—Yes; although the real cost might be greater, as you know.

Guardians' discretion as to relief.

2184. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the right to relief, I think you said it was the duty of the Local Government Board to see that that right was fulfilled, and that the guardians did their duty in dealing with destitution; is it not also true that the guardians have it entirely in their own hands as to deciding who is really eligible for relief, and as to the amount of relief they consider to be adequate to meet the case; those two points are still left to the guardians' discretion, are they not?—Yes; subject only to the possibility of the auditor forming an opinion that the amount of relief is unreasonable.

Action of auditor and Central Authority in cases of excessive relief.

2185. Are there any instances on record where an auditor has drawn the attention of the guardians to any particular case of relief which he considered excessive?—There are a great many instances where the auditor has called the attention of the Board to the fact that in his opinion certain relief which was given was excessive in amount.

2186. Are there any surcharges on record for that?—Very few. It is very difficult to state reasons on the part of the auditor which will hold good before a court of law; and yet the auditor may be doing his duty in calling our attention to the fact that the relief given in a certain union is far beyond what would be necessary to relieve destitution, as, for instance, where you have a case of the total earnings coming into a family being at quite a high level, and yet the guardians order relief to some member of that family. The auditors have called attention to cases of the latter kind.

2187. In cases probably where they hold that there is no legal obligation?—That is the sort of case.

2188. Then the action of the auditor is really the only safeguard against excessive relief?—It is the only safeguard against excessive relief, except letters of remonstrance from my department, which would be generally based on the report of the auditor, or on the report of the inspector.

2189. Suppose a case where there is ample income in a household for the whole of the persons who are living in that household, but that one member of that household (who might be a distant relative) is in receipt of relief from the guardians; would the auditor consider that that case, which is clearly not a case of destitution, would be a case for surcharge; and, are cases of that kind being brought under the notice of the Local Government Board?—Yes. I have a whole group of cases of that nature under consideration now.

2190. What action do the Board take on such cases?—They would have to judge whether the reasons assigned by the auditor for making his surcharge were good and sufficient, so as to enable them to sustain the surcharge. The question of stating adequate reasons in that class of case to which you allude is one of very great difficulty.

2191. Do cases where there is no question of legal liability, but where the guardians give an excessive amount in relief ever come under the notice of the Board?—Yes; the auditor occasionally reports such cases.

2192. I believe there is the greatest possible divergence in practice between different unions as to the persons who are regarded as eligible for relief, and as to the amount of relief which is considered to be adequate to meet the case, is that not so?—That is so, and that difference is reflected in the statistics.

Effect of auditors' action in cases of excessive relief.

2193. (*Chairman.*) Assuming that the auditor cannot enforce a surcharge, because the Local Government Board on appeal do not uphold it, does the auditor's protest stop the practice in connection with which the surcharge was made?—In some cases it might, but as a rule it does not; I mean where the principle on which relief is given is so bad that the auditor calls attention to it, there is something wrong with the union, and the guardians are either giving this sort of relief on a bad principle, or else their attitude may conceivably at the time be rather hostile to the Board.

2194. Assuming there is a protest by the auditor which is not followed up by a surcharge, I understand you to say that that protest does not always stop the practice?—It does not do so in every case.

2195. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Are there any instances where it has?—There are instances where a protest has done considerable good. My practice is now, instead of writing to the guardians, to communicate with the inspector, and suggest to him that he should meet the guardians and go into the matter with them, face to face.

Publicity of action of auditors and Central Authority as to audit.

2196. (*Dr. Downes.*) Is there any machinery by which the protest of the auditor or the protest of the Local Government Board is made public to the ratepayers?—No.

2197. So, if the guardians choose to go into committee, the protest and the letter may be considered in private and shelved, and nothing known about the matter by the public?—The auditor's duty is to communicate his report to the Board, and our duty is to communicate the report to the guardians; but it is no part of our duty to communicate it to the public or to the Press.

Ratepayers' right to object to expenditure.

2198. (*Mr. Lock.*) On the other hand, the aggrieved ratepayer has a right, under the General Order on accounts, of complaining as to any point in the audit?—He can attend the audit, and the Board often state that they think complaining ratepayers had better attend the audit; but I doubt whether the aggrieved ratepayer would have any right to ask for a copy of the auditor's report.

2199. The phrase in the order is: "The auditor shall receive any objection made by a ratepayer or any person aggrieved against the accounts undergoing audit or any item or charge therein or any vouchers or authority for the same, and shall examine into the merits of such objection and make a decision respecting the same, stating the grounds thereof and offering to enter the same in the book of accounts then being examined, if required to do so, as in the case of disallowance or surcharge." I read that as meaning that the document, so to speak, would be for the moment available for the aggrieved ratepayer?—I can only say now that this matter is one of difficulty, and that it is receiving consideration.

Ad hoc guardians.

2200. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the form of election to boards of guardians, I would like to know whether you disapprove of the principle of electing members *ad hoc*?—I cannot say I disapprove of it. It occasionally has unfortunate results owing to causes which I have indicated; but I do not think that one can disapprove of a system which appears to be pretty well inevitable.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan 1906.

2201. I thought from your previous evidence that you rather approved of a selected board?—No, I should not have said that my evidence is in that direction; I rather spoke of the advantages of having a board of guardians freely elected by the ratepayers,

2202. Still, you said there was the greatest possible difficulty in getting the ratepayers to vote upon the one hand, and upon the other hand the compounding householder was not directly interested; and all that militated against the selection of proper people for the administration of Poor Law unions?—In some large urban unions that is so.

2203. Have you a suggestion for the remedy of that?—No, I have not.

2204. Do you think, upon the whole, that the *ad hoc* principle still holds the field?—That is a matter for the Commission to inquire into.

2205. I would like to have your opinion, so far as you are concerned?—So far as I am concerned I am not prepared to suggest an alteration for the country generally. I have always thought the case of London ought to be dealt with separately, because there are reasons which affect London alone, such as the Metropolitan Poor Fund. On that matter, I suppose, I shall be asked a question when I come to the London part of my evidence.

Effect and need of Exchequer grants.

2206. I think you said also that the Exchequer grants lead to extravagance on the part of local bodies?—That was my suggestion though I think it would be better to say, not that they lead to extravagance, but that they diminish the financial responsibility of the guardians.

2207. Do you think then, that they are mischievous—generally?—I should say that they were mischievous as a whole to the principle of independent local government, that is, of collecting rates locally raised and expending them for the benefit of the locality.

2208. Granted that we have a highly centralised Poor Law administration, would there be the same excuse for that centralisation and central control if no grants were given to local authorities; is it not almost a *sine qua non* of centralisation that some national grant should be given?—No, I should not like to say that. I should say that if the State had given that guarantee of ensuring that the destitute pauper was relieved, whether the central Treasury paid a part of the cost or not, it would then be the duty of the State to enforce such regulations as would ensure its guarantee being carried out.

2209. Is it not the fact that under the old Poor Law when there were no exchequer grants, the extravagance in local relief was often greater than obtains anywhere at the present day?—That was so, but whether the absence of grants was the cause of that maladministration some think is a very debateable point; I should say certainly that the absence of grants was not the cause of the maladministration.

Publication of reports on union administration.

2210. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would there be any practical objection to the inspector or the auditor issuing a report to every ratepayer on the character of the administration of any union?—I think that in some cases those reports might be useful, but in most cases I do not think they would have the slightest effect, because I do not think they would be read. In certain exceptional cases, for instance, we will take the present cases of Leicester, Poplar, West Ham, and unions of that sort which are undergoing a period of very high pauperism, I think a published report of the actual current administration might do good.

2211. In order to make it not invidious, and in order to show that the Local Government Board had no animus against a particular union, would it not be desirable that it should be a matter of common form to issue to the ratepayers a report on the administration of the whole of the boards?—Would you suggest that that should be published in the newspapers?

2212. I would suggest that it should be not only published in the newspapers but handed to every ratepayer?—I am afraid that would be rather a large order, but I quite see that some good might result from such reports being circulated.

Friendly Societies Exemption Act, 1894.

2213. Will you please turn to Question 2037, where you refer to the Friendly Societies Exemption Act of 1894; I understand that it was left to the Local Government Board to issue an order to permit the guardians to put that Act in force?—I do not think that was so.

2214. I thought it was left to the Local Government Board whether it was put in force or not?—No.

Out-relief unions.

2215. With regard to the out-door unions, what constitutes an outdoor union? Is it merely that an out-door union is one which has no workhouse, or is there any other definition of an out-door union?—The out-door unions were formed for two reasons: they were a suggestion of Mr. Andrew Doyle, if I remember aright. There was a Committee in 1873 on Boundaries; he then suggested the formation of out-door unions as a means of solving a good many boundary questions where a difficulty arose because a union was in two or three counties. He suggested that so much of the union as was in each county should be made a separate out-door relief union, and at the same time he said that in his judgment that would have a good effect on out-door relief, beause it would make the guardians in the smaller unions more directly responsible for the out-door relief they gave. There are twelve such unions in England.

2216. And they have no separate workhouse?—That is so, they use a common workhouse.

2217. Is the workhouse paid out of a common rate?—Yes. The out-door relief falls on each individual union.

Finance of out-relief unions.

2218. Then in those unions out-door relief falls on the local rate, and the cost of the workhouse falls on the general rate of the amalgamation?—That is so. York is a good instance of that sort. There is the city and county of York; there is the North Riding Out-relief Union, which is called Flaxton; there is the West Riding Out-relief Union, which is called Bishopthorpe; and there is the East Riding Out-relief Union, which is called Escrick. So that in the York Union there are four out-relief unions, and one union for the purpose of in-door relief.

Unions without workhouses.

2219. It has been suggested that a way of checking out-door relief in London would be to make each union pay for its out-door relief?—The exact effect of the out-door relief union is a point on which I suppose the Commission will take further evidence, but I should mention here, to save confusion hereafter, that there are a certain number of unions in England without a workhouse at all—not out-door relief unions, but unions using the workhouse of a neighbouring union. For instance, there is a union near Ipswich which has no workhouse because its workhouse was closed; and then there is Westhampnett union, which has no workhouse, but boards its paupers out, because its workhouse happens to have been burnt down.

2220. But they have to pay for the boarding out?—Yes. Those are not out-door relief unions, and should not be classified with them.

Accessibility of information as to Government and railway property in different unions.

2221. With regard to Government property and railway property, you made the very interesting statement that the contributions from those two sources diminished the financial responsibility of boards of guardians; I suppose it would be quite easy for us to obtain, from the Treasury, say, the exact distribution of Government property all over England?—I should think so.

2222. And we might also get the distribution of the railway property from the Railway Department?—Possibly. I have here a return of railway property which is taken from a Parliamentary Return made in 1899. You will see from this that there are twenty rural unions in England where the railway property bears the largest proportion to the rateable value; the return also gives the cost of relief in those unions and the rate per cent. of pauperism. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (21).)

Parliamentary return.

2223. Would not a return of all the railway property in the different unions be quite as easily obtainable as in the case of Government property?—I should think so.

Origin of "compounding."

2224. With regard to compounding, that arose, did it not, in the 18th century, because it was discovered that the guardians were always excusing poor people from their rates; that was the reason, was it not?—I will take that from you.

Effect on excusal from rates.

2225. I happen to know that it was the reason; it arose on clauses in local Acts. Would not an objection to it which was made on its origin still hold good, namely, would not magistrates still be likely to excuse poor

people ?—They would, and I think, historically, you will find that that had a good deal to do with the modern system of compounding. I think Mr. Chamberlain took the question up with others. It was said what hard luck it was to be continually selling up these poor people for the poor rate.

2226. If you go to Petty Sessions and watch the magistrates excusing very poor people from sending their children to school, I think you will probably consider that they would do the same sort of thing with regard to the rates of very poor people ?—They might; but then you see compounding is not universal, so that there does exist material for further inquiry into the matter.

2227. I gather that compounding divides itself into two—compulsory and non-compulsory compounding ?—That is so.

lect on
ensal from
tes
franchise.

2228. (*Chairman.*) Following up Mrs. Webb's question, is the ratepayer who is excused from paying poor rates disqualified as a Parliamentary voter ?—No; he votes.

estitution
the
ndition of
lief.

2229. (*Mr. Nunn.*) May one take the opportunity of going over your points with regard to the fundamental principle of the poor law ? I think you said that the fundamental principle of the Poor Law was to relieve destitution, and that it aimed at doing so humanely to the individual pauper, while it safeguarded the community by making the lot of the pauper less eligible than that of the independent labourer. May I take it that that is the principle of the poor law as understood by the Local Government Board ?—Yes.

ature of
terrence of
lief.

2230. I want you to tell us what you consider to be the elements of ineligibility, so far as the law is able to render relief ineligible. Does ineligibility consist of these three elements: firstly, of the loss of personal reputation (what is understood by the stigma of pauperism); secondly, the loss of personal freedom which is secured by detention in a workhouse; and thirdly, the loss of political freedom by suffering disfranchisement. Are those the main elements of ineligibility, or have I left any out ?—I think those would be the main elements.

2231. Those are almost absent in nearly every form of relief which is now being given by boards of guardians, are they not ?—I should not say so at all.

terrence of
edical
ief.

2232. For instance, take medical relief in infirmaries; no one minds being detained in an infirmary so long as he is ill, and if he does not have to pass through the workhouse he suffers no stigma of pauperism, does he ?—I think only a small proportion of relief is given in infirmaries.

2233. A good deal of the disfranchisement which follows from ordinary forms of relief a man escapes by receiving medical relief, and that principle is largely extended to relief that is given in infirmaries; is that not so ?—Yes, there is a tendency in that direction.

terrence of
dinary
lief.

2234. With regard to most of the out-door relief there is very little personal stigma, there is no detention, and there is, on the part of the women, at any rate, no loss of enfranchisement ?—That is so.

2235. If the law, therefore, is administering a large amount of poor law relief without this ineligibility attached to it, do you think that there is any other principle in the field which may be put forward in defence of such variations from strict administration of the poor law as an ineligible form of relief ?—No. I do not see on what other theory you can proceed.

2236. You think that that still holds the field ?—I think so, and I think it holds the field more or less efficiently in nine-tenths of the unions in England.

2237. So that it is as difficult to render the lot of the pauper less eligible than that of the independent elector as it is difficult, for instance, in the case of infirmary relief ?—In the case of the sick it is impossible.

ttitude of
entral
uthority
to:
) Co-opera-
on between
uardians
d
arities.

2238. The only means which the community can take is to try to render the lot of the pauper who is not sick more difficult than that of the independent labourer ?—As I shall show later on, the conditions of the standard of living of the independent labourer must have a direct bearing on the administration of poor law deterrents, that is to say, on the comforts of the infirmary.

2239. With regard to the co-operation of charities and boards of guardians, are there any directions or suggestions on that subject from the Local Government Board, apart from Mr. Goschen's circular of 1869 and the orders in certain London unions and the list of charities published in 1878 ?—I think not.

2240. There are no suggestions or instructions as to co-operation ?—No. It is understood that that is the policy of the board, but it has not been laid down in any circular.

2241. There is nothing for any particular guardian to lay his hand on in defence of the principle ?—No.

(2) Duties of guardians.

2242. Has the Local Government Board done what some other central bodies have done, namely, issued instructions or suggestions to guardians upon their election as to how they may carry out their duties ?—No.

(3) Management of sick-wards, and

2243. I think detailed instructions have been issued with regard to the management of sick wards in the infirmaries ?—Instructions to guardians are contained in the General Consolidated Order.

2244. But those instructions do not have much reference to principles, do they ?—No. The work has been done, and pretty efficiently done, by private publishers; but of course that is quite a different thing to a circular by the board.

(4) Qualifications of relieving officers.

2245. The board has not done anything yet, has it, in directing the training of any of the officers connected with out-door relief ?—No, we have not, except by doing our best to remonstrate if a man appears to be unfit.

2246. Has there been any suggestion that the social status and the general qualifications of a relieving officer, say a chief relieving officer, might be somewhat different to what they are at the present day ?—I have not heard of it with regard to relieving officers, but I have often heard of it with regard to masters of workhouses.

The name "relieving officer" infelicitous.

2247. The name of "relieving officer" is rather an unhappy one, because it assumes that he is going to give relief; has there been any consideration of the possibility of altering the name ?—I think not; but so many people are worrying about the English language in connection with the poor law now that I think that suggestion might be usefully considered in connection with some others.

Committees of guardians.

2248. There has been one point raised in connection with the form of the administration of relief by rural and urban district unions; when a rural district council or an urban district council appoint a committee for the administration of poor law relief, what, precisely, would be the form of that committee ?—They are all guardians.

2249. And they all act as such ?—Yes.

2250. Without any sub-committees ?—They may appoint committees or they may not, as they like; but they are all guardians.

Co-opted guardians.

2251. Are there any co-opted or nominated members ?—There are a few co-opted members; under the Act of 1894 there was a power to co-opt.

2252. Co-opt *ad hoc* for certain purposes ?—Only as guardians of the poor.

Distinction between urban and rural councils and boards of guardians.

2253. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) An urban district council is an entirely separate body from a board of guardians, and has nothing whatever to do with it, I think ?—That is so.

2254. And in point of law, too, rural district councils are entirely separate bodies from boards of guardians ?—That is so.

2255. Only members of a rural district council are *ex officio* guardians, but there is no relation except in that way between those separate local authorities, is there ?—There is none whatever.

2256. (*Mr. Nunn.*) But they may be the same persons ?—Let me give you an instance; the ordinary country board of guardians would consist of district councillors who act as guardians, but as guardians they are a separate body from the district council; there would be, or might be for any urban districts within that union, guardians elected as guardians for those urban districts and sitting with the district councillors as guardians, but not themselves being district councillors; and then there might be a co-opted man or two.

Deterrence of relief.

2257. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In the case of misfortune, is a necessary consequence of the reception of relief the loss of personal reputation ? I can understand that there would be the loss of the privilege of voting, but the loss of personal reputation does not follow of necessity, does

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

it, strictly speaking?—Do you mean that a man need not be ashamed of it?

2258. The loss of personal reputation is rather a different thing, but I will accept your phrase that he need not be ashamed of it?—That might be so. I think the reception of relief might be inevitable.

Rating of flats in London.

2259. On the matter of compounding there is something akin to compounding, is there not, in the large properties as well as in small properties; for instance, in the West End of London a great many people who live in large flats are people whose interest in the locality is very slight owing to the fact that they do not pay rates?—They have no interest in the fluctuation of the rate.

2260. Therefore that would account, to some extent, for their not voting at elections and not taking the slightest interest in anything going on in the locality?—I am afraid it would.

2261. I presume that when you come to deal with London that would be the time to ask you a question with regard to guardians becoming directly absorbed in the borough councils, so that the election for the one should be the election for the other; that would apply mainly to London, would it not?—I should think so.

2262. Perhaps, however, you might give your judgment on that point now, and let us know whether you think that would be a desirable thing to do?—As to whether the guardians should be a committee of the borough council do you mean?

2263. Yes, or treating them as the rural councillors are treated, so that you would have practically the same body, but meeting at different times for the different purposes?—That is a very large question. If you really want to know what I think about London you will have an opportunity of finding out by-and-bye. It is not exactly your suggestion that I should put forward; I should go further than that.

Effect on elections of guardians' non-Poor Law functions.

2264. In the same sense one gathers from your evidence that the interest in the election of guardians is, generally speaking, due to the fact that there is some extraneous thing which has no real reference to the guardians' work at all, such as vaccination, for instance, and which had better be omitted from consideration?—Yes.

2265. Therefore, in the same sense, when there is an interest in an election it is rather an unhealthy than a healthy sign in that particular?—I should say that it does not do the guardians as a body any good.

Effect of audit surcharges.

2266. And the result is not a satisfactory result from the point of view of the constitution of the board of guardians. Then with regard to the power of surcharge you said that a surcharge would prevent the recurrence of an irregularity; is that always the case? One sometimes finds in regard to other bodies that after a surcharge people say: "It does not very much matter; we are quite sure to be let off," and so the thing does occur again?—That is so.

2267. Would you say that it was quite a preventative of the recurrence?—No, it is not quite a preventative, but it very often has the effect of correcting an irregularity. I do not mind saying that if there is a recurrence I do not think the board ought to remit; I think then we ought to be a bit strict, and I think we should be in certain cases.

2268. Have those cases often occurred?—No; I have given you the exact figures. Actual recourse to the enforcement of a surcharge is rare.

2269. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) May I ask whether the auditors surcharge under general powers or under some specific enactment giving them power to investigate individual cases of relief?—I think they act under their general powers to judge of the reasonableness of the relief.

Effect of compounding on exemption from rates.

2270. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In regard to compounding having been at any rate to some extent, the result of excusing the poor from paying their rates in olden days, and the possibility of that being the case to-day, supposing there were no compounding, is it not the fact that in the great majority of cases those who are very poor now are excused the payment of their rates when they are not compounded?—In the country the practice varies a good deal, but as a rule the very poor people are excused.

Distinction between medical and other relief.

2271. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard again to the fundamental principles of the Poor Law, although both are forms of pauperism, might not a difference be rightly recognised, and is it not recognised, between the relief of the sick, and the relief of that destitution which is due simply to poverty?—The distinction is made in practice.

2272. But there is a theoretic basis for it, is there not?—I think not. Some sickness is inevitable and is such sickness as a man cannot provide for; but there are other forms of sickness which a man could have provided for by an exercise of thrift. Therefore, I should not put the whole class of the sick together.

2273. I am looking at it in this way—that the provisions for pauperism may cause people to become poor, but are unlikely to cause people to become sick—which is a different point from that from which you are looking at it, is it not?—Yes. No man would deliberately become sick on purpose, I think.

2274. Therefore, it does justify some difference in the theory of the treatment?—Yes, and that makes all the difference with regard to some classes of the sick.

2275. May we not say as to the question of the comparative eligibility of the two lots, that the chief difficulty concerns out-relief, in other words, institutional relief is much more capable of providing restraints which are objected to, and therefore the great difference arises in connection with out-relief?—That is so. I propose later on to give the Commission my view as to what is meant by the workhouse test, and as to what is meant by the deterrent conditions of the workhouse.

Return as to pauperism in unions containing large proportion of railway property.

2276. (*Chairman.*) In your previous examination, and again to-day, you have mentioned the large contributions which railways in certain specific districts make towards the rates, and consequently towards the Poor Rate; and I understand that the return you have handed in illustrates that?—Yes. It is taken from a return which was made in 1899 showing that railway property bears a proportion of 9 per cent. to the total rateable property of England and Wales. The return which I have put in shows country unions which derive most benefit from railways. I find that there are, say, twenty of them who have more than 20 per cent. of their rateable value railway property; one, Welwyn, goes up as high as 58 per cent., and there are a good many over 30 per cent. Whether it is a coincidence or not I do not know, but I suggest it is a matter which is well worth your examination. The rate per cent. of pauperism and of cost of relief in all those unions except about three is above the average. The great exception is at Bradfield Union, where with 30 per cent. of railway property the cost of the relief in the £ is only 7d., and the rate per cent. of pauperism is only 1·1. In most of these cases the pauperism is over 3 per cent., and in a good many it is over 4 per cent.

See Qs. 20 and 2222 and App. III.

Corporate and Local Government franchise.

2277. (*Miss Hill.*) I suppose none of the railway companies are at all represented on the boards of guardians because they have no votes?—They have no votes.

2278. Has any scheme ever been proposed by which they could have votes?—I have never seen one.

2279. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There have been representations, have there not, that corporations should be allowed to appoint someone or another to vote on behalf of them?—Yes.

2280. And corporations in that connection I presume would include railways?—Yes. There have been, of course, very great complaints. You will find the subject was investigated by the Local Taxation Commission, before whom some remarkable instances were given.

Procedure Select Committee

2281. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the referring of questions to Select Committees of the House of Commons, you mentioned I think that questions that would otherwise be dealt with more or less on the principles of the administration of the Local Government Board would be referred to a kind of miscellaneous Committee who might bring out any kind of conclusions?—I did not quite put it in that way. I said that their conclusions perhaps did not take sufficient account of the possible effect of their recommendations, or something of that sort.

2282. These questions I think you point out are becoming in a manner more and more important; is there any suggestion that you could make by which as a matter of course evidence should come with a memorandum, we will say, from the Local Government Board on such

questions to such Select Committee; or, is there any form of control which would allow of a revision or of a further report from the Local Government Board on such reports of Parliamentary Committees?—There is no such power now.

2283. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is it usual for the Local Government Board official to attend Select Committees as he does the municipal Committees?—Sometimes he is called.

2284. Is he always there in attendance?—No, not on Select Committees of that character.

2285. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is there any suggestion at present made by which you can in any way bring the view of the Local Government Board before the Committee over and above simply giving evidence?—No.

2286. There is no reference of the report specially and officially to the Local Government Board with a view to their opinion being taken?—No; and there is no certainty that any of our people will be called as a witness.

ission of harges.

2287. With regard to remission, is it desirable to have such a broad power of remission? Would not the fact that surcharge by an auditor affected the local authority at once (as it would any business person or a local business authority) be a great safeguard if, when the auditor reports against them, they know they must pay?—It is not a question of their paying, but of the man surcharged being made to pay. You may have some unfortunate individual guardian who has signed a cheque being let in for a sum of money which perhaps it is beyond his competence to pay.

2288. But the board of guardians might very well be treated as a corporate body, and a surcharge might very well fall upon the whole body of members?—That is a possible solution; but I should like to call your attention again to the fact that a great many of the surcharges are purely technical, and purely formal, sometimes being made because the money is charged in the wrong account.

2289. Might there not be a division of what are called the technical surcharges from the others, so that with regard to the technical surcharges there should be remission, and not with regard to the others?—That might be done; and there might be a general screwing up of refusals to remit.

lifica- s of ers.

2290. With regard to the qualifications of officers, I notice that a great many of the points are negative—"No person shall hold office who cannot keep accounts"; and so on; would it not be possible to revise the General Consolidated Order and to put in more positive details of what is required?—It would be quite possible to insist on more specific qualifications.

ponsi- y of clerk o applica- s for f.

2291. With regard to the clerk, is he considered responsible for the way in which the investigation is made, and the way in which recommendations are submitted to boards of guardians in regard to cases of out-door relief?—No, he is not responsible.

2292. So that where a clerk—as we know, for instance, in the case of Mr. Vallance—has done a great deal in that direction, it has been rather done by the position he has taken up than by the actual requirements of his official position?—It is done by his personal influence. A great many boards of guardians resent the interference of their clerk in individual cases of relief.

of ds of rdians.

2293. Are not many boards of guardians quite unwieldy from the point of view of the discussion of cases?—Some boards of guardians are very much too large for the proper conduct of any business.

2294. Then one point of reform would be the revision of these boards from the point of view of making them, if it were possible, more suitable business bodies?—I have already pointed out that, in my judgment, some of the provisions of the Act of 1894 regarding the numbers of guardians and areas need reconsideration; because the whole object of legislation is to get efficient local governing bodies and nothing ought to stand in the way of that.

edure as scusal rates.

2295. When an individual is exempted from paying his rates, is that done by order of a magistrate?—Yes.

2296. Would any less cumbrous method be feasible? It is evidently a method which it is very difficult to apply, because a magistrate can hardly know all the evidence and would be rather inclined, I should imagine, to be lenient than just?—That is so. I do not think, however, that there are many cases of remission, as I hear very little about them. I am talking of the country.

2297. And the same with urban districts?—I do not think there are many cases of remission; but I do not know.

2298. We have no return on that subject, have we?—I know of no return; I have asked for one, but I cannot find one. I think such a return might be useful.

2299. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Are there not some instances where the magistrate sits at the town hall and hears such cases, quite apart from the police arrangements?—Yes.

2300. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would any report from the board of guardians go before the magistrate in regard to particular cases in which remission is desired?—I do not think the board of guardians, as a board, would know very much about that unless they had an investigating officer. It is very much a matter for the overseers.

2301. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It would not be a union matter at all, would it?—No.

2302. And, therefore, the guardians would have nothing whatever to do with it?—That is so.

2303. It is a question as regards the parish. The overseers are very well aware of the fact that an application is to be made to the magistrates, and as they are cognisant of the circumstances, it therefore rests with the overseers and not with the guardians to take any action in the matter, is that not so?—The overseers are the persons responsible and they are the best body, I think, for determining a case of that sort. They probably know the people in country parishes. In town parishes I quite admit that the check on the remission may be extremely imperfect; and that a magistrate sitting to remit would naturally remit. It is a delightful thing to spend other people's money.

Workhouse plans: Report of 1834.

2304. (*Chairman.*) As regards in-door relief, the Commission of 1834 gave special attention to the plans for workhouses, did they not?—You will find in the first report of the Commission some model plans for workhouses which seem to me to have a somewhat more than historic interest. There are two kinds of plan; one is a plan of workhouses invented by Sir Francis Head, who describes them as being labourers' cottages turned into a hollow square, in which square the guardians can introduce any system of labour they think fit. That was practically the first idea of the Commissioners. They did not exactly accept Sir Francis' description, but still you will find in Kent all the old workhouses built on that plan; and if the Commissioners visit any workhouses they will be interested in seeing the gradual development of one of those workhouses built on that system into a modern workhouse. The other form was also curious; it was Bentham's Panopticon. Bentham's Panopticon was a sort of building like a star-fish with a tower in the middle. His idea was that it might be adopted both for prisons and for workhouses—you will remember that at one time he was a contractor for paupers. The master was apparently to sit in the middle of the tower and observe the operations of the paupers in the wings and in the yards between them. In England there are a good many panopticon workhouses still in existence.

Rate of disappearance of able-bodied paupers.

2305. I suppose the plans of the workhouses were a good deal regulated by the idea that there would be an abolition of able-bodied paupers?—So far as I read the early history, the abolition of able-bodied paupers almost at once began to affect the construction of workhouses. The able-bodied pauper disappeared very rapidly; for instance in 1842, 38 per cent. of the population of the workhouses were able-bodied; in 1860 the figure had fallen to 15 per cent., and in 1890 to 13 per cent., but unfortunately in 1905 there seems to be something like a recrudescence of the able-bodied paupers for the percentage went up to 18. What is meant by an able-bodied pauper we shall have to discuss later on.

2306. Has the definition varied during that time?—No

2307. Were these workhouse plans you have told us of intended for rural districts?—They were intended for all districts at that time.

Dr. Edward Smith's report on workhouses.

2308. There was a report of Dr. Smith that was made in 1867, which I think you want to refer to?—Yes. There was a very interesting report on forty provincial workhouses by Dr. Edward Smith in the year 1867. It is quite evident from the figures he gives that the workhouse had then become pretty much what the workhouse is now,

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

that is to say, a refuge for persons who are mainly old and sick. Even then the workhouse was a good deal simpler in construction than it is now, for I find on my notes that in 1866 the Kensington ratepayers objected to a workhouse as being too costly,—and it was for 400 beds, the site to cost £4,000 and the building to cost £13,000.

State of workhouses in 1867.

2309. Then the conditions of those inside the workhouse having so materially changed, I believe there was legislation in 1867 for the purpose of improving the conditions in London?—Attention was called to the state of the London workhouses, and various reports were made upon them which you will find summarised in the speech which Mr. Gathorne-Hardy made in 1867 when he introduced his Act. The condition of the London workhouses was intolerably bad; and I may say—though I cannot refer to the particular Blue-book at this moment—that the conditions of some of the north country workhouses were also very bad indeed. It is from about the seventies that the beginning of these very expensive workhouse buildings and workhouse infirmaries may be said to date, that is, the modern workhouse as it is now had its origin about that period.

Orders and circulars of Central Authority as to workhouse inmates since 1885.

2310. I believe the Local Government Board or the Poor Law Board took special precautions by issuing orders as regards the management of the workhouse?—Up to 1890 the rules for the government of workhouses were not much changed, but since that period there have been a succession of orders mainly with the intention of ameliorating the condition of the workhouse inmate. For instance, in 1885 there was a circular as to married couples in workhouses, pointing out to the guardians what the law was. I need not remind the Commission that the law is that if both husband and wife are above sixty years of age they have a right to live with one another, and that if one is above sixty they may live together with the permission of the guardians. In 1891 there was a circular addressed to the General Inspectors as to the supply of books in workhouses, and of toys for the children. In 1892 there was an order permitting the guardians to give the inmates of workhouses tobacco and snuff. In 1893 there was a very important order which authorised the appointment of Ladies' Visiting Committees and which gave the right of visiting the workhouses to every individual guardian. In 1894 there was an order which allowed the guardians to give dry tea, sugar and milk to the women, so that they might make their own tea. In 1896, there was a further circular as to the classification of inmates. In 1897 came perhaps the most important order of all, the nursing order. In 1900 there was a new dietary order; I do not know whether I should class that with the other orders as making a change for the better in the conditions of workhouse life. I rather prefer to look upon that order as one of decentralisation and simplification, but I may as well include it in my list. Then lastly came the circular of August, 1900, as to the treatment of the aged deserving poor, as they called them. You will notice how very rapidly all these orders have come one after the other since the year 1890; that year forms a sort of epoch in PoorLaw administration. The effect will have to be tested by statistics.

Result of recommendations of Select Committees.

2311. Were these orders which were issued by the Local Government Board the result of legislation?—They were the result of the recommendations of Select Committees.

2312. And of what I suppose I may call the pressure of public opinion, or at any rate of a certain class of public opinion?—Yes, I suppose they were.

Movements of indoor pauperism over a series of years.

2313. Having described to us the improvement which has taken place in the workhouses in recent years, will you now tell us the nature of the workhouse test?—It is often held that workhouses are ceasing to be deterrent, and that statement will be repeated to you, I have no doubt, by many of your witnesses. I have caused to be prepared a diagram (*See* Appendix Vol. I.(A),No.V. (10),) which shows, roughly, what the progress of in-door pauperism has been in relation to population and to able-bodied pauperism. You will find that in-door pauperism from 1860 up to 1895 has kept pretty constant, sometimes up, sometimes down, but still, so to speak, clinging to the line of population till the year 1900, and then you see how rapidly the curve goes straight up; it had kept pretty well at 7 per 1,000, and now it has gone up to something more.

2313A. Does that rise point to any change in workhouse conditions?—That is a very important question, and I should first like to make one point before we discuss that question. It has always appeared to me that there is an irreducible minimum of pauperism—whatever it may be; that is to say, that in any organised community there must be a certain number of impotent folk, who must be kept in an institution ultimately. I think it is quite clear that that must be so. What that irreducible minimum is, is a much more difficult question, because you have to consider that the minimum may be provided for in ways which are not known to the Poor Law, as, for instance, by the help of friends, or by charity, and thus it may be taken off the rates. A good many years ago I endeavoured, on my own account, to get some sort of rough idea of what the minimum was. I took a good deal of pains in a certain Lancashire union, and I made out then that it was something like 1·1 per cent. I then asked a French friend of mine to make the same sort of investigation in France, and he did it, I am perfectly certain, with a great deal of care, and arrived at much the same conclusion. I think now that I put the minimum much too high; but that is not certain. It certainly would appear too high looking to the fact that the indoor pauperism clings about the figure of 7 per 1000; but then you have to add to that the lunatics in asylums, and the charity folk, and a certain proportion of out-door paupers, who evidently ought to be receiving in-door relief. I have dealt somewhat at length with this point, but it is a mere theory of mine, and no person that I have been able to discover who has any expert knowledge as a statistician (which I certainly have not) has gone into the matter. But I do submit that it is a very important point in considering this question of in-door pauperism, because, the nearer you get to the irreducible minimum, the harder it is by any administrative means to decrease your indoor pauperism, because your margin is so much smaller.

"Irreducible minimum" of pauperism.

2314. 1·1 per cent. was the figure that you named as the irreducible minimum of pauperism in this country, and that is also, I think, the figure arrived at by a gentleman who investigated it in France; does that include only those who applied for public relief, or does it include all those who are unable to maintain themselves?—It was meant to include those members of the community that must *ex necessitate rei* be maintained by somebody or another in an institution—or should be.

2315. And their dependants?—They, most of them, would not have dependants. They would be lunatics, they would be cripples, they would be blind; they would be the ones with chronic ill health.

2316. I am afraid I interrupted you just now?—That is all I have to say on this point of the irreducible minimum, and I put it with a good deal of hesitation.

The workhouse test.

2317. Whatever might be the deterrent character of a workhouse there still will be a large number of persons who are compelled by their necessities to go to the workhouse, will there not?—Yes. That takes me to my next point, which is the question of the deterrency of a workhouse. That is an old point. Sir Francis Head in 1835 said, "It is no use building workhouses unless we have sense and firmness enough to regulate them justly. They are to be inhabited by the lowest and poorest class of society, and before bread and cheese, bread and butter, suet puddings, meat puddings, tea, milk and vegetables be pronounced insufficient for the paupers' diet we ought to raise the wages of the English labourer. For we have no moral right to break his spirit by elevating the poorest above the poor." There you evidently see, reading between the lines, that there was already a tendency to make the workhouses more comfortable than Sir Francis Head, at all events, held to be justifiable. Again a few years later, the Commissioners say, "With regard to the aged and infirm there is a strong disposition on the part of a portion of the public so to modify the arrangements of workhouses as to place them on the footing of almshouses."

Sir Francis Head's opinion.

Cause of rise in standard of workhouse comfort.

2318. The standard of comfort in workhouses has risen, and I understand your contention is that it has risen because the great bulk of those inside the workhouse are people who are aged or infirm, and it is not possible to make their conditions inside the workhouse worse than would be the conditions of people of the same class of life if they were outside the workhouse?—That is partly the reason. Another reason seems to me to be that the workhouse comforts must bear a relation to the standard

of living of the lowest classes, and as the latter standard of living becomes better the workhouse comforts may safely be extended. I think that on a matter of this importance I can, without taking up too much of the time of the Commission, point out what the original idea of the workhouse test was. The best illustration that I have seen is in connection with the Irish Poor Law. I have here a report which was made in 1879 as to the amalgamation of certain Irish unions for Lunatic Asylum purposes; and in that report the Commissioners quote from the writings of Sir George Cornewall Lewis. It was alleged that if you introduced the workhouse system into Ireland it would break down, for you could not possibly make a workhouse of so low a standard of comfort that it would be deterrent to the Irish cottar "That view was very strongly pressed on the English Commissioners at the time, and Sir George Cornewall Lewis says, "Now the whole of this reasoning must, it is evident, fall to the ground, if it can be made evident that the lowering of the diet is not in fact the keystone of the workhouse system in England, and that the success of this system under the operation of the Poor Law Amendment Act has been owing to a highly different cause . . . .The true sanction of the workhouse system is to be looked for in a different quarter. A man struggling with poverty would be content to live in a public institution, on a worse fare than the most rigid parochial economists have ever ventured to introduce into a workhouse, if he was permitted to spend his time in idleness, to go in and out of the house at pleasure and to live in the house with his wife and family. It is the compulsory labour, the discipline, and the classification, which are the real objects of the pauper's dislike. The mere physical comforts of a public institution must always be in many respects superior to those attainable by a poor man in his own dwelling. The inmate of a workhouse is certain, whatever may be the quality of his food, to have enough of it; he will never, except for punishment, be reduced to short commons; this security alone is of considerable importance to a poor man." But he has to give up his personal liberty, and that is the true nature of the workhouse test as it was understood at that time. What the effect of the introduction of workhouses into Ireland was is a point which must be perfectly well known to this Commission, but it certainly never broke down owing to the rush of people to get into them. I should never be afraid of increased comforts in workhouses, provided there was a restraint on liberty, and that discipline was maintained. It seems to me that the real point was touched in quite early days by one of the Commissioners, Mr. Tufnell, who says that many inmates of the new workhouses have expressed their contentment, and that many people have altered their opinion of the harshness of the law after a visit to one of the new workhouses. He goes on: "This process, however, always is to me fraught with evil forebodings the realisation of which can only be prevented by carefully keeping up what seems to me our sole barrier against them, namely, a system of restraint "—all of which brings me to the point to which I wish specially to call the attention of the Commission. If it be the fact that workhouses in certain districts, notably in London, have to a certain extent ceased to be deterrent, I suggest that possibly the explanation is not to be found so much in these Orders and Circulars for amelioration, as I will call them, as to the fact that in a great many workhouses the inmates have an amount of leave of absence which, according to my view, is quite excessive. I have detained the Commission at some length on this subject, because I feel that it is an important matter on which the Local Government Board itself wants help. We want to know the fact as to whether workhouses are ceasing to be deterrent, and if they are, whether the change is not attributable to a very large extent to the amount of leave which is given to inmates.

2319. Could you describe to the Commission the sort of leave which is given and its duration?—In some London unions everybody over sixty perhaps would go out for the whole of Monday, and some other people would go out on Tuesday; then on Wednesday friends would visit, and so on. This matter was very much brought to my notice some years ago when I was chairman of a committee on workhouse accounts. We found that one of the difficulties was framing forms of account which would meet the fact that on certain days in the week hundreds of people were outside the workhouse, and therefore not eating their food. The whole accounts had to be re-arranged to meet that difficulty, as Dr. Downes knows.

2320. Did they get no allowance for going out?—No. I remember very well some years ago that in an urban workhouse in my district I found that practically the whole of the old people went out on one day in the week, and that a certain proportion of them who were industrious got a day's charing

2321. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) There is a system in Marylebone, at least so I was informed three years ago, that 300 males go out one week and 300 females the next week?—That shows a certain amount of selection

Leave of absence helpful to discipline.

2322. (*Chairman.*) What is urged on behalf of this leave of absence? Does it make it easier for the master of the workhouse to maintain order and discipline?—I think it is only part of the general desire to treat a destitute person in a workhouse in a very kindly way.

2323. (*Mr. Nunn.*) But it does give the guardians a means of light punishment which they otherwise would not possess, does it not?—It certainly is useful in that way.

Limits to deterrency of loss of liberty.

2324. May I make it quite clear? The argument in favour of the loss of personal liberty as the chief element in ineligibility does not apply to persons who are too sick even to desire to leave the houses, if in infirmary workhouses, does it?—No. The whole question of institutional relief to the sick is a very difficult one, and it is none the less difficult because the question is more or less acute in largely populated urban unions only, especially in London.

2325. (*Chairman.*) It would not apply in the same degree to people beyond a certain age, would it?—No.

2326. It would not apply, because they would not have the same power of locomotion?—There my theory of the irreducible minimum comes in. The conditions of workhouse life would only affect a certain proportion of the inmates, and would not affect the class you mention and the class of the sick.

2327. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is leave of absence confined to those who are over a certain age?—I think you will find great variation in different unions on that matter; but in all Poor Law matters the exception tends to become the rule.

Report as to "leave of absence" in London workhouses.

2328. (*Chairman.*) I suppose it makes things work smoothly inside a workhouse?—I think so.

"Leave" as an inducement to pauperism.

2329. (*Mr. Nunn.*) This leave makes it easier for children to persuade their parents to go into the workhouse instead of having to keep them at home themselves, does it not?—It does.

Paupers' right of discharge.

2330. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Speaking of leave of absence, cannot a pauper leave at any time he likes?—He can discharge himself when he likes.

2331. And he can come in the next day, can he not?—He can.

2332. You cannot therefore prevent his absence, whether you call it leave or not, because it is in the discretion of the pauper to take it or not?—It is within his discretion to discharge himself, but then if he discharges himself more than once within the month he is kept twenty-four hours, and if he discharges himself more frequently he is kept forty-eight hours, and so on, up to 168 hours.

Abandonment of distinctive workhouse dress.

2333. Do they get leave of absence without discharging themselves?—Yes, and they go out in the workhouse clothes. In a great many unions now the paupers are dressed in ordinary clothes; that is, the dress of the workhouse inmate is supposed to be assimilated to the dress of the people outside. That makes the leave of absence rather better perhaps.

Procedure for granting "leave of absence."

2334. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It is in the discretion of the guardians, is it not, to determine whether they will grant leave of absence from the workhouse to a pauper?—Quite so.

2335. The practice is, is it not, to give general directions to the master, and the master, acting on those general directions, exercises his own discretion?—Yes; he is

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

supposed to be able to refuse inmates leave, but it is very unpopular to do so.

2336. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Does not the master bring up special cases for the guardians to decide?—I should think that would be very much a matter of the internal administration of the unions.

2337. (*Miss Hill.*) Is there not a tendency in certan unions to allow the men to go out for several days together and leave their families in the house?—I have seen that.

Effect of Nursing Order on number of trained nurses in workhouses.

2338. (*Chairman*). I think your next subject is the question ofthe Nursing Order issued by the Local Government Board; will you tell us something about that Order?—I think that the Order of the Board which has done most to improve the conditions of workhouses is the Nursing Order which was issued in August, 1897. The effect of that Order has been to increase the total number of nurses who are employed in workhouses in England from 3,658 to 5,895. In 1896 there were no superintendent nurses, but there were 1,651 nurses in town workhouses; in 1901 there were 164 superintendent nurses and 2,413 other nurses in town workhouses; and in 1905 the latter number had amounted to 2,646, with 163 superintendent nurses. In country workhouses the numbers were in 1896, 498; in 1901, 704, with 63 superintendents, and in 1905, 759, with 68 superintendents. The numbers in separate infirmaries showed a corresponding increase. Therefore, the Order may be considered to have been extremely effective in increasing the number of nurses.

Dr. Edward Smith's Report on Workhouse Nursing, 1867

2339. Side by side with this growth of nurses there was a separation of infirmaries from workhouses, was there not?—Yes. I should like, before I quit the subject of the nurses, to refer to a Report which was made by Dr. Edward Smith in 1867, in which he points out the difficulties of getting nurses in country workhouses. He says, "There are three grounds upon which the guardians base their hesitation to appoint paid nurses, namely, first, that in small workhouses containing, say, less than 100 inmates, the number of sick is very small and not too large to be under the direct care of the matron; second, that of the so-called sick five-sixths of these are aged and infirm and require no special skill to be bestowed upon them; and third, that there are in most workhouses one or more women who have acted as nurses for many years, and who are quite as competent to discharge the duties of nurses as those who usually apply for the paid offices." He goes on in this tentative sort of way, and says: "Upon the whole I am of opinion that in every workhouse there should be a responsible, and as far as possible, a trained nurse." The difference in the point of view is immense. Now the Order provides that in every workhouse there shall be no pauper nursing, and that pauper attendance shall only be allowed by the express direction of the medical officer. It provides for the appointment of a superintendent nurse in certain cases, and, more important than all, it makes the medical officer directly responsible in this way, that if he wants a nurse for a particular case, it is his duty to request the master of the workhouse to get him one; so that a medical officer cannot now complain that the nursing is insufficient; if it is, it is his own fault.

Abolition of pauper nursing.

Prevalence of trained nurses in workhouses.

2340. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there a trained nurse now in every workhouse?—There is in almost every workhouse. Of course there are some very small workhouses where there are no sick.

Separation of infirmaries from workhouses.

2341. (*Chairman.*) If that finishes what you have to say about nurses, perhaps you will now tell us something about the separation of infirmaries from workhouses generally?—There is a considerable movement in favour of the separation of the whole administration of infirmaries from that of workhouses, and a complete return will be handed in of the number of cases where infirmaries are self-administered and have very little to do with the workhouses at all. Sometimes the guardians make proposals for the entire separation of the infirmary from the workhouse, and sometimes they say openly that their object is to run the Poor Law Infirmary as a charitable hospital, and they point out—as a deputation a week or two ago pointed out to me—that in certain towns a man who goes into a separate infirmary is not disfranchised. As I have told the Commission before, some revising barristers take that view; and this deputation told me that their object was to build an infirmary so separated from the workhouse that it should not in any way deter a sick person from using it, and should not disfranchise him if he did use it. In connection with that point I may say that we have frequent proposals to use different terms for designating the various Poor Law establishments. We have proposals to call a pauper a poor person, we have proposals to call workhouses homes of rest, and we have proposals to call an asylum a mental hospital, all of which is not without its significance; I suppose from the point of view of the English language it has but a small significance, but it does show the sort of process which is going on in the minds of some local administrators. I think in certain orders we have allowed the paupers to be called poor persons in certain connections, and I think we have allowed the term poorhouse to be used for workhouse; but our principle is that the source of the aid which is given by the institution should not be concealed, so that one should be perfectly certain from the name by which the institution went whether it was a rate institution or not.

2342. Have you any evidence to show that a somewhat different class of person is making use of these infirmaries to those who were in the habit of going there formerly?—We have, I think, nothing but general evidence, and some statistical indications that that process is going on. We are, as I said in a former part of my evidence, tapping a social stratum which was not formerly accustomed to yield pauperism, and a great many people go into sick asylums now who would not have gone into them in the old days. This diagram (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (10)) will be further supplemented by another (Appendix Vol. I. (A), V. (11)) which I hope will be ready in a day or two, which will show the number of sick included in the able-bodied line. According to our somewhat extraordinary classification for statistical purposes, in the able-bodied is included a certain proportion of sick—called "able-bodied, temporarily sick"—and that will be the class of sick, namely, the comparatively young and curable sick, who would be tempted into Poor Law institutions by their complete separation from the workhouse. You will notice in the diagram that the able-bodied line showed an enormous drop, but that now there is a recrudescence of it, and it has come right up again. That is a point on which you will be able to form a much better opinion when you have before you the statistical memorandum which is being prepared, for there you will get the exact figures, and the diagram is merely a rough indication of what the figures mean.

2343. If that ends what you wish to say about the growth of infirmaries, we will now go to the question of the classification of workhouse inmates?—With regard to that classification, I may say that it is a point on which a very great deal has been heard in the last ten years, and it is a point which no doubt will be dwelt upon by a good many of the witnesses before this Commission. In the different circulars in regard to these matters, we have dwelt rather on the hardships which the deserving and decent inmate would have to suffer from association with the more disorderly ones, and we have suggested the provision of cubicles, separate apartments, and so on. I am bound to say that I do not think, taking the whole of England together, that those recommendations have had very much effect. In some unions they have been carried out, but my impression—and it must of necessity be only a general impression—is that more unions tried it and then dropped it. It is pointed out in some of the more recent reports, and it is my own experience, that the complaints by the paupers themselves as to want of classification are very rare. You may hear from time to time of a pauper who will complain of somebody who is noisy or of a lunatic; but a general complaint that they are mixed up with company that they are not accustomed to, or not familiar with, is very rare; and in my experience classification in that sense according to character or conduct has been more or less dropped. Experience has shewn that it is not a thing that the paupers themselves care very much about. A person who is a pauper in a workhouse is bound to be pretty well behaved; he is usually old, he is by force of circumstances sober, and really the only vice left to him is probably bad language, and the inmate comes from a class which has not the same dislike to bad language that another class would have. I think the fact is undoubted that the people are not very anxious

to be classified by force, or by regulations of the guardians; and I think many reasons can be given in explanation. I should say myself that the real reason is that, an old man or an old woman may have all the virtues but they may be abominably disagreeable to live with, and they may have all the vices and yet be rather amusing persons. I think that the whole classification question has been made too much of.

2344. So that you would not advocate its further development?—If the people want to be classified and there is room in the workhouse, I do not think there is a decent visiting committee or a decent master that would not meet their wishes and let them be classified; but to classify them compulsorily in order to moralise them, I think is absurd.

ssification girls and men.

2345. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think it is the case that girls over the age of fifteen and women are practically classified together, are they not, and is that not a case in which a further classification does seem absolutely necessary?——Yes, in a case of that sort; but that is not for the comfort either of the girl or of the woman—it is for the purpose of discipline.

2346. And to avoid the possible demoralisation of the girl's character?—Yes. The reason for that further classification would be the same as the reason for the classification of children generally.

ercrowd- of town rkhouses.

2347. But it could not be demanded under the present orders, could it?—It is not in the General Consolidated Order, but, as I say, if they have room the visiting committee will do it. I think one of the greatest evils is the over-crowding of town workhouses. That unfortunately goes on to a considerable extent at this moment, that is to say, the needs of the urban population have gone beyond the provisions of workhouses for them.

nployment inmates.

2348. (*Chairman.*) If that finishes what you have to say about classification, we will now go to the question of employment in workhouses?—The employment of people in workhouses is, I venture think, the most difficult and perhaps the most unsatisfactory part of the system. It is so very much easier in urban unions to allow the old people to sit about doing nothing than to give them some healthy occupation, that you will find that not nearly as many people have occupations as ought to have. I am talking now of the large urban unions. That is a point which is, I think, criticised by Dr. Aschrott who seems to me to be an exceptionally good witness both for and against our Poor Law system. He is an absolutely unprejudiced man and not, I think, very fond of the English or of English ways, and he is a man of very great ability. He says of our workhouses generally that they are models for imitation; he is very laudatory as to them generally, and he says, "the proper mean is preserved between humanitarian indulgence and the stringency demanded by the interests of the community." But he says the workhouse employment is unsatisfactory. Personally, I do not think that any rules or regulations of my Board can do much to improve that. It must be improved by the guardians and the masters themselves, but it will be greatly aided by the charitable ladies who visit the workhouses, and help us by carrying out what is known as the Brabazon scheme and other similar schemes. The Brabazon scheme, I may remark, is a revival of a practice which is alluded to by the Commissioners of 1834 as being in operation in the Gravesend workhouse. Probably the Commission are quite well aware what the Brabazon scheme is, but I do not like to give any evidence on any Poor Law matter without again expressing the great obligations we are under to the inventors of that scheme, and to the ladies who carry it out. It has really introduced a new element of comfort and decent living into numbers of workhouses.

tility of rther rules the bject.

he Brabazon heme.

2349. I am afraid I am one of the ignorant, so I must ask you very shortly to state what the Brabazon scheme is?—It is this, that ladies visit the old people and teach them to do something with their hands; they teach them to knit, sew, to do wool work, and all that sort of thing.

2350. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I believe it is called the Brabazon scheme on account of its being introduced by the Countess of Meath when she was Lady Brabazon?—I think it was due to Lady Meath, but I know that Mrs. Egerton of Bat le was an active pioneer.

2351. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) They sell the proceeds, do they not?—They sell the proceeds for the general benefit of the workhouse inmates, and take care that the people who do the work know that they are working for the whole of the community, and not for themselves only.

2352. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) The proceeds are used to some extent to buy materials for the future working of the scheme, are they not?—Yes.

2353. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is it in operation in many rural workhouses?—I believe it is in a good many, but sometimes in an imperfect form: still it is making its way.

2354. (*Chairman*) Who starts the fund?—Some charitable ladies, as a rule.

2355. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Lady Meath lends the money, I believe?—Yes, I think so, through an association.

2356. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) They borrow through Lady Meath to begin with; she makes a loan of some £20 or £30, whatever it may be, for the cost of the original material, I think?—I believe that is so. They not only teach people to knit and so on, but they make use of the old men at their former occupations; for instance, if they find an old poacher in a workhouse he probably can make a rabbit net, and so on

Employment of aged inmates in rural and urban workhouses.

2357. (*Chairman.*) There are other schemes at work, of course, for inmates of workhouses; have you anything to say on those?—In country workhouses the matter solves itself, because if you have land you will have work in suitable weather, and if you have stock you have always got some old men in the workhouse who are only too glad to look after the pigs and cows and so on. I think when you visit the country workhouses you will find that, as a rule, the old people have enough to do, certainly in decently good weather, to keep themselves fully occupied; but that is not the case in large crowded urban unions, and I have always felt that that was a weak point which required special attention.

Sale of produce of pauper labour.

2358. Would you advocate some more general system of finding occupation for these poor people?—Yes. With regard to the whole question of the labour of workhouse inmates you have many difficulties. There is the difficulty which has arisen in the case of the sale of the proceeds of prison industry, that is to say, there are objections on the part of labour organisations and so on to selling in the open market anything which is made by pauper labour; and those objections led to Mr. Secretary Cross's order with regard to the proceeds of prison labour. There is a good deal to be said as to that, which I think is summed up pretty well in McCulloch's *Literature of Political Economy*, to which I refer the Commission. He argues that it is perfectly legitimate and proper that the proceeds of prison or workhouse labour should be sold in the open market, and he seems to me to make some sort of a case. The point was put in rather a new light to me the other day by the evidence of Mr. Torr, who is a gentleman who has taken a great deal of interest in labour colonies. He said, if your labour colony did not buy anything, perhaps it ought not to sell anything, but you must remember that it buys from the outside, and to that extent, at all events, it is perfectly justified in selling to the outside. So, I think, if you have organised labour in workhouses you have a perfect right to get rid of the produce. But I, myself, do not think that, unless we have a greater change in the workhouses towards the more able-bodied system than we have had for the last twenty or thirty years—and there are some indications of it—the question need trouble us much, because the present inmates of the workhouses are not people who are likely to produce to an extent which would interfere with the labour market.

2359. If any system is started for the purposes you indicate, disciplinary and otherwise, by which work is given to inmates of a workhouse, I assume it may be urged on behalf of the guardians that the proceeds of the work would not pay for the cost of the system?—Yes, it might.

2360. Has that ever been urged as an argument?—That, I think, is one of the points.

2361. It is an extra charge on the ratepayers, simply in order to effect some moral improvement amongst the inmates of the workhouse?—Yes. I am particularly anxious not to anticipate my evidence, but I may say in this connection that it has always seemed to me perfectly absurd that the body of men who will object to anything being sold out of a prison or a workhouse is exactly the same body of men who are very apt to allow a pauper who

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

is receiving out-relief to compete with the independent labourer outside. This seems to be an absolute inconsistency.

Systematisation of inmates' work.

2362. Do you think that, on the whole, something might be done to systematise more the work for inmates in workhouses?—Yes.

2363. But are we to understand that you would advocate it as a deterrent to going into the workhouse?—No, I think not; I would advocate it as a means of rational occupation. Speaking of the old people's work, I do not think that that is a deterrent. I do not think that you can make old people do work of that nature, any more than you can enforce anything like hard labour on them in a convict prison. One of the most pathetic sights in the world is to see aged convicts doing what they call hard labour, which is simply knitting stockings and such things. You cannot in any institution enforce compulsory work on a man after he has attained a certain age. I am merely talking of work now as a means of occupying the old people, and I would call it occupation rather than work. The subject of a deterrent must be dealt with when I have to answer questions about test houses in urban unions.

Nature of work for aged inmates

Test workhouses for able-bodied.

2364. You mean test-houses for the able-bodied, do you not?—Yes.

2365. That is the subject to which I think we have now come; have you any suggestions to make on that head?—I think that in all large urban communities you must have a test house where you can have task work for the able-bodied loafer. You will find a model house of that description in Manchester, and it will be very interesting for the Commission to get the number of men that have been dealt with there. If you do not have a test house, you will have your workhouse crowded up with loafers, and you will have no means of keeping in check that class of the population who positively prefer an institutional life if it is given under anything like tolerable conditions. There seems to be a certain class of men who, as long as they are secure of to-morrow, do not in the least mind physical discomforts. In Germany, in their labour colonies, they have got a very good name for this class of men. If I may translate it roughly, they call them colony loafers. Unless you have a test workhouse, you will never be able to deal with those men. So far as the large communities are concerned, it is better to have one big test house than one for each union. I understand that there has been a great trouble in London in getting proper test houses (which I have no doubt the Commission will conclude are requisite) because of the difficulty of getting combination among the guardians for the purpose.

Manchester.

Nature of prescribed tasks of work.

2366. Are the tests which are imposed at these houses upon the able-bodied uniform tests?—They would be uniform in the same test house, and we should sanction the work, because, unless we sanction the work, there is always a difficulty in getting a conviction from a magistrate for refusing to do it. The work should be both irksome and unskilled; and it is a problem to fix upon work of that character. You have got to find work which anybody can do, and which nearly everybody dislikes doing. It is no use giving your man stone-breaking or oakum-picking, because that is highly skilled labour. You have got to give him something like corn-grinding or flint-crushing, cross-cut sawing, or some work of that sort, which is laborious and which is wholly unskilled. I need not dwell on the matter at any great length, because I hope in a week or two the Report of the Vagrancy Committee will be out; and in that report you will find the whole question of labour colonies, the work which can be done there, and the diet which should be given, dealt with at very considerable length. The evidence is of great value, and I hope that the report is of some value.

Report of Departmental Committee on Vagrancy.

Lunatics in workhouses.

2367. Your next subject, I think, is the complaints that are made as to the retention of imbeciles in workhouses?—Yes. The Cottage Homes Committee in 1899 strongly recommended the removal of all imbeciles from workhouses; and you will find in the inspectors' reports, notably in those of Mr. Preston-Thomas, instances of the hardships which sane poor persons in workhouses, especially in small workhouses, undergo from their compulsory association with people of unsound mind. To make myself clear, I may say that all persons of unsound mind are statistically lunatics—they are lunatics in workhouses and lunatics in asylums—but the theory has always been from early days that the asylum was for the violent, the dangerous, the curable lunatic; whereas the workhouse was for the chronic, the incurable, the harmless lunatic. Speaking very generally, the certificates for removal from workhouses used to be given not only by magistrates but by the chaplain of the workhouse and various other persons; and then the imbeciles were removed from the workhouses to the asylums. In those days the Commissioners in Lunacy, who visit paupers who happen to be lunatics in asylums as well as paupers who happen to be lunatics in workhouses, used to make the complaint that curable or violent lunatics were detained by boards of guardians in workhouses on the ground of economy. The cost in a workhouse was, say, less than half that in a lunatic asylum, and that was regarded as an inducement to guardians to retain these poor persons in the workhouses instead of sending them off to be cured in the asylums. That was an often reiterated complaint. It was one which I always resented, and which I never believed; but that was my mere personal feeling about it. However, as time went on, the grant of 4s. per week was made in 1874, partly as a grant in aid of local taxation, and partly to meet that objection. Now, lunatics are kept in workhouses, but in far less numbers then thay used to be. There has been, as I think everybody admits, a great transfer of lunatics from the cheaper institutions to the more expensive ones; and that process is still going on, but still there are many lunatics in workhouses. There are also some who are remanded there for fourteen days. But the proportion of lunatics now in workhouses is very much smaller than it used to be, and varies immensely as between union and union. You will find in some workhouses that they have no lunatics at all, as all their lunatics are in asylums; and you will find in some others that they have 30 per cent. or perhaps 40 per cent. of their lunatics in the workhouse. The possible explanation may be that if the guardians have room in the workhouse they will keep the lunatics there, but if they have no room in the workhouse, rather than build, they will make the county build for them, that is to say, they will send the lunatics to the county asylum by magistrate's certificates. The variation in the proportion of the number of lunatics in workhouses and in asylums chargeable to the several unions is so great as to suggest that it depends rather upon the fact whether the guardians want workhouse accommodation or do not want workhouse accommodation. You cannot suppose that the lunatics in one union are more curable or more violent than the lunatics in another, and yet you will find, as I say, in some cases, 100 per cent. in the asylums, and in others you will only find some 60 or 70 per cent. In the larger unions the imbeciles have separate wards, and the question of classification does not occur; but in the small workhouses the question of classification does occur, and is very largely influenced by the grant.

Variable proportion of lunatics in workhouses.

2368. Is the 4s. paid on behalf of all lunatics or only on behalf of lunatics in asylums?—It is only for those lunatics who are in the asylums.

The "Lunacy Grant."

2369. Then, putting all other considerations on one side, it is worth the while of a board of guardians to transfer as many of their lunatics as they possibly can into the asylums, is it not?—Yes, if they want accommodation.

2370. Does the 4s. cover the extra cost?—The 4s. was meant to exactly cover the difference between the workhouse cost and the asylum cost, so as to give no financial inducement in any way; but, as I shall show later on in my evidence, the cost of maintenance in asylums has increased very much indeed, and faster than the cost in the workhouses has increased; so that the grant does not in my judgment, act with the same force that it used to do.

2371. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is the cost in asylums a charge upon the county, while in the workhouse it is a charge upon the union?—The guardians pay the maintenance charge out of the union funds, and the county pays the other charges. The maintenance, which varies from, say, 9s. to 14s. a week, is paid by the guardians in respect of each pauper sent from their union.

Apportionment of cost of pauper lunatics in asylums.

2372. (*Chairman.*) May we say, broadly speaking, that the effect of the grant of 4s. per week has been to secure better treatment?—It has been to transfer the lunatic from the cheaper workhouse building to the more expensive asylum building, and to raise the total cost of maintenance per lunatic to about

Effect of "Lunacy Grant."

£28 a year. It has often been done within my own knowledge for the express purpose of providing this or that union with additional accommodation. Whether the man is better off in the asylum or in the workhouse, I do not know; personally I should prefer the country workhouse.

2373. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) If he goes to the asylum, he has much less chance of employment afterwards if he recovers, has he not?—Much less.

Lunatics in workhouses not necessarily objectionable.

2374. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Would these imbeciles be kept in the infirmary part of the workhouse?—Some would be in the infirmary, and some would not be in the infirmary. I should like to say that I rather think that this question of the separation of lunatics has been just a little exaggerated. I know that you can easily instance cases where a noisy lunatic or a lunatic who is offensive to the eye may be a real grievance to other persons in the workhouse; but there are lots of lunatics who are not anything of the sort. I have some lunatics in workhouses who are very old acquaintances of mine, and I cannot help remembering a case where the life of an infant was absolutely saved by the care which an imbecile girl bestowed upon her. So that if there are exceptional instances one way, there are exceptional instances the other way, and I do not myself believe that in a very large number of cases there was very much grievance amongst the old people. I have often asked them about it, and they have said: "We don't mind poor Mrs. So-and-so, she does not do any harm." Still what my board have got to do—they have been instructed to do it, and their inspectors' reports in some instances point to the necessity of doing it—is to devise and recommend some means whereby lunatics shall be taken out of workhouses altogether; and if the Commission will permit me, I should like to say, speaking entirely for myself, my own view of what the procedure ought to be. I think the matter might be settled once for all if all lunatics were made a county charge. The county council would then be responsible for lunatics in workhouses, for lunatics in asylums, and, I should hope, for certain classes of the feeble-minded and epileptics who are not sufficiently provided for under the existing law. They would then be able to make, as they can under the existing law, bargains with certain of the unions (which have separate accommodation for them) to take in lunatics; or they might, with the consent of my board, pay for individual lunatics, or they might remove the lunatics to the asylum, or they might classify them; and if they had to build they would surely build not on the asylum scale, but on the workhouse scale for these people. It may be that an expenditure of £500 or £600 a bed is justifiable for lunatics who are either curable or dangerous; but it cannot be that such an expenditure is justifiable for people who are harmless and incurable. Lunatics in asylums must—and we know they must—contain a great number of persons who are perfectly harmless and quite incurable; what the exact proportion is we do not know, because you must remember that the pauper in the lunatic asylum is not under the same inspection as a pauper anywhere else. He is under the inspection of the Commissioners in Lunacy, and we have nothing to do with asylums. I venture to think that the true remedy is the centralisation of the administration, both in the county, and in the central administration. I think the bodies who look after the lunatics in workhouses and in asylums should be the same bodies both locally and centrally.

Proposal to make county councils responsible for all lunatics.

Access of Local Government Board inspectors to asylums.

2375. Then that would necessitate the inspectors of the county authorities having access to workhouses in which there were any lunatics?—Or the inspectors of workhouses having access to the lunatic asylums for the purpose of inspecting the pauper lunatics there, and bringing the classification into line.

2376. Have they not access now to the county asylums?—No.

Guardians' visits to asylums.

2377. Then when a lunatic is transferred to an asylum is the Poor Law authority no longer responsible?—That is so. Every board of guardians visit the asylum from time to time and look at their own patients, that is, the patients for whom they pay; but that is all that they do.

2378. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would not the bulk of the persons transferred be classed as harmless senile dements?—They are not altogether senile dements. They are imbeciles, and they vary from the senile dement to the half-baked youth.

2379. The larger clearance, as it were, from the workhouses, would be rather of the aged infirm, I take it?—I do not think so. As the 4s. removes most of the financial objections to the transfer, the moment the pauper becomes old and troublesome, the master or the medical officer find very good reasons for taking him before a magistrate. Since the Lunacy Act, 1890, the certificates for removal and for retention in workhouses have been given with a great deal more formality than was formerly the case, and now a man cannot be detained in a workhouse without a certificate of the justices; whereas, formerly he could be detained on the certificate of the medical officer. Here, I am anticipating my evidence again, but I should like to point out, as showing the importance of this question, that in the year 1894 the maintenance of lunatics in county and borough asylums and registered hospitals cost £1,466,185, and in the year 1904, that is, only ten years later, the cost of maintenance amounted to £2,286,652, which shows a most ominous increase. (*See* Appendix Vol. I (A), No. V. (18).)

Procedure for detention and removal of lunatics.

2380. (*The O'Connor Don.*) Is not the certificate of the magistrates rather a matter of form, once the medical certificate has been given?—I should not like to say it is a matter of form, because I have known many cases where a man has been remanded for a further period.

Increase in number of lunatics and their cost.

2381. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Has the increase in the number of individual lunatics in asylums been in proportion to the increase in cost?—No, it has not been proportionate at all; the cost has gone up faster than the numbers.

Reports of Aged Poor Commission and Cottage Homes Committee as to lunatics in workhouses.

2382. (*Chairman.*) Have you anything to say with regard to the recommendations of the Aged Poor Commission, and the Cottage Homes Committee of 1899?—I cannot, at the moment, find my reference to the report of the Aged Poor Commission. I think I have already said that the Cottage Homes Committee in 1899 recommended the removal of all lunatics from workhouses; and the Commission did so, too, I think.

Combination of unions for workhouse classification.

2383. Will you now kindly tell us your views about workhouse classification?—It has often been suggested, with a view to the classification of inmates and the securing of better nursing for the sick, that rural unions should be grouped. That is a point that is very often discussed, and the suggestion that it should be done was definitely made in a speech by Mr. Walter Long. The matter was considered by the Cottage Homes Committee in 1899, who were rather opposed to it on the ground that such a classification of rural unions would separate poor folk from their friends. To my mind that is an objection which undoubtedly prevails to a certain extent; it may be, perhaps, that it is a little exaggerated, but still, it is a point against the proposal. What is more against the proposal, from my point of view, is the absolute want of local support which schemes of that sort get. There is nothing on which the average guardian is more sensitive than any change in his area. He looks upon it as his right, and he does not like to be mixed up with the neighbours at all. It is quite impossible, except by general legislation, to get over that prejudice. I have had a hand on several occasions in amalgamations of this sort. They are the most invidious and difficult things which a general inspector has to do. Quite old friends would make it a personal matter with you if they think you have been concerned in altering their landmarks—even in the strongest possible cases. I have one in my mind now, where the proposal was to amalgamate two unions, one of which had a workhouse with eleven inhabitants in it! There was absolutely no objection to the amalgamation that any reasonable man, as I thought, could see; but the opposition, the fighting, the influencing of Members of Parliament, was perfectly extraordinary. In another case where there were two unions, both with very bad workhouses, both with the same sort of population and in the same county, where it was suggested that they should be amalgamated and a joint workhouse built in a far more convenient spot than either of their present ones, there was absolutely no local support whatever for it. I held the inquiry, and I think there was one man only in the room who was in favour of the amalgamation. I was obliged to report to my board that the change was out of the question, because there was no local support. I am perfectly certain that there is not a Commissioner in this room who would go down and see these unions, and look into the circumstances, and would not at once say, obviously, the thing to do is to have an amalgamation; that

Views of Cottage Homes Committee.

Objections to combinations.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

will save money, and will improve everything else. But it was not to be. Although this Commission may, and the House of Commons may, my department cannot ignore the feeling which I say prevails in the country against any amalgamation scheme of this sort, which, as very many guardians suppose, would lead up to a transfer of their business to the county councils. I think there is more difficulty now in this matter than there used to be.

Powers of Central Authority and county councils to amalgamate areas.

2384. Has the Local Government Board the power of over-riding local objections ?—We have ample powers. We can amalgamate.

2385. Would the local friction that would be caused be such that in your department it is better not to exercise that power ?—I think it is one of those things, which, if it were left to the Local Government Board, would not be done ; I mean to say, even if we had a recommendation in favour of it, I do not think we could do it. There is another point, namely, that you could amalgamate the unions, but in practice it is for the county councils to amalgamate the sanitary districts. But if you are going to amalgamate two unions, you should certainly be able to amalgamate the sanitary authorities as well ; yet, if the county councils are not backing you, you will fail. There are two or three such cases that the Commission might very well investigate. We cannot pass by this recommendation as a mere recommendation made casually which can be neglected. It has been made very strongly ; and it is very strongly felt by some people that it is the true solution of certain difficulties as to the nursing, and so on in small country workhouses ; so we have got to consider it. I have asked my colleague, Mr. Jenner-Fust, to look into and specially report on the matter. There is the county of Westmorland, for instance. The county of Westmorland, I think, has two unions in it, and three if not four workhouses. You would have thought that with a real self-governing area that was about good enough reason for amalgamation ; but I am told there is no support whatever for the proposal to amalgamate.

Case of Westmorland.

Expediency of closing unnecessary workhouses.

2386. What might be done, do you think ?—I think the board might safely close some unnecessary workhouses. I think that, fortified with a strong recommendation by a Commission, we might do a good deal—not universally, by any means, but here and there—in regard to a case where a workhouse might be closed and a good deal of money saved thereby. A very good instance of that is where, owing to an accident (the occurrence of a fire) the workhouse at the Westhampnett Union was burnt down. They get on perfectly well without a workhouse, they board their paupers out, and they say it is more satisfactory, and it is cheaper. I know most of their paupers ; the sick ones, certainly, are very much better attended to than they ever could have been attended to in the old House. You will find, here and there, instances of that kind, and I think advantage might be taken of those.

Westhampnett workhouse.

Power of Central Authority to close workhouses.

2387. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Has the Board power to close without further legislation ?—We have power to close a workhouse.

2388. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) But it is only exercised where the workhouse is considered to be unfit for occupation as a workhouse, is it not ?—We have got to say that it is unfit. I have here the particulars of a case which I think is worth your attention ; it is from a report which I got yesterday, and it refers to a workhouse in a very small union with a decaying population, the boundaries of the district not being satisfactory. There always appears to have been an idea that something would be done to obviate the necessity of building a workhouse, but our architect has been down, and he reports that the workhouse was built in 1836, at a cost of £4,000. He says of it : "Most of the floors on the ground are of stone or of bricks, and are much worn. The windows are of a bad shape, and the wards narrow, low, and poorly ventilated ; in fact, the whole place seems to have remained pretty much as it was when it was completed sixty-five years ago. Having regard to all the circumstances, it would not be, in my opinion, possible to put the buildings, drainage, and heating into anything like a satisfactory condition without involving an outlay of £3,000 to £4,000, and to spend this sum on a cheap and rough building such as this is would be a most injudicious expenditure." Then he says : "The only practical alternative would be to set to work on a scheme which would have for its object the ultimate reconstruction of the whole workhouse on modern lines." The reconstruction of the whole workhouse on modern lines would mean an expenditure of ever so many thousand pounds—ten or fifteen, perhaps. What in the world are we to do in a case like that ? I have now asked that the inspector should report as to whether it would be possible to pull that workhouse down and close it. It is a very exceptional case, but it illustrates these two points—the difficulty of providing adequate accommodation in very poor unions, and the tendency that there is to recommend the very best. No architect likes patching up the £4,000 building.

2389. (*Chairman.*) Now, I think we come to the subject of the relief of able-bodied men ; I think you have a number of suggestions and observations to make on that ?—Yes. I will begin with out-door relief, and I will endeavour to keep my evidence on that within the narrowest possible limits. With regard to the powers and duties of guardians, Sir Hugh Owen, when before the Select Committee on Want of Employment, put into the Appendix a memorandum,* which states concisely and very clearly the powers and duties of the guardians, the powers and duties of relieving officers, and the effect of existing orders. If I were asked to put in anything of the sort, I should put in the same memorandum ; I cannot add to it at all, or make it better.

Out-door relief of able bodied.

Memo. by Sir Hugh Owen.

2390. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Could that memorandum be reprinted, as I should think it would be a very good thing for us to have it ?—I should think it could ; it only fills about three pages of the Blue Book.

2391. (*Chairman.*) Would you now tell us what are the powers and duties of the guardians with regard to out-door relief ?—The first point which must be borne in mind throughout is that the powers of the guardians with reference to the granting of relief are as extensive as they well can be. There is no limit to the amount of relief which they can give, except reasonableness, of which the auditor is the judge. They have the rates to fall back upon, so that practically they can spend anything they please. They are the sole judges of who is to receive relief and who is not, subject only to the elastic provisions, or rather, I would say, the wide provisions of the Regulation Order or the Prohibitory Order. It is in their hands to decide whether a pauper is to have relief in an institution, or whether he is to have out-door relief.

Guardians' discretion as to out-door relief.

2392. Perhaps you would now refer a little more fully to these two orders ?—The orders in question (and I have no doubt Mr. Adrian has pointed out to you what they are) are the prohibitory order which is issued to country unions and a great many urban unions, and the regulation order which is issued to London and to certain other unions which are mostly in Lancashire. If you look down the list of the unions which are exempted from the prohibitory order, I think outside London and Lancashire, you will not be able to find at first sight the reason why they were omitted, because there were certainly until quite recently some very small country unions under the regulation order. At the time of the issue of the order, they probably had no workhouse, or for some reason of that kind they were put under the regulation order. It would appear to be of very great importance that the prohibitory order should be issued wherever it can be issued, instead of the regulation order. It will be suggested to the Commission that this will be a reform of very great value ; and it will be suggested that there is no conceivable reason why it should not be done. So far as statistics show, the actual administration is rather stricter under the regulation order than it is under the prohibitory order ; that is to say, a greater proportion of the relief is institutional in London (for which there are special reasons, owing to the operation of the Metropolitan Poor Fund), and in Lancashire (where there is no Metropolitan Poor Fund), than is the case in the bulk of the unions which are under the prohibitory order ; from which, perhaps, the inference might be drawn that the orders have had no effect at all, or only a very small effect on the way in which relief has been administered, the whole thing depending on the guardians. I do not think that inference would be quite justified by the facts. The Commission must remember that it is inevitable in growing urban unions with a large population that the Poor Law should be administered rather more on in-door lines than

Prohibitory and Regulation Orders.

Comparison of administration under the two Orders.

* Third Report of Select Committee on Distress from Want of Employment (H.C. 365-1895). Appendix No. 30, p. 557.

on out-door lines. For instance, in urban unions the rents are very much higher, and although, as relief is often given, the pauper has, on the face of it, nothing to live on, still he must, as a matter of fact, pay his rent somehow; and if the rent is higher, the scale of relief must be higher, and so the guardians will be less tempted by the usual fallacy of cheapness to give out-door relief. Then, again, in towns the poor live much more in lodgings, which are taken for a short period, than they do in the country. The guardians hesitate before offering the workhouse to an agricultural labourer who has possession of a cottage of his own, and who has some furniture. They do not like doing it. They think that if the man once leaves that cottage, he will never get back again and will stay in the workhouse all his life. There is no such objection to offering the workhouse to a man who is living in a lodging in a town, and who practically has no furniture. I should say that it might be practicable, and certainly would be useful to prohibit the granting of out-door relief altogether to people who have no furniture; for one thing there is no object in it. There is another reason. In a town union where the population is large, matters are more left to the judgment of the chairman and of the relieving-officer than they are in a rural union. In a rural union, almost every pauper who has got anything to be said for him would have it said for him by the guardian of his parish, who is a neighbour. You can hardly judge in a dry light the case of the old woman that you meet every morning as you go out of your gate, and who probably has a tongue of her own; and so you have just a little feeling that it is better not to offend her. That is putting forward probably the best of the reasons which induce guardians to specially advocate a case from their own parish. All these reasons which I have enumerated working together, do make it very much easier to be strict in urban unions; in fact, as I have said, they make it inevitable that relief should be given in urban unions more strictly than in rural unions. That tendency is so strong as to over-ride altogether the difference of the check imposed on guardians by the prohibitory order, or by the regulation order. The reason why pauperism is less and administration stricter in the regulation unions than in the prohibitory unions is because they are urban unions, and so the conditions tend towards stricter relief.

2393. Can you illustrate that?—In Lancashire there are twenty unions with a pauperism of under 2 per cent., and in Lancashire they are all regulation unions. In Lincolnshire there is no union with a pauperism under 2 per cent., and there are five of them with a pauperism of more than 4 per cent. Contrasts of that sort you find everywhere. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (14).)

2394. In what you are now saying are you including London?—The London administration is not comparable, in that as in many other particulars, with the country administration, from the simple fact that the whole cost of in-door relief is, in London, by the operation of the Metropolitan Poor Fund, paid off a larger area than the union.

2395. But do not the same conditions hold good in London as those which you have described as prevailing in urban districts elsewhere?—Yes; the in-door relief of London is very much higher than the in-door relief of the country.

2396. You have something to say now, I think, as regards the position of members of friendly societies?—I suppose one of the most salient facts with regard to Poor Law relief is that practically no member of a sound friendly society is ever a pauper; when I say no member is ever a pauper I mean that the members who are are infinitesimally few in number. That point is well brought out in the evidence of Mr. B. Stead before the Aged Poor Commission, and it has been the subject of more than one Parliamentary Return which you will get. I do not propose to give any detailed evidence about friendly societies, but I have no doubt you will have that in plenty. I should like the Commission to ascertain for themselves the exact number of pence per week which will insure lifelong independence to a labourer.

2397. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Do you mean in his old age?—I mean in his old age as well.

2398. (*Chairman.*) I assume there is a variation in the amount of contribution to these friendly societies?—Yes.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

2399. Have you anything to say about total abstainers, and whether they at all contribute to swell pauperism?—You will find, I think, also that practically no total abstainer is ever a pauper. I was told last week that some had been discovered in the county of Cornwall, but I think you will find that practically a man who is a total abstainer is not a pauper. Stated like that, I think there is a certain amount of cant about it. The reason why a man who is an abstainer does not become a pauper is not because he is a teetotaller, but because he has got sufficient moral courage and strength to submit to a present deprivation for some future good. It is for the Commission to consider whether that amount of self-control is too great a task to ask of the ordinary English labourer; but if he can exercise it, he may rely upon it that he will end as an independent man and not be a hanger on the body politic.

Total abstinence and pauperism.

2400. You say that neither members of friendly societies nor total abstainers become paupers even in their old age?—That is so, I think.

2401. That, would you say, is as far as your experience goes?—That is as far as I wish to say now.

2402. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Does that apply to the country districts as well as to the urban districts?—Yes.

2403. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Then is the Out-door Relief (Friendly Societies) Act, 1904, practically a dead letter?—No, it is not a dead letter.

2404. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Does a total abstainer mean a lifelong abstainer?—I think so.

Thrift and pauperism.

2405. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I should like to know whether you consider that that belongs to a general thrift of character, in other words, that it is not due so much to total abstention as to the kind of character which the man possesses, which enables him to exercise self control?—It is the same mind behind the member of the friendly society and behind the total abstainer.

2406. (*Mr. Phelps.*) The fact that the total abstainer does not become a pauper is the effect (as in the case of a member of a friendly society) of a common cause, and does not stand in the relation of cause and effect to the fact that he is a total abstainer?—That is so.

Proposed returns as to pauperism among total abstainers.

2407. (*Chairman.*) That is a very important surmise of yours; can you give us any clue which we could follow up as regards total abstainers?—A return *ad hoc* from the general inspectors for a certain number of workhouses might help you. That is the best I can do for the Commission. I made exactly the same statement that I am making now in the year 1895, and I made it again in the year 1899, and I think if I had been wrong I should have heard that I was wrong.

2408. The brewers and the distillers have not upset you?—No. I should have heard very clearly that I was wrong if I had been wrong, but as a matter of fact I have heard nothing.

Effect of unsound Friendly Societies.

2409. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Are the returns with regard to friendly societies available?—Yes. One thing that really ought to be done is to absolutely crush out unsound friendly societies. They are abominable institutions, and most cruel. If you had sat, as I have done for so many hours, on boards of guardians, you would be able to recall case after case where some poor man had helped himself for years, and then the society had broken up, and he was obliged in his old age to become a pauper, feeling his pauperism infinitely more keenly than if he had done nothing to help himself.

2410. (*Chairman.*) Inasmuch as sound friendly societies from your practical experience, prevent their members becoming paupers, would you say that it is the business of the Government to prevent the starting of unsound friendly societies which, by breaking down, create pauperism?—They bring the whole principle of friendly societies into disrepute, and, what is more, unfairly compete with the solvent societies.

Administration as a cause of pauperism.

2411. I think you would allege that pauperism is a matter which is a good deal regulated by administration?—Yes. I am often asked what is the main cause of pauperism, and I am obliged to say that the main cause of pauperism is the guardians. It is the guardians whose administration makes pauperism. Pauperism to a certain extent follows trade. When I give you, as I hope to give you, the Board of Trade returns as to employment, you will see that there is a correspondence. (*See* Appendix

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

29 Jan. 1906.

Vol. I. (A), No. V. (8).) You will see at once that the pauperism in country unions where the age of the inhabitants is much greater, must of necessity be higher than the pauperism in unions where the age limit is low. You will find that, according to the census returns, in some unions they will have as many as 800 people over sixty years of age in every 10,000; you will find in other unions that the number of 800 falls to about 400. Circumstances like those must make a difference; but taking it over a large number of unions you will find, I think, that the rate of pauperism varies directly with the amount of out-door relief given. Sir William Chance's book on *The Better Administration of the Poor Law* is full of such illustrations. It may, I suppose, be your present purpose to ask why Bradford had only a pauperism of 1·1 per cent. in 1901, I think, whereas Leeds had a pauperism of 2·6, the population of the two towns being approximately the same. I suggest that the cause of that difference is found in the fact that, whereas Bradford has only 1,200 out-door paupers, Leeds has 4,200, and that, whereas Bradford has 1,500 in-door paupers, there are 1,700 at Leeds. I hesitate to multiply instances of this sort, because they are so common, and they meet you everywhere. I have prepared a table (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (14)) which, to a great extent, shews the matter, so far as the rate of pauperism goes. Take, for instance, two unions in Sussex which have practically no difference between them. One, Petworth, has a pauperism of 4·3, and the next union, which is Thakeham, has a pauperism of 2·3. The only conceivable difference is that in the one case the guardians give much out-door relief, and in the other case they do not. That is the most commonplace statement in Poor Law.

Effect of old-age on pauperism.

Comparison of pauperism in Leeds and Bradford.

Comparison of pauperism in Petworth and Thakeham Unions.

Return as to percentage of pauperism in various unions.

2412. What return is that from which you have just quoted?—This is a grouped return of every union in the country which has 6 per cent. of pauperism, 5 per cent., 4 per cent. and so on. But of far greater importance than even that point of comparing the unions one by one, is to take the history of a certain union and to see what happened to the number of paupers after certain changes of administration had been made. Sir William Chance's book is full of illustrations of that. In his book you can see what happened at Brixworth, what happened at Bradfield, what happened at St. George's-in-the-East, and so on—those are extreme unions, but what happens in an ordinary union is no less striking, for you will see that a very small change in the restriction of out-door relief will knock numbers off the pauper list quite astonishingly. I suppose the leading case is that one at Leeds, which has been so often quoted. It is quite an old story now. The Leeds Guardians, instead of each sitting on the Committee for his own ward, by a sort of self-denying ordinance, sat in other peoples' wards, and the result was that some thousands a year were saved. That was before my time. I should like to add that I am perfectly certain that what happened previously was a sort of unconscious action on the part of the guardians; I do not think they purposely gave relief to their own constituents, because they thought they would get some advantage from it. But there is a sort of unconscious fairness which comes to a man when he has got nothing to gain on either side.

Result of change of Relief Committee at Leeds

EIGHTH DAY.

Tuesday, 30th January, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

2413. (*Chairman.*) At the close of your evidence yesterday, you advanced the proposition that pauperism was very largely regulated by administration; now I think we come to the point that in your judgment out-door relief in itself is insufficient, and must be supplemented by other means of subsistence; what have you to say on that?—All the experts are unanimous in thinking that all domiciliary relief is and must practically be supplemented by earnings and other sources of income. The fact is that where guardians are obliged by force of circumstances to undertake the whole cost of the relief, it is always in-door relief. With reference to out-door relief so supplemented, there is also a practical unanimity amongst administrators from the early Commissioners down to the last strong evidence that I have in my mind with reference to it—that of Sir Hugh Owen—that all relief so supplemented must affect adversely the wages, or, which is the better term, the earnings, of the independent labourer. That is a point of very great difficulty. It seems to me, if you will forgive me for giving my own view on the matter, that it would be rather difficult to show that in rural districts, where of recent years there has been a great demand for labour, the rate of wages or earnings has been diminished to any appreciable extent by the grant of out-door relief. In towns where there is occasionally a great demand on the part of the labourers for work, the case against out-door relief would be stronger. But I venture to put before the Commission this point, that whether earnings (and I prefer the word earnings to wages) are appreciably lowered or not, at all events when any piece of work is done by a man in receipt of relief, that piece of work is done once for all, and cannot be done by the independent labourer. If I hire a pauper in receipt of out-door relief, who by the fact of his out-door relief is enabled to remain on the labour market, to, say, sweep my carriage drive or cut my hedge, the drive is swept, the hedge is cut, and the work does not remain for the independent labourer I suggest that this is a matter of absolutely vital importance to the whole question, and needs all the consideration which persons interested in the subject can give it. It does not appear to me outside the line of possibility to advance the question a good deal further by specific inquiries in certain selected unions. I would point out that the early Commissioners laid great stress upon the matter and

Inadequacy of out-relief *per se.*

Effect of out-relief on wages and labour market.

showed, what is indeed the fact, that friendly societies are most careful not to allow members who are in receipt of benefit to do any work outside. That may be, for one reason, because they are afraid that there would be imposition on the part of people receiving benefit if they are allowed to work; but I have no doubt a great deal is also due to the feeling that it is not fair that a man whose earnings are supplemented even by friendly societies' relief (and still more by Poor Law relief) should compete in the open labour market with independent people. I would like to read on this subject two quotations, one from a current newspaper which I found in my drawer by accident two or three days ago, and the other from a letter.

2414. Perhaps you would kindly read those?—The newspaper extract is headed, "Working for 6d. a day," and it says:—"A woman who appeared before the Stonehouse (Plymouth) Board of Guardians yesterday, for a continuance of relief, stated that she was engaged by a firm of Government contractors in making military trousers from khaki cloth. Her duty was to completely make trousers, including button-holes, as the firm possessed no button-hole machine. For completely making the trousers she received only 3d. per pair, and had to provide the cotton herself. It was only possible to make two pairs per day. Several of the guardians expressed astonishment at this statement, but the applicant emphatically reiterated her statements. The chairman said it was a bad case of sweating, and the continuance of the relief was granted." That, to a thinking man, seems simply astounding. The other quotation I should like to read is from a letter which came into my hands last week in the ordinary course of official business. It is in these words: "Honourable Sir, I beg to bring before your notice a Poor Law Act or system which I consider requires attention and more liberal treatment. I am in the habit of employing men who are discharged by employers on account of their age, to assist for two or three hours daily, for which they earn 3s. or 4s. per week. In two cases they are men who have been in receipt of Poor Law relief of 3s. 9d. per week. One, H. K., who is now doing this odd work, at the end of six weeks' grant of relief had to make a fresh application, when he was asked if he was earning anything, and how much. On his telling the guardians 3s. per week, he was told he was not entitled to relief, and they stopped the pay. Now I think you will agree with me that even if the earnings amounted to 4s. a week, 7s. 9d. including the pay is not too much for a man to provide decently for himself, and that the law should extend the earnings to at least 4s. a week." The writer may be quite correct in saying that 7s. 9d. is not too much, but I should like to know precisely by inquiry what the effect of that Poor Law relief was on his wages bill. I instance those two cases as showing that the matter is one really of current administration, and I say that in my judgment the point requires an absolutely careful investigation.

2415. You have stated your objection to these small doles of out-door relief; what is the contention of those boards of guardians who give them? I assume it is that it is cheaper to so support an out-door pauper than that he should become an inmate of a workhouse?—A great deal of the mal-administration of boards of guardians depends on a number of catchwords: "Mr. Chairman, it will be cheaper to give out-door relief;" "Let us help them who help themselves;" "She does a bit; give her some more." I suppose some guardians would consider those maxims to be crystallised wisdom, but whether they are crystallised wisdom or not, I contend that they have a permanently bad effect on the independent labourer in the particular matter of the competition of the pauper with the independent person.

2416. You have referred to the policy of friendly societies, and you have told us that they will not give relief to anyone who is in receipt of wages; would not the object of that rule be to act as a deterrent to members of friendly societies applying for sick relief?—Apparently. You will find in the very interesting early reports of Mr. Tidd-Pratt that he says that friendly society relief ought not to be more than, I think it is, a third of the ordinary wages, because, as he also says, a certain proportion of mankind are quite content with a very small competence provided they need not work.

2417. Assuming that there was more rigid supervision over out-door relief, and that the class you have indicated were refused out-door relief, what would become of them?—Experience shows that the bulk of them would disappear from the Application Book altogether somehow or other. I think that it is almost universal Poor Law experience that they would either be helped by their friends or they would get other work, or (to refer to the letter which I have just read to you) I think it is pretty obvious that the gentleman who employs them might spring a shilling or two in their wages and pay for his own labour himself. *Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.* 30 Jan. 1906. Effect of restriction of out-relief.

2418. The contention of outsiders sometimes is that, if this relief were knocked off, there would be a considerable mortality from starvation; what is the experience where the system has become stricter? Are there any statistics to show that in the process of its becoming stricter there was an increased mortality?—There are most abundant statistics on the subject. I have not the quotation here, but I very well remember what Canon Bury of Brixworth said. He said: "This union has practically abolished out-door relief; it has done so in the face of hostile opposition, and you may be perfectly sure that if any real hardship had resulted to the independent poor from the restriction of relief you would have heard of it." On the other hand, you will find it alleged by people who have given special consideration to this subject, that those unions where there is a great restriction of out-door relief are very little affected by strikes or bad trade, much less indeed than the unions where the administration is lax; and it is alleged, you will also find, that the people are absolutely better off. I suggest this point: There are only a few unions (for reasons which I hope to deal with later by-and-by) where there is a conscious restriction of out-door relief in order to dispauperise; it will be quite easy to go to those unions, and to find out whether in them the rate of wages is higher or whether it is lower; whether the contributions to friendly societies are greater or whether they are less; whether there is more drunkenness or less drunkenness, whether the conditions of housing are better or worse; and whether there is more poverty or more charity than there is in unions where the Poor Law is laxly administered. Suggested inquiry into conditions of unions where out-relief is restricted.

2419. Could you give us a list of the unions between which such a contrast could be made?—I could. They are well known. The unions in this country with a pauperism of under 1 per cent., or of one per cent. or thereabouts, are, unfortunately, but few, and I will hand a list of them in. I will make special reference to unions like Bradfield, Brixworth, St. Georges-in-the East, Newhaven, and Blean, where for one reason or the other the guardians have had a definite policy for the restriction of out-door relief. You will find in the last issue of the "Charity Organization Review," a paper on the administration of out-door relief. Three unions are there taken as typifying three policies of relief. The first is the policy of making in-door relief the rule and out-door relief the exception. In that union £4,503 was spent, of which only £263 was for out-door relief. The second is the policy of making out-door relief the rule and in-door relief the exception; there £6,371 was spent, of which £2,632 was for out-door relief. I may say that these two unions are of much the same size. The third is the policy of limiting out-door relief to those only who are really deserving, whose character is above suspicion, and who have exhibited thrift; I cannot at the moment put my hand on the figures for that union, but you will find that they are somewhere between the two extremes. Instances of effect of restriction of out-relief.

2420. (*Mr. Booth.*) Have you the names of the unions?—Bradfield is the strict union, Cosford, in Suffolk, the lax union, and Abingdon the moderate union. Instances like these are quite common.

2420a. (*Chairman.*) There is another argument which it occurs to me might be put forward by those who advocate a large system of out-door relief. It might be contended that although strict administration might be beneficial to the union in which it was practised, it would be detrimental to the neighbouring unions by driving into them persons who previously had relief from the union which had altered its administration?—That is an allegation which has been very often made, but it is an allegation which can easily be proved or disproved by a very simple local inquiry in the unions affected. I know that the Effect of restriction of out-relief on neighbouring unions.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

charge is especially brought just where you would have expected that it would be brought, that is, in the case of the Whitechapel union. But the clerk to that union has always said that he removes a good many more paupers under orders of removal than he receives from other unions. I should not take the clerk's opinion or any opinion ; I should like to find out the absolute facts, which in that particular case would not be difficult.

2421. Can you give us your impression on this point ?—My impression is that there is nothing in it.

General advantages of restriction of out-relief.

2422. Therefore you would say, I take it, that strict administration in a union is not only beneficial to the union itself, but even to the surrounding unions ?—I should almost go as far as that. I would like to couple up the three things I have said. I put it hypothetically—if it be that a man by a moderate exercise of self-restraint and foresight can prevent himself from becoming a pauper, if it be that practically no man can become a pauper, except with the concurrence of a board of guardians ; and if it be that by his own action and with the concurrence of the guardians he becomes a pauper, then his relief is an injury to his neighbours : then I submit that there is the very strongest ground for holding that any out-door relief which is given, must be given with the greatest care and discrimination, and must be reserved for those exceptional cases who are unfortunately bound to be dependent on their neighbours by their own misfortune, in other words, for the irreducible minimum.

2423. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think those unions in which a strict administration of out-door relief is the rule, generally decline to give non-settled out-door relief, do they not ?—Yes ; non-settled out-door relief is seldom given by unions that are strict.

2424. In that case it would take a year before an applicant in the adjoining union could get any out-door relief by passing over from the strict union to the lax union, would it not ?—It would be a year before he was irremoveable.

2425. That is a degree of forethought which is not very usual in applicants for out-door relief, is it ?—I am afraid not. A year is a long time to a man of that class.

2426. (*Chairman.*) I think you consider that a system of unwise out-door relief inflicts injury on independent persons ?—Personally I think it does. But all I would suggest in my evidence is that by following the lines which I have indicated it can be made the subject of almost scientific inquiry.

Tendency of out-relief to lower wages.

2427. Would you say that this out-door relief in populous centres may tend, and sometimes does tend, to so far lower wages as to inflict injury upon those who are engaged in the trades or occupations in which the outdoor paupers may be temporarily employed ?—Yes.

Correlation between out-door and in door relief.

2428. It is contended that a strict policy of out-door relief tends to decrease the amount of in-door relief ; what have you to say on that point ?—That is a statement that is made by almost everybody who is advocating strict principles. I myself believe it, and I have actually used it in ordinary administration ; that is to say, I have said to a board of guardians "I think on the face of it you ought to extend your in-door accommodation ; I will write you a letter which will take the whole responsibility from you—at least as much of the responsibility as can be taken from you—and put it on myself, and I will advise you that you need not build, because your present system of restricting out-door relief will gradually tend to empty your workhouse." In that particular case I was right, and the workhouse emptied. The point is one that would not be readily conceded by a person who had not very much experience in Poor Law administration but it is one which might be ascertained as a fact, yes or no, by a very moderate amount of inquiry. It is of importance, because if it be the fact, then it follows as a necessary corollary that the poor who have been refused out-door relief, or who have been offered in-door relief and have refused it, somehow or another become self-supporting and do not come into the workhouse. As an old workhouse master said to me once "Since the guardians have not been giving so much out-door relief, when an old man in the workhouse dies no one comes in to take his place." Somehow or other a new force, a new factor, in the life of the people of that union has been brought to the surface—some hidden charity, some resources of self-reliance, some moral force : at least, that is my opinion. But again I say that the definite fact is one which could be ascertained with no great trouble.

2429. You believe that a strict enforcement of Poor Law relief calls into existence certain moral forces that were either in abeyance or non-existent before, and that those forces overcome to a very remarkable extent the material difficulties which seemed before to surround the applicants for Poor Law relief ?—That is exactly how I should put it.

Suggested inquiry in Unions h ing little relief.

2430. I think you have made the suggestion that the circumstances of the unions which refuse all out-door relief should be investigated by the Commission, but I think you also suggest that there are other factors which should be investigated, the circumstances of the population with regard to savings, etc., being one ?—Yes. What I have said briefly amounts to this : that the unions which restrict relief, not for economy, not for convenience, but with a definite intention of dispauperising the people, are but few, and that the actual effect of that policy, especially on the labouring folk, should be carefully investigated. I have been a witness many times before Commissions and committees investigating these subjects. These inquiries have always amounted to one man's opinion against another man's opinion. In a matter so complex as Poor Law, it seems to me that as one gets older one becomes a little less cock-sure, and it may be that some factors in the problem have been overlooked ; it appears to me time to move the investigation from matters of opinion to matters of fact, and what I submit is that the salient facts are not incapable of an investigation which would show their real bearings with reference to the life of the labouring classes.

Case of G gow pedl pauper.

2431. I have here a statement in connection with the parish of Glasgow, which, I think, rather illustrates what you are contending for. James Burns was a pauper in the Barnhill Poorhouse, and he was allowed to go out, and when he came in there were found, chiefly inside the lining of his jacket, two rolls of brown tobacco (two ounces each), seven one-ounce lengths of small black tobacco, two dozen boxes of matches, two sticks of black sugar, four pieces of shortbread, nine small Abernethy biscuits, half-pound of snaps, four 1-lb. bags of sugar, two ½ lbs. of cough lozenges, two 1d. packets of writing paper, one packet of white pepper, one packet of red pepper, four oranges, two ounces of tea, half-a-dozen old periodicals, two weekly papers, and one gill of rum. A book containing notes of several of these commissions for certain inmates (but not including the rum) and for whom intended, was also found in his possession ?—That is of course an illustration in point.

Reasons f lax out-re

2432. Is there a pressure in many localities upon the Guardians which tends rather to lax administration ?—There are many reasons for lax administration. It is emphatically one of those cases where it is so easy to go wrong and so very difficult to go right. In the first place, the very financial constitution of an English union tends towards outdoor relief, because outdoor relief is charged to the whole union and the representation is parochial. As I said yesterday, the ordinary guardian, when it costs his parish very little, is not going to offend, perhaps, the parson's wife, or the old pauper herself, by saying, "No ; on general grounds, for the good of the community, you ought to come into the workhouse." It is a difficult thing for a man, especially when it does not cost him very much, to apply a stringent remedy which affects an individual whom he knows, for the benefit of the generation that is coming thirty years hence. Then again, among, I was going to say the worst class of guardians, there is the perennial fallacy, as I believe it to be, that outdoor relief is cheaper. Quite away back in the thirties the attention of the Commissioners was called to this by the Assistant Commissioners. Sir Edmund Head writes, "It is most curious to see how the dread of expense in single cases, and insensibility to the fact that numerous and prolonged small outdoor allowances amount to more than the cost of the few and short cases which enter the house, has taken possession of particular boards of guardians." That sort of thing is always present. I should here like to read, if you will allow me, a quotation from a report which I made to the Local Government Board on this very point, in the year 1892.

2433. We should be very glad to have that placed before us ?—I said this : "The charge of harshness to the poor, which is often brought against the advocates

of a strict administration of out-door relief, is due for the most part either to a confusion of thought or to a want of practical acquaintance with the procedure of an ordinary board of guardians. Strict administration as a settled policy implies a high standard of public duty on the part of the guardians, for it involves an amount of patient labour which can hardly be expected from an average board of unpaid administrators. In the first place, the principles which all experience shows are the only safe guide in the administration of public relief must be mastered, and, what is more difficult, must be constantly borne in mind. It is very easy to make things pleasant all round by the grant of public money; pleasant to the applicant, pleasant to the guardians who advocate the case, and pleasant to the guardians themselves, who, in granting the relief, feel the joy of a benevolence which, though it is vicarious, is none the less genuine after its kind. The hard task is that of the boards who administer relief as conscientious trustees of the public money; who insist that their officers shall give the fullest information with regard to each case; who form a painstaking judgment as to the amount and the kind of relief which is necessary; and, finally, who, in coming to their decision, hold the immediate interest of the individual applicant to be subordinate to the general well-being of the class from which the applicant comes. It is easy to get rid of an application by a small weekly dole; it is a work involving much vigilant care to make certain that in every case where relief is given the relief shall be sufficient for the necessities of the applicant, and shall be given in accordance with sound public policy. To insure this, in the first place, the arrangements of the workhouse, especially those for the sick and infirm, must be beyond reproach; and this implies a constant and kindly supervision by the visiting committee. Next, there must be no slackness on the part of the medical officers or relieving officers. It is a difficult and often an invidious task for a board of guardians to insist that medical officers shall give personal attention to the cases on their list, or that relieving officers shall devote their whole time to the duties of their office, shall personally distribute the weekly relief, and shall not only occasionally visit, but shall constantly watch the necessities of each out-door pauper. Members of a board of guardians might by experience and reflection become convinced that out-door relief tends to lower wages, to damage the position of the independent labourer; and to impede every impulse towards temperance and thrift; but for any board of guardians to adopt a policy of indiscriminately refusing out-door relief would be impossible. The current administration must be improved to the highest point before any general policy of restriction could have any chance of even a temporary success; and as such a policy would be unpopular among certain classes—not, probably, the labouring classes—the guardians must in self-defence take care that there is nothing to be said against their machinery of relief. Then, apart from all question of general policy, as the administration approaches the highest standard, the proportion of out-door relief will diminish, for the simple reason that, not only will the cases who are not destitute be discovered and struck off the lists, but the guardians, as their knowledge of the circumstances of each case increases, will come to realise how impossible it is to adequately relieve a large proportion of them by any grant of out-relief. The typical boards of guardians, who think that systematic in-door relief is a hardship to the poor, do not scruple to give small weekly grants out of the common purse to every applicant whose circumstances are said to be known to any member of the board, and against whose character the relieving officer has nothing very specific to allege. The applicant is, in fact, got rid of by a weekly dole, the amount of which is in most cases ludicrously out of proportion to the plea of absolute destitution which is the alleged cause of the application for relief. Often the value of the relief given would not do much more than pay the rent. In many cases, perhaps the majority, it is painfully evident that either the pauper must starve on the amount of relief given, or that the relieving officer has not sufficiently mastered the facts of the case to enable him to advise the guardians of the exact circumstances and sources of income of the applicant. If any relief at all is given to an applicant, it is the plain duty of the guardians to take precautions to insure that the relief is adequate, and that the pauper is sufficiently fed, clothed, and lodged. This responsibility is discharged in the case of inmates of workhouses, whereas in the case of out-door paupers too much is left to the chance that the relief given will be supplemented by other sources of income. The worst form of this supplementation is when the pauper earns money by his own work, for then it is obvious that he is kept on the labour market, and enabled to do work which would otherwise be done by independent labourers, by means of a subsidy paid out of the poor rates. The best form of it is when the pauper is helped by his relations. But even then the guardians should take the utmost care to ascertain whether he is properly looked after." I can add nothing to that.

Examples of effect of inadequate out-relief.

2434. Those being the influences at work, I assume that the motive power for an improvement or a reform of local poor law administration must come from one of two sets of circumstances—either the ratepayers are alarmed at the increased expenditure and take combined action, or there happen to be on the board one or two individuals of exceptionally strong character, who by resolute personal effort induce the guardians to adopt a stricter method of administration?—It is almost always the case that unions which have a definite policy of dispauperisation are influenced by some one man, or at most by two men. It is so rare to find a man with sufficient moral courage, sufficient knowledge of the subject, and sufficient leisure to undertake a duty of that kind, that as a rule you do not find more than one or two of them in a union.

Causes of restriction of out-relief.

2435. Assuming that there were one or two exceptionally strong people on a board which adopts improved administration, is there any tendency, when those persons cease to be guardians, for the board to go back to the older method and become lax?—Unfortunately there is a very great tendency to that. I have in my mind a union which, only six or seven years ago, used to give under £10 a week for out-door relief, and last week it gave £42. That was a case where the guardians got discouraged and politics intervened. The chairman, who was the strong man, left the board, and the result has been what I say. The Commission are aware that statistics relating to one day are of very little value; but that is a case where an investigation will be extraordinarily useful, as shewing what has been the effect on the labouring classes of this extra relief—whether they are better off, whether they are richer, whether they are more moral, than they were when out-door relief was restricted to almost nothing.

Tendency to relapse into lax out-relief.

2436. It seems to me from the statements you have made to us that if there is to be any general improvement in poor law administration, pressure must come from outside the locality?—That is so. I think something might be done in two ways. Possibly something might be done by some general changes, especially in regard to finance, in order to bring about a better system, at all events to allow the guardians to judge each case on its merits, without any financial *arrière pensée* or any fear that they were losing money by that system. Then I think a very great deal might be done by changes in what I may call the business aspect of giving the relief. After all, never mind what economic theories you have, you are giving some millions a year in out-door relief, and it seems to me essential that those millions should at all events be expended under the best business conditions available.

Methods of improving administration of out-relief.

2437. I think later on in your evidence you propose to indicate to us where you believe there could be considerable improvements made as regards the giving of out-door relief?—Yes. Of course in all these matters you have external waves of opinion to take into consideration; such a wave of opinion swept over England at the end of the 18th century and resulted in the crash of 1834, and it may be that there is such a wave going over the country now. Dicey, in his last book on law and opinion, speaking of the general socialistic movement, says, "Of a movement which has not yet reached its close, it is impossible to pronounce anything like a final judgment. It may be allowable to conjecture that, if the progress of socialistic legislation is arrested, the check will be due, not so much to the influence of any thinker, as to some patent fact which will command public attention, such as, for instance, that increase in the weight of taxation which is apparently the usual, if not the invariable, concomitant of a socialistic policy." I do not quote that as indicating in any respect an agreement with Mr. Dicey, but as showing the sort of line which a very considerable thinker is following.

Effect of public opinion on poor law policy.

2438. I am afraid the difficulty nowadays is to define what is a socialistic policy, and what is not?—I think we know what he means.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

31 Jan. 1906.

Infrequency of application of workhouse test.

2439. Now we come to the workhouse test, do we not?—Yes. If a man who had read all that has been written about workhouse tests and the hardships of them were to go round and attend the ordinary meetings of boards of guardians, I think he would be very much struck by the fact that he might attend meeting after meeting and never see a test order given. The administration runs on, and the relief is given—well given or badly given according to the general policy of the guardians; but actual test orders, to find out whether a person is destitute or not, are quite uncommon. I have here a return showing the number of workhouse orders which were given in the last quarter in Brighton, which is a large union. The guardians at their meetings gave 106 orders, of which eight were accepted; these were, I suppose, almost all of them test orders given with the express intention of discovering whether the applicant was destitute or not. During the same quarter, the relieving officers gave 902 orders, of which 798 were accepted. That means to say that when the relieving officer gave an order he probably gave it because the applicant wished to come into the workhouse, or because it was necessary that he should come into the workhouse, but when the guardians gave an order it was because they were in doubt whether the man was destitute or not. In the one case eight out of 106 were accepted, and in the other case 798 out of 902 were accepted.

Return as to orders for workhouse in Brighton.

Medical relief arrangements: In London and Country.

2440. Independent of the figures which I understand you have not before you, could you state anything to us as regards medical relief?—Yes. Medical relief was not much considered by the early Commissioners, and it does not bulk very largely either in the accounts or in the reports. There was some question as to whether the Irish dispensary system should be introduced into England some time in the "Seventies," but otherwise medical relief does not really seem to have been a very important part of the administration. Yet, of course, to the poor person it is. I should mention that in London the dispensary system is in force. The ordinary practice in the country is to divide a union into so many districts, and to have a medical officer for each. This medical officer is bound to attend on the permanent paupers, and he is bound to attend on any person for whom he gets an order from the relieving officer or the board of guardians. In London they have dispensaries at which the medical officer attends. That is an essential difference in the administration, which you will no doubt investigate.

2441. Does the medical officer at the dispensary attend anyone who applies?—The medical officer attends any one who applies with an order. Another point on which you will no doubt receive a great deal of evidence, has been the contention that medical relief should be given on loan. Strict poor law administrators have always held that medical relief was in a great many cases the first step to pauperism; and there is no doubt that guardians give orders for the medical officer with more laxity than they give orders for other necessaries, because the medical officer being paid by salary, whether they give an order or not does not affect them financially. With a view of checking that first step to outdoor relief, the Board have had a great many suggestions under consideration as to the questions whether the medical relief could or should be given on loan, and whether it was possible to make arrangements that it should be given on loan. The first difficulty is that, the medical officer being paid by salary, you cannot quite decide what the amount, put into terms of money, should be which ought to be repaid by the recipient of the medical relief. To meet that, we have had a number of suggestions, to which we have to some extent acceded, to the effect that medical officers might be paid in part, at all events, by fee, so that the fee would be a definite sum which could be recovered on loan.

Form of medical Officer's salary a bar to medical relief on loan.

Type of applicants for medical relief.

2442. Have you in your experience noticed whether the applicants for medical relief include any social stratum that would not apply for ordinary poor law relief?—I hardly think so, in the case of outdoor relief; but with regard to indoor relief, that is a different question, which I think we shall have to discuss later on. There is an allegation which probably is well-founded, that where outdoor relief is laxly given, provident benefit clubs, I mean medical clubs, are killed. It is very striking, as the Commission will no doubt hear, how those clubs vary in numbers in different parts of England. In some parts of the country almost all the poor people belong to medical clubs; in the union I was mentioning just now, I believe that practically the whole labouring population did. In some other parts of the country medical clubs are hardly existent. It would be interesting to trace as a matter of fact how far the existence or non-existence of medical clubs depends on the amount of relief given. In parts of Yorkshire, for instance, you never, or at any rate very seldom, have those cases which are so common in the south of England, where a man applies for a confinement order for his wife. Those are cases where very often the man has never received outdoor relief, and he is hardly of a class that does receive outdoor relief. He may be a labourer in regular employment, yet when it comes to paying for the expenses of the birth of his fourth, or fifth, or sixth child he is hard put to it, and he goes to the guardians for it and gets an order which is sometimes on loan, but frequently not on loan. In the North of England you have a great many medical clubs who take those cases at a fixed fee of, say, 10s., and then the guardians do not hear of them. All that is a matter that I am sure you will get a great deal of information upon from my colleagues, if you ask them.

Effect of out-relief on medical clubs.

2443. Now I think we come to the suggestions which you have to make in connection with the relief of able-bodied men; will you take those in whatever order is most convenient?—Outdoor relief to able-bodied men is in only a few unions chronic. Under the regulation order, or under the prohibitory order where the guardians have an outdoor labour test order attached, the guardians may give outdoor relief to able-bodied men under what is known as the stone yard system, that is to say, the men are given a certain number of days' work in the stone yard in lieu of being taken into the workhouse. Where the relief is given to those men as a constant part of the administration, I think you will find that there is something wrong with the administration of the union. I do not think it was contemplated by anybody that outdoor relief in a stone yard, which must of necessity be a very demoralising form of relief, should be chronic, that is to say, that it should be an ordinary part of the administration of the union. I think what was intended was that it should be a useful or, it may be, a necessary adjunct to the workhouse in times of distress, in times of strikes, or in times of lock-outs. The Board have done, and are doing, all they can to minimise the demoralising effects of the stone yard by endeavouring, to the best of their power, to insist on the regulations which seem in their judgment to be necessary. The first of those regulations (or principles, as I prefer to call them), is that where a man is relieved in a stone yard it shall be relief and not wages, that is to say, that a man shall be relieved up to the necessities of himself and his family, and his work shall not be treated as labour to be remunerated by wages, but shall be given as a test of his destitution. There are several points of difficulty with reference to these tests. In the first place, guardians try, as far as they can, to make money by the labour. That always appears to me to be a very fatal thing to do. If they try to make money, in the long run they will lose more money than if they had not tried to make it. In the next place, the work which is done when they try to make money is nearly always skilled labour, such as stone-breaking, or something of that kind. Another trouble is that boards of guardians continually try to get back to the payment of wages rather than to confine themselves to the giving of relief, with the result that a man who is a good stone-breaker, or a hard worker, sometimes earns in the labour yard money which is perhaps above what he would earn outside. I have no doubt alleged instances will be given to you where men have given up their ordinary labour and taken their place in the stone yard. I myself have known men who have been six or seven years in the stone yard. Then there is the last condition of difficulty. The order says that the man shall be kept on work during the time he is being relieved, which would mean he ought to be kept on work for six days a week. Now, do what we can—and we have written some very forcible letters on the subject recently—we have the utmost difficulty in preventing boards of guardians giving a man one, or two, or three days a week work in the yard. The guardians feel very strongly about that. They say it is very hard luck that a man should be kept on work for six days for the pittance they give him. They say that he ought to be able to go out

Labour yards.

Regulations for labour yards and their evasion.

and look for work himself. In my judgment the work that a man does in a stone yard is of very small importance in comparison with the number of days which he is kept off the streets and off the labour market. In times of distress there is no work outside except casual work, and if the man is receiving relief and allowed to loaf about the streets, he takes that casual work from the independent labourer. In times of real distress it is a very bad thing to allow under-paid men to loaf about the streets. They are certain to get into mischief, like they did in 1879 in the time of the cotton strike, and like they have done in South Wales several times in my experience. They begin to riot. So if you have a stone yard system at all—supposing the Commission should make any recommendations with respect to it—I would suggest that a man should always get five and preferably six days' labour as a test in return for his relief. That is a point which is, I think, of vital importance. If we have that, it is undoubted that a stone yard will be a very useful adjunct in certain times of distress; but if we have not got that, then a stone yard becomes wholly mischievous. I remember the case of a strike in the cotton trade a good many years ago; the guardians of the particular union that I was looking after then were at their wits' end to know what to do with the able-bodied men. There was a great difficulty in finding them work of any sort, and a great difficulty in administering the labour yard. It was suggested that, instead of the ordinary test, the men should come and sit in the dining hall of the workhouse for a certain number of hours a day. It was treated as a joke on the first day, but on the second day they began to drop off, and at the end of a week we had found out the most effective labour test that I have ever seen. That was in the town of Blackburn a good many years ago, but I forget the exact date. I should add this also from my experience, which used to be considerable, that if you give 100 men, even in times of distress, orders for the workhouse, not ten will take them, but if, in times of distress, you give 100 men orders for the stone yard you will find ninety will take them. The stone yard is not, and never can be, a test in the same way as the workhouse is a test.

essity for tinuous k in ur yards.

kburn: ention in ng-hall test.

2444. Your next point I think refers to women in distress, especially in the textile trade districts?—That is a point of no very great importance, but still you must remember that in times of strike and distress in the textile industries you have a great number of able-bodied women on your hands. It is very difficult to find any work for them, and yet they too ought to be taken off the streets if possible. That only affects a very small part of England but I myself have found great practical difficulty in dealing with it on more than one occasion. I would refer you to a report I wrote so long ago as the year 1877 with regard to a strike at Bolton in Lancashire, which is quoted in Sir William Chance's book, and which was published in the Board's annual Report of that date. There the difficulty was rather acute. It was a strike where about 1,800 men struck, and by their strike 12,500 people, including 5,000 women, were thrown out of employment.

iculty of lying ur test ble- ied en.

ort on on strike, .

2445. I suppose a considerable proportion of those women were at work in the same trades as the strikers?—They were turned out of work because some of the mill hands who worked the machinery struck, and therefore there was no work for them. Of course they claimed everybody's sympathy, and as the strike went on they became really distressed, but there was a great difficulty in finding labour tests for them. We did not want a labour test, but what we wanted to do was to keep them from wandering about the streets. That is, I should think, a matter almost beyond remedy, but I just mention it.

2446. But I take it that it is a difficulty which may arise anywhere in England where a considerable number of women are employed in factories?—It is a difficulty, and it is a difficulty that ought to be considered as part of the whole question of this relief to able-bodied men and women by means of a labour test.

e relief.

2447. Now I think we come to your next sub-head, namely, strikes and lock-outs?—That is a point on which I understand you will get much more precise evidence than I can give you from my colleague, Mr. Bircham, who is the inspector for South Wales, and who will describe to you the legal effects of the famous Merthyr Tydvil Judgment. At the same time, it has been my lot to see a very great deal of strike relief. I have always been struck by the great danger which seemed to me to exist of the administration, that is, of boards of guardians, being captured by the trade unions who are on strike, or by the masters' associations perhaps, and then the relief being used as a weapon by one party against the other. Supposing, for instance, you have a board of guardians, as you have had, who are altogether labour men, and a strike comes along, then you have nothing between the relief of the strikers at the cost of the rates (in other words, fighting the masters with the masters' own money), but the good sense of the guardians, and their shrinking from doing an unfair thing, and the orders of the Local Government Board. I am not going to minimise the first check at all. I have seen cases where trade unions might very well have utilised the funds of the guardians to fight the masters, and have refrained from doing so, or have refrained from pushing their advantage home. I trust a good deal to the fair mindedness of my fellow-countrymen, but men's blood gets up, especially in an industrial fight—it is very difficult even for the bystander to avoid taking sides—and the point is one that well deserves consideration. The orders of the Board, which form the second line of defence, are no doubt invaluable. They are invaluable to the guardians themselves as keeping them up to the mark, and they are of great help to the guardians in resisting the pressure of the men and the little rioting that goes on. But if a board of guardians want to set those orders aside, they can do it. The audit is not coming along for some months, and it is very easy indeed to say, Let it appear that the applicant for relief has got a sick child, and he then can be relieved. It is very easy to relax the stone yard regulations, so that there are practically no stone yard regulations whatever. Therefore the problem is this: Under the existing law there are only between us and a possible great abuse these two things—the fair-mindedness of the guardians and the orders of the Local Government Board—one of which is a quality which I do not under-value, but which has its limits; and the other of which, as a means of repression of an unwilling board of guardians, is illusory.

Ineffectiveness of labour yard regulations.

2448. Disfranchisement would be a check on applications for relief in ordinary times; may we assume that it would not be much of a check during the excitement of a strike?—I think it would, and I would suggest to the Commission that that is just where the subject should receive their careful attention. The disfranchisement of the recipient of relief is a most important point. However, it does not follow that because a man is disfranchised for the receipt of relief he will lose his vote. The election may not come along very soon, and then there will be a new register. However, you have to consider the probabilities of those conditions being changed. That of course is politics and altogether above my head; but still my experience is that even under existing conditions the dislike of disfranchisement, which hardly affects the ordinary pauper—if it did, he would not care about it—in the case of the high-class working man who is on strike has a very great deterrent effect.

Disfranchisement as a deterrent to relief.

2449. Now we will pass on to your proposals for a stricter administration?—Among general proposals which would have the effect of promoting a stricter administration of Poor Law relief you have the question of areas. It has often been suggested that if the area for in-door relief were extended and the area for out-door relief remained what it is now, or were restricted, you would enable the guardians to consider whether they should give in-door relief or out-door relief without any financial bias, or perhaps with a financial bias in favour of what the proposers of such schemes would hold to be a better system of administration, namely, a more in-door relief system of administration. In the Bill of 1888 I think it was originally suggested that that grant which was afterwards given to the Local Authorities in the form of a fixed sum based on the cost of the officers, should be given by a payment of so many pence per head of in-door paupers. There was a great opposition to it, and it was withdrawn. I remember at that time in some West of England constituencies, which I knew, it was put about among the electors that "Unionist" meant a man who was in favour of forcing all the poor people into the union. Any way, that proposal was withdrawn. In London the proposal was carried out more or less, and in London for every in-door pauper

Effect on administration of larger areas for indoor than for out-door relief.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

the guardians get 5d. a day from the Metropolitan Poor Fund and 4d. from the Exchequer grant, so that practically the entire cost of the maintenance of the London in-door pauper is thrown upon the whole metropolis. The exact reverse of that happens in the country, where the pauper is a parish pauper, in the sense that his guardian sits for the parish in which he lives, but the relief is paid not from the parish, but from the union. The tendency in the country is rather on the part of the administrators to give out-door relief, because it is for the benefit of their own clients at the cost of the union. The tendency in London would be supposed to be to give in-door relief entirely, because it is paid for out of two funds raised by a large area, in the one case national and in the other case metropolitan. I do not know London, and therefore I cannot say with any certainty or with any force what the actual results have been in London; but I would call your attention to a statement by Sir Henry Longley, who was an authority on that and other matters of Poor Law administration of the very first rank, to the effect that when he attended London Boards of Guardians he was struck by the fact that he heard exactly the same arguments in London (that out-door relief was cheaper) as he had heard in the country. He also said—but, mark you, this was before the Act of 1888—that he did not believe that the extension of area for in-door relief had had any effect. Whether the present inspector for London would agree with that, I do not know; but it would appear to me that in all probability the additional grant of 1888, and the fact that the guardians now are more alive to where the money comes from than they probably were in Sir Henry Longley's time, have led to people getting in-door relief in London who have not got it elsewhere. The facts in London show that the proportion of in-door relief given in London is much larger than the proportion of in-door relief given in the country. In connection with that, I would refer again to the subject of the out-door relief unions. There was a definite proposal made for an alteration in the area, and one of the two reasons for that proposal was that it would tend to increase the proportion of in-door relief which is given by the guardians. The proposal was not made solely on that ground, nor indeed was the origin of the proposal other than a desire to find some solution of the difficulty in the case of unions which overlap in some areas. The change was supported by very experienced officials on the ground that it would tend to a stricter administration. It would be a very curious and not a very difficult investigation to find out what had been the precise effect of the change on the twelve or fourteen out-door relief unions which now exist. I do not know them very well, but not long ago I attended a meeting of some four or five of them, and I did not see that there was any difference between their procedure and the procedure of an ordinary board. Statistics would tell us whether there had been any marked change in the direction of giving more in-door relief than had been given before.

Incidence of cost of relief in London and in country.

2450. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Before you leave this part of the question, may I ask you to make this point clear. As to the incidence of the cost of in-door and out-door relief, I think you intend to convey that outside London both in-door and out-door relief are a union charge, and in no sense a parochial charge?—They are altogether a union charge.

2451. Whereas in London there is a different arrangement in consequence of the operation of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—Yes. In the country there is a tendency towards out-door relief, because the individual guardian knows the relief is not paid for by the parish, but is paid for by the whole union.

2452. But that is not a financial reason, is it?—It is a sort of domestic reason.

2453. (*Chairman.*) And the domestic consideration outruns the financial consideration?—Yes.

2454. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is there nothing analogous to the Metropolitan Poor Fund in the large provincial cities?—Nothing.

Mr. Pell's out-relief proposals.

2455. (*Chairman.*) Now, I think, we come to certain specific proposals made by Mr. Pell in 1876 for the practical improvement of the business part of out-door relief?—In 1876—which was a period in which interest in Poor Law questions had very much revived, when Mr. Goschen's circular was still affecting people's minds, and when the Poor Law conferences were beginning to make their influence felt—the Central Poor Law Conference sent a deputation to Mr. Sclater-Booth, who was then President of the Local Government Board, and made to him, through Mr. Pell, certain definite proposals for reforming the current administration of the poor law. The proposals made were answered by the Local Government Board. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A). No. V. (26).) Some of those reforms are still much in the minds of the Poor Law Conference and other persons interested; and I think it would be worth while, as they represent the only definite proposals in that direction which have been made to the Local Government Board by a body of the importance of the central Poor Law Conference, to go through them. The first was, "That, in order to give better effect to the principle of the poor law, boards of guardians be empowered to frame bye-laws, which, when duly approved by the Local Government Board, should have the force of orders until revoked by authority." That proposal was based rather on the experience of Manchester and some other unions which adopted a code of rules or regulations, such as, for instance, that no out-door relief should be given to the wives of convicted persons, or that no out-door relief should be given for a longer period than six weeks, and so on. What the conference had in their minds was that in order to give those regulations (which, as somebody put it in those days, stereotyped the better mind of the guardians) some permanence, they should be made permanent bye-laws, or standing orders which should affect the administration of boards of guardians precisely as the general orders of the Local Government Board do. The conference made a mistake in using the term "bye-laws" because a bye-law connotes—I remember the discussion at the time—a penalty. This was not a matter of bye-laws; it was a matter of regulation or standing orders. The board objected that if such powers were granted they would "inevitably tend to introduce variety and exceptional practices in the administration of relief, and in this manner would prevent the attainment of that uniformity which it was the object of the Poor Law Amendment Act to establish." I suppose I ought not to criticise these somewhat antiquated opinions of the board, but in my judgment that answer is rather weak. I think it would be a good thing to encourage certain experiments in relief. That would enable the board by-and-by to decide what was the better course. The effect of such standing orders would be, no doubt, that the better would be taken and the worse left; and the better would be given the form of an Order applying to the whole country. However, so it was, the board never assented to that proposal, and I do not think that proposal has been revived—certainly not in recent years.

Mr. Pell's suggested "bye-laws" as to out-relief.

2456. As I understand, the proposal was that where a board of guardians passed certain orders or certain recommendations, which were approved by the Local Government Board, the board of guardians should not have the power of rescinding them except with the assent of the Local Government Board?—That is so. I have here a great many rules of administration which have been adopted of recent years by a very large number of Guardians on their own initiative. They carry no real binding force, and the guardians are very apt to make exceptions to them; but where a board of guardians enforce them, they do a very great deal of good. I think in the Board's report of two years ago you will find yet another code which was drawn up by my colleagues, Mr. Preston-Thomas and Mr. Fleming, for the use of guardians in their districts. You will find a number of other codes in "Knight's Guardians' Guide," which is a most useful little book that was published in 1899, prefaced by this quotation from Carlyle, "The poor law is a protection of the thrifty labourer against the thriftless and dissolute."

2457. Before you leave this part of the subject, did any boards of guardians object to this proposal on the ground that it would rather tie their hands thereafter?—No, because it was not proposed that it should be forced on boards of guardians. It was only proposed that where a board of guardians passed a resolution that they would adopt rules, then those rules could be made an order compulsory on them.

2458. And they would not have the power of rescinding them?—Except by the direction of the Local Government Board.

2459. That point was not objected to by the boards of guardians, was it? — I think not. But the president refused to allow it to be done.

2460. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There was no general representation in favour of it, was there?—There was no general recommendation of it.

nchester -relief s.

2461. (*Chairman.*) Perhaps you would give us an instance where rules of administration were adopted, and tell us what those rules were?—I have here the Manchester rules. I choose those because they were more rigidly adhered to in Manchester than in any union within my knowledge. The first rule is "Out-door relief shall not be granted except in cases of sickness to (*a*) able-bodied men with families residing in furnished lodgings; (*b*) men of improvident, drunken, or immoral habits." The other rules are, "(2) All orders to able-bodied men for relief in the labour yard shall be given for periods not exceeding four weeks, and each application for renewal shall be treated as a new application. (3) Out-relief in the labour yard shall not be granted unless the relieving officer has, since the application, visited the home of the applicant, and has recorded the date of such visit in the relief application and report book; cases in which the relieving officer has not had time to visit shall be relieved by him in kind only, or by an order for the workhouse. (4) The relieving officer shall be required to make at least fortnightly visits to the homes of all the able-bodied men receiving relief in the labour yard. (5) The hours of labour in the labour yard shall be, during the winter months, from 8.30 o'clock a.m. to 4.30 o'clock p.m., with an interval of one hour for dinner, and from 8.30 a.m. to 12 noon on Saturday; and reasonable facilities shall be given, at the discretion of the guardians, to enable the men to seek for work, but the period of leave of absence shall not, except for special reasons, exceed half a day in any one week. (6) The scale of out-relief to able-bodied men and their families shall be as follows, namely: —for a man and his wife 4s. per week; for each child under sixteen, 1s. per week. (7) All able-bodied inmates of the workhouse, shall be kept at test work in their own wards during the whole of the hours of labour. In addition to personal inquiries made as to the circumstances of each applicant for relief, the relieving officer obtains, when practicable, a certificate from the medical officer as to the nature of the illness of every person applying for aid from the rates, on the ground of sickness, and a report as to whether the case is a proper one for admission into the workhouse infirmary. In cases of application for relief on the ground of want of work, an 'earnings' note is sent to the last employer of the applicant, and any of the children who are, or have been at work, inquiring whether the person named in such note is still employed there, the average wages; if left, the cause of leaving, and general character. All replies pass through the hands of the superintendent of the relief department, and are by him forwarded to the respective relieving officers. Where an application is made in consequence of sons refusing to support their parents, a notice is sent to each son, whose address is known, directing his attendance at the township offices, to afford him an opportunity of explaining the reason of his alleged neglect. A similar method is adopted in regard to husbands whose wives apply for relief in consequence of their alleged neglect. Those are very good illustrations of the nature of those proposals. You will notice that they nearly all deal with the case of able-bodied men, and that they will be wholly inapplicable to the ordinary country union. The ordinary country union, which made regulations for similar purposes, would require very different regulations; but for Manchester those rules were excellent, and had the most extraordinary effect on the administration of the union. I myself saw the out-door relief of Manchester fall from over 3,000 to just a little over 600, being accompanied at the same time with a rise in the in-door relief, which was absolutely inappreciable—being only 100 or 200. I was in Manchester at the time, and I should have heard of any case of hardship if there had been any; but I heard of none. Those rules were enforced in the most rigid way, and it is worth while explaining to the Commission how they were enforced. The Manchester Board of Guardians held a relief committee every day; the relief committee consisting of one guardian. Of course there was the usual academic and rather pedantic discussion as to whether a committee could be one man; however, there was one man.

les in- plicable to ntry ions.

ll in nchester t-relief.

e-man ief mmittees.

2462. Was it the same man each day?—No; the guardians took it in turns. One of them sat at 9 o clock, on his way down to business usually. The guardian sat *here*, the relieving officer *there*, and near the guardian was the relief clerk. The guardian made his order. If it contravened the regulations the relief clerk said "That is in contravention of standing order so and so." The guardian might say, "Well, I do not care if it is, circumstances justify me." Nothing more was said, and the order was made. When the order came up for confirmation at the full board, the relief clerk reported that Mr. So and So had made an order in the case of such and such a pauper in contravention of regulation so and so. The chairman asked for an explanation, and the guardian who had made the exceptional order had to defend his decision. Sometimes he was supported, sometimes he was over-ridden; but all the circumstances were gone through over again. That resulted, according to my judgment—and I can speak much more freely about matters of a great many years ago than I can of matters happening now—in absolutely the fairest administration of out-door relief that I ever saw. It was absolutely uniform. Every poor person in the city knew exactly what he was going to get in certain circumstances, and there was no speculative application for relief.

Procedure for out-relief in Manchester.

2463. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Was the guardian's decision often reversed?—Yes, pretty often.

2464. I suppose the applicant got to know of that?—I suppose he would.

2465. That did not have any bad effect, did it?—Not that I knew.

2466. (*Chairman.*) Was it not the other way about, not that it was brought to the knowledge of the applicant, but that the guardian was put on his defence before his brother guardians?—He was put on his defence before them, and so he got to know the feeling of the board of guardians.

2467. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Was the applicant present when the relief clerk told the guardian who made the decision that it was in contravention of the regulations?—I do not say the relief clerk told the guardian in the presence of the pauper. The pauper went out, and, so far as he was concerned, the order was over before the relief clerk spoke.

2468. (*Mr. Booth.*) Was the clerk a clerk of rather a special character with high pay?—He was a man of very special character. He was an extraordinarily good public servant.

2469. He seems to have been almost a legal assessor in the matter?—He was absolutely impartial.

2470. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Had the applicant an appeal to the justices at that time?—No. There is no appeal in England to the justices on matters of relief; we do not have that in this country.

Power of Justices as to relief.

2471. I thought it existed at one time?—I do not think so.

2472. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is it not the fact that the system has practically broken down in Manchester?—I was told when I was there the other day that the number on out-door relief was now 1,625.

Reasons for failure of Manchester system.

2473. Although those regulations still stand, they are not adhered to?—I am told that those regulations still stand, and that they are not strictly adhered to—that is another very significant fact.

2474. (*Mr. Lock.*) What is the result?—The result is that the out-door pauperism has about trebled.

2475. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Are we to understand that the system has broken down and out-door pauperism has increased because these individual guardians, although they still sit, do not adhere to the regulations?—That is what is stated to me.

2476. (*Mr. Booth.*) When did the change occur; when did the adherence to the regulations cease?—If you will allow me, I will warn Mr. Jeaner-Fust, who is the inspector of that district and who is coming here to give evidence, to be prepared with the facts. I should like to add this one thing, that naturally, under the Manchester regulations, all the permanent cases came before each member of the board of guardians in turn. There was a different

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

Mr. Pell's proposals cont. :—

man sitting every day, and as a permanent case came up again and again in ordinary rotation each member of the board in the end had it under consideration. They each knew all the cases, and had each taken the responsibility for them. I have no doubt that the supporters of Mr. Pell's proposal will say to you that if you had only made those regulations standing orders, which were not revocable at the option of the guardians, they would have been in existence in many places, and would have rescued hundreds of people from the status of pauperism and put them into the free labour market again.

Grandson's liability to maintain grand-father.

2477. (*Chairman.*) Now will you deal with the next proposal urged by the deputation to Mr. Selater Booth ?—The second point was, "That the liability for the maintenance of a pauper be extended to the grandsons of the pauper." As to that, the President saw no objection to the proposal, and said that if a suitable opportunity occurred he would be willing to introduce a Bill to give effect to it.

Extension of Guardians' power to recover relief.

2478. What have you to say about the third proposal ?—The third proposal was, "That all relief be recoverable at the discretion of the guardians within a certain limit of time after the stopping of the relief," instead of the recovery being limited to relief expressly given on loan as it is generally supposed to be. That is a small point, but it has never been attended to. Of course, reasonably speaking, whenever a man gets money he ought to repay any relief he may have received.

Recovery of Medical relief on loan.

2479. I think the fourth point dealt with the money value of medical relief ?—Yes. The fourth proposal was, "That a money value should be put on all medical relief in order that it may be recoverable." That was to meet the difficulty about giving the medical relief on loan. That has not been done, but the board in certain cases have allowed guardians to pay their medical officers partly by fee.

Declaration that relief is on loan.

2480. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is it not the case that, in order to be able to recover relief by loan, the applicant must understand that he is receiving the relief under those conditions ?—I believe that is a moot point. I myself have always been of opinion that you could recover all relief, but I believe I am wrong.

2481. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It must be declared to be given on loan at the time, must it not ?—Yes, so it is held.

Case of refusal of relief on loan

2482. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Supposing the man does not accept it, then he could set the law at defiance if he is really destitute, because, if destitute, he must be relieved and he need not accept the relief on loan ?—That is so, and of course that is the difficulty. A question which no doubt will be put to me by-and-by is, What is to be done with a pauper who will not accept an order for the workhouse, and who will not accept a loan of necessities in order to be relieved. It is the same difficulty in another form.

2483. (*Mr. Booth.*) If a board of guardians attempt to collect the loan, will they have to go before a magistrate ?—They will have to go before a county court judge, because it is a civil debt.

2484. Would not the county court judge insist upon proof that the loan was accepted by the pauper at the time ?—I believe that county court judges have different views on the matter.

Power to compulsorily remove paupers to workhouse.

2485. (*Chairman.*) Now will you go to the next recommendation ?—The next, the fifth recommendation, was, "That power should be given to the justices in petty sessions, on the certificate of the medical officer of the district, to order the removal of an applicant, who is without lodging or accommodation, to the workhouse of the union." The President thought that some such power as that contemplated might be beneficial in the case of 'sick and infirm paupers or applicants for relief, who are without proper lodging or accommodation, and who refuse to go into the workhouse,' but he was not prepared to go further than this."

2486. (*Dr. Downes.*) I think he also said that he would be prepared to give the proposal further attention, whenever an opportunity occurred for dealing with the amendment of the law ?—Yes, he said he would give the proposal further consideration. That is a proposal of which we are going to hear a great deal more. Cases occasionally come before every board of guardians where a person is living in conditions which are impossibly bad, and where the person himself is more or less crazy or suffering from senile decay, and yet obstinately refuses to go into the workhouse. The question is, how far you should be empowered to compel him to go into the workhouse. The question will come up—and it will probably come before the House of Commons—with regard to a certain number of vagrants who wander about to their own hurt. We have evidence from London police magistrates of the pitiable nature of the cases of old folk, who ought to be in an infirmary and properly looked after, but insist on wandering about. Nothing keeps them quiet; they are charged with some vagrant offence, and the magistrate says, "I will let you off if you will go into the workhouse." He sends an officer to the door of the workhouse with them, and then they refuse to enter, and wander off again, only to be brought back in a wretched condition two or three days later. The purely voluntary nature of the entry into an English workhouse is an important principle, and no doubt some questions will be put to me with reference to it when we come to deal with the subject of the ins-and-outs; but I am not sure that Sir Henry Longley has not hit the main point when he suggests that, as in the city of New York, the application for relief might be made a constructive self-commitment for a certain period; that the acceptance of in-door relief, or of relief of any sort in the cases that we are now referring to, should be on the condition that the guardians shall be empowered to get an order to remove the person to the workhouse; and that when that person has actually entered the workhouse the provisions of the Pauper Inmates' Discharge and Regulation Act, 1871, shall be extended so as to cover such a case. It is one of those difficult questions where the cases affected are not very many, but when you have seen one of those cases you have a very strong conviction that something ought to be done, and the danger is, lest, in desiring to do something for that one particular case, you should injure the whole administration. I cannot help thinking, however, that the point is one which might be solved on the lines indicated by Sir Henry Longley.

System of relief in New York : "Constructive self-commitment."

2487. (*Mr. Nunn.*) He does not say how we are going to get them into the workhouse though ?—That can be done by a magistrate's order.

2488. (*The O'Conor Don.*) How are you to keep them when you get them there ?—The suggestion is, that in those cases it would be held to be a self-commitment to the workhouse for three months, or for whatever time might be fixed.

2489. (*Mr. Nunn.*) That would require fresh legislation, would it not ?—Yes. The whole subject bristles with difficulty, and I think it will have to be considered first with respect to the case of the vagrants.

Detention in workhouse of infectious cases

2490. Has not a master of a workhouse the right to detain a person who is without any visible means of subsistence and has not got any home of his own ?—No. The only right he has to detain anyone is under the Act which says that you must not ask for your discharge to the danger of yourself or others. That is meant to cover the case of infectious disease.

2491. (*Mr. Loch.*) And the medical officer of health certifies there ?—Yes; but that does not cover other cases of disease which are also a source of danger to others.

2492. (*Dr. Downes.*) In fact, the power was restricted by the Lunacy Act, 1890, I think ?—That was so.

2493. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Some words were struck out in the old Act; that is how it was done, was it not ?—Yes.

Restriction of period of out-relief.

2494. (*Chairman.*) Now will you deal with the sixth suggestion ?—That was a proposal "That no out-relief should be given for a longer period than thirteen weeks without fresh application." The President entirely approved of the suggestion, but nothing has been done. I should certainly say that no out-door relief ought to be given for longer than a month; but that is a matter of opinion, and I will come to that again later.

Miscellaneous proposals by Mr. Pell.

2495. Was there not another suggestion ?—Yes, there was a suggestion that boards of guardians should be empowered to subscribe to the publication of the reports of the conferences, which, I think, was the one suggestion which was carried out. There were a certain number of other suggestions made with regard to more or less minute points in the provisions of the relief orders. I may say that I have here a printed copy

of the letter which the Local Government Board wrote to Mr. Pell, giving the reasons for assenting to or dissenting from these proposals.

2496. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) What was the date of that letter?—It is dated May 12th, 1877, and it is signed by Sir John Lambert. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (26).) I have also a memorandum by the then President, Mr. Sclater Booth, relating to the administration of out-door relief, which I will deal with later.

2497. (*Chairman.*) Was that memorandum issued at the same time?—It was issued afterwards. Among the other suggestions which the deputation made, the most important was that the regulation order should be withdrawn, and that the out-door relief prohibitory order should be made universal. There are several points that could be made about that, but the Board did not favour it, and the question is still to be answered whether those relief orders are really adequate to the present wants or whether there should not be some change in the form of a new order. The matter was dealt with by Sir Henry Longley, who suggested the issue of a new order which should practically combine the provisions of the three orders.

2498. What post did Sir Henry Longley hold then?—He was inspector in London, and I am referring to a report of his which was published in the third annual report of the Local Government Board.

2499. Was any action taken on Sir Henry Longley's suggestion?—No; the Board objected to making the prohibitory order universal, partly on the ground—and the very sound ground too—that if the prohibitory order were made universal, there would be continual applications to suspend it in times of distress. Sir John Lambert says in his letter, "The President has the less hesitation in adhering to the policy which the Board have hitherto pursued in this respect, as he finds that both in the Metropolis and in some of the unions in the manufacturing districts, such, for instance, as Manchester, the administration of relief is ordinarily conducted upon principles quite as stringent as those laid down in the order in question, and in a manner which would serve as an example for many of those unions in which the order has long been in force." That is a point which I dealt with in my evidence yesterday, when I gave reasons why, as a matter of fact, the prohibitory order unions were not as strictly administered on paper as the regulation order unions. With regard to Sir Henry Longley's suggestion, I think I should like to put in this very significant quotation from his report on Metropolitan Pauperism. "Inasmuch as at the instigation of the Board individual boards of guardians, aided by the expression of public opinion, have voluntarily made substantial progress, by the abandonment of the out-door labour test, towards a formal and decided advance in Poor Law administration, it is for the Board, in the exercise of its exclusive and most important function, not only to embody and to realise for general dissemination the scattered results of individual experience, and to constitute the successful efforts of one board of guardians the standard and measure of the practice of their neighbours, but, further, to register and to give permanence to the progress which has been already made, and to secure it, as a step towards a further advance against the fluctuations of opinion and of constitution incident to local bodies, by means of an Order which shall nevertheless have been suggested by their independent action. This no board of guardians, however firmly they may adhere to sound principles, can do for themselves; they are unable to impose a binding rule of practice upon themselves, much less upon their successors, and I cannot but think that the intervention of the Board in such a case is aptly characterised in the pregnant remark recently made in my hearing at a Poor Law conference by an active guardian, 'We look to the Local Government Board to save us from ourselves'." However, that point of view never has, up till now, commended itself to the Local Government Board, and the orders have not been changed. In the letter of Sir John Lambert's which I have handed in, will be found the explanation why the Board refused their assent to a change in the prohibitory order, which was that relief in sudden and urgent cases should not be granted for more than a month at a time, the reason being briefly the danger of interfering with sick relief. Then there was a small proposal that the Guardians should not be allowed to pay part of the cost of a funeral, but only the whole cost.

2500. As I understand, these proposals were not accepted by the Local Government Board, and, therefore, as they were not accepted, and the reasons for their non-acceptance are to be found in the document which you have handed in, we might perhaps leave this part of the subject?—I think so. I have dealt with the big questions; the rest of the proposals related to small matters of administration.

Limitation of number of cases dealt with by relieving officers.

2501. Having now concluded your evidence on the suggestions made by Mr. Pell, we will go to the next branch of the subject. I understand there are various ideas you have in connection with the improvement in the transaction of the business of relieving officers?—Perhaps the most important of the suggestions made for what I may call the introduction of better business principles into the administration of relief, are those which relate to the relieving officers. The fact is that you will find, as between one union and another, a great want of uniformity in the number of cases which are looked after by the various relieving officers. It is held to be of the first importance that the number of cases assigned to each relieving officer should not be too large to enable him to exercise an efficient supervision over them. This point of view has become more especially important since the better class of poor law administrators have adopted the view that, after the guardians have reduced a man from an independent labourer to the status of pauperism by a judgment which is quasi-judicial, they are bound to see that he is properly fed, properly lodged, and properly clothed, and they can only discharge that responsibility through the action of the relieving officers. The Board have adopted that view, and we do, as a matter of practice, put pressure upon boards of guardians to appoint additional relieving officers where they seem to us to be necessary. We have quite recently brought the full weight of our influence to bear on certain boards of guardians with this end, and quite successfully. Another way of increasing the efficiency of the relieving officers' work is one which is adopted in a good many large towns, which is, to appoint additional relieving officers under the name of cross visitors or superintendents, whose duty it is to discharge all those duties of a relieving officer which interfere with his current work (as, for instance, the removal of lunatics to asylums, which is a duty imposed by statute on the relieving officer) and also to assist the guardians by making special visits to the homes of paupers in all doubtful cases.

Cross visitors.

2502. Have you had any difficulty in inducing boards of guardians to take up these extra or special points?—We have had some difficulty, but in certain cases we have insisted, and the thing has been done. I am prepared to say that we should always insist in cases where there is no doubt about the facts.

2503. You may insist, but have you any legal power of enforcing your wish?—Yes. We can get a mandamus against a board of guardians and compel them to appoint a relieving officer; and, as we have the power, we have also the responsibility.

Salaries of relieving officers and cross visitors.

2504. (*The O'Conor Don.*) What is the usual salary of a relieving officer?—The salaries vary from £90 to £200, and perhaps a good deal more than that in the case of superintendent relieving officers in big towns.

2505. How are the cross visitors paid?—They are appointed as assistant relieving officers as a rule and they get from £150 to £250 or £300. Some of those officers are very skilful men.

2506. Then they are paid more than the relieving officers?—They should be.

2507. Is £90 about the lowest salary paid to a relieving officer?—I think it is. It must be remembered that the relieving officer very often has other small offices. I merely mentioned those sums roughly as showing you the class of man who is appointed.

Cross visitors as assistant relieving officers.

2508. (*Mr. Booth.*) The cross visitors are called assistants, are they not?—The cross visitors (or superintendent relieving officers) are usually appointed as assistant relieving officers,

2509. But they are superior to the relieving officer?—Yes, they are.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

Assistant relieving officers.

2510. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Have the relieving officers anything to do with sanitary matters?—No, nothing. The days have long since gone by when the relieving officer was also sanitary inspector.

2511. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Does not an assistant relieving officer derive his authority from the relieving officer for any acts that he performs?—No, he would have direct instructions from the guardians.

2512. That is, the assistant relieving officer would?—Yes; and he would not have a district.

2513. I was thinking of his being governed by his denomination of "assistant relieving officer," which seems to imply that he has a superior officer?—His duties are to assist in the relief work.

2514. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) He is appointed to discharge certain specified duties, is he not?—That is so. He would, for instance, be appointed assistant for the removal of lunatics, or to visit any cases as directed by the guardians in any of the relieving officer's districts. He would have no district, and he would be appointed generally to superintend the relief.

2515. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Now you are speaking of a superintendent relieving officer and not of a cross visitor, are you not?—Sometimes you have a cross visitor who is also a superintendent relieving officer, and sometimes you have a cross visitor who is not.

2516. It is as well to keep the position of the relieving officer and cross visitor separate, is it not?—Yes. There are various officers who all tend to relieve the current work of the relieving officer, and therefore give him more time to attend to his proper duties. There is, for instance, the pay clerk, whose duty it is to pay the outdoor paupers.

Recourse to mandamus by Local Government Board.

2517. (*Chairman.*) Have the Local Government Board ever been compelled to have recourse to mandamus, in order to enforce their views on the guardians and compel them to appoint a relieving officer?—I think not; but we have meant it.

Abolition of relief stations.

2518. The next suggestion, I think, that you have to make relates to the abolition, as far as practicable, of pay stations, does it not?—Yes. Pay stations, I should explain, are houses or rooms rather, which are taken at various points by the relieving officer, and at which the recipients of relief attend to receive their relief from the relieving officer. The system is one of very old standing, and the Board have always, until recently, without exception sanctioned any application for an additional relief station, provided that it was not in a public-house or in some unsuitable place of that sort. Before Committees and Commissions, various complaints have been made against the system, as, for instance, that children are sent to the relief stations to receive the parish pay from the relieving officer. Then it is notorious that occasionally one of the paupers will act as a sort of commission agent and collect the pay of other paupers for a small sum. A graver objection to relief stations is that if you have relief stations, you have no certainty that the relieving officer really visits the home of the pauper. If there were no relief stations, you would at all events know that in nearly every case the relieving officer had gone to the house of the pauper to pay his relief. In the Application and Report Book there is a column with the heading, "Date of Last Visit to the Home of the Pauper," but in cases where relief is ordered for a long period—in some instances, unfortunately, for six months—that book does not come before the guardians with respect to that particular pauper, except when the relief is renewed, and there is no certainty that the pauper will have been visited during all that time, for the relieving officer would pay the relief at the relief station and might never have seen the pauper. Therefore, the abolition of relief stations, or their restriction to the smallest possible limit, would be the best check that the relieving officer discharged what is one of his primary duties, namely, that of visiting the pauper. I will give you a graphic illustration in the shape of an experience which happened to me two or three years ago. I went into a workhouse, and there I saw an old man whom I knew. I said to him, "I thought you were gone away, and were getting non-resident relief in a neighbouring union?" "Well," he said, "I did; I went away to live with my son, but, you know, my daughter-in-law—she got the relief from the relieving officer, and I never saw any of it at all. She would sometimes give me a little tobacco, and sometimes a glass of beer. I got sick of it, so here I be." Then the nurse said, "We are very glad to see him; he is a very nice old man, and he is perfectly happy." I thought, "This is a very wicked world, and I had better make some further inquiry." I found out that the union, in the workhouse of which that man was resident, was still continuing to pay the non-resident relief to the next union. Then I thought, "What are they doing in the other union?" I went there, and there I found that the relieving officer was still continuing to pay to the daughter-in-law the 3s. a week with the utmost regularity. You will think that is an instance of very bad administration. Well, both those unions are very fairly administered; the guardians are men of fair business capacity, the clerks are good clerks, but the system is wrong. There are heaps of morals to be drawn from it, among others, that the pay station is an institution which should be abolished as far as you possibly can abolish it. I have made many suggestions in that direction, and not long ago all the relieving officers in Kent asked me to meet them and confer with them about it. That was officially impossible, because I could not confer with the relieving officers except through the guardians who appointed them. What they wanted to say to me was, "If you abolish relief stations, you will increase the work of relieving officers to a very great extent, and they will require extra assistance." I think the importance of ensuring that the relief shall be paid to the pauper himself in his own house is so great that I would not hesitate to recommend any increase of the relieving officer staff which was necessary to that end. I put the suggestion forward as one of the most important ones which I am able to make for improving what I have already termed the business side of the present relief administration.

Effect of relief stations on number of relieving officers employed.

Importance of direct payment to pauper of out-relief.

2519. And you would say that, although an addition to the staff of the relieving officers might run up expenditure, on the other hand it ought to compensate for that by the prevention of fraud, and of cases such as that you have just mentioned?—Yes, it would do that; and not only would it do that, but it would be a great step towards ensuring the proper and just treatment of out-door paupers.

2520. Assuming it was not possible to abolish all pay stations, in your judgment ought the money to be paid to any other person than the pauper himself?—I think not.

Objection to relief stations.

2521. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Are these relief stations universal?—No. They vary very much in different unions, and a return shows that with exactly similar unions there is the greatest diversity of practice. I have managed in the course of the last few years to induce guardians to do away with a good many of them, slightly increasing in some cases the pay of the relieving officer, and I have not heard that anyone was any the worse for it.

Arrangements as relief stations.

2522. Is it always fixed by the board where they are to be?—Yes; the guardians ask for sanction to hire a certain room.

2523. Then the relieving officer never selects them for himself?—The relieving officer would probably report to the board of guardians that he had got a relief station, and ask for their sanction.

2524. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Must there not be some official always in these relief stations?—No. It is arranged that the relieving officer shall visit there at certain fixed times, and that any messages for him would be conveyed to him from that building. In some respects it is a convenience to the pauper.

Duration of orders for relief.

2525. (*Chairman.*) I see that your next point relates to the duration of the orders; you have a strong opinion on that point, I think?—Yes. You will remember that Mr. Pell suggested that no order for relief should be valid for more than thirteen weeks; I would go further and say that a board of guardians should not order relief for a longer period than one month. The ordinary practice is to order relief for thirteen weeks, sometimes up to twenty-six weeks, and then to hold what they call a revision of the out-door relief cases. The revision of the out-door relief cases is very long and very laborious, and is naturally felt by the guardians to be a great bore; further, it does not really do much, as a rule, either to ensure uniformity in the way in which the different cases are treated, or to check improper relief. By far the best way is to give

short orders and let the cases come up by themselves for revision. I have experience of several unions where no relief is given for a longer period than to the next meeting of the guardians, as for instance, Newhaven, where the pauperism is only 1 per cent.

2526. You advocate that the order should be in force for a shorter period, because you think that, by adopting that practice, each case would be decided on its merits as it comes up?—Each case would then be brought before the guardians at every meeting. Guardians might say, "That is a hardship, because we know that woman's circumstances, and they never change, so why should we not order relief for a longer time?" I say the reason why you should not order relief for a longer time is that you should not accept her as a permanent pauper without continual inquiry; her circumstances may vary from week to week; she may be ill, and require a little more relief; or she may have a son come home, and require a little less; she ought not to be removed from your constant supervision for a longer period than, say, a month.

2527. Under the present system there is a periodical revision of the list, is there not?—Yes.

2528. Does that entail any change in policy?—No; it is a revision which the guardians make, as they say, to secure that the relief given in various districts of the union and in various individual cases shall be uniform.

2529. Then you suggest what would practically amount to a more frequent revision?—Yes, that each case should come up for revision by itself once every month. That is ensured by giving short orders.

2530. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Do you mean that all the details, including the visit of the relieving officer to the home should appear in the application and report book from time to time?—Yes.

2531. That is a different thing to revising a list?—Yes, it is quite a different thing.

2532. (*Chairman.*) Your next point is, I think, that relief committee orders should not be issued except under certain conditions, that no guardian should sit for his own district permanently, and that more general rules of relief should be adopted?—The ordinary rule is that all cases of relief shall be heard by the board of guardians; The Local Government Board can, and do on application, issue what are called relief committee orders enabling the guardians to break themselves up into committees for the purpose of hearing applications for relief. The extreme case was the one of Manchester which I quoted this morning. (*See* Answer 2461). Where we give these orders, it seems to me a point worth consideration whether we should not insist on certain conditions. You will notice that if a board of guardians is broken up into committees for relief purposes, there is a danger that the guardians of one part of a union may perpetually sit to deal with the paupers coming from that same part of the union, that is to say, they may put themselves in the position of being administrators of relief to their own clients and their own neighbours. That is a system which I think must ultimately lead to extravagance in the giving of out-door relief. The suggestion is, whether it would not be practicable to insist, either that the committees shall change about from one district to another and deal with the cases from one district to another, or that the relieving officer should bring his books round first to one committee and then to another, which would mean practically the same thing. Then there seem to have been made at various times suggestions, at Poor Law conferences and elsewhere, that another condition of the granting of relief committees to any union should be that that union should administer its relief under those standing orders which we were mentioning this morning, that is to say, that there should be some further guarantee beyond the general orders of the Local Government Board that the relief was given in a uniform way. Whether, if the first condition, namely, that the relief committees should change from one district to another, were carried out, it would be in some degree unnecessary that the second suggestion should be carried out, namely, that the standing orders should also be imposed, is a question.

2533. Assuming that such conditions were to be laid down by the Local Government Board now, would they have any authority to enforce them upon boards of guardians?—I think a board of guardians having got its relief committee on certain conditions would, as a rule, observe those conditions.

2534. Why cannot it appoint its committee under other conditions?—It cannot appoint a relief committee without our consent.

2535. So that you can prescribe the conditions?—We can prescribe the conditions, and conditions have been prescribed in certain cases. I have mentioned the subject, because it is one that is frequently brought up at Poor Law conferences, and has indeed been talked of from quite early times.

2536. I think your next point is that of compulsory case papers?—Yes. The information which a board of guardians now requires under the orders as to out-door paupers is contained in the relief application and report book, which contains a list of the applicants for relief. In some unions they try to make a relieving officer put one case on each page, with the result that they do get something like a consecutive history of the case; but that is an imperfect means of recording the whole circumstances of the case, and the questions in the application and report book do not quite cover the information which some people believe should be recorded before the guardians can decide a case which is brought before them. For a good many years, some boards of guardians have adopted what are known as case papers, which constitute a much fuller record of the circumstances of the pauper than is possible under the relief application and report book. Paddington, I think, is the first one that started that. The system is gradually spreading. I myself think it is a good system for many reasons. You get practically a consecutive history of the case, and you get the information in a form which can be utilised in case the pauper from being an out-door pauper goes into the workhouse. At present, under the application and report book, there are no means of apprising the visiting committee of the workhouse of the facts which are recorded in that book, but under the case paper system the case paper with regard to each pauper would naturally be handed to the visiting committee.

2537. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Might we have some of these papers and application books shown to us?—Certainly. I will hand in some case papers, and I will hand in a sheet from the relief application and report book, so that you can compare them. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. 24 and 31). Another advantage of the case paper system was pointed out to me only the other day. We are living now in what I may call a fissiparous period of Poor Law, and instead of having one institution we have many institutions—workhouses, infirmaries, cottage homes, and all the rest of it; and sometimes a family gets broken up amongst those various institutions. Unless you have a case paper which records when they go and where they are, there is no register of them. It has been put to me as quite a possible thing to happen, and as an actual thing that has happened, that the links are lost, and that there might be considerable trouble in piecing them together again. If you have case papers, properly kept and properly registered, you would have a history of any family that was broken up, and such a thing could not happen.

2538. I suppose the only objection to this is that it would put more work on the relieving officer?—One very great and very well-founded complaint against our system of both in-door and out-door work is the wholly unnecessary amount of book-keeping and writing and cross-writing which it entails. That is a matter which does really need reform. The moment the case paper system is introduced, it is my experience that the clerk, the relieving officer, and everybody else says, "One more book, more clerical work"; and they revolt. As a matter of practice, if the board can dispense with the application and report book and stick to the case papers, I am told by experienced clerks that the clerical labour involved in the case papers is actually less than the clerical labour involved under the present system. But I understand that there are difficulties as to the audit of the accounts; whether those difficulties are insuperable or not, I do not know.

2539. Reverting for a moment to the question of returns which local authorities make, are those returns statutory?—Some are statutory, but a great many are not.

2540. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The returns required under

Advantages of case-paper system.

Drawbacks to Application and Report Book.

Case paper system gives a history of each family.

Excessive book-keeping required of officers.

Difficulties of case papers.

Authority for returns required of guardians.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

orders are are not statutory they ?—At all events they are compulsory on the clerks.

Powers of Local Government Board to reduce book-keeping requirements.

2541 (*Chairman.*) Could the Local Government Board by revising their list dispense with some of these returns—those obtained under statute may not all be absolutely required to be made by the statute itself ?—I was not so much alluding to the book-keeping necessitated by the returns, though that is an important matter, as to the account and other books which have to be kept under the regulations of the Board. They have not been revised for a great number of years. I merely illustrate that as one of the difficulties of getting the case paper system adopted.

2542. Assuming that the case paper system did give additional work, you think the local officers could get compensation by the reduction of the number of returns required in other directions ?—Yes.

Experiments on lines of Elberfeld system.

2543. I think the next point you wish to bring before us is your desire to encourage tentative experiments in the way of the German or Elberfeld system ?—I think it is of very great importance that when a board of guardians conscientiously wants a free hand in trying experiments of that sort, the Local Government Board should help them. I instance the Elberfeld system, because it is a matter of common knowledge that it is being tried in the Bradford union as an adjunct to the Poor Law administration. I am not discouraged by the fact that it has been tried in several other unions, and has come to an end. I think anything which will enliven the interests of the local administrators in Poor Law questions, and in principles of Poor Law generally, should be encouraged.

2544. What prevents them now adopting experiments of that kind ?—They do adopt them, and they can adopt them, if they see fit. I only wish to emphasise the fact that I think the Local Government Board should give them every encouragement to adopt them.

2545. Have they to get the approval of the Local Government Board first ?—In certain cases they have to do so; those are cases which involve varying the duties of their officers. In this particular case, probably they would not have to do so.

Objections to non-resident relief.

2546. Then I think you have a strong opinion about non-resident relief ?—I think non-resident relief should be put an end to. I believe it is bad business and often leads to abuses. I notice that many boards of guardians do not give it and do not receive it. I know that you have plausible cases where a woman says, "I want to leave the union and live elsewhere with my daughter." That may be all right, but I hardly think that it is the business of the ratepayers to maintain a system which is so open to abuse in order to meet exceptional cases of hardship of that description. Personally, I should be glad to see non-resident relief abolished. It can only be given in certain cases which are laid down in the regulations and I should like to see the regulations altered so as to prohibit it in nearly every case. You will notice that the case which I quoted just now (*See* Question 2518) was a case of non-resident relief, and it is rather typical, I think, of some of the mischiefs which may come from it.

Number of persons receiving non-resident relief.

2547. Have you any idea as to the number of persons who are in receipt of non-resident relief ?—I have not at the moment, but I will try to find out.

2548. Notwithstanding certain individual convenience which might result, you think that a system which so lends itself to fraud ought to be abolished ?—I do.

Removal of paupers over 60.

2549. Now I think you wish to speak about district removals ?—Yes. That brings me to the very wide question of settlement and removal, and I do not know whether that is a matter that the Commission will look into. I express no opinion as to it, but while conceivably it may be necessary to keep up what yet remains of the old law of settlement and removal, I think that in the case of people over sixty, it is a great hardship that they should be removed against their will, and I unhesitatingly recommend that no removals of persons over the age of sixty or sixty-five should be allowed. If that were done, we should, to a great extent, automatically put an end to non-resident relief.

No appeal by pauper against removal.

2550. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there no power of appeal to the Local Government Board by the pauper against an order of removal ?—No. The power of the Local Government Board with regard to appeals is this—that if the two unions that are in conflict as to the settlement of a pauper put in a case the Local Government Board can decide that case. If the power of removal is to remain, I think that that procedure should be made compulsory. I cannot see that any advantage to the public service can arise from the fighting out by two unions and two union clerks of some abstruse and difficult case of settlement right up to the House of Lords, and the expenditure of very large sums of money on it, when they could send the case over to the Local Government Board and get it decided for nothing. I will give you a good instance of the absurdity of the whole procedure. There was a fight as to the chargeability of a child between two unions, one a London union and one a country union. The country union won, and the child was removed to the London union. An uncle of the child then asked it to come and stay in the country union; the child stayed there a year, and then became chargeable to the country union after all. That was the sole result of a very expensive and troublesome litigation. That did not happen in the bad old days of removal of which we hear so much; that happened the year before last.

Decision of settlement by Local Government Board.

2551. (*The O'Conor Don.*) I suppose you are aware that the hardship of removal is very much felt in Ireland, where we have no law of settlement, because paupers are sent over to the Irish unions from the English, although they have spent all their lives in England ?—I know that; not only are they sent to parishes in Ireland, but they are sent to unions in Ireland.

Removal of paupers to Ireland.

2552. Are not the law costs in connection with these removals sometimes very considerable ?—I believe it is fortunately the case that removals are very much rarer than they used to be, but I know at times the costs are pretty heavy.

Cost of removals.

2553. As I understand, you would be for checking these removals as much as possible, and limiting the age to sixty-five at all events ?—I certainly would not compulsorily remove any old person. That would be on the ground of humanity. I am not proposing to go into the broad question of the necessity for keeping up the law of removal generally.

Removal of paupers over sixty.

2554. You have given us a good deal of evidence about out-door relief, but I do not think you have yet stated to the Commission whether that out-door relief is generally given in the form of money or in kind; have you anything to say on that point ?—The only restriction with regard to that point in the orders of the board is that in cases where relief is given to able-bodied people half at least shall be in kind; otherwise the matter is one for the discretion of the guardians, who usually in practice give the relief in money; and that practice is an increasing practice.

Out-relief given half in kind.

2555. When the relief is given in kind, how is it given ? Does the relieving officer give the provisions himself, or does he give an order to the pauper to get the provisions ?—There are several ways of giving it. The relieving officer is responsible for the giving of it in every case. Sometimes he gives it himself, but rarely—that would be in special cases; sometimes he gives it by orders on the tradesmen; and sometimes the guardians make a contract with a tradesman to supply the out-door paupers; but the relieving officer is still responsible for the weight and quality of the articles supplied. I mention that because it is a point which the Commission may hear of later on. I remember one case in particular where the relief in bread had been habitually given to the recipient short weight. That became known by an accident and—apart from any penal consequences to the contractor—the relieving officer was held responsible, because it was his business to see that the weight was proper. He was the person whom we blamed, because if relief is given he is responsible for the giving of it.

Procedure for giving out-relief in kind.

2556. In that case you say there was a contractor for the supply of the bread ?—Yes; he had a contract with the guardians for supplying the bread for the relief.

2557. Is that a usual system ?—That is a common system in large unions.

Out-relief given in k from guar dians' sto

2558. Could you tell us what is the general difference between giving the relief in the manner you have mentioned, that is directly or under contract, and giving

it by an order to a tradesman ?—The giving of an order to a tradesman is obviously open to abuse; and the giving of an order to a contractor is not altogether free from abuse, as in the case which I have mentioned to you. In a large union, the only way to my mind, or the best way to my mind, in which out-door relief can be given, is for the guardians to have a store of their own.

2559. Is that practice of having a store much followed ?—Yes, it is in some large unions.

2560. Is it followed in London ?—I do not know about London, but it certainly is so in Manchester and some other unions. The guardians have a store, and the applicant for relief gets an order for relief which she takes to the store of the guardians; the storekeeper says, "In what form will you have it ?" and the woman says, "I will have a shilling's worth of bread, sixpennyworth of candles, so much sugar," and so on up to amount of the order. In that way, the pauper gets the relief at practically cost price.

ture and ount of ef in kind.

2561. Is the relief never given only in kind or only in money ?—It is very seldom given wholly in kind. Occasionally guardians have to give out-door relief to a woman and her children, and she or the husband is a drunkard. In cases like that it is given wholly in kind.

2562. Is it usual to give it half and half ?—It is usually given in England entirely in money, but in exceptional cases, as I have explained, it is occasionally given altogether in kind. In the case of the able-bodied men, it must be given half in money and half in kind, or not less than half in kind,

2563. Is there anything else you wish to say on that point ?—No.

2564. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Is flour given now at all ?—Flour is still given in some remote places, because the old women say they like it to make soft puddings instead of bread. There was a complaint at one time that flour was given, and that the out-door paupers had not the means of baking the flour now that the cottage oven is pretty well an extinct institution.

2565. (*Mr. Bentham.*) There are districts where it is not extinct ?—There are districts where flour is given, and I have satisfied myself that they are districts where flour is properly given.

2566. Where it is a common practice for people to bake their own bread at home ?—Yes; and occasionally where the woman has the means of making soft puddings, and wants to do so, either because she cannot bite bread, or because she has a lot of children.

2567. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Where relief in kind is given at a store belonging to the guardians, does the pauper in receipt of it call for it himself or herself ?—He should do so, but he occasionally gets a neighbour to go for it.

2568. The relieving officer does not issue it directly to the paupers ?—That is not the practice, so far as I am aware.

orkhouse tary: ews of or Law mmis- ners 1836.

2569. (*Dr. Downes.*) Perhaps, going back to your previous references to workhouse dietaries, you could tell us how the Commissioners proceeded in 1836 ?—What troubled the early Commissioners mainly was the fact that in the existing parish workhouses the dietary was extremely good, that is to say, people were more or less tempted, by means of the food, to stay in the workhouse and behave themselves. I have here a very characteristic comment by Sir Francis Head: "In Kent stall fed charity, in order to bait the workhouse trap, arranged, printed, and published a bribe which we consider one of the most astonishing documents in the pig-stye history of our poor laws. Contractors were to furnish, *inter alia*, warm, clean, sweet comfortable beds; servants to cook and serve the victuals and attend on the poor; good sweet wholesome fat meat, good sound small beer, best flour, good Gloucester cheese, good and clean butter.' Lastly, the contractors were to provide wigs for such as wear them or require them." The wigs have nothing to do with the diet, but that is the end of the quotation. The first thing which the Commissioners had in their mind was that the diet should be worse than that of the poorest agricultural labourer, and they set out a number of dietaries in a circular letter saying, that in making this selection especial reference must be had to the usual mode of living of the independent labourers of the district in which the unions are situate, and on no account must the dietary of the workhouse be superior or equal to the ordinary mode of subsistence of the labouring classes. That is what was mostly in their minds when they sent out these dietaries, which are very simple.

2570. There are six of them I think selected from samples which had been in use in different parts of the country for a number of years ?—Yes. I believe we have in this volume old workhouse dietaries dating back to the year 1768.

Early samples of dietaries.

2571. To those set specimens of dietaries, I think there is a foot-note which perhaps you would give us ?—These dietaries are very important from this point of view, that they are the first indication of the workhouse classification. In the dietaries for able-bodied men and women there is this footnote which has had a very wide-reaching effect on the whole in-door administration of our poor law: "Old people of sixty years and upwards may be allowed something extra." That fixes the age of sixty as the statutory time for the cessation of the able-bodied period of a man's life. Nowadays the term "able-bodied" means two or three things, and one is a man who is under sixty.

Early discrimination in favour of aged.

Origin of existing age-limit in classification of able-bodied.

2572. Did that not lead to stereotyping the division between the able-bodied and the not able-bodied ?—That is so.

2573. I think the practice was for a board of guardians at that time to select one of those six dietaries, and the Commissioners then issued an order giving it effect ?—Yes.

2574. I believe that went on until what is known as the Andover Inquiry, did it not ?—Yes, until about 1847.

2575. You are acquainted with that Inquiry, are you not ?—Yes, perfectly well. The famous Andover Inquiry was one of the real reasons why the Poor Law Commissioners were turned out and the Poor Law Board constituted in their stead. That arose from a scandal in the Andover workhouse, and one of the details of this scandal was that a certain number of the paupers had got at the pig tubs and gnawed the bones. There was a great fuss about it, and there was an inquiry which resulted in the transfer of the local government of the country from the old Commission to the new Board. That, by the way, is the reason why still to this day in the General Consolidated Order you have the proviso that no pauper must be employed in breaking up bones. However, what is more important was that the *onus* of the charge against the Commissioners with regard to the dietary was that they had not informed the Andover guardians that they had sanctioned better dietaries than the one which they had sanctioned for Andover. It appeared to be in the mind of the committee that investigated the case that the Commissioners should have told the Andover guardians that it was still open to them to make a choice of a better dietary.

Andover scandal

Origin of Poor Law Board.

2576. The Andover guardians had chosen the one marked No. 3, I believe ?—That is so. A more wicked accusation never was made than was made against the Commissioners then.

2577. I believe the Commissioners had rather improved No. 3 in other unions, but had not informed the Andover guardians that they had improved it ?—Yes.

2578. The Select Committee in the House of Commons consequently held, rightly or wrongly, the Commissioners responsible, on the ground that this action of theirs admitted that the first No. 3 was an insufficient dietary ?—Yes—obviously very wrongly held.

2579. I believe there was evidence also that the dietary had been further diminished by the dishonesty of the master ?—That is a detail.

2580. That led, I think, to important changes with regard to the Commission ?—Yes, and what more immediately concerns us is this, that the new Poor Law Board came in with their minds very full of pauper dietaries.

Dietary policy of Poor Law Board.

2581. I think Mr. Buller was the President of the new Poor Law Commission and Lord Ebrington was the Secretary ?—Yes.

2582. Do you know what was the first action of the new Poor Law Commission ?—They got Dr. Lyon Playfair, as he then was, to report on the nutritive values of various sorts of foods.

Dr. Playfair's report on nutritive values of different foods.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

30 Jan. 1906.

2583. I think Lord Ebrington found a difficulty in obtaining evidence as to what could be regarded as a standard of diet?—Yes

2584. And also as to the composition of the different kinds of foods that were given?—Yes. That was the first instance probably where there was any attention paid to dietary from a scientific point of view.

Analyses of nutritive value of dietaries.

2585. I think the records you have there include the analyses of some 529 known dietaries?—It may be so; there are a great many here.

2586. And I believe those show extraordinary divergencies at that date, in spite of the action of the Commissioners in endeavouring to get set dietaries adopted?—Yes. The ingenuity of the guardians in getting a dietary different from their neighbours was quite remarkable.

2587. Did the new Commission at that time take any action on those analyses?—I do not think so.

2588. I believe Mr. Buller died soon after, did he not?—Yes, and the interest in the matter was lost. I suppose the Andover case was beginning to be forgotten.

Procedure for adoption of workhouse dietaries by guardians.

2589. Then I think they adopted the practice of requiring the guardians to frame their own dietary, and to send it up to the central authority for approval with a certificate from the medical officer?—Yes, the certificate from the medical officer was to be to the effect that the dietary was sufficient.

2590. That appears on a dietary of 1851, I believe?—Yes, for the first time.

2591. And that in fact was the practice which went on down till quite recently?—That was the practice which went on till the whole dietary question came to the front some few years ago.

Model dietaries by Dr. Markham and Dr. Edward Smith.

2592. I believe there have been various attempts at obtaining uniformity, such as those made by Dr. Markham and Dr. Edward Smith, who framed model dietaries?—Yes.

Dr. Downes' suggestions as to dietary in 1893.

2593. Coming down to a later time, some reference has been made to a model dietary which was described as having been drawn up by myself; I think that possibly what Mrs. Webb had in mind were some suggestions which were drawn up in 1893?—Yes. I have a print of them here.

2594. They were merely suggestions, and there is no model dietary given in that Paper, I think?—That is so. I should like to say that of all the troublesome, wearisome work which ever fell to the lot of the Local Government Board, I thould think the revision of those workhouse dietaries was the worst. They were full of the most extraordinary details, put in in the most incomprehensible fashion, and the attempt to secure uniformity was quite hopeless. We used to send them back time after time to the guardians, and the guardians replied they were advised by their medical officer that the right thing to do was to have roast mutton instead of something else, and so on.

2595. And it led to interminable and trivial correspondence?—To absolutely futile correspondence.

2596. I think in the early nineties the Local Government Board took up the work where it was practically left by Lord Playfair?—Yes.

2597. And they caused a number of dietaries from different parts of the country to be carefully examined?—Yes. I have here the results of one of those examinations made in the year 1891, which is signed by me and by you.

Diversity of dietaries in 1891.

2598. I believe those examinations revealed a continuance, and perhaps even an increase, of the extraordinary diversity in different unions in regard to dietaries?—Yes.

2599. In fact there were no two dietaries which were strictly alike; they differed in rations, or they differed in the quantities of food given, or in the mode of preparation of the food?—Yes.

Waste of bread under ration system.

2600. Then I think complaints were made to the board on the various points which are referred to in that paper?—Yes. Then we got to what was quite an agitation. The agitation was on the great question of the waste of bread. We received complaints from all over the country that people had a fixed quantity of bread given to them, but appetites varied, and there were no means of giving A's bread to B in order to supply B's deficiency out of A's superfluity, the consequence being that the pig-tub was full of the workhouse bread, and the workhouses were models of mal-administraton. The fuss that was made about the waste of bread led to an agitation which was quite formidable. Then we took another step.

Departmental Committee on Workhouse Dietaries.

2601. I think that was, that a committee was appointed to consider the question?—Yes, that was Mr. T. W. Russell's Committee.

2602. I believe the committee made various recommendations?—Yes. Roughly speaking, that committee to a great extent met the complaints by yielding to them; that is to say, they reported that bread should be granted according to appetite instead of according to allowance; and there was a difference of dietary made so far as the children were concerned.

2603. The medical inspectors, I think, were instructed to frame dietaries that would be applicable to different boards of guardians?—Yes.

Dietaries Order, 1900.

2604. The outcome of the report which they made was, I believe, the dietaries order of 1900, which is now in force?—Yes.

2605. I think you have described that order as one of simplification?—I have described it as one of simplification and decentralisation.

2606. I think it was found that the variations in the existing dietaries were almost innumerable; the permutations of the varieties were so great?—Yes.

Ingredient tables.

2607. The first point of simplification was the adoption of a uniform ingredient table?—Yes. That was a sort of fixed cookery book, telling you how to make everything from dumplings to meat puddings.

2608. I think the accounts committee, over which you presided some time back, found that that lent itself to the simplification of meal accounts?—Yes; it is invaluable in the way of workhouse accounts.

Dietetically equivalent rations.

2609. The next point of simplification was the reduction of the rations to certain definite fixed rations, I believe?—Yes, the ration of each food was a known and fixed quantity.

2610. These rations being more or less equivalent?—Yes, if you mean equivalent dietetically.

2611. One great trouble with the old dietaries being that they varied enormously in point of nutriment?—Yes.

Discretion of guardians in selection of dietaries.

2612. Then, I think, the order leaves it free to the guardians to select their dietary from these rations?—Yes.

2613. And the rations themselves are representative of the rations that were previously in existence in different parts of the Kingdom?—Yes; so that sometimes a board of guardians could, without making any alteration in the amount of food given, reduce their old dietary to the terms of the new dietary.

Rations according to appetite.

2614. It was provided by the order that bread could be served according to appetite?—Yes.

2615. That the service of food to the children was to be to appetite?—Yes.

2616. And that, subject to the directions of the medical officer, the service of food to the sick should be to appetite?—Yes.

Revision of diets by medical officer.

2617. I think there were further provisions for the revision of diets by the medical officer, and for his examination of inmates on admission as to their fitness for employment?—Yes.

Restrictions on alcohol.

2618. There were also restrictions on the allowance of alcohol?—Yes.

Medical officer's control over sick diet.

2619. A further point that was introduced into that Order was, that the dietary of the sick was still to be prescribed by the doctor, but on a set form?—That was so.

2620. Was the effect of that to give a different diet to each day?—Yes.

Monotony of former dietaries.

2621. I think previously medical officers had simply directed in a great many cases that there should be one diet, to consist of so much meat, so much vegetables, and so much bread, and that had resulted in the same diet being given day after day?—Yes.

2622. But a form appended to the Order led to a variation from day to day?—Yes.

2623. Have you anything to say as regards the cost of the dietary?—The new dietary order was evidently a great administrative advantage. It has been alleged against it that it has led to an increase of cost. I do not think it did anything of the kind; however, that is a matter of opinion, and I do not know that the question of the cost has really ever been investigated. If it did lead to an increase of cost, I should think it is quite clear that it was because the guardians chose, under the freedom which was given to them by the Order, to increase the dietaries themselves.

2624. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you mean by that statement to select the most expensive diet?—Yes. Many of the boards of guardians had a quite inadequate diet, and instead of choosing some diet rather like their own, they chose the most expensive on the whole list; and they were the first to grumble.

2625. The set dietaries themselves varied in value, so that it was possible for boards to increase the cost of their dietary by selecting the most expensive dietary?—Yes, within certain limits they could increase the cost in that way.

2626. In those cases where they selected the most expensive dietary the cost was increased?—That would be so, I suspect, in some unions. There were some unions where they had four bread and cheese dinners a week; that was not possible under the new dietary, and in those cases therefore the cost was clearly increased and ought to have been increased.

2627. (*Dr. Downes.*) There has been a great difference in the care and the mode of issuing the bread, I believe?—On the question of bread, I should think there has been an actual saving. That is one point from the Poor Law point of view. Another point is whether we have not rather lost sight of the point of view of the old Commissioners too much, and whether this new dietary is not too attractive for the pauper and is not in excess of what is enjoyed by the labouring classes outside. It probably is rather in excess of what the labouring classes get outside. But I do not think that this is attractive to them. You see on these dietaries there are no things like red herrings and such-like luxuries which the people outside do get and which they wish to get, because if you give them any money to spend that is what they spend it on.

2628. I believe it is open to guardians to choose a very plain dietary indeed for the paupers?—Yes. Upon this question of diet I should like to say that I have lately been doing a course of prisons, and what has struck me most with regard to the feeding question is that what people of our class would appreciate most is well cooked food, and that in prisons, the cooking of the simplest fare is excellent. The prison diet is quite nice and quite attractive; but the same fare badly cooked would be rather horrible. Yet no one would suggest as a means of test or of deterrent that the food should be badly cooked. Naturally as workhouses become larger and better managed the food must be nicer because it is better cooked. As to the cost, I find that the cost in St. Pancras for the year ended Lady-day, 1905, was 2s. 2⅞d. per head a week.

Cost of food in St. Pancras Workhouse.

2629. In the report of the inspectors on which this Order was based there is a suggestion that the Order should be divided into two parts, one part consisting of schedules of rations and ingredient tables, the object of that as suggested in the reports being that it would lend itself to revision?—Yes.

2630. I believe that all these public dietaries must have regard to the recognised scientific standard of the time?—Yes.

2631. If they are to be defended in Parliament or to the public they must be based upon the accepted scientific views?—Evidently so.

2632. I believe that you have recently had evidence in another capacity of some observations that have been made in regard to dietary standards?—Yes.

Possible future revision of dietaries.

2633. Which may possibly lead at no distant date to altered views on the part of dietetic experts?—What appears to me as a purely unscientific individual is that recent medical investigations have shown that it is possible to live on quite a different scale both in quantity and quality of diet from what was held to be necessary some time ago. I think myself that there is a germ of a considerable alteration in the discipline of institutions in that fact. I do not know whether I shall be supported by men of science, but from the evidence given before the Vagrancy Committee it seems quite possible that by-and-bye, when more is known about these things, we shall get into the position that the State will be able to say to the inmates of an institution, "This amount of food is quite as much as is good for you and is probably better for you as freeing you from diseases, as for instance, gout, than the food that you would choose for yourself, and therefore that is what we will give you, and if you want to have anything more you must work for it or you must behave yourself for it, and thus you may get a certain amount of extra money which you can spend in luxuries that are to be had at the canteen." That is a question which does not immediately come before you in dealing with pauperism, which is mostly old age pauperism, but still by-and-bye you will get the question of test-houses, of labour colonies, and so on, brought before you either directly or indirectly, and I thought therefore that I might say that much on the subject, so as to draw your attention to that part of the Report of the Vagrancy Committee which deals somewhat in detail with the point.

Diet as method of discipline.

2634. You would say, therefore, that the question of dietary standards is rather in a state of transition at the present time?—I think there can be no doubt that we shall have to reconsider the whole question of dietaries.

NINTH DAY.

Monday, 5th February, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*)

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

Irreducible minimum of pauperism.

2635. (*Mr. Booth.*) You have told us that you think there is a minimum amount of pauperism which is practically unavoidable, which at one time you said you put down at 1 per cent., but which you now think too high. Do you mean that we are to take that figure as an average or do you mean it to represent the minimum everywhere, in all unions and under all conditions?—Naturally the minimum would vary in different parts of England and in different unions. The state of public health, the death rate and other conditions would all affect it more or less. The 1 per cent. was merely a rough statement, which I got at by the examination of the circumstances of one particular Lancashire union.

2636. It is rather a national question as you put it, is it not?—Yes, it is.

Classification of paupers.

2637. With regard to the classification that comes a little later on, what you said rather resulted in minimising the difficulty; you thought that the difficulties of classification were largely imaginary on the part of others than referable to the feelings of the actual people who are to be classified?—Generally I agree with that, but without putting it quite so high as to use the word "imaginary."

2638. With regard to the younger women and the older women, I think you are ready to admit that there is some need for classification?—They should be classified.

2639. As a moral question?—Yes, and as a question of convenience also. The women who do one sort of work should be separated from the women who do another sort of work or have another sort of occupation.

Brabazon scheme.

2640. With regard to the Brabazon scheme, does it work equally successfully in urban unions as in rural unions?—I do not think the nature of the union makes any difference, but the nature of the Brabazon Committee makes a good deal of difference—I mean to say, one committee may be much more sensible than another committee.

2641. Is there the greater need for that form of interesting occupation for the workhouse inmate in the town, or for the workhouse inmate in the country?—For the inmate in the town, undoubtedly.

2642. And would you say to some extent a greater difficulty in applying the system in the towns?—I should not say exactly that: probably it is so, for there would be greater numbers to deal with.

2643. It has spread in a wonderful way, has it not?—It is spreading quite as fast as I should wish to see it spread. It is not a matter which one can press on a board of guardians, because the condition of success is that the committee should be ladies of sound common-sense, and you are not always able to put your hand on such people who are willing to undertake the duty.

2644. Are the things that they make, things which can be called useful things, or are they more of the nature of ornamental trifles?—Some of them fulfil both functions; for instance, a favourite article which is made is a very bright coloured mat.

Disposal of articles made under Brabazon scheme.

2645. The object of my question was this: Can a utility be found for the things that they produce, either in the workhouses themselves or in some public institution, so that the question of the sale and therefore of competition with other forms of labour would be avoided; or are they things from which you can only get a return by selling them as things are sold at a bazaar to the rich?—I never was at a fancy bazaar myself, but I should think they would hold a sort of fancy bazaar and sell those things.

2646. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Or a sale of work, which is a different thing?—Yes, it would be.

2647. (*Mr. Booth.*) It is, of course, important to avoid not only the actual fact of competition, but any appearance of competition with unpauperised labour?—The articles that are sold under the Brabazon scheme are not sufficiently large in value or in bulk to attract any attention whatever.

2648. Then they need not be considered from that point of view?—They need not.

Test-house for able-bodied.

2649. With regard to test-houses for the able-bodied, a test-house must not be a small local institution, but needs rather a large area to work satisfactorily, does it not?—It is better to have rather a large area.

Technique of stone-breaking.

2650. With regard to your evidence as to the skilled character of stone-breaking, I do not doubt that the fact is as you state it; but it might surprise people to be told that stone-breaking was a skilled matter. Have you studied the subject, and have you seen the men doing it, and do you know that the men who are used to it can do a great deal more, owing to the skill that they have acquired, than others who are not used to it can do?—It most emphatically is a very skilled occupation indeed. An expert stone-breaker knows exactly where to hit the stone, and the beginner or the bungler, however strong he may be, cannot compete with him. The difference between the two is immense.

2651. Then in a certain sense the loafer is a skilled man, because he is a man who has been constantly at it?—He has served his apprenticeship in jails and in workhouses all the time, and he knows how to split the stone. Oakum-picking, also, is a skilled occupation.

2652. Therefore a man who had never been put to such a test before would be at a great disadvantage?—He would. I knew a man who not only could break stones that nobody else could break, but could break his hammer whenever he wanted to do so.

Incidence of out-relief.

2653. With regard to the circumstances of those unions which practically refuse all out-door relief, that result (of which I knew before, but which you have pointed

out so clearly) has not involved an increase of inmates in the workhouse, at any rate, except very temporarily, if that. Do you consider that that proves that the class of people who can be relieved outside are quite distinct from those who are relieved inside; in fact, is out-relief a method of dealing with an entirely different class of poor person?—So it would appear.

ike-relief.

2654. With regard to the question of poverty or distress resulting from strikes and lock-outs, the kind of relief which is a danger under those circumstances is out-relief only, is it not?—Yes.

2655. If you were to offer the test of the workhouse they would not accept that at all, would they?—I should think they would never do so.

2656. So that the difficulty in those cases could be absolutely met by refusing out-door relief?—Some of the dependants might have to come into the workhouse, but the men themselves I should think would practically never do so.

tension of ing area indoor ef.

2657. With regard to the extension of the area of chargeability for indoor relief which you have treated in regard to London, does the same argument apply to other parts of the country, namely, that it would be desirable or might be desirable to extend the area of chargeability?—I did not, I think, express any opinion as to the advisability of extending the area; I brought it before the Commission rather as a historical fact for their consideration.

2658. I put it in this way: Do the same considerations, whatever their value, apply to other urban districts as well as to London?—I should think so.

asons for ing hibitory er or ulation er.

2659. (*Mrs. Webb.*) You have mentioned that the regulation order is issued to Lancashire, and that the prohibitory order is issued to the rural districts and certain towns; what determines the policy in that respect?—The policy was determined a good many years ago. So far as I remember, Lancashire had not sufficient workhouse accommodation in the opinion of the Commissioners to deal with the possible developments of the Poor Law; and therefore the regulation order was issued to them, and not the prohibitory order. Another reason was that, in some parts of Lancashire, the introduction of the new Poor Law was opposed with great vehemence, and the Commissioners had to temporise. In one union, Todmorden, a workhouse was not built at all until somewhere in the seventies.

2660. As regards a place like Coventry, for instance, what would determine you to issue a regulation order rather than a prohibitory order?—The question does not come up now, because the order is so very seldom altered.

2661. Do you never alter it?—I cannot recall a case myself, but there may have been cases.

2662. I notice you say that in spite of the fact that Lancashire has the regulation order—which I gather you do not think as good as the prohibitory order, on general principles—it has a low rate of pauperism?—The rate of pauperism in Lancashire is very low.

se of low perism in cashire.

2663. Do you attribute that to the character of the occupations of the people, or what do you attribute that result to?—I attribute it in a great measure to the fact that the Lancashire man is notoriously a hard-headed administrator. A great many of the guardians are accustomed to be at works, they know what a big business is, and so they would be apt to manage their affairs in a more business-like way than some other folk. That is one reason. Another reason is the one on which I dwelt at considerable length the last time I gave evidence, namely, that in the urban unions the tendency is to be rather stricter than in the rural unions, for many reasons, one of which is that the cost of lodging in a town is so much higher than the cost of lodging in the country; and consequently, if out-door relief were given, the absolute minimum of out-door relief must be much higher in such districts as Lancashire.

2664. You cannot have any special comparison in that respect as between Lancashire and other urban districts, so that there must be something peculiar to Lancashire?—You will find that the same holds good with Yorkshire. Some Yorkshire unions have a very low pauperism also.

2665. Burnley, I believe, gives a large out-door relief, does it not?—It used to do so. I may say this, which is perhaps what you want to get at—naturally where you have a highly organised work, as you have in the textile trades, people are more apt to provide for themselves; they are more educated, they are accustomed to combination, they have their trade unions, they have their benefit societies, they even have their large contributions, paid throughout the year, for their Going-Away Fund in the Whitsuntide holidays; and they are accustomed to think of rather more than to-day.

2666. Would you attribute that at all to the greater regulation of the hours in Lancashire?—That has never occurred to me as being a possible reason.

2667. If we wanted to test the causes why pauperism in Lancashire was low, it would be necessary, would it not, to investigate what are the circumstances of the pauper's life, or rather the life of the possible, potential pauper?—Yes.

Importance of ascertaining effect of out-relief on wages.

2668. I gather that you think that it is of enormous importance that we should investigate the effect of out-door relief on the rate of wages?—Yes.

2669. How would you suggest that should be done; would you suggest that we should follow up the life history of the paupers?—I think the investigation would have to be local, and in selected unions.

2670. We should have to take a certain number of cases, I assume, and see what the actual effect was?—Yes.

Separate classification of persons receiving medical relief.

2671. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In the answer to Question 2341 you point out the movement in the direction of the separation of workhouse hospitals or infirmaries from the workhouse itself, and I almost understand from what you say that you do not approve of this to the extent that it has been adopted at the present time; am I right in thinking so?—I did not mean to convey any such impression. If you ask me my opinion of it, as I suppose you will do, I say that I think the evidence goes to show that in some districts separation is almost inevitable.

2672. But provided it is not inevitable, do you think it an advisable thing to do so, as far as possible, or do you not agree with the separation of the two classes of pauper inmates for the sake of separation?—If there is no administrative advantage to be gained by it, I think it should be postponed as long as possible.

2673. Then the advantages, so far as you look upon it, should be administrative advantages?—Yes. The source of relief which a man is receiving should never be concealed; if it is relief obtained by the compulsory contributions of his neighbours that should be recognised.

2674. Whatever class of relief it might be?—Yes.

Increase in able-bodied paupers.

2675. I think you attribute the large increase in the number of able-bodied who are returned as inmates of workhouses to the fact that temporarily sick cases (all of which are classed as able-bodied) are being treated now more frequently than formerly?—To a great extent, I think the increase is due to that cause.

2676. That points to a new form of classification does it not?—The classification has always been the same. It points to a greater use of the workhouse infirmaries by the sick.

Need for revision of statistics as to able-bodied.

2677. It also points, does it not, to the need of a better classification, so that it could be seen by statistics what is the number of people who avail themselves purely of hospital treatment, and what is the number who are able-bodied and do not require any hospital treatment at all?—I certainly think that the whole of the statistics with regard to what are called the able-bodied need careful reconsideration.

"Destitution" and medical relief.

2678. It has been said previously, I think by you, that a great difficulty presents itself with regard to the class of sick persons, because there is not the same evidence of destitution in their case as there is in ordinary cases. How can it be said that any sum whatever, spent upon bringing back a sick person to a state of health, or, that any sum spent upon the chronic infirm in any way, makes them equal to the condition of the poorest independent labourer? They are destitute of the means of independence, and I think that Sir Francis Head's remark can only apply to those hangers-on, as he terms them, who are, on the average, physically and mentally equal to the independent labourer,

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

and I do not think that really it could apply to the sick; do you?—I suppose the fact would be that, so far as material comforts are concerned, the sick in workhouse infirmaries are in a far better position than the corresponding class outside; but then the sick person in a workhouse infirmary has a disability of his own, namely, his sickness. No man would voluntarily become sick in order to get the extra comforts of a workhouse.

2679. Does not that, therefore, put him outside the phrase that the hanger-on should not be as well cared for as those on whom he hangs?—I do not think the term "well cared for" occurred; he must be better cared for.

2680. That is my meaning; he must be outside that designation altogether?—Yes. The maxim loses its force when you have a man who, from his circumstances, is in a worse position with regard to health, say, than the independent person.

2681. The sick, in their relation to the independent labourer outside, should be looked upon as in a different category altogether to the ordinary able-bodied person?—Undoubtedly so.

2682. Then I do not see that any difficulty presents itself in arriving at what is destitution in a sick case. Suppose a person has not sufficient money in the household to provide for his cure, then, whatever may happen to him, although he may have sufficient to live upon in the ordinary way, he is destitute in the eye of the law?—Yes; but there will be some difficulty in finding out that fact, because a person might very often conceal his means in order to get inside a workhouse infirmary.

2683. Providing his means were known, and say a special operation were required, or he was suffering from phthisis and required treatment in a sanatorium, although in the ordinary sense the man is not destitute, yet he cannot pay for his cure in a private sanatorium or for the special operation; therefore, from that point of view, he is destitute in the eye of the law, is he not?—You are putting to me an exception to the maxim which I quoted from Sir Francis Head as applied to an individual. If you take it as applying to a class the difficulty that I, at all events, am face to face with is this, that it may be necessary to take a sick person into a workhouse infirmary, but simply because of his sickness and in order to cure him. That, however, is not the ideally best way of doing it. Those cases should be treated by charitable hospitals. But then all poor law history shows this, that if the rates interfere charity is killed absolutely dead; a man will not pay heavy rates for an infirmary, and at the same time subscribe to a hospital. So that you see the poor law maxim is transferred rather from the individual to the community.

Effect of Poor Law hospitals on the provision of voluntary hospitals.

2684. In your experience, is it usually to be relied upon that charity will step in if the poor law refuses to take up the treatment of a special class of cases?—No. What appears to me to be coming about is this, that the great growth of population in the urban centres necessitates a further provision of hospitals and such like institutions, but charity has not provided those institutions. The old charitable institutions are insufficient, and then, perhaps of necessity, the poor rates step in and build what, to all intents and purposes, are rate hospitals. Those rate hospitals having once been built and continuing to be built, I do not think you will get the same charity that you did in the old days. I do not think, for instance, that there will be any more Bartholomew's Hospitals or Guy's Hospitals or St. Thomas's Hospitals for London. I regret the change. Whether it is an inevitable change or not, or what conditions should be imposed on the undertaking by the rates of this duty, is one of the most important questions which I think the Commission will have to deal with; and it is one of extraordinary difficulty and complexity, according to my view.

2685. Do you mean that the greater the extension of hospital accommodation under the poor law and its more efficient administration, the less there will be done by voluntary organisations for sick persons?—That is my fear—and not only that there will be less done by voluntary organisations, but by co-operation among the people themselves.

2686. Do you think that that is already being felt now?—I cannot say.

Classification of workhouse inmates.

2687. In your answer to Question 2343 you dealt with classification, and at the close you say, "I think that the whole classification question has been made too much of." There you are speaking of the classification of the various inmates of a workhouse. You say also, "In my experience classification in that sense according to character or conduct has been more or less dropped"; is not classification being more and more adopted according to character and conduct now than formerly?—Perhaps it is being adopted more now than formerly. I am talking now of classification inside the workhouse. My evidence went to show—and that is a point which you might well put to my colleagues—that I have received very few complaints from inmates to the effect that they are not classified. I think you will find that a great many unions which adopted classification schemes have more or less dropped them.

Method of allocating lunacy grant.

2688. On the question of the treatment of lunatics, county councils now pay to the guardians 4s. per week for each pauper lunatic chargeable; could you tell me whether it is the practice that that payment is only made for completed weeks?—I think it is only made for completed weeks, and that any contributions from the relatives must be considered.

2689. Then if the period were six weeks and six days six weeks only would be paid for?—I think you are right; you probably know.

2690. Have you had any complaints on that score?—No, at any rate not recently.

Question of future disposal of workhouse lunatics.

2691. In the answer to Question 2372 you say that the effect of this grant of 4s. per week "has been to transfer the lunatic from the cheaper workhouse building to the more expensive asylum building, and to raise the cost of maintenance per lunatic to a total cost of perhaps £28 a year. It has often been done within my own knowledge for the express purpose of providing this or that union with additional accommodation. Whether the man is better off in the asylum or in the workhouse, I do not know; personally I should prefer the country workhouse." You say a little further on that you would prefer that all lunatics should be transferred to the county councils?—That they should be made a county charge.

2692. And that all harmless lunatics should come under the same administration?—Yes.

2693. I think you will admit that they are as well cared for in workhouses as they would be in county asylums?—I think that no reasonable complaint can be made of the treatment of imbeciles in workhouses. It is a fact that the Commissioners in Lunacy very seldom raise any complaint whatever as to the treatment of imbeciles who are under the charge of the guardians. It would be open, even under the existing law, for the county councils to arrange with any board of guardians to keep the imbeciles in the workhouse subject to the consent of the Commissioners in Lunacy and of the Local Government Board.

2694. I think you say that the matter might be settled once for all, if all lunatics were made a county charge?—That is so.

2695. Would you advocate arrangements between county councils and boards of guardians for the retention of certain inmates if it were thought fit to retain them, because there were existing the buildings necessary for that class of case?—Yes.

2696. It is a fact, is it not, that there are a great many harmless lunatics already in the county asylums but chargeable to boards of guardians?—There must be.

2697. Yet they have allowed the increased cost to mount up considerably higher than the cost in a workhouse; but no classification has taken place hitherto in county asylums in order to provide cheaply for the harmless cases, has it?—I think there have been some steps in that direction, but as a rule in most counties there are no such arrangements.

2698. I only wanted to ascertain whether you thought it would be likely that the county authorities would be more economical if they had the whole of the harmless lunatics under their charge than they are at the present time when they only have part of them. After all the whole question is one of cost, because the question of treatment is considered satisfactory by you?—I

suggest much greater pressure being put on county councils in the direction of cheapening asylums.

2699. Do you not think these cases might be met by boards of guardians having the grant for all harmless lunatics in their charge, if the accommodation is considered satisfactory by the board ?—You must remember that this question arose on the report of the Cottage Homes Committee which was made in 1899 in which they say definitely that in their opinion persons of unsound mind should be removed from the workhouse.

2700. To another institution ?—Yes.

2701. But they do not recommend that they should be transferred and become a county charge, do they ?—I rather think they do.

2702. This is the recommendation I have in mind, "Your Committee think that however preferable uniformity of administration may be it will be necessary to make exceptions to meet cases of this kind, and they suggest that it might be practicable in such a case to permit the guardians to retain the imbeciles and epileptics in their charge, receiving from the county council for each imbecile and epileptic so retained the payment which your Committee have recommended should be made to boards of guardians in respect of the maintenance of imbeciles in the county institution. Such a privilege should be dependent on a certificate to be granted by the Local Government Board that the separate accommodation for imbeciles and epileptics in the workhouse is adequate in every way, and that there is adequate accommodation in the rest of the workhouse for the proper classification of the inmates" ?—The point that the Cottage Homes Committee were dealing with was this: Here was a proposal to transfer imbeciles from workhouses altogether, not for the sake of the imbecile and not for the sake of economy, which is the basis of my proposals, but for the sake of the other inmates. They naturally had to consider the case of those unions which have imbecile wards absolutely and entirely distinct from the rest of the workhouse; and they make their proposals in order to meet that case. If, for instance, you go to the Brighton workhouse, as I trust you will, there you will find an entire block of buildings for the imbeciles separated from all the rest with a separate staff of attendants and practically arranged in such a way that the other inmates could not possibly be troubled with the imbeciles because they never see them.

2703. Their recommendations, I take it, meant that they ought to be moved from the workhouses for the sake of the inmates and not because they would be better either under the county authority or under any other authority. I think you will find that they say on that head, "your Committee are disposed to think that the central authority should be the Local Government Board rather than the Lunacy Commissioners and the Home Office. Such details as the mode of admission of inmates should be regulated by the Local Government Board, who should have powers, as regards those institutions, similar to those which they possess as regards the asylums for imbeciles provided by the Metropolitan Asylums Board." Therefore, that all points to a separate institution and to its not becoming a county charge. I take it you disagree with that ?—I should rather like to read that report again as my memory is not very clear about it. The question is solved if you put all the persons of unsound mind into the hands of one local administrative body. They will then be able to classify their asylums and when they want to build a new asylum, instead of building an expensive asylum, they will build a cheaper sort of asylum (rather on workhouse lines) for the imbeciles and retain their very expensive buildings for the dangerous and incurable. Then in cases where the workhouse accommodation is ample, they will make arrangements with the guardians to keep the imbeciles there, so as to avoid fresh building. An additional ground for that proposal is the financial ground. I will give you an illustration. There is in Sussex a union of a very large rateable value indeed—it has a rateable value of one-fourth of the entire county of East Sussex. The county of East Sussex is proceeding to build a new asylum which, we will say, cost £400,000 or something like £400 a bed—I trust it will not be more than that. The union I have in mind, having one-fourth of the rateable value of the county, is responsible for a fourth of that expenditure; that is, they are responsible for the service of the debt on say £100,000. But they have only ninety-two lunatics in that union, so that their responsibility for that building amounts to over £1,000 a bed for each of their lunatics. I think that is a financial consideration which has got to be borne in mind. It seems to me that it would be best to forget the union altogether and let the county take charge of these people.

2704. You believe, then, that all certified lunatics ought to be dealt with by one authority ?—Yes.

2705. And that should be the county ?—That should be the county as being the only one competent for the purpose.

2706. Do you not thereby create another anomaly, namely, that part of the paupers would be under the charge of the guardians and part of them would be under the charge of the county authority ?—Paupers now who happen to be lunatics are under the charge of two authorities locally and two authorities centrally, which is what I want to avoid. In this case I suppose they would be paupers in the sense that they are paid for out of the rates, but they are not paupers under the administration of the guardians, and they are not paupers to whom the granting of relief has to be considered from the point of view of whether it is a mischief to the independent people or not. Personally, I should not consider anybody certified under the Act of 1890 as a lunatic as a pauper at all; I would call him a man who from the necessity of the case has to be chargeable to the rates, and I would take him out of the administration of the guardians, and I would pay for him out of the State funds.

2707. I suppose you would mean that to apply to all chronic cases of lunacy ?—Yes. A man cannot make himself a lunatic; he becomes a lunatic by the act of God, and he is an unfortunate person who has got to be considered from quite a different point of view to the man who makes himself a pauper.

Supplements to outdoor relief.

2708. In your answer to Question 2413 you say, "All the experts are unanimous in thinking that all domiciliary relief is and must practically be supplemented by earnings and other sources of income. The fact is that where guardians are obliged by force of circumstances to undertake the whole cost of the relief, it is always indoor relief." Is not that rather too sweeping a statement ?—I have not the slightest doubt that you could produce to me an exception here and there in some unions; therefore it is perhaps rather too sweeping; but I adhere to it entirely as a general statement.

2709. Take the case of a union where there is a large number of aged people who are past work, and who are living with their relatives and friends; the relief they get would cover practically the whole of the cost of their maintenance under the conditions under which they are living, and I cannot see that that would have the slightest effect upon the labour market outside or upon the earnings of the rest of the family ?—I do not think that in the answer you have quoted I have said anything about the labour market outside. I have only said that the relief must be supplemented in some way or other. In the case that you put before me the relief is obviously supplemented, because the people live with their relations. All I say, so far as that is concerned, is that practically every case of outdoor relief must be supplemented in some way or other; where it is supplemented by earnings the point is raised whether that does not tend to decrease the earnings of independent people.

2710. Take the case where these aged people are living by themselves; they are living under conditions which are quite satisfactory to the guardians, and in many cases those people are provided with all necessaries by the guardians under those circumstances ?—They are living with their own folk, are they not ?

2711. In the case I am putting now they are living alone. You would deprecate any extension of that practice, I take it ?—I do not say so in the answer you have quoted; but I do not like any outdoor relief, because it is so open to abuse. If, however, you produce to me a case of a pauper who does not work so as to interfere with the labour market, who does not have children, and who is properly cared for, then I say that the main objections to his getting outdoor relief are done away with. It would be rather pedantic to say that such a person should not get outdoor relief; but he would have to fulfil those three conditions.

Conditions under which outdoor relief is unobjectionable.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

The policy of classification.

2712. Then comes this question: If you do not grant outdoor relief in a case of that kind, ought you not to have a better classification inside, so as to a certain extent to prevent people of that class from being compelled to mix with the class of persons whom you have described in your evidence?—Yes. That was the theory of all those Committees and Commissions which sat in what I shall presently deal with as the political period of Poor Law administration, that is to say, onwards from 1895. These schemes were thrown out partly against pensions and partly against indiscriminate outdoor relief, and they were to a certain extent carried out; and when I come a little later on to the question of cost you will see what has happened in consequence.

2713. If that class of case is not to be given outdoor relief, has it not always seemed to those who are administering the law that they ought to provide institutional relief which would be more acceptable than the present form?—Yes.

2714. But I take it that you would deprecate all this form of classification which is the only means of getting the guardians to adopt institutional relief rather than outdoor relief?—I am not deprecating classification; I am merely stating the fact that I think classification has been made too much of, because the people do not appreciate it as we hoped they would. Another fact is that classification has been to some extent dropped. As I say, I do not deprecate it at all, but I do say that you ought to have some regard to the wishes of the people themselves in this matter of classification, and, as I pointed out, they may not prefer to live with certain people with whom you would classify them.

The proper subjects for out-relief.

2715. In the answer to Q. 2422 you defined the class of persons who you think might be dealt with by out-door relief, and you say, "I submit there is the very strongest ground for holding that any out-door relief which is given must be given with the greatest care and discrimination, and must be reserved for those exceptional cases who are unfortunately bound to be dependent on their neighbours by their own misfortune, in other words, for the irreducible minimum." What class of case had you in your mind as being an unfortunate case?—I do not know that I had any particular case in my mind, but I have plenty of cases, as, for instance, a man who has belonged to an unsound benefit society which has broken down, or the man who has in some way or another lost his savings, or the man who has had a long illness and has come to the end of his resources.

2716. He would be the most likely person to have exceptional treatment over other classes in the way of out-door relief, would he not?—Yes.

2717. Assuming that you would grant that, would you not also say that relief ought to be given sufficient to cover the whole cost of his living rather than that he should be compelled to go into an institution?—I do not think so. I think in nine cases out of ten he would really be better off in an institution.

2718. Then you would dispose of all this class entirely?—I should not mind giving him out-door relief if he were in other respects suitable and if he fulfilled my other conditions.

2719. Sufficient to meet all his requirements?—Yes.

Charity *vice* out-relief.

2720. In the answer to Q. 2430 I think you stated that the strict administration of out-door relief tends to a reduction in in-door relief; does your experience show that in those unions where it has been tried charity has been more or less equal to dealing with those cases that must be dealt with by charity?—I think you will find on investigation of the circumstances of these unions that a strict administration of out-door relief has stimulated charity.

2721. You think that is so in your experience?—In my experience it certainly has been so.

Effect of parochial representation on boards of guardians.

2722. In answer to Q. 2432 you dealt with the subject of the representation being parochial, while the charge was a union charge, and you said that that took away to a certain extent what I might term the judgment of the parochial representative in dealing with those cases strictly according to their needs?—I think it must have some influence.

2723. Have you thought out any means of getting over the difficulty, such as whether parochial representation should be abolished, or any other method adopted?—It has often been suggested that parochial representation should be abolished. As you are aware, in large towns there is the division into wards for electoral purposes. There is this against it, however, that a board of guardians should represent all parts of the union, and therefore I should not like to see the parish system abolished, difficult as it is to work and unequally as it does work. There are evident advantages in having representatives from all parts of the union, even for such a comparatively small matter as the visiting of the poor in the workhouse. It is a great check on maladministration that the inmate should occasionally see a guardian who comes from his own neighbourhood.

2724. Then I take it you believe that the parochial representation could scarcely be altered?—I think not.

2725. In what other way would you get over the difficulty in order to insure better administration on the part of the parochial representative; could it be compulsorily arranged that no man should deal with a case of relief arising in the parish he represented?—I have often suggested that to boards of guardians, but with very poor success.

2726. That would avoid any patronage being exercised by the parish representatives, would it not?—Yes; it would certainly be better.

2727. But it would be a most difficult thing to enforce, would it not?—Most difficult, because there is always this plausible excuse for it, that the person from the applicant's parish knows most about him.

2728. And for that reason the rest of the board are willing to fall in with the suggestions of the parish representative?—That is it.

2729. This mal-administration must continue then?—I do not say that it is a grave sort of mal-administration. I only say that I have put before the Commission all the reasons which will account for the very large proportion of out-door relief which is given; and that is one of them.

Cottage Homes Committee's recommendation as to imbeciles and epileptics.

2730. Probably we shall hear more on that point from other witnesses?—Yes. May I go back to your questions (*See* Q. 2699, etc.) in regard to the Report of the Select Committee on Cottage Homes? Here is the paragraph which I was thinking of. First of all they say "that all pauper imbeciles and epileptics should be provided for outside the workhouse."

2731. That is, in separate institutions?—Yes, in separate institutions. Then they say "Your Committee consider that these separate institutions should be provided by the councils of counties and county boroughs. These councils now are charged with the provision of asylums at which pauper lunatics are maintained, the guardians paying the cost of maintenance. Your Committee do not suggest that pauper imbeciles and epileptics should be admitted to the lunatic asylums, but that separate institutions should be provided expressly for their accommodation. Such institutions need not be so costly as lunatic asylums, as the inmates would not require the elaborate accommodation and attention which is essential for lunatics." The only point on which I go further than that is that I suggest that the whole cost should be charged upon the county; and I also suggest that it should be borne by the county as a charge from which the word "lunatic" might very well be expunged.

2732. You assume that the separate institution is under the county?—Yes.

2733. But the Committee further on say that is not what they mean?—They go on to state certain exceptions.

2734. They say that the institution should be under the Local Government Board rather than under the Lunacy Commissioners, and that points to a separate institution entirely, not to county asylums, I take it; it is a setting up of another authority and another class of institution, apart from county asylums and workhouses?—These would be separate institutions under the county authorities and under the inspection of the Local Government Board. I say the whole administration ought to be transferred absolutely.

Proposed restriction on out-door medical relief.

2735. With regard to the question of relief on loan which you deal with at Q. 2441, could not that difficulty be overcome by restricting the medical relief in out-door

cases to those who are in such a state of destitution that their wages are not of a sufficient amount to enable you to recover by way of loan? Recovering an amount granted by way of loan for medical relief means repayment by small weekly sums, does it not, because you could not get it all at once from such a person?—That is so.

2736. Therefore it must be by small sums?—Yes.

2737. I believe the practice of a medical man generally working among the poor, is to send a collector weekly to his patients for instalments of the money due to him?—I believe that is so.

2738. If, therefore, medical relief was restricted to those cases where a man's weekly wages did not allow him to bear the burden of a weekly repayment, there would not be much point in giving relief on loan; it therefore seems to me that this giving of relief on loan, so far as medical aid is concerned, is rather over-rated; do you think so?—The comparative amount is small, but it involves the important principle that free medical relief will interfere with provident societies and efforts of that kind to induce the poor to provide for themselves.

Instance of abuse of pay stations.

2739. It is suggested that all medical relief should be given on loan; do you agree with that?—No; I think it would be rather absurd to give a man relief on loan when it is perfectly obvious that he cannot repay it; and I have always had a sort of misgiving about it, because I think if medical relief were given on loan guardians might be apt to give it more indiscriminately even than they do now.

2740. At. Q. 2501, dealing with relieving officers, you say "The fact is that you will find, as between one union and another, a great want of uniformity in the number of cases which are looked after by the various relieving officers." Do you find that that applies to urban unions as much as it does to rural unions?—Yes; I think that the inequality in the areas and the populations under the relieving officers applies everywhere.

2741. Have you at all thought out what should be the number of cases you think a relieving officer is competent to look after?—It depends very much upon the size of his district. The acreage is of even more importance than the numbers.

2742. Do you find it pretty general that there is an insufficient number of relieving officers for the work that they have to do?—It is so in a great many unions; but I should not say it is so generally.

2743. We shall get evidence upon that from the inspectors, I suppose?—I think you will have more detailed evidence from them. The Commission will bear in mind that one of the difficulties about the relieving officer has been that he has so often had to fill other appointments. He is the vaccination officer; and he used to be the school attendance officer, registrar of births, and so on.

2744. At Q. 2518 you deal with the question of what are sometimes called relief stations, but what are, I believe, properly termed pay stations?—Yes.

2745. You agree with the proposal to abolish pay stations?—I think practically they ought to be abolished, but in saying that I should add that occasionally you may have a need for one.

2746. In a great many unions there is a pay clerk who pays the relief instead of the relieving officer, is there not?—Yes.

2747. And the relieving officer never touches the money at all?—That is so.

2748. In that case, could you abolish these pay stations easily?—No. In very large unions where there is a pay clerk, a pay station is a very useful institution in a way. Still, where there is a pay clerk, it is obvious that the relieving officer has not got the same check that he has where there is not a pay clerk, and he has to pay at the paupers' own homes.

2749. I take it that the reason why you would abolish pay stations is because you think their abolition would compel the relieving officer to visit more frequently the homes of the people, because he would then have to take the pay to them?—Yes.

2750. All these visits have to be reported by the relieving officer in his Application and Report Book, have they not?—That is so.

2751. And that book comes before the guardians every time a case of relief is dealt with?—Yes.

2752. If short orders were granted instead of long ones—and I understand you recommend at most that they should be granted for one month at a time—then it would come to the notice of the guardians whether the relieving officer had visited a given house within a month?—Yes; and that would meet one of the main reasons why I think pay stations should be abolished. I should like to give the Commissioners an illustration of the sort of thing I am thinking of. It is a very striking instance of what may go on when you have pay stations. There is a parish, the squire of which happened to be a friend of mine, and I knew his servants. The relieving officer had a pay station at the gardener's house, and he used to leave all the money with the wife to be distributed among the paupers in the parish. She was a very sensible woman, and she did not always distribute the relief in the same proportion that the guardians had ordered it. She checked their orders by her own knowledge of the people, and her own good sense. Some of the good ones got 7s. 6d., and some of the worse ones got 6d., and were told they were very lucky to get anything I watched this for some time with a great deal of amusement; and then to my regret I had to stop it.

2753. (*Chairman.*) Was the result an economy to the parish?—I think the relief was better administered than when the guardians did it.

2754. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What had the relieving officer to say for himself in that case?—I forget what he said.

2755. Was he continued in office?—Yes; the guardians did not seem to think very much of it.

2756. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You cannot say that pay stations ought to be abolished in their entirety; you admit that there must be exceptions?—I think you will probably find exceptions in large urban unions where you give heavy relief in kind, or where you have pay clerks.

2757. Generally speaking you think pay stations are mischievous?—Yes.

Woman as relieving officer.

2758. (*Chairman.*) Is the relieving officer ever a woman?—The board have always protested against it, but I think there is one case where a woman was appointed.

Case-paper system.

2759. (*Mr. Bentham.*) To go to another point, you have told us that for a good many years some boards of guardians have adopted what are known as case papers, as constituting a much fuller record of the circumstances of the pauper than is possible under the Application and Report Book; has this system always been successful where you have known it adopted?—It has always proved successful where I have known it adopted, but that has not been in very many cases.

2760. I take it that the case paper is the only record that is kept in the office and that there is no record in any other book or document, but that all the documents relating to the case are kept together in each case paper; is that not the practice?—Unless they have a register of cases, which, I think, is the practice.

2761. Do they keep a register where they adopt the case paper system?—I think so.

2762. Only for the sake of the number, I take it; the register gives no other particulars?—It just gives the number and the name.

2763. Has it ever come to your knowledge that these case papers sometimes get misplaced, and then all record is lost entirely?—I have not met with such a case.

2764. You would not usually lose a book; but you might lose a paper if that is the only record that is kept?—I have known an instance where it was thought desirable by the master to disinfect the workhouse books owing to a case of small-pox, and they all got burnt.

The irreducible minimum of pauperism.

2765. (*Professor Smart.*) You have spoken of the irreducible minimum of pauperism; you mean, I presume, the case of those for whom the State will always have to make provision?—The State or charity.

2766. (*Chairman.*) I put to you two questions upon that: I asked you, were the 1 per cent. all those who had to be supported by the State or the rates, or by their friends and you said, as I understood you, that the 1 per cent

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

were those who were incapable of maintaining themselves?—Yes.

2767. My recollection of your evidence further is that you accounted for the difference between that 1 per cent., which is 10 per 1,000, and the actual number on the rates, by saying that a certain proportion were maintained by their friends?—Yes. Of course the Commission will understand that the 1 per cent. is a very tentative figure, to which I do not adhere. In arriving at that figure I included the people, like those in blind asylums and cripples' homes, who are maintained by charity and not by the State or by the rates.

2768. (*Professor Smart.*) You did not want to clearly separate off charity from the State at that time; but I understood you to mean that there was an irreducible minimum which would always require to be maintained by the State, irrespective of all other provisions?—What I meant was that there was a number of persons who would have to be maintained by somebody or other, and that that number I termed the irreducible minimum. I said that there must be a certain number of impotent folk who must be kept in an institution ultimately. That is what it came to.

Economists and abolition of poor law.

2769. Would you agree with Ricardo when he said that no scheme for the amendment of the Poor Laws merits the least attention which has not their abolition for its ultimate object?—I know that Malthus, Ricardo, Lord Brougham and a number of thinkers of that period were of the opinion that the Poor Law should be abolished, and that it was a pure mischief; and more people were of opinion that the only justification of a Poor Law was that it should be so administered that ultimately it would become unnecessary. The first Commissioners, I think, quite clearly did not agree with Ricardo. You may remember that in their report they say that under certain conditions relief might be given even beneficially. Their language throughout is not the language of people who thought that the Poor Law should be abolished at once.

The irreducible minimum of pauperism.

2770. Might we not say that the ultimate object of the Poor Law is the relief of a certain portion of this irreducible minimum?—Yes.

2771. Is it not our first duty as a Commission to find out what the irreducible minimum is?—I should think it would be a very useful and very onerous task.

2772. In theory, the proper object of the Poor Law is surely the very first thing we have to deal with; and that includes the question whether the Poor Law could be abolished altogether or whether relief *plus* charity should be a State provision?—In other words, that the object of the Poor Law would be to relieve such numbers of the irreducible minimum as are not relieved by charity, and so to administer the law that nobody else shall get any relief. That, I suppose, would be the statement of the stalwart economists.

2773. So far as I see, there are three ways of dealing with the destitute—through blood relations, through charity, and by the State, is that not so—I think you have said that somewhere?—I am only hesitating because I was rather taken by surprise and a *quartum quid* might occur to one afterwards—I mean another alternative might present itself.

2774. Perhaps you will tell us if an alternative crops up in your mind as we go along. I suppose you would say that the method of provision by means of blood relations is much the preferable way?—Yes.

2775. And that you would always exhaust this means first?—Yes.

Extension of duty of maintenance.

2776. Of course in the case of poor people that is a very limited means. Would you extend the duty beyond the blood relations you have mentioned, say to brothers and sisters?—I think not. The only suggestion for the extension with which I am acquainted is, that the chargeability should be extended to grandchildren for their grandparents. In England grandparents are responsible for their grandchildren, but the grandchildren are not responsible for their grandparents.

2777. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I rather think it is different in Scotland?—It is certain to be, I think.

2778. (*Professor Smart.*) I understand you would always try to persuade even outside relations to recognise a moral claim?—Yes; and I should try and persuade masters in the case of servants to recognise the moral claim of an old servant on his old employer.

Respective spheres of charity and relief.

2779 Am I wrong in assuming that where there is a choice between charity and the State you would prefer the work to be done by charity?—I would.

2780. I suppose there are two reasons for that—one is the case of endowed charities where the money is there, at any rate, waiting to be used and cannot be used in any other way; and, therefore, where there is already a fund provided, there would be no sense in taxing the ratepayer as well as applying the endowed charity?—One of the difficulties of administering charities is, that in many cases where the administrator thinks he is relieving the individual, he is really relieving the rates.

2781. The second and more serious reason I think is, that charity is not a right of the poor; they cannot claim it, and, therefore, it does not enter into their calculations; whereas, if they knew that a State provision is waiting for them, they are tempted to unthrift?—That is a statement of the theory.

2782. Am I right, then, in saying that the superiority of charity to State relief is, from this point of view, that charity is necessarily limited and cannot be depended upon?—That is it. I should add that another reason for the preference of charity to Poor Law relief is, that a man who does an act of charity is doing himself good, whereas the guardian who gives relief and thinks he is doing an act of charity is doing himself harm.

2783. You extend the moral sphere?—You do.

2784. Then you would agree with Ricardo, I imagine, that if by law every human being who wants support could be sure to obtain it, and to obtain it in such a degree as to make life tolerably comfortable, theory would lead one to expect that all the other taxes put together would be light compared with the single one for the Poor Rate?—That is so. I have here an extract from the Politics of Aristotle which I turned up the other day. It runs in this way: "Where there are revenues the demagogues should not be allowed after their manner to distribute the surplus: The poor are always receiving and always wanting more and more, for such help is like pouring water into a jar with holes in it."

2785. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Did not Aristotle include any other class but the poor?—I am only quoting what he says. Perhaps you would like me to finish the quotation—"Yet a true friend of the people should see that they be not too poor, for extreme poverty demoralises the democracy."

2786. (*Professor Smart.*) That, of course, is the reason why, if you have a Poor Law, you must make the position of the pauper less desirable than the position of the independent labourer?—Yes; or, as it is put more accurately, the condition of the pauper shall be, or shall appear to be, less desirable than that of the independent labourer. I think the words "shall appear to be" are important.

2787. That indicates another advantage as regards charity, namely, that if you can throw the poor man on to charity, you need have no scruple about making him fairly comfortable, for charity being uncertain and limited, it cannot be depended on and this uncertainty of getting the charity is a sufficient deterrent in itself?—Yes.

2788. Would you go the length, then, of saying that we should all like that every person who has fallen into destitution through no fault of his own should be as well provided for as the wealth of the community will allow, so long as this provision cannot be depended on and does not act as an inducement to unthrift?—I agree.

2789. In short, the inducement to unthrift is the dangerous thing?—Yes; but I should not like to say it was the most dangerous thing. The most dangerous thing is the interference with the labour market and with wages and with earnings.

Constituents of the irreducible minimum of pauperism.

2790. In the light of these principles I want to get your idea of the irreducible minimum. It contains first, I imagine, widows and children: their case is very clear?—It would not have occurred to me that theirs was a very clear case. I should not have included them, and I did not mean that class of case.

2791. Of course, I mean destitute widows and children. If a widow has a number of children, she must either

neglect her children or practically earn no wage ?—I think I shall answer your question if I say that widows and children were certainly not in my contemplation when I talked about the irreducible minimum.

2792. Not destitute widows and children ?—I should not have said so. I said there would be cases where women might be able to support children.

2793. Say widows with large families ?—That again was not the class of case which I was contemplating. I was contemplating more those cases which rest on physical disability and which must be helped.

2794. I am afraid that we in Scotland do count the widow and her children as forming a very large portion of our work ?—Here, too, they are a very large and a most difficult portion of the work ; but they were not in my mind when I was talking about the irreducible minimum.

2795. Would you put deserted wives and their children in the same category as widows and children ?—Yes.

2796. With this difference perhaps, that the widows and their children could be thrown more freely on charity than the deserted wives and their children ?—Yes.

2797. Inasmuch as in the one case you would have to set the law in motion ?—Yes. Our Poor Law experience in England is wholly unfavourable to deserted wives.

2798. Another case, and, I think, a very clear case of the irreducible minimum, is that of the sick, the impotent, the feeble-minded and the lunatic ; I suppose there would be no doubt about those ?—Yes—and the crippled and the blind.

2799. Of course neither sickness nor lunacy in itself has a claim on the State ; I mean to say that if a man has a sick child or a feeble-minded child, he should support it just as he supports his other children ?—Yes, he should.

2800. But there are a great many instances, of course, where the case is quite clearly one for the State ?—Yes.

2801. The last class is, I think, the aged poor ; do you consider those part of the irreducible minimum ?—No ; but some of them would be.

2802. Would you exclude them on the ground that it might tend to improvidence ?—I did not use the phrase "irreducible minimum" with any idea of the consequences following from their relief. I only wanted to bring out what I believe to be a statistical fact, namely, that a certain proportion of the people must of necessity be kept in institutions, and this fact also, that, as you reduce your Poor Law relief, you get nearer and nearer to that irreducible minimum and reduction becomes increasingly difficult as you get nearer and nearer to that point.

2803. Of course the aged poor might be dealt with by an old age pension scheme ?—I have not prepared evidence about an old age pension scheme.

2804. They are not necessarily a part of the irreducible minimum ?—No. An old age pension scheme is a very good illustration. We are told that old people in workhouses could be provided for under such a scheme, but I think you will find that there are large numbers—perhaps 90 per cent. —who, owing to their infirmities, could not be provided for except in an institution.

2805. Even if you had an old age pension scheme, do you not think a good deal of the work would fall upon the State all the same ? I have in my mind just now a case of a soldier with a pension of 7s. a week. He lives in the poorhouse and they charge him 4s. 6d. for maintenance ; he gets his pension once in three months, when he discharges himself, drinks himself nearly dead in a couple of days, and returns a wreck ?—I hope the Commission will take the opportunity of going to Chatham or Portsmouth on a pension day.

f of
ws and
en.

2806. I wish to recur to the widows and their children ; have you any rough idea of what proportion of the expense of the poor relief is incurred on their account ?—The Commission, I think, will be able to get those questions answered either from the statistical memoranda which will be sent in, or from some evidence which I shall give a little later on when we come to the question of cost.

2807. Is it an important percentage at all ?—It is a very important percentage.

2808. I think you will agree that when this class does come upon society these people should be regarded not as persons who have sinned ; because a husband dies and leaves his wife and children in poverty that is no ground for penalising them, and therefore the state of these people should be made as comfortable as possible, should it not ?—The condition of every dependent person should be made as comfortable as is consistent with public policy.

2809. But there is no reason for penalising them in order to deter others from following their example ? There are such things as imprudent marriages.

2810. But there are not such things as husbands committing suicide for the sake of putting their wives upon a fund ?—No.

Relief of widows and children in Scotland.

2811. What would be your criticism of the Scottish system of invariably giving this class outdoor relief except where the mother is vicious ? I may be asking an ignorant question, but the reason for it is that I am a Scotsman, and I have heard nothing but denunciation of the outdoor relief system since I came here, and so I want to put before you some of our cases in order to see what your answer is. When a widow with her children applies to us for relief we first ascertain what blood relations she has and then we ascertain what she is getting from charities or from friendly societies. If these two sources are not enough we give her so much for herself and so much for each child, on the assumption that she is able to do some work, such as washing or charing or office-keeping. We look on the relief as an addition to her other revenue enabling her to do her duty by her children. Our first principle is to keep the home together ; we do not take the children from her, or divide her from the children, except where she is not to be trusted with the care of them. I want to know from you what your criticism of outdoor relief is in this special case ?—I am naturally nervous about criticising any system of Poor Law relief which is not my own.

2812. I am afraid we require criticism, because we do not often get it ?—The Scottish system is one of outdoor relief entirely, and differs so very materially from ours in the prohibition of relief to able-bodied men that it is very difficult to criticise individual cases from the English point of view. But I should say in that case that in the first place you are clearly and obviously giving out-door relief in aid of wages. You will find out by an investigation most likely that where you have many of those cases the wages of women are lower than they ought to be. As I have suggested, that is not a matter on which I am disposed to dogmatise, and I only put it forward as a matter, which, in my judgment, ought to be very carefully investigated. In the next place I should think that in most of those cases the widow lives in great poverty, that is to say, that even your relief and the amount of her wages are not sufficient for her to live and thrive upon ; that therefore her children probably will not be brought up quite as they ought to be, and that it would on the whole and in the long run be better for some of those children to receive institutional relief. That is the sort of criticism I should make on your case. When cases are put to one they are always the most difficult ones that are chosen, and the question of the relief of widows is an especially difficult one, because very often if when the woman comes before the board of guardians she looks nice and tidy, Poor Law principles are cast aside altogether and the guardians act on sympathy.

2813. Still we may, and we do, give large sums in this way in order to keep the widow in such a position as that she may do her duty by the children ; and it is quite possible to regard that as cheap if you thereby preserve the unity of the family ?—There are some families the unity of which is of inestimable value ; but as to some families the sooner they are broken up the better.

Relief of aged poor in Scotland.

2814. We do that, of course, where necessary. Then I want your criticism of our outdoor relief to the aged poor. In Scotland we hold that where an aged couple becomes destitute we should preserve their home, and by giving a small sum we find that in consideration of other sources (such as friends, charities, and so on, and perhaps a little work) such aged couples may be kept together and look after one another. Is there any very marked inducement to improvidence in that ? The breadwinner, you see, has always to count on the probability of one of the two not reaching old age, in which case the survivor would have to go into the House ?—It would seem to me that there the general principles of

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

provision for old age would apply. I admit the great difficulty of a board of guardians doing an act which seems harsh to this or that old woman that they see before them on the ground that their action is for the ultimate benefit of the class from which the applicant comes. That is very hard; but still it seems to me that their duty is to restrict outdoor relief as far as possible, though, as I have said, where there is nothing else against it except what I may call the doctrinal effect of it, one is rather apt to think that outdoor relief may be given without much mischief.

English out-relief policy.

2815. On the other hand, do you not think that a good deal of the distrust and hatred of the poor law system in England is very much due to this frequent breaking up of the home of old couples?—I do not think it is. I demur to two things; I should not describe the feeling towards the poor law as being one of distrust and hatred; and in the next place I think on the whole that the right administration is one which is not adopted. There are very few unions indeed that are really strict; there are very few boards of guardians in all England that would not give outdoor relief to such a couple as you have described. It is given all over the country. The official statement as to outdoor relief is given in Mr. Chaplin's circular of 1900 as follows:—"The board consider that aged deserving persons should not be urged to enter the workhouse at all unless there is some cause which renders such a course necessary, such as infirmity of mind or body, the absence of house accommodation or of a suitable person to care for them, or some similar cause, but that they should be relieved by having adequate outdoor relief granted to them." That is the last circular which has been issued on the subject.

Effect of charity and of poor relief.

2816. (*Mr. Booth.*) I gather that Professor Smart has suggested that the uncertainty attaching to what may be received from charity makes it less demoralising and attractive; but I feel that there is another side to that; for instance, whatever may be the advantages which may come from betting, uncertainty does not make it less demoralising and attractive. I should have thought with regard to outdoor relief too that one of the great demoralising advantages is that very thing, that they may hope to get it but may after all not get it; I should not have thought therefore that uncertainty was any security from demoralisation; what do you say?—What are called speculative applications for outdoor relief no doubt are very demoralising; but still the certainty of relief being given if you are destitute and if you will only fulfil certain conditions so as to be put in the status of a pauper is, I think, much more demoralising to a man than the expectation that he may get charity.

Constituents of the irreducible minimum of pauperism.

2817. (*Chairman.*) To clear up the point as regards your estimate of the irreducible minimum of pauperism, which is an important one, do you include in your tentative figure of 1·1 per cent., those who from infirmity, from physical or mental defects, or from sickness are unable to maintain themselves?—Yes.

2818. But you do not include in that figure any proportion of paupers who are exempt from those ailments?—No.

Position of widow who refuses indoor relief.

2819. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) May I ask what would happen in England in the case of a widow and her children if she declined the indoor relief that was offered?—Do you mean if they were really necessitous persons?

2820. Yes; what would happen in the case which Professor Smart has taken in Scotland? The poorhouse there is regarded as a test for the sick and infirm. In the case of a respectable widow and her children who was offered only the poorhouse, if her parish council suggested that and it was referred to me whether the poorhouse only should be offered to them, I am afraid I should say no?—What would happen in England in practice would probably be that you would hear nothing more about her, because somebody would look after her.

2821. That is to say, she would be helped through charity?—Yes, that would probably be the case in practice. If the family were destitute and the mother still declined to go into the workhouse, that would soon become a sudden and urgent case, because they would be starving, and the relieving officer would then have to relieve them as a sudden and urgent case till the next meeting of the guardians.

2822. Following that up, do you not think it would be a good thing if in the event of the guardians saying, We offer you nothing but indoor relief, there was a power of appeal on the part of the applicant?—No; I do not think there should be a power of appeal. I think that would be cumbrous, and that it would be decided by a body which might be very much under political influences.

Appeal against inadequate relief.

2823. Not the Local Government Board?—I think it might be, and also conceivably it might be decided by a person who would have very small acquaintance with the reasons which induced the guardians to take that particular line in that case.

Relief of widows with children.

2824. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Surely in few cases the alternative is between the workhouse and out-relief, it is between the schools for the children and out-relief?—I was coming to that. In England there is no union I know of which habitually says to a widow and her children, We will not relieve you. There are a few that you will hear of in the course of the evidence about which you can read at great length in the report of the Lords' Committee of 1888, where the guardians say to an able-bodied widow, You shall support two of the children, and we will take the rest of them into the workhouse as a means of relieving you. The object of that is partly as a test of destitution and partly to provide for the better education of the children. A widow with a large family of children is rather overburdened with their care, and she is not able to go out to work, therefore the children become neglected. There are, therefore, many reasons why boards of guardians should adopt that policy. On the other hand, I am bound to say—though it may not be an answer to the question—that I personally have misgivings rather about it because I think that it may very soon (and I think there are indications that it has happened already) cease to be a test at all, and that widows may come forward in order to get their children sent to schools where absolutely the best education which is given to anybody of that class in England is given; and that would be a very serious thing.

2825. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Then, as I understand you, the result is in any case that the household is broken up, and the widow and her children are separated?—The widow parts with some of her children for the sake of her children, as I presume we all have to do. The position is exactly the same—for the good of her children she parts with them exactly as for the good of our boys we send them to school.

2826. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Are not the unions which say to the woman, "You must either send your children in or have no relief," looked upon as the best administered unions in the country?—Yes. They are very few in number, and I think they are nearly all in London.

2827. There is no choice given to the woman at all; if she wants relief either for herself or for the children it must be indoors?—I have often heard a board of guardians try to persuade a woman for her own good to let the children go into the school; but some unions simply say, No, that is our rule.

2828. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) In the case which Professor Smart figured, the children would go to the public schools?—Yes, and so would all children. The difficulty that is felt is that the children of very poor widows are not properly done by and cannot be properly done by at home; but as a matter of practice you will find that in ninety-nine unions out of a hundred in England out-door relief is given to every widow, in point of fact, who satisfies the guardians that she is destitute and has more than one child, or, at most, two children.

2829. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Even if she is earning something, if she has more than the one child she is regarded as destitute?—Yes.

2830. (*Mr. Booth.*) Are her children at all boarded out with her, and does she ever receive money for taking charge of her children in the same way as money would be paid if they were boarded out with some stranger?—The usual order is 2s. 6d. or 3s. to the mother, and so much for each child; then in order to see that the children shall not starve, a certain amount of relief is given in kind, that is, in the shape of bread.

2831. (*Mrs. Webb.*) But she never gets the boarding-out order?—No, she never gets the boarding-out terms; she never gets the 5s. a week for each child.

2832. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would she if she had her children on those terms, be subject to inspection as though they

were boarded out?—I do not think that is ever contemplated.

2833. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) They do not regard that relief as boarding-out at all, do they?—No.

2834. It is not boarding out at all, although the guardians may arrive at the amount in a particular way?—Yes. She is not paid for the children by such a scale as the boarding-out scale.

2835. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would there be any inspection, as if they were boarded out?—If the doctrine which I hold is true—that when the guardians have put a man by their semi-judicial decision into the status of a pauper, they are bound to look after him altogether, then I cannot help thinking that there should be some sort of visitation and inspection on a much more careful scale than is now done by relieving officers in the case of a widow with children in order to see that the children are properly looked after.

2836. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there no visitation nor inspection now?—The relieving officer visits as he does in every other case; but supposing the relieving officer gives the relief, as in laxly administered unions very often would be the case, at a pay station, then one of the children would be sent for the relief and taught, "That is the source that you are going to get help from."

2837. Does he not visit where she is living?—He is supposed to do so, and no doubt does, but the children may be at school, and it would be no part of the relieving officer's duty to make more than a very general inspection of the house.

2838. Does he not report to the board of guardians?—Yes. Sometimes he would report that the house is in a very dirty condition and he thinks the board ought to do something; then the woman is sent for and receives a talking to.

2839. That would be a reason, would it not, for giving her indoor relief in place of the out-door relief that she is drawing?—Certainly, because the children are not being properly looked after.

2840. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is it not the fact that these homes are visited oftener by a relieving officer than they would be by an inspector, and even far oftener than they are visited by the inspectors of boarded-out children at the present time, who in fact visit once a year?—Yes, providing the relieving officer does visit.

2841. Is it not part of the guardians' duty to see that he does?—Yes, it is.

2842. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Does he not have to enter into the application and Report Book the date of his last visit?—Yes, in such a case as that of a widow with children, but there we come to the old trouble that the relief may be given for three months, and then the case does not come under the purview of the guardians until the end of the three months.

2843. But, as a rule, would not the case of these widows be reviewed every three months?—I do not think that every three months is enough. It is only in the best unions, and the most strictly administered unions that short orders are given.

2844. Is it not also the fact that the education authority fills up cards as to the attendance of the children at school—at any rate they do so in the Metropolis?—These children have to attend school like all other children.

2845. The attendance of these children at school is shown quite automatically by the production of these cards to the relieving officer, is it not?—Yes, in fact all children are very much better looked after now than they were. The compulsory attendance at school is one thing, and the keen action of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children is another good thing; so that a child does not require the same looking after that it used to require. Still I think that the children of widows are a class that require the very special attention of boards of guardians.

2846. (*Mr. Loch.*) In regard to the stricter unions to which you refer, have you had any special complaints as to their treatment of widows?—No; however that is a matter which, as I have said, should be investigated to the very bottom. The condition of the population under very strictly administered unions is one of the points that does require investigation.

2847. In those strict unions the rule is always to give very short terms for relief, is it not?—Yes. I know some unions where they never give any order for a longer period than to the next meeting of the board of guardians, so that every case is continually under review.

2848. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think it was suggested that the most natural person with whom to board out a pauper's child was its own mother; the payment which is made to a foster mother includes a certain payment for services rendered, does it not?—I think so.

2849. You would not naturally give that payment to a mother for the care of her own children?—No, one would not.

2850. (*Miss Hill.*) You have referred to the Brabazon scheme, which I think is usually managed by a committee of ladies, or a group of ladies at anyrate, is that not so?—Yes.

The M.A.B.Y.S. scheme.

2851. Then we know of the ladies that work the M.A.B.Y.S. scheme, which deals with children after they leave the workhouse school; I am very anxious to know whether there has been any systematised offer to bring additional groups of ladies, not being guardians, into communication with the people both in the schools and in the workhouses. The more I have seen of the work of the few lady guardians I know the more it strikes me that they really require a very great deal more help. I know it is very difficult to introduce odd visitors into institutions like those under the Poor Law, but it seems to me, especially with regard to the schools, that it is very important; and I should like to know whether any organised committee of ladies has been formed in any districts; do you know of any?—You are aware, of course that there are ladies' visiting committees which can be constituted by any board of guardians for any of the poor law institutions.

Ladies' visiting committees.

2852. They are not general, I think, are they?—There are a great number of them.

2853. In London?—I am not sure as to London. One effect of the election of lady guardians has been, I am afraid, to some extent to do away with those committees; the lady guardians do the work instead of the visiting ladies.

2854. They cannot do the sort of work I was thinking of, I am sure, because their number would not be sufficient?—It has been suggested in one or two cases that outside the Metropolis the Girls' Friendly Society might do the work of visiting the children sent out from the schools in the same way that the M.A.B.Y.S. Society does in London.

2855. I thought they did?—I do not know whether they have actually started doing it, but it was suggested. It would be a very useful thing if they did it. I may say at once that I absolutely welcome in the administration of the workhouse any outside body that will merely conform to the regulations and display a certain amount of common sense. Subject to those conditions, as I say, I welcome external light and aid.

2856. And the way to do it would be by means of some of these visiting committees authorised by the guardians, is it?—Yes.

Workhouse infirmaries and their effect.

2857. (*Mr. Phelps.*) I think from what I gathered, you said that workhouse infirmaries have very much improved of late years?—That is so.

2858. And that they are ceasing more and more to be a deterrent?—I think that is a deduction which may fairly be made from the figures.

2859. Have you any instances in your mind of people being taken direct to an infirmary without passing through the workhouse?—I think you will find in the London evidence that in some of the London infirmaries there are a good number of even what would be called in a hospital "casualty" cases, that is to say, people who, in default of a general hospital, are brought into the infirmary for instant medical aid.

2860. In the case of a person who requires institutional relief the alternative is to go into a hospital, or to go into a workhouse infirmary?—Yes.

2861. The treatment now would be very much the same in both, I take it?—Very much the same, I think.

2862. Do you think the moral effect, if one may use the term, on the recipient would be really different?—In the case of absolutely unavoidable sickness I should say it would not be very different. There is a shrinking

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

on the part of the relations from allowing their relatives to go to any institution which is connected with the poor rates, but I do not know whether that shrinking in the case of unavoidable sickness is enough to make a great difference between the workhouse infirmary and the hospital.

Medical relief and disfranchisement.

2863. Do you think it is fair that in the one case the patient should lose his franchise, and in the other case he should not?—In absolutely unavoidable cases I admit that there is a difficulty in sustaining the disfranchisement except on grounds of general public policy.

State hospitals.

2864. Would you be prepared to welcome a scheme by which all institutional relief in cases of sickness should be made a government matter, and at the same time all out-door medical relief should be abolished?—I think we ought to take those points in two, ought we not?

2865. In cases requiring institutional relief would you be prepared to say that no civic consequences should follow on a man's accepting it?—That is to say that we should frankly accept a scheme of State hospitals?

2866. That we should make all the hospitals State hospitals and put them on the same footing as the workhouse infirmaries?—To be quite honest, I have done my very best to find reasons against it, because I do not like it. I am afraid there must be some mischief behind it which I do not see. But logically, I cannot avoid the conclusion that the time has come when the whole question of institutional relief for the sick at the cost of the rates must be reconsidered; and the point of disfranchisement would, of course, be an important question.

2867. Would you agree with General Booth when he says that when a horse is down the thing is to get him up, and that our natural interest as a community when we find a person who needs help is to put him on his legs as soon as possible?—Yes.

2868. With regard to out-door medical relief, there is no reason why a man should not make provision against the need of it, is there?—Apparently there is not.

Effect of medical relief on provident dispensaries.

2869. Have you any figures of your own, or could we get any figures with regard to the effect on provident dispensaries of variations in the administration of medical relief?—I do not think there are any actual figures in the possession of the Board, and I think that that point could only be cleared up by an enquiry in the localities. I have a very strong impression that there is a direct correspondence between the two subjects.

Alterations in quality of medical relief

2870. Have you noticed of late years an increase in medical relief in consequence of the free granting of what are called "medical comforts"?—I do not think that medical relief has increased owing to that. There is a continual struggle on the part of medical officers and others to give medical comforts, or what are called medical extras, as a part of relief. With respect to what was really the worst part of that system, namely, the giving of alcohol, I think you will find that that has very much decreased. In some cases the guardians have made up their minds quite definitely and clearly that if alcohol is to be given it must be given as a medicine; and in some instances they have gone so far as to say that it is a medicine which cannot be safely administered in a pauper's own home, and if the medical officer thinks that alcohol is necessary the pauper must come into the workhouse to receive it.

2871. Have you ever found that the range of medical relief and medical comforts has been extended because it has not carried disfranchisement with it, whereas the same amount of relief given as out-door relief would do so?—I have not the slightest doubt that that must be the effect, but I have got no figures to prove it.

Difficulties of classification.

2872. A good deal has been said with regard to classification, and as to its falling into disfavour; is that in part because of the difficulty which is found in the definition of "deserving"?—No. What I had rather in my mind was that the form of classification which we offer to what we are pleased to call the aged deserving poor man inside the workhouse is not what he wishes.

2873. Would you agree with the pauper who said, "Sir, we sorts ourselves"?—I should. Besides I think there is a great deal in the old Yorkshire proverb: "Heaven for climate, but t'other place for company."

2874. Is it not the case that boards of guardians find, and very properly find, a difficulty in summing-up at the age of seventy the whole of a man's life, his opportunities and the use he has made of them, and pronouncing upon them and saying he is deserving or undeserving?—It has always seemed to me positively absurd that any board of guardians should say they are going to investigate the whole circumstances of a man's life, his temptations, his bringing up, his character, his physical propensities, and then say whether he is to be a sheep or a goat. You cannot imagine a more unsuitable tribunal for pronouncing such a decision than a board of guardians.

2875. That is to say, the epithet "aged" is a question of fact, but the epithet "deserving" is a question of opinion, and they ought never to be put together as if they stood upon the same ground?—That is so. I must say this, that in spite of all the talk about desert and merit being a claim for relief which has gone on since, we will put it, the year 1884—which is the date, by the way, of the last Franchise Bill—I do not think that the arguments of John Stuart Mill have ever been answered. I have them here, and I will read them. You will remember the famous passage in which he says:—"What the State may and should abandon to private charity is the task of distinguishing between one case of real necessity and another. Private charity can give more to the more deserving. The State must act by general rules. It cannot undertake to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving indigent. It owes no more than subsistence to the first, and can give no less to the last. The dispensers of public relief have no business to be inquisitors. Guardians and overseers are not fit to be trusted to give or withhold other people's money according to their verdict on the morality of the person soliciting it; and it would show much ignorance of the ways of mankind to suppose that such persons, in the almost impossible case of their being qualified, will take the trouble of ascertaining and sifting the past conduct of a person in distress so as to form a rational judgment on it. Private charity can make these distinctions; and in bestowing its own money is entitled to do so according to its own judgment. But the administrators of a public fund ought not to be required to do more for anybody than that minimum which is due even to the worst. If they are, indulgence very speedily becomes the rule and refusal the more or less capricious and tyrannical exception." I know that that is not a popular doctrine now, but personally I fail to see that there is any logical answer to it.

J. S. Mill the functi of charity and poor relief.

2876. In answer to Mr. Booth I think you said that in the case of women, classification might be desirable in a workhouse?—Classification is desirable.

2877. Do you think that the effect upon the women who are classified, not in class A or B, but in class X or Y, is not harmful?—Do you mean to say that there is a certain amount of harm in picking out a class for punishment or for distinction on the ground of good or bad conduct?

Difficulti classifica

2878. Stamping them in that way and giving it as the opinion of the world that that is their position?—If you classify for good conduct you are also classifying for bad conduct; and that brings you to the argument which you will find in the old commissioners' reports against marking unchaste women with a distinctive dress in workhouses—which is all very well worth reading. (*See* Appendix to Report of Poor Law Commissioners for 1840, p. 98.)

2879. Have you any experience of a place in which charity has co-operated closely with the Poor Law?—Very little. I have not had one of those unions where the thing was perfectly systematised, but I have had a good illustration in the Milton Union of North Kent where the relations between the guardians and the existing friendly societies in that union are very close indeed. The union clerk and the union chairman take a very prominent part in the organisation of the friendly societies of the district.

Co-opera between guardian and frie societies.

2880. (*Dr. Downes.*) There is a description in Sir William Chance's book of the arrangement in the Milton Union; do I understand that that continues down to the present time?—I think it does. There is the same chairman and the same clerk.

2881. Is it your experience that strictness in the administration of ordinary out-relief tends to providence against sickness?—Undoubtedly.

Effect o out-reli insuran against sickness

2882. Had you any experience of medical clubs in your district?—I do not know much about them as matters of detail, but I know of their existence, and I

know perfectly well that if you give indiscriminate out-door relief you can crush out every medical club in the neighbourhood.

2883. Taking the various forms of provision against sickness, first of all, you have the provision which the man himself can make by his thrift and insurance, then you come to the provision which might be made by chari'y, and, finally, you come to the provision which should be made by the State if the others fail ?—Yes. I adopt that classification.

2884. Which would you consider the most desirable of those three methods ?—I think you have put them in their order of merit.

2885. If the last, that is, the provision by the State, comes first, is it your experience that it would tend to choke the growth of the others ?—It chokes the second and it absolutely kills the first.

ect of poor
' medical
ef on
untary
pitals.

2886. As a concrete example, are you aware that in London the number of beds in the general hospitals has shown very little increase for years past ?—I am told so.

2887. And, on the other hand, that the number of beds in the Poor Law infirmaries in London is greater than the number of beds in the general hospitals of England and Wales put together ?—That is so, but I would say occupied beds also.

ndon
ths in
blic
titutions.

2888. I do not know whether you are also aware that statistics show that 35 per cent. of the deaths annually in London are deaths occurring in public institutions ?—Yes, and I think it is a constantly increasing percentage.

2889. You will find that in the Annual Summary of the Registrar General, I think. Are you also aware that of that 35 per cent. the larger proportion (over 18 per cent.) are deaths in workhouses or workhouse institutions ?—Yes.

ect of high
ality of
dical relief

2890. Have you considered the case of the man who is just above the stage of pauperism, with regard to the provision of medical relief under our present system; is there anything open to him such as he would find in a Poor Law infirmary ?—It would cost a man hundreds a year to get for himself in some cases what a pauper gets for nothing. Consider what it is—it is a perfect ward with a carefully regulated temperature, night nursing and day nursing, and a resident medical officer.

2891. I do not know whether you have considered the possibility of remedying that state of affairs; it is clearly one for the Commission to consider, I think ?—It is a most important question; and it does seem to me that possibly the solution of it may be found in the abandonment of the whole problem as one which is outside the scope of ordinary pauper relief and pauper administration, namely, by frankly admitting that in a populous urban community there is a class for whom charity does not provide and cannot provide, and for whom perhaps the State should provide. But if you do that (and you may have to do it), you will, in my judgment, stop any provision of further charity hospitals all over the country, or of further beds.

2892. I take it, it would also stop the growth of thrift and of the provision by insurance against sickness ?—It would check it to a very great extent, that is to say, to do it with anything like safety, you would have to surround it with innumerable safeguards.

2893. Then, I take it, that our present position is, that we stand in danger of conferring a privilege on pauperism ?—That is so; and of generally weakening the natural feeling against Poor Law relief.

2894. And the spirit of independence ?—Yes.

endance
listrict
dical
cers at
rdians'
etings.

2895. To return for a moment to out-door medical relief, has it been the practice in any of the unions in your late district to require the district medical officers to attend the meetings of the guardians ?—In some cases, but unfortunately only rarely.

2896. Should you not approve of their attending ?—I think they ought always to attend, when any considerable amount of medical relief is given.

2897. Very often a personal conference between guardians and a medical officer is distinctly advantageous to the mode in which relief is administered, is it not ?—Most advantageous.

2898. I think you would agree that the medical officer is the most important officer of the guardians, after the relieving officer, for out-door relief ?—Yes.

2899. And that it is highly desirable that those officers should work in unison with the guardians ?—Yes. Shall I give an illustration of that ? A good many medical officers think that the amount given in relief is not enough, so they proceed to recommend extras—so many pounds of mutton, we will say, not on medical grounds but because they think on general grounds that the pauper is not receiving enough. That is a practice which is extremely embarrassing to the guardians, and it should be put an end to. A personal conference between the medical officer and the guardians will often put that matter straight at once.

Statistics as to feeble-minded paupers.

2900. With reference to the question of persons of defective intellect in workhouses, I do not know whether you have alluded to the large number of persons who are classed as feeble-minded who have to be maintained in institutions ?—My former evidence only related to what are known as lunatics, that is to say, any person of unsound mind in a workhouse is considered a lunatic; but there is another class of feeble-minded of which we have a return in the half-yearly statement of pauperism, In that return for March, 1905, it is shown that in workhouses and other Poor Law establishments there were in the special wards or establishments for persons of the feeble-minded class 1,368, in other wards 6,529, in other institutions 360, and receiving out-door relief during the half year 1901. Inquiry was also made as to the number of feeble-minded women who had given birth to children in workhouses during the previous five years. The books referred to did not admit of this information being given with any degree of completeness, but I think 635 cases occurred in the period mentioned. You will remember that that question is now under investigation by another Commission. I mention it here because much the same arguments that apply in the case of lunatics would apply in the case of the feeble-minded—I do not say in all cases, but in most cases.

2901. That class forms a very large proportion, I think, of the whole indoor pauperism, does it not ?—Yes.

2902. A considerable number of those persons would very probably, in country workhouses, be found in the infirmary wards, would they not ?—Yes.

Old and infirm in sick wards.

2903. Also in such country workhouses, I think, if my recollection is right, you will find a great number of old people and infirm people who are not strictly sick in the ordinary sense of the word ?—That is so. The number of acute sick in country workhouses is very small.

2904. They are put there no doubt because it is a convenient and comfortable place for them. The figures, therefore, of any return of persons in a sick ward do not necessarily mean that those are sick people ?—Not sick in the ordinary acceptation of the term.

2905. I put those questions because, as you may be aware, the public are sometimes exercised in their minds as to the proportion of nurses to the number of people in so-called sick wards; but everything depends, does it not, in the particular instance on the class of case which happens to be in the sick ward ?—Yes.

Effect of strict out-relief on deaths from starvation in London.

2906. You were asked a question as to the mortality in places where there is strict relief; I dare say you are aware that in London there is a return of deaths from starvation which has been furnished to Parliament for many years past ?—Yes.

2907. Are you also aware that the number of deaths in those returns annually was considerably greater in the early seventies, when a good deal of out-door relief was given, than it has been in later years ?—I believe the deaths have steadily diminished; and I believe they include a large number of persons who are in receipt of out-door relief.

Labour tests for women.

2908. A small matter which you have mentioned in your evidence, was the difficulty of finding a labour test in the case of women; I do not know whether you have ever had it suggested that they might be engaged in preparing lint or bandages for surgical dressings ?—I have never had experience of that.

2909 But that would be a suggestion worth considering, perhaps ?—Yes.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

Dietary for able-bodied men.

2910. In the case of able-bodied test houses for men, should you be in favour of a reconsideration of the present arrangements for dietary so that the diet might be more adapted to the actual work that the man does?—Certainly.

2911. Under present conditions, I think the loafer gets practically the same diet as a man who is working hard?—Yes.

2912. And that might be remedied?—I think the time has come when the whole dietary question will have to be reconsidered again—at least, I am afraid so.

Convalescent homes of friendly societies.

2913. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) In reference to friendly societies and medical relief, is it not the case that some friendly societies have their own convalescent homes?—I think so.

2914. So that, even in the case of institutional relief it is not always essential that they should become paupers in order to get what they need?—That is so. That sort of provision would be extended if there were a greater restriction on Poor Law relief.

2915. And, no doubt, they enjoy their own Homes very much more than they would enjoy the Poor Law Homes that are provided for them?—Yes.

Effect of Out-door Relief (Friendly Societies) Act.

2916. Does the Out-relief (Friendly Societies) Act tend to put a premium on those friendly societies which pay the smallest allowances?—Yes.

2917. That is practically the unsatisfactory societies, is it not?—That is practically the upshot of it and, according to my judgment, it prevents the friendly societies from really dealing with the question of provision for old age, that is to say, by separating the sick benefit from the age benefit.

2918. That has been recommended constantly, has it not?—Constantly.

Possibility of obtaining return.

2919. Would it be possible to get a return showing how far relief had been given in connection with this Act, and what friendly societies the men applying for it were in?—I suppose it would be possible to get such a return through Parliament.

2920. If we could show that those who applied for any help under this Act would be only those who belonged to unsound societies, that would be a strong case against them, I suppose?—Yes.

Utilisation of pauper labour for work in and about the workhouse.

2921. Going to workhouses, can you tell us to what extent the actual work of and in the house is carried on by pauper inmates?—The number of able-bodied in country unions is now so small that there is an increasing necessity of having to hire outside labour to do the work.

2922. In the urban unions is it mostly done by the inmates?—Yes; but at certain times of the year, for instance, in the hop-picking season in Kent, the workhouses are denuded of all the able-bodied inmates. Here I should like to mention that sometimes when that has been the case, I have suggested to boards of guardians that instead of giving widows out-door relief, they should hire the widows for half-a-crown a day to come and do charing in the workhouses. That is occasionally done, with the effect sometimes that the widows go off the out-door relief list and do not come to work. A curious thing is this—and it is very curious as showing how great is the sympathy for the widow—that a great many guardians object to that and say, "No, let the poor woman have her relief"—knowing perfectly well that she is working for somebody else.

2923. It used to be the custom in a union I knew very well, for the widows to be given 10s. a week and to be employed as scrubbers in the infirmary?—That is what ought to be done. But you should pay them an adequate wage; do not pay them a penny less than they are entitled to in the open labour market.

2924. (*Dr. Downes.*) That is very commonly done in the London infirmaries, I believe?—I think it is done in London; but when I have suggested it in the country, I have been met with the objection I have named.

Out-door relief as a subsidy to ow paid trades.

2925. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I should like to ask you a few further questions about the relief of widows. I think you will agree with me that in London certain trades are very largely supported by the rates?—I am perfectly convinced that they are not only in London but elsewhere. That is a point which I ask the Commission to investigate.

2926. It has been calculated that many thousands a year go from the rates direct into the pockets of employers?—That is so; I believe.

2927. It is customary also, is it not, to give relief to quite young women in the slack season of their trades in London?—I know very little about London relief, but I do know that that is the sort of thing that is done.

2928. So that the London employer can turn off his girl and women hands every autumn or when he likes, and will be quite sure that they will be kept by out-relief and charity until he chooses to take them on again?—One of the most specious pleas for out-door relief is what you hear in towns with a specialised manufactory—it used to be so in the old days in Sheffield—"These are times of distress; give them out-door relief to keep the men together." That is absolute, sheer, cold-drawn protection.

2929. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Are you speaking of the able-bodied?—Some are able-bodied, some are not.

2930. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) The women I have in mind are women of from twenty-five to forty years of age?—I understood so. In further reference to Mr. Patten-MacDougall's question I might say that when guardians have got into that state of mind that they mean to give out-door relief, they can give out-door relief. If an able-bodied man comes up for relief it is very easy to invent a sick child, or a sick child is suggested.

2931. (*Chairman.*) You would say, I take it, that the guardians support trades in this sense, that they encourage the masters to ret rid of hands in the slack times?—What I mean is, that it is done to keep the men together. They say this, "Here are bad times, and unless we give the men relief, they will go away and seek for work elsewhere; so we will give them relief and then, when we want them, we shall be able to put our hands on them." Exactly the same considerations are involved in Mrs. Bosanquet's question as to giving the women relief in slack times.

2932. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) My point is that there are many trades in London where the women never gain a subsistence wage the whole year through because they are supported during slack times by out-relief or by charity, and also there are plenty of trades to which they can go, and would go, in which they could earn a living wage if they were not so supported here?—That is so; they are anchored to the place by the small dole.

2933. (*Chairman.*) Are they receiving outdoor relief at the same time as they are receiving wages?—Yes, that is, if they are sick, or if they are not able-bodied, they would be.

2934. I want to ge clearly in my mind how it is the rates help the trade or the masters. If these women could not get outdoor relief, would you contend that the master would not discharge certain of his employees in slack times?—He would be less apt to discharge them than he is now, because then he might lose them. He knows that after the slack time will come a good time, and he wants to keep the people together.

2935. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I would push it further than that; I know to my knowledge that many women are actually earning a very much less than subsistence wage and are having it supplemented by what they are getting under the Poor Law?—That just illustrates what I say of all outdoor relief. You cannot go to a board of guardians in the country but you will find that one of the main reasons for giving out-door relief to a poor person is "because she does a little," "because she earns a little," "because she does the best she can for herself."

2936. (*Mr. Patten-Macdougall.*) Is she certified not to be able-bodied by the medical officer?—She may be able-bodied in London because, under the Regulation Order, you can give out-door relief to everybody.

2937. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I am certain that many trades can exist in London only because of the out-door relief?—That, of course, is a question which I cannot answer, because I do not know London.

2938. (*Chairman.*) In consequence of giving out-door relief they accept a wage or a price which would not keep them alive, and which they could not otherwise accept?—That is a point which, in a former part of my evidence, I have entreated—I do not use any less word than that—this Commission to investigate. I am convinced myself that the greatest wrong that is done to poor people in

England now is done by means of the out-door relief which is given to persons who are earning wages. That is my own personal conviction.

2939. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) I rather agree with you, but I want to put it in another way: Side by side with the people who are given out-relief, are there not other people working at exactly the same trade and for identically the same wages?—That is what I cannot tell you, because I do not know the trade or the place.

2940. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) With regard to out-relief in the slack season, is it true that in London it would be possible for these people to get any other work during their slack season?—As I have said, I do not know about the London conditions and I can only give you general opinions. I have never attended a meeting of a board of guardians in London in my life, except twice.

2941. Your experience then has all been in the country?—Yes.

2942. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Would you then agree with me in this, that there is a congestion of under-paid labour in those districts where out-relief is freely given?—That is another most important point which also affects the labour market according to my view, and which it will be for the Commission to investigate. If you give out-door relief regularly—never mind in how small sums—you will find a tendency to make a local congestion of the worst paid labour and of the poorest people. For a very small sum these people will stay in London and will not attempt to go outside. One of my most interesting early recollections of the Poor Law was seeing in Cumberland and Westmorland several of the folk who had been hand-loom weavers. When the hand-loom weaving trade broke down they received small sums of out-door relief, and I found them there thirty or forty years afterwards still receiving out-door relief. It was perfectly clear that if they had not got out-door relief they would have been working in Bradford or in Leeds. I remember the case of a little country union where they had a local flax industry. It was a very strictly administered union indeed. The flax mills were suddenly shut up, rather cruelly as I then thought, and practically the only source of wage-earning was closed. The guardians had to consider whether they would give these people out-door relief, or whether they would refuse to give them any but indoor relief. They argued it out. If we give them out-door relief they will be here for ever; we shall anchor them to this place with a small dole and we shall be making permanent paupers of them; if, on the other hand, we offer them the workhouse, the owner of the mill will have for very shame to help them, their friends will help them, charity will help them, and they will go away to be self-respecting, self-supporting people elsewhere. The latter policy prevailed. I do not think I ever saw such a sight within the walls of a workhouse as I saw then. The hall was full, the dining-room was full, the corridors were full, as the people came in, for it was at first their only resource. In a month the place was empty, some of them had gone to America, some elsewhere—the whole countryside of them had gone. I think that that action of the guardians absolutely saved those people from a degraded and miserable life. I instance that as a good example establishing the evil of out-door relief as tending to congest labour. You will have to ascertain how far that congestion has gone on, and what has been its evil effect on the rate of wages of independent labour.

2943. You have suggested that there was a great difficulty in giving out-door relief to women in exceptionally bad times in the textile trades say; is it not the case that during the cotton famine, when this difficulty was very great, they adopted a plan of classes, such as sewing classes and domestic economy classes, which answered very well?—Yes. Given the friendly aid of charitable folk, you can get through times of emergency in that way. My point is, that in order to do the work well, you have to call in aids other than the Poor Law machinery.

2944. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the inquiries which are made in the cases which are relieved in a Poor Law infirmary, does it not often happen that the man is admitted and that the inquiry is made or is not made afterwards?—Yes.

2945. That is one of the great difficulties of dealing with Poor Law infirmary relief, is it not?—Yes.

2946. With regard to the Application and Report Book and the inquiries made in consequence of the use of it, is there no system by which the guardians can have the statements of the applicants verified by reference to any other board of guardians?—Their statements are often verified by reference to employers. *Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.* 5 Feb. 1906. Verification of statements of applicants for relief.

2947. Those would be local employers?—Yes.

2948. In an ordinary case there are many facts which require evidence from without the locality; is there no system of cross help as between board and board in verifying statements?—I think one relieving officer would usually give another relieving officer information.

2949. Would he, even if he belonged to another union? I think so. I have never found any difficulty about that.

2950. (*Mr. Nunn.*) But he is not bound to do so?—He is not bound to do it, but I think he always does it. I have sometimes had a complaint that a relieving officer was not quite so obliging as he ought to be in that matter, but it is very seldom.

2951. (*Mr. Loch.*) My question leads me on to this point—that the information is hardly systematically obtained, so far as I know in Poor Law inquiries?—That is so.

2952. And that until some system of cross reference is more or less accepted as a matter of course it is rather difficult for such information to be systematically obtained?—I do not think the number of cases where cross reference is necessary would be very great.

2953. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think in one or two unions there is a special relieving officer who has to go outside the district to make inquiries in other unions, is that not so?—No large union ought to be content with merely its staff of relieving officers. That staff ought to be organised and classified. You ought to have your cross visitor and your superintending officer. Then you ought to have a special man to remove lunatics. A very fruitful source of bad relief is that the relieving officer has certain statutory duties to perform which over-ride his duties to the guardians, as, for instance, the removal of lunatics, and the looking after lunatics in various ways, and when he is asked what he was doing on a certain day he replies that he was removing a lunatic, or something of that kind. You have not got him altogether in your hand for his whole time, as you have an in-door officer. Therefore it is very essential that the various functions of the relieving officer should be specialised and divided among other officers so that one man should not be overloaded. Cross visitors and superintendent relieving officers.

2954. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the Poor Law orders do you know, in the little report one gets from Elberfeld and other German towns, how very clearly the definition of relief and the principles of it are set out?—Yes. Characteristics of Poor Law Orders.

2955. That is an element which is lacking in our orders, is it not?—Yes.

2956. And the orders are not promulgated in the same way as those are?—What orders are you referring to now?

2957. I mean our Poor Law General Orders?—No; those are simply sent out as directions to be obeyed.

2958. But they are not available or stated in the simple manner in which one gets them in Germany?—In issuing an order the Board generally issues with it an instructional or circular letter, dealing with the subject under consideration, as indeed they do when a new Statute comes out which bears on Poor Law matters or on local government matters generally.

2959. True, but the local public of the place have not a collection of the methods and principles and definitions, such as they have in an ordinary German town?—I have often wondered how far those were useful in a German town. As you say, they vary very much from us. Elberfeld system of exposition of principles of relief.

2960. Taking the simple question of the definitions in the Elberfeld system, where you rely greatly upon outsiders knowing exactly the conditions under which relief is given, they define quite clearly what the Poor Law should or should not do, do they not?—Yes.

2961. Is it your opinion that if it were introduced in some form into our Poor Law literature and made local, that would be of service?—Anything which gives people a greater interest in it would be of service; but

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

I am not quite sure whether we should, from one period to another, stick to the same explanatory or hortatory passages.

Criticism of Application and Report Book.

2962. With regard to the case papers, is it not a difficulty that it is very hard to find out all cases in the Application and Report Books as they now are, each report book having its own index?—I think the present Application and Report Book is in a very bad form.

Relief of widows in Scotland.

2963. With regard to the relief of widows and the amount that is given to them, I have here a little report of the methods of administering Poor Law relief in certain large town parishes in Scotland. In that report they say: "Where the dependents are very numerous, it indicates the presence on the roll of a large number of widows with young children. As we had not the number of such widows, and as they constitute a class that cannot well be 'tested' by the offer of poorhouse relief, we resolved to confine our comparison to the rates paid in 'single cases' (namely cases without dependents) to whom the 'test' of poorhouse relief can always be applied. If the aliment be adequate in such cases, it may, we think, be assumed that it will also be sufficient in respect of widows with children, and *vice versa*. To arrive at the number of 'single cases' we have made a somewhat rough classification by regarding them as cases in which the aliment is at the rate of 3s. per week and under. The following table shows for each parish (1) the percentage of cases on the outdoor roll at 3s. per week and under, excluding lunatics and children boarded-out, (2) the average weekly aliment for such cases, and the average rents of one and two-roomed houses." It follows from this statement that there are, for instance, at Leith 66 per cent. of cases at 3s. per week, and that the average weekly aliment is 2s. 7d.?—Would that be for the widow alone?

2964. That is for the single person. Would you not conclude from that, that with our out-door relief system in Scotland there is probably the same difficulty of insufficiency as there is here?—It looks like it.

2965. The problem, that is to say, is the same though the conditions in many ways may be slightly different?—Yes.

Relief in first six months of widowhood.

2966. To go to another point, I understand a widow by the order has a right to relief during the first six months of widowhood?—Yes.

2967. During that time do they refer the case to any charitable body and see if the widow can be so helped as to avoid her coming on the rates at all?—That is what is done at Bradfield, I think, and some other unions. You will find a description of what is done in the Bradfield union on page 145 of Sir William Chance's book.

2968. In that way a considerable number of widows are prevented from becoming chronic paupers, are they not?—Yes.

2969. With regard to the experimental methods you refer to, do the boards of guardians as a rule take into account outside charitable agencies or help?—Do you mean the larger charities, or do you mean the charities received by the individual pauper?

2970. I mean both the larger charities and the smaller charities such as may come into the income of the pauper?—Boards of guardians are very apt to neglect that source of income altogether. In strictness they ought to take into consideration every source of income, even if it were manna from heaven; but as a matter of fact they are very apt to pass over sums received from charities, and sometimes the private almsgiver will make it a condition that the guardians do not take any notice of what has been given.

Co-operation between charities and boards of guardians.

2971. Would it be a good thing to have a kind of representation of charitable agencies, by co-optation or otherwise, on the boards of guardians?—I am certain that in large towns, and especially in London that is one of the keys to the problem. You must have closer co-operation between charitable endowments and the boards of guardians, and what is more, you ought to have closer co-operation between the Charity Commissioners and the Local Government Board in that way. We ought to take much more notice of the condition of a union with regard to endowed charities than we do. You will get some quite remarkable instances, I think, from the other inspectors' of unions where the charities are quite sufficient to pay the whole shot of the out-door relief, instead of which they are misused and appear to have the result not of diminishing pauperism but of increasing it.

2972. As a suggestion, would a parallel voluntary committee be of service; doing all kinds of work as in connection with the Brabazon scheme and various other supplementary business connected with Poor Law relief?—In every union, I should say, that that would not be necessary, but in large unions or in unions with special difficulties or circumstances it would be a great help to the Poor Law administration, as it might provide the necessary personal care of people such as cannot be given by the paid officers of a Poor Law authority, to say nothing of the money question.

Rent and relief.

2973. With regard to the payment of rent, it is sometimes said, can guardians pay rent; what do you say upon that?—They are prohibited from paying rent in the Order. You may not set a man up in business or pay his rent. I think a man may use the relief if he likes for paying his rent, but you may not pay rent directly to the landlord of the pauper. As you are aware the rent question is a burning one, especially in London; and in some cases it is alleged that landlords who sit on boards of guardians practically get their rents paid out of the poor rates, that is to say, they favour their own tenants.

2974. (*Chairman.*) Would not the tenants then get relief in the shape of money in order to pay rent?—You may not pay rent directly to the landlord, but still if you give a man out-door relief he has a means whereby he may pay his rent. It has been suggested very strongly that one of the headings in the case paper or in the out-door relief application book should be the name of the applicant's landlord, so that the guardians might fully be aware of what they were doing.

2975. (*Mr. Loch.*) The puzzling part of it is the wording of the order. The prohibitory order, Article 5 says, "It shall not be lawful for the guardians, &c., to pay wholly or in part the rent of the house or lodging of any pauper, &c." And then it goes on, "provided always, that nothing in this article contained shall apply to any sudden or temporary lodging procured in any case of sudden and urgent necessity, or mental imbecility, or shall be taken to prevent the said guardians, in regulating the amount of relief to be afforded to any particular person, from considering the expense to be incurred by such person in providing lodging." The out-door regulation order is much simpler, but there is a qualifying clause which turns the edge of the first clause. One more question about the labour. This process has been going on sometimes in London, has it not, that the guardians refer the man, we will say, to the Church Army or the Salvation Army to do some work for them?—They pay the Salvation Army 6s. a week to employ the men, exactly as used to be done before 1834. It is a curious revival of an old custom.

Indirect provision by guardians of work for paupers.

2976. There is this further point. If the man comes back then he may be prosecuted or taken before a magistrate for not doing the work when he had a chance?—Are you referring to a special case?

2977. I want to take the general practice which has been prevalent, in the last five or six years particularly, of referring men to a place where work was more or less artificially provided for them which, if they did not do, the man was taken before the magistrates as a loafer. Does that seem at all a necessary thing in connection with our Poor Law?—If London were so properly organised that it had recourse to a proper test house run by the guardians themselves, or a labour colony in the true sense—I do not mean an agricultural colony; I am not talking about that—I should have thought that this sort of bargain would have been unnecessary, except of course that you may allege that there are certain religious influences that might be brought to bear upon a man by the Salvation Army or the Church Army, which must of necessity be absent in an institution run by boards of guardians.

2978. As a matter of fact it is hardly contemplated by the orders and the general method of the Poor Law system, I believe?—That is so. It seems to me that really it is a reversion to those systems condemned by the

early Poor Law Commissioners of paying an employer to employ your pauper for you.

ılation of and in- f.

2979. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I understand that the system of administering outdoor as compared with indoor relief is all regulated by orders of the Local Government Board, and that accordingly Boards of guardians have very little discretion in the matter?—You are quite right in supposing that they are regulated by the Local Government Board; but that the guardians have little discretion is not the fact. It is evident that they must have very great discretion, otherwise you would not have the enormous discrepancies which are disclosed by the statistics in the administration of the respective unions.

2980. Having that discretion there is, I understand, no appeal against it, and their determinations are final except when the Local Government Board choose to proceed, if they ever do proceed, by way of mandamus?—Their recommendations with regard to cases of relief to individual paupers are absolutely final, and the Local Government Board are statute-barred from interfering in the case of the relief of any pauper.

tion on icant's sal of in- relief.

2981. Accordingly if a pauper is offered merely indoor relief and does not care to take it, the applicant has no remedy?—He has no remedy.

2982. I think you told us before that you are not of opinion that it would be a wise thing to provide for a power of appeal against the decision of the guardians in a case where they had only given indoor relief?—I see many reasons against it.

ections to eal inst ant and n of relief.

2983. I should like you to mention some?—I should think it would be a general weakening of the authority of the guardians, and I think in that way it would diminish what is of even more importance than the administration of the Poor Law, namely, the general character of the local governing bodies of England. I think that the central body would be wholly incompetent to exercise a sound judgment on the conditions of the individual cases submitted to them. I think that the central authority would probably fall into a way of dealing with those cases in classes. They could not have the accurate local knowledge which a board of guardians could have in such matters.

2984. Assuming in the first instance that there was a very full inquiry into the case by the board of guardians or by their relieving officer, and that subsequently when the appeal was taken the Local Government Board might make full inquiry themselves by their own officials, would that not meet the last of the three reasons you gave?—If it were thought possible and practicable to have a very full inquiry in the case of every pauper who did not like the orders that the guardians have given to him, then a full inquiry would meet that point. I suppose the facts could be ascertained by the Local Government Board just as well as by the district authority; but there would have to be a local inquiry into the subject.

2985. Are you of opinion, too, that—assuming that were so—the cases would be too numerous for appeals of that sort to be practicable?—I think they would be much too numerous.

2986. That, of course, would be a very considerable factor in the consideration as leading you to be of opinion that it would not be advisable to have such an appeal?—Yes, but that is not the only reason. I have given two other reasons. Personally, I am afraid I should in almost every instance leave it to the guardians; I should say "I do not see any reason to interfere."

ieving er's re- nsibility payment on-settled ef.

2987. I understood you to say that a relieving officer has no duties towards the non-resident poor of another parish; is that so?—It is a lawful order for a board of guardians to instruct its relieving officer to pay relief for another union; but it is entirely in the option of any board whether they will assist in giving what is called non-settled relief or not.

2988. Non-settled relief, as I understand it, is relief in a parish or union other than that to which the pauper is chargeable?—That is non-settled relief.

2989. Where there are cases receiving non-settled relief I take it that the relieving officer of the parish paying such relief has no reciprocal duty towards the parish of chargeability?—Not unless he is so directed by the guardians.

Very many unions decline either to give non-resident relief or to pay non-settled relief.

2990. In the case of an applicant claiming relief from a different parish from that in which he is residing I suppose the probable result is that he would be given only indoor relief?—The probable result would be that he would have in-door relief given to him, and then that he would be removed, that is to say, if it is the practice of the particular board of guardians to remove.

2991. Apart altogether from the other conditions of the case, would not that lead to a breaking-up of the household and to removing him from his relations?—I do not think that. You must remember that many unions do not enforce removal; it is not their practice to remove; it is their practice to give the relief.

Leave of absence from workhouse.

2992. As regards leave of absence from workhouses, I think you told us of a good many instances where that tends to abuse, and where there is too much latitude allowed. What kind of restriction would you propose upon the present rule about leave of absence from workhouses; would you propose to limit it, so as to prevent there being any absence overnight?—There is no absence overnight, I think, now. Very rarely a man may get leave to go away and stay with his friends for a few days as being more convenient than allowing him to discharge himself and then get re-admitted. I am talking of the practice which has prevailed in so many London unions and other unions too, in recent years, of allowing the inmates to go out *en masse* during the day. I merely suggested that you might find that that was one of the causes of the overcrowding of the workhouses, and as supporting the allegation that they were less deterrent than they ought to be. I brought it up in that way.

2993. I understand the practice varies in different workhouses?—The practice varies very much.

2994. I take it that it varies to this extent—that leave of absence in many workhouses is not confined to the aged and well-conducted, but is permitted with much less discrimination?—I think that is so. When the question was asked me before I had not a copy of the last circular of the Local Government Board—I am referring to the one issued in 1900—in my hand. In that circular we did not deal with the question of leave of absence from the workhouses in detail; it is left entirely to the guardians.

"Officers' grant."

2995. As regards nursing in workhouses, that is, as I understand it, regulated by an order of 1897; is there any Government grant towards nurses in workhouses?—No. The grant, as I have explained, is based on the number of officers who were employed in the year 1888. It is an unvarying grant, and does not alter at all; so it may be said that we have no grant which affects boards of guardians according to the number of nurses they may appoint—I mean, they do not get more money if they appoint more nurses.

2996. Then you cannot enforce your order by means of giving the grant or withholding the grant in cases in which the order is not complied with?—No.

2997. I think no portion of your medical relief grant goes towards the nurses?—That is so; nurses are simply in-door officers.

Training of probationer nurses.

2998. Is any provision made under your order for the training of probationers for workhouse nursing?—I think there was an order issued as far back as 1873, allowing the managers of the Poplar and Stepney Sick Asylum to train probationer sick nurses, and I think we laid down in that order the conditions as to probationer sick nurses. Of course recent Orders prescribing Regulations for Infirmaries and Sick Asylums provide for the training of probationers.

2999. As regards cases which are treated in the workhouse infirmaries of which you have been speaking, I want to ask you now whether there is not a certain overflow always from the ordinary hospitals which must either lack medical attendance or be taken into the workhouse infirmaries; do you find that here in England?—Yes. The ordinary hospital—I am not talking about London, about which you will get other evidence—looks on the workhouse as a sort of adjunct to which it can remove cases which become incurable or very troublesome. That affects the number of deaths in workhouses very considerably.

3000. Perhaps I may read to you from a Scottish

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

report*, and you will be able to say whether it accurately represents the case as it exists in England. "The poor-house hospitals, equipped under modern conditions, also attract other sick poor persons, who, although not destitute, and therefore not objects of parochial relief, are unable to gain admission to a general infirmary. This result may be due to different reasons, either, for example, because the infirmary has no vacant beds when application for admission is made, or because the illness from which the applicant is suffering is such that the infirmary does not treat it. Cases of chronic rheumatism, bronchitis, cardiac trouble, ulcerated legs, phthisis, etc., are not as a rule received into a general hospital or infirmary. Further, for similar reasons, the general infirmary authorities not infrequently hand over to the parish authorities cases they have had under treatment that have become chronic, or cases that, from pressure on the accommodation, or from other good cause, they are unable to receive or retain." Is that an accurate statement?—I think I would accept that statement as referring to England.

Reimbursement of relief.

3001. I want to ask you further whether your experience is that payment is received by the workhouse authorities in any way in regard to these cases, many of which are able, so far, to pay for such treatment?—Payment is to a large extent received, but it very much depends on the board of guardians. It is very difficult to enforce the payment, and some practically do not do it, but some are very anxious about it. As a rule although the case would not pay in the hospital he might be made to pay in the workhouse infirmary. You will find in all those matters that the guardians are much more keen to get relief repaid from out-door cases than they are from indoor cases. One of the advantages of the case paper system is that guardians would then have information about the means of the relatives of an indoor pauper in the case paper, if he has been an out-door pauper—information which they have not if merely the ordinary form is adopted. Many a man whose relations have paid as long as he is an out-door pauper escapes payment when he gets into the workhouse, because it does not occur to the authorities to ask for payment.

Provisions against overcrowded workhouses.

3002. You told us, I think, with regard to the overcrowding of urban workhouses that you do not have any provision when a workhouse is so overcrowded for removing and boarding any of the paupers who may be there in other workhouses?—There are ample means for that. One board of guardians may make a contract with any other board for the reception of their paupers. At the present moment there are many London paupers boarded-out in the country.

Lunatic grant.

3003. As regards the payment on behalf of lunatics, I understand the payment is at the rate of 4s. per head, is it?—Yes.

3004. It is not a fixed sum in this sense, is it, that there is a lump sum granted—but it is 4s.—per head for each lunatic?—It is an unvarying grant of 4s. per head for each lunatic.

3005. However much it may amount to in the course of the year?—Yes.

Cause of increase of lunatics.

3006. I think you have also told us that the number of lunatics who are so removed is largely increasing?—The number of lunatics altogether is increasing.

3007. Is that due, to some extent to the fact that the relations are not so anxious to keep them now and look after them and give them treatment at home as they were in the past?—I do not know. That is a subject which is discussed in the Reports of the Commissioners in Lunacy. I should say myself that that might be a factor in the increase, but it would only be a small one. There are other causes for the increase of lunacy.

3008. But it may contribute something?—It might contribute something towards it.

3009. May this also contribute—that the local medical officer prefers to get rid of such patients and have them put, either into the asylum or into the workhouse instead of having to treat them as outdoor paupers?—Yes, that may contribute; but then I am perfectly certain of this—without casting the slightest slur on workhouse medical officers and masters—that that has been a very strong reason for the removal of numbers of people from comparatively cheap workhouses to expensive asylums.

3010. Are there not many cases in the workhouse of perfectly harmless lunatics who might very much better be retained outside?—If they had friends who were willing to look after them, do you mean?

3011. I am assuming that?—I do not know whether there are many. A considerable number of the lunatics in this country are boarded out—I mean to say are outside, just as numbers of the feeble-minded are outside.

Position of applicant's refusal of indoor relief.

3012. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) You were asked in the case of an actually destitute person who absolutely refuses to come into the workhouse, what would happen, and you said circumstances might arise, or very shortly would arise, which would warrant the relieving officer in regarding the case as one of sudden and urgent necessity, and he would then report that to the board of guardians at their next meeting; assuming the board of guardians still ordered the person to come into the workhouse, and he still refused, and no fresh circumstance had arisen would the relieving officer be able to continue the provisional relief?—Yes. The usual procedure would be that the Chairman would write in the Application and Report Book "Left to R.O.," and then the relieving officer would have to watch the case.

3013. Would he go round and give the provisional relief as long as he liked?—Yes.

Suggested powers of compulsory removal to workhouse.

3014. Is that power of continuing outdoor relief to such persons much abused?—There is no doubt there are a certain number of cases such as those which I have mentioned already and which are mentioned in Mr. Albert Pell's proposals to the Poor Law Board in 1877, who ought to come into the workhouse. They are perhaps half crazy and are living under conditions that no human being should be allowed to live under, and yet they will not come into the workhouse. The suggestion made then was that you should have a compulsory power of removal to the workhouse, but that has never been carried out. I am disposed to think both with regard to that class and with regard to tramps that there should be such a power, although one must attach a very great importance to maintaining what I call the purely voluntary nature of the English workhouse. At present you can leave the workhouse when you like and the guardians cannot compel you to go into it; it is purely voluntary.

3015. It practically comes to this, does it not, that anybody who is destitute can get out-door relief?—If he likes to undergo the suffering necessary to make himself absolutely an urgent case. The great importance of the matter is from the point of view of whether an offer for the workhouse can be considered as adequate relief. You will remember that in the old statute of 1723 it was expressly laid down that if a poor person refused to enter the workhouse he should be struck off the book or books of persons who are applying to the overseers for relief. That statute has a curious history. It was twice repealed and re-enacted, and finally was not got rid of till somewhere in the 80's, when it was swept off under a statute law revision. That was the old idea, but that is not the idea now. Still, logically, an order for the workhouse is adequate relief, for if it were not that it would be open to the pauper to choose his own method of getting relief. As a matter of actual administration the point is settled by the procedure which I have stated; that is to say, a man refuses the workhouse, and then, if he is destitute, he falls into such a condition that he becomes a case of sudden and urgent necessity, and the relieving officer has to relieve him under that clause; and so it can go on for quite a long time.

Ancient penalty for refusing to enter workhouse.

Conditions attendant on out-relief after refusal to enter workhouse.

3016. (*Mr. Phelps.*) But he must always make a fresh application, must he not?—Yes.

3017. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) And must be visited by the relieving officer?—Yes.

3018. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) And the relief must be given in kind, must it not?—Yes.

Relieving officer's responsibility where pauper refuses to enter workhouse.

3019. (*Mr. Booth.*) Must he make a fresh application himself?—Yes.

3020. I thought you said the relieving officer had to watch the case?—He must make a fresh application in strictness, but, as a matter of fact, when you have a case of that sort the relieving officer always watches

*Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Medical Relief, &c. (Scotland), 1904.

it and hears about it, because he knows very well that if he does not watch it and the case dies and there is a coroner's inquest, he may get into trouble, although perhaps he ought not to get into trouble. It seems to me that the dilemma is this—if the applicant is crazy he ought to be removed into the workhouse; and if he is not crazy surely it is with him to decide, and the responsibility ought not to be put upon the relieving officer. It is a most onerous responsibility and, what is more, exposes the relieving officer to threats of being indicted for manslaughter, and so on, in case the man dies. The present position is not logical, and it is not very satisfactory; it is not so unsatisfactory as you might think, but it certainly is a point which ought to be dealt with in your recommendations.

3021. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Are there many cases where relief given by the relieving officer provisionally week by week has been surcharged by the auditor?—No; I do not think we have any trouble in that way. Our troubles are altogether different.

ord of
es of
licants for
f.

3022. In the event of out-door relief being given to persons who are in receipt of wages, would the fact that the person is in receipt of wages be recorded in the application and report book?—It would be reported in this way: "Partially disabled."

3023. The relieving officer would consider it a part of his duties to enter the fact that the person was in receipt of wages elsewhere then?—Yes, he would enter that and also what the man was getting from various sources.

3024. Is there a column for that in the application and report book?—Yes.

ditor's
wers as to
essive
ief.

3025. Would an auditor have power to deal with that; in other words would an auditor cut off a certain amount of relief if he considers it to be extravagant?—No; he must either do nothing or disallow the whole order.

3026. He cannot reduce the amount?—No.

3027. (*Chairman.*) Does he not report on it as a matter of fact?—He may report on it; but he would not report on it unless there was quite a group of cases of the sort.

fficulties in
sing rates
famine
ief.

3028. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) In the event of abnormal distress arising from strikes or lock-outs or agricultural distress or any other difficulty of that sort, is there ever a rate imposed which is so large as to make it difficult of collection?—Such a case has never been known, not even in the time of the cotton famine, although there, as you may remember, they had a rate in aid towards the end of the time and other unions in Lancashire had to contribute. There has been no instance where the boards have had to stop giving relief because they had no further money. However, I should like to say this, that there are cases where the rates have been so high that they are extravagant to collect. If the rate is raised above a certain limit, especially in times of distress, you have more emptics and more people going away because they cannot pay, and more people getting excused and so on; so the higher the rate the greater the loss in collection.

3029. There is no power in England, is there, to spread one half the cost of any abnormal distress over the county at large?—No, there is not.

easures for
lieving
stress
ring Lan-
shire cot-
n famine.

3030. In the case of the Lancashire cotton famine, which you have just referred to, they had a special Act I believe?—Yes. It was strongly opposed by those people who had the cause of sound poor law legislation and the cause of local government most at heart. You can read all about it in two books—Arnold's "History of the Cotton Famine" and a book called "The Need of a Settled Policy in Times of Distress," by McCullagh Torrens.

lleged rela-
on between
nacy grant
d increase
lunatics.

3031. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Beginning first of all with the case of imbeciles in workhouses, you told us that the number of lunatics has considerably increased, in consequence I think, you said, of the 4s. grant?—I did not say that it was in consequence of that grant; I said that the number had increased.

3032. Concurrently perhaps?—That may be, but I did not mean that they had increased in consequence of the 4s. grant. I do not think any grant could make a lunatic. The case of a lunatic is different from the case of any other pauper.

3033. They have increased in asylums, have they not?—Yes. The statistics show that the asylums are now practically taking the increment of lunatics.

3034. It is the case, is it not, that to send a lunatic from a workhouse to an asylum involves a certain cost to the guardians over and above that which they would pay in the workhouse?—Yes.

3035. The average cost in the asylum is somewhere about 10s. a week, is it not?—It is even more than that.

3036. In some cases it is more, but I think the average cost is somewhere thereabouts. Deducting the 4s. from the 10s. there is a charge of 6s. a week on the guardians, which I take it would be more than the cost of the lunatic in the workhouse?—It would be a little more. The grant of 4s. a week was arranged so as to exactly fill the difference between the two.

3037. I do not think it was intended quite exactly to do it?—It was intended, I think, very nearly to do it.

3038. I think the intention was probably to make it something less?—It may have been so, but it was very near it at the time, and as the increase in the maintenance rate goes up the grant becomes less and less effective.

Pauper lunatics maintained by relatives.

3039. May not one reason why the number of pauper lunatics in asylums is large be this: that in a great many cases relatives repay the cost of maintenance in an asylum, and that the guardians are aware of that fact, the reason being that the difference between the cost of a pauper lunatic in an asylum and the cost of a private patient in an asylum is very considerable?—Yes.

3040. Consequently there are, are there not, a good many cases of lunatics sent to asylums as paupers who would not ordinarily be paupers, but who are sent there in order that they may be treated as paupers in the asylum, and whose relatives are willing to repay the cost of their maintenance there?—I have never heard that alleged. It may be so, and very likely is so.

3041. It has not come before you?—No, it has not. As you are aware, we have had considerable correspondence with the Commissioners in Lunacy from time to time as to the recovery of sums from the relatives of lunatics.

3042. Of course where the amount is recovered from the relatives the guardians would not get the 4s.?—No, they would not.

Difficulties of special workhouses for special classes.

3043. In one part of your evidence you talked of the grouping of workhouses with a view to larger areas, and you spoke of the difficulties that there were in carrying out arrangements of that kind. Is not one of the difficulties this—that supposing you propose to alter a union area the natural way of looking at the matter by the guardians is whether they will lose rateable value or gain rateable value in proportion to the charge which the parish involves?—That is the first thing that occurs to them.

3044. Consequently would it be your experience that usually where a union will lose they object to the alteration and where they will gain they are in favour of it?—I should say that their tendency would be against it all the time even where they gained by it; that is to say we do not get such an active assistance in making a change from the people who gain as we get violent opposition from the people who lose.

3045. But the assistance, if it came from the local authority, would usually come from where the union would gain from the transfer?—Yes.

3046. It has sometimes been said that one difficulty which would arise I think from having very large areas for the purpose of indoor relief would be that persons would be sent to workhouses situate at a considerable distance from their relatives?—That was a consideration which had a great effect with the Cottage Homes Committee.

3047. Do you yourself share that view?—To some extent. It is a point against the proposal.

3048. Do you think that there is ground for supposing that the old people in workhouses would object to be placed very far off from their relatives?—Yes, they might; but a great deal more has been made of that objection than in my judgment it is entitled to. Of course it is, as I say, a point against the proposal.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

5 Feb. 1906.

3049. What I was rather trying to ascertain was whether the objection is well founded or not ?—The foundation is small, but there is a foundation for it. A great deal depends on the size of the area you are taking. If you have one workhouse near a market town which is used for two or three unions there is no force in the objection at all ; but if you are going to amalgamate the whole county of Surrey, say, or the whole county of Kent, for the purpose of workhouse classification, then the objection would take a very different form.

Objections to county as area for indoor relief.

3050. Therefore you would say that if there were a proposal to make the county the area for in-door relief it would be much too big an area to take ?—Yes. As I said in answer to another Commissioner, I attach great weight to the visiting of a workhouse inmate by somebody from his own neighbourhood. That is a great check on all sorts of abuses.

Unions without workhouses.

3051. You mentioned one or two cases where it would be practicable to have a union without a workhouse ; such cases must arise from the voluntary action of one board of guardians agreeing with another board of guardians to take their cases, must it not ?—Quite so.

3052. The boards could not be compelled to do it ?—No they could not.

3053. Where there is no workhouse do they make some provisions with regard to casuals ?—Yes, sometimes. Occasionally they have an arrangement whereby a casual coming from the east shall be charged to one union and a casual coming from the west shall be charged to another union.

Safeguards against abuses in workhouses.

3054. With regard to the avoidance of abuses, or the checking of abuses in workhouses, are there any arrangements in force which have that effect ?—I can say that the Local Government Board take every possible precaution that they can against abuses in workhouses. The safeguards they rely upon are these—A visiting Committee of the guardians ; the Ladies' Visiting Committee ; then the medical officer is usually a man in independent practice outside, and cannot afford to have a scandal ; then there is in the majority of unions in England a chaplain, who is also an independent man from the outside ; then there are visits and religious services held by ministers of various denominations ; then there are the visits of relations to paupers in the workhouse ; then you have the freely elected board of guardians who have to answer to the parochial electors at regular intervals ; and lastly—and I should put it least—there is the central inspection of the Local Government Board.

Visitation of workhouses.

Resident workhouse medical officers.

3055. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) Is there a resident medical officer in some cases ?—In large workhouses there is, and, what is better, in large workhouses there are occasionally resident assistant medical officers with visiting medical officers from the outside, men in private practice. In recent years our whole policy seems to have been to get independent persons from the outside to visit the workhouses.

Existing compulsory classification in workhouses.

3056. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to classification in workhouses, a certain classification is compulsory under the General Consolidated Order, is it not ?—Yes.

3057. But that is limited practically, is it not, to age, sex, infirm and able-bodied ?—Yes.

3058. A further classification is optional with the guardians, is it not ?—Yes.

3059. Although there is a sort of direction to them in the Order to consider the matter ?—Yes.

Attributes of Local Government Board's circulars, General and Special Orders.

3060. Then you have spoken about certain Orders and circulars which have been issued by the Local Government Board. I suppose it might be taken that where a circular is issued it is merely issued as a matter of exhortation to the guardians, or of advice or recommendation ?—That is all.

3061. But where an Order is issued it is thereupon compulsory upon them to give effect to it ?—An Order has the force of law.

3062. The more important Orders are usually General Orders addressed to a number of boards of guardians, are they not ?—Yes.

3063. But sometimes it happens, does it not, that a matter which would ordinarily be dealt with by a General Order is dealt with by a Special Order in the case of a particular union, because that union is freshly set up or some change has taken place in its circumstances ?—That is so.

3064. Has that Special Order the same attributes as a General Order ?—It is advertised differently.

Necessity publicatio of Special Orders amending General Orders.

3065. But it is published in the *Gazette*, is it not ? — Yes. There is this point which might give rise to some misconception—though a General Order is only an Order which is applicable to several unions, still an Order which varies or rescinds a General Order is also a General Order, and has to be published in the *Gazette* although it only affects one union. The reference to that is to be found in 10 and 11 Vic. c. 109, Sec. 15.

Number local Act affecting Poor Law administ tion.

3066. You told us that in a certain number of unions there were local Acts which affected the administration of the union ; they are not very numerous, I think, are they ?—I have the list* of them here ; there are fourteen of them.

3067. Would it be possible to put in some statement, or could something be got from the guardians showing generally what the effect of those local Acts is as affecting the administration of relief ?—I think it might be done. We cannot do it, I think, in the office of the Board itself, because so many of the sections have been repealed and it would be a rather complex piece of work. I think the Commission will find that as a matter of practice there are very few of them that affect Poor Law administration at all. We only get to hear of them, and they only become a trouble when we have to deal with questions of boundary. Then sometimes we find there is a local Act in existence which may impede our action.

Justices' powers as out-relief obsolete.

3068. Coming to the question of out-door relief, I think the Justices have certain powers which you have called to mind under the Act of 1834 ; among others they may order relief in cases of sudden and urgent necessity or if the guardians refuse. Do you know at all whether those powers are ever acted upon ?—They are acted upon very seldom.

3069. Might they go ?—They might certainly go. Practically you will occasionally find a Justice determined to act on the powers, but when it comes to the point you can always pick a hole in his action and so it is practically impossible for him to do it. Those powers, therefore might just as well go.

Principle allocation Prohibito and Regu tion Orde to unions

3070. You told us about the difference between the Prohibitory Order and the Regulation Order, and you dwelt on the fact that the Regulation Order is particularly in force in London and also in Lancashire, but I do not think you meant to say that the Regulation Order was limited to London and Lancashire ?—No, I did not.

3071. The object was, was it not, that it should apply to places with large populations where it was supposed that the able-bodied poor could not actually be relieved in the workhouses ?—It was supposed to apply to unions where the workhouse accommodation was considered to be insufficient to enable the Prohibitory Order to be acted upon.

3072. It was the case, was it not, that a somewhat more stringent order was issued previously to that, but in the same year, and had to be withdrawn because it was found to be too stringent ?—Yes ; that I believe was the history of the matter.

Prohibiti of rent-re

3073. With regard to the prohibition on the guardians to pay rent which is contained in the order, was not the real intention that they should not pay back rent, but that this was not to interfere with their paying for board and lodging required when the application was made, so that if the man was destitute and required board and lodging they were not precluded from paying ?—That is so. As I said, it obviously meant that the rent should not be paid direct to the landlord. The abuses of such a practice would be evident, especially if it were a case of back rent.

3074. The duty of the guardians is not to pay a man's debts ?—No, it is not.

3075. But to relieve his present destitution ?—That is so.

3076. Therefore, they would not pay any back rent that he might owe ?—That is so.

* For list of local Act Unions, see paper handed in by Mr. Adrian, C.B. Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. 1 (H).

ficulties as medical ief on loan.

3077. Then we come now to quite a different matter, namely, the question of medical relief on loan. Does it appear to you that the practical difficulty of making any satisfactory rule upon that subject is almost insuperable ?—I think so.

3078. On the one hand, if you pay the medical officer entirely by fee you will pay him too much for dealing with a particular case, and too little for dealing with another, or, which comes to the same thing, you do not fix a proper payment for the particular case which he attends ?—That is evidently so.

bour yards an ergency edient.

3079. Then you referred to the difficulty with regard to labour yards, and the giving of work in them; notwithstanding those difficulties, would it be your view that it would be beneficial that there should be some system according to which the poor are set to work if they are able-bodied, and are relieved out of the workhouse ?—If able-bodied men are to be relieved at all, I think you must have some out-door labour system in times of emergency.

posed ck on vision of our yards.

3080. Would you say that usually it would only be in times of emergency ?—Yes; and I am not sure that the consent of the Local Government Board ought not to be necessary before the Labour Test Order is acted upon.

3081. So that it would be advantageous to make some consent necessary before it is put in force, although the Order may be technically in force in unions ?—Yes, I have got a case here which is rather interesting, where a surcharge was made and enforced upon a board of guardians, because they only employed the men for two days a week in the labour yard.

3082. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) And gave them a week's wages ?—They do not pay wages—they gave them a week's relief.

3083. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is that a current case ?—No; it is a case of some two or three years ago.

tention of and outs.

3084. You referred also I think to the fact that there is a certain amount of compulsory detention in the workhouse at the present time in the case of people who go in and out frequently ?—Yes; up to seven days.

3085. The time was increased, was it not, under the Act of 1899, so as to provide that if a man had, in the opinion of the guardians, discharged himself frequently without sufficient reason the detention might be extended to 168 hours ?—Yes.

Central Authority's power to require appointment of additional relieving officers.

3086. With regard to the relieving officers, it is in the power of the Local Government Board, is it not, to require a board of guardians to appoint an additional relieving officer if they think fit to do so ?—Yes.

3087. Have they, in some instances, exercised that power ?—In several instances recently they have done so.

Books required with case paper system.

3088. With regard to the case paper system, where that is in force, I assume that the relief order book ought to be kept as well as the case paper, in order that the actual direction of the guardians may be preserved in a book which can be produced at any time ?—The relief order book would take the place of a register and would be kept separate from the case papers as a record. The application and report book I do not think would be necessary.

3089. And I think that has been dispensed with in some instances ?—Yes, although I believe there is an objection to doing so.

Proposed extension of Central Authority's powers to decide settlement.

3090. Then you told us about the settlement; there has been a suggestion that appeals to the Local Government Board might be made compulsory; do you think it would be difficult for them to determine in that case not only the question of law, but the question of fact as to where a man had resided or where he had acquired a settlement ?—My suggestion was that if they failed to state a case they should have no remedy.

3091. That is if they did not agree ?—Yes; and then they have got to agree on a case before they could take the removal.

3092. The alternative would be, would it not, to have an enquiry for the purpose of determining the question of fact ?—Yes.

3093. And that might be possible, might it not ?—That might be quite possible, though I hesitate to suggest any such addition to the work of the board.

TENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 6th February, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

Riots against guardians.

3094. (*Chairman.*) After the Commission of 1834 reported, a great change was made in the administration of the Poor Law, and there were certain disturbances and riots; in your recollection have boards of guardians ever been subject to any proceedings of that kind in consequence of an alteration in the administration of the Poor Law?—Not as against the central authority, but I have several times in my experience seen local riots partly directed against the guardians. For instance, in 1879 there was a strike in the Lancashire cotton trade which ended in very considerable riots; mills were burned and, for the only time in my recollection, the Hundred Rate was levied to pay compensation to the mill owners. During that time on several occasions when I was going to meetings of the board of guardians I was escorted there by policemen and escaped from the back door in a cab. That was because of the actual pressure of the numbers to be relieved by the guardians, and because it was felt that probably the guardians might have been more liberal than they were. My duty was simply to explain the law. Again, rather later, there was the case of Middlesbrough, where the men paraded about the town with loaves of bread held up on sticks and clamoured for food or work. When men are in distress they will put this kind of pressure on the guardians, and it is on those occasions that the orders and audit of the Local Government Board are such a support to the guardians.

Local Government Board orders and audit a bulwark for guardians.

3095. I think the first case you mentioned was at Blackburn?—It was all over North Lancashire.

3096. Those are the only two cases you can recollect?—That was the only case of actual riot, but I have known many cases of disturbances. In South Wales I remember, somewhere in the seventies, they had soldiers down. When there is a strike and the men are poor, their blood gets up and you have to be prepared for them.

3097. The disturbance is more due to the strike than to the administration of the Poor Law?—It would be in consequence of the local administration. The men were not organised, and they were not clamouring for a change in the law. They were clamouring for perhaps a laxer administration by the board of guardians.

3098. Taking ordinary times, that is not so?—We hear of nothing of the kind.

Nursing of infirm in sick wards.

3099. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Yesterday you were discussing the sick wards and the infirm wards. I understood you to say that in the sick wards now it was a mistake to suppose that nurses were needed in the same proportion as they would be in a hospital, because many of the people were not really sick. Were not you rather confusing sick wards when you said that?—I do not think I said that.

3100. I took it down at the time. It was in answer to a question by Dr. Downes, and it seemed to me there was a little confusion between infirm wards and sick wards. In most workhouses you have infirm wards and sick wards. The infirm wards are where the people are who do not require nursing, but it is the sick ward against which very often the criticism is levelled, because there are not enough nurses and because in quite recent times you had pauper nurses?—I do not think you were present when I dealt with that question at rather more length. What I said was that in the old days, or even up to the time of Dr. Edward Smith's report, there was a feeling that trained nurses were not necessary in workhouses because the sick were chronic. That was the time when for eight thousand sick in London you had 111 paid nurses, and when in the whole of London there were but three night nurses. Then I pointed out that the whole character of the administration has changed; the nurses have gone from tens to hundreds, and a class of sick come into the Poor Law infirmaries now that never did come before.

Former number of poor law nurses in London.

3101. I am rather thinking of a workhouse where you have infirm wards, and where the infirm wards are wards for only infirm people, and on the other hand you have a sick asylum or another place where really sick people go to. What I understood yesterday was that you said that most of the people in these sick wards were not sick at all, they were only infirm—chronic cases?—My answer yesterday referred to country workhouses and not to urban workhouses.

3102. Do you know any district that you can put your finger on where the provision of a decent infirmary has, within your knowledge or within the knowledge of anyone you are acquainted with, stopped thrift on the part of the people living there?—No, you cannot trace such an effect as that over so small an area. You have to deal with this economic cause and effect over a much larger area than one isolated instance.

Effect of medical relief on providence against sickness.

3103. Do you know of a group of districts or a large area, because I understood you to speak definitely yesterday?—What I meant was that it was a matter for special investigation in certain districts; that I personally was convinced that the lax administration of relief certainly did discourage medical clubs and thrift clubs of that sort.

3104. That, of course, presupposes that you are aware of the wages and housing conditions, and all the rest of it connected with the social life of the people so treated?—It would follow to some extent. It can only be an opinion.

3105. You are only giving it as an opinion?—Yes, but I suggest it as a matter for special investigation.

3106. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I gathered you thought the State hospital under any circumstances would rather lead to the discouragement of thrift ?—In the long run.

3107. France would be rather a case against that, would not it ?—Yes, France would.

3108. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) My point, of course, is this, that it is purely a matter of opinion on your part. You have not any facts or figures as to the social conditions of any particular district which you can put your finger on to say : Here thrift has been discouraged and medical clubs have gone under ?—If you ask me whether I have a complete account of the social and economic conditions of any part of England by which I can definitely prove that the lax administration of relief has led to a lack of thrift, I have not, but I have seen numberless individual instances which have led me to suppose that such is the case.

3109. Take a district like West Ham, for instance; that has grown up in my lifetime, and has certainly grown up in yours; are there any rich people there ? Take Canning Town, for instance; have any rich people lived there to look after, or in any way attend to, the poor who we know are there ?—Your point all the way through is that charity would be so much better ; I suggest to you that in the districts where you have what is called lax administration because of good infirmaries and that sort of thing, you have not the charitable people living there, or at any rate you have not people with sufficient means to provide it ?—Your point would be that there are certain districts where the people are so poor that a somewhat lavish administration of relief is necessary.

3110. Not exactly lavish; that is not the point. My point is that there is no one there to do what you say you want done instead of Poor Law relief—that is charity ?—Therefore the rates must do it ?

3111. I want to get the fact from you ?—As to the fact that they do not live there I agree. I do not suppose such people live in Canning Town, though some rich railway companies and dock companies are there.

3112. There is no one to provide the charity, that is my point, so there is no alternative but to go to the Poor Rate ?—All my life I have heard of East End distress, and of attempts to get money in aid of it. I should think there was more charity going in those poor parts of the East End of London than there would be in many poor country parishes. I have not had the East End in my district.

3113. Have you any accurate statistics, or is not a good deal of what you have said opinion which you have formed, and one has, therefore, only to treat it as opinion ? —I may say that I have a number of tables and curves, and so on, which deal with that point; they show the increase and decrease of rateable value, pauperism, population, and various other points of that sort, but whether I have anything which would exactly show what you ask, I could not say, because what you ask is not exactly statistical.

3114. But what I want to get at is this : In the examination yesterday there was a good deal made of the point that charity was so much better than the rates ; and that it would be better if people were relieved by charitable effort. At any rate that is what I gathered, and my point is that in very many urban districts there are not rich people living, and there are not endowed charities ; as a matter of fact there is not anything to do what you think ought to be done for the relief of sick people by providing hospitals, therefore they are compelled to go to the rates ?—I think it would be very much better to get evidence of this description from what I call first-hand sources. I am not a first-hand source. I know nothing from actual experience of these districts, but I have heard and have read of places like St. George's-in-the-East, Whitechapel, and some other unions in the East End of London, where the relief keeps pretty constant, and where the rates are not oppressive. I have always been under the impression that that was to a great extent due to the fact that the resources of charity and the resources of self-help (which I suppose are individually in the men in Canning Town as they are in other places) were drawn out by a more careful and more rigid administration of public relief.

3115. I was coming to that. In your evidence you compared unions such as Brixworth, St. George's-in-the-East, and others, to show the difference in administration. What I want to get from you is, have you any evidence as to the social conditions prevailing in Whitechapel thirty years ago, when the policy which you have just mentioned was first started, and have you any evidence to show the Gentile population at that particular time, the rateable value of Whitechapel at that particular time, and the alien population and the rateable value of Whitechapel now, because they are essential things in forming a judgment as to the value of the comparison in your evidence ?—I have no accurate figures. I suppose there would be some evidence on the point, but evidence would be impossible, as to the number of Jews in Whitechapel in those days. It is said the reason why Whitechapel manages to retain its strict administration is because of the Jews ; that is to say, it is apparently saved by the Jews.

3116. What is it you form your conclusions from ?—It is a matter of opinion, but it is an opinion based upon thirty years' actual practical experience of the administration of the Poor Law. Over 250 unions in England have been in my district. Every week I attend meetings of boards of guardians, and I see the administration; and naturally one is acquainted with the current literature on the subject, so I submit to the Commission that at all events I have a right to form an opinion upon the point.

3117. I am not questioning your right ; I hope you will not think that I have not enough respect for you to value your opinion ; I really have, and I am not saying that at all complimentarily. The whole point that I want to get at (because I consider this is vital to the whole discussion of the Poor Law) is that when we get an opinion stated by a gentleman like yourself, we are entitled to have it in evidence what it is you base that opinion upon, because some of us have other opinions which experience has also led us to form. What I really want to get at is whether, in judging St. George's-in-the-East, which is on all fours with Whitechapel, you have taken into account the enormous growth of the alien population, and, in forming a judgment as to the ratio of pauperism in St. George's, you have taken the Gentile population and found out what proportion of paupers there are in it as compared with the entire population ?—That is a point which I have not considered.

Difficulties in comparing St. George's-in-the-East and Whitechapel.

3118. I think that is an essential point in judging St. George's-in-the-East and Canning Town, for instance, where there are no aliens. Do you really think that most of the people who are in the infirmaries of London, or anywhere, are people who were able to exercise thrift and therefore could have kept outside ?—Yes, I do. I will state later on the reasons which have in my judgment led to the enormous increase of expenditure in London. I believe that there is no part of England where a strict administration of the Poor Law would not save a certain number of those who at present are paupers and restore them to the ranks of independence.

Effect of administration on pauperism.

3119. There, again, you must have some evidence. If you are going to submit that later, I will not pursue it. You must have some evidence as to wages and conditions because, again, they govern it ?—I think you will find, even in the poorest districts, you may have an administration which will check the growth of pauperism. I look upon pauperism as an actual evil—as a social disease.

3120. That is all right, I know that, but what I want to get from you is, how it is you come to the conclusion ; what are the figures and facts which have made you come to the conclusion that the bulk of people in infirmaries ought not to be there ; that they ought to be maintaining themselves at home ?—I do not think I said that. I think I said a certain proportion of them, under a stricter administration, would not be there.

3121. What do you think is the proportion ?—That I do not know. That would vary a great deal with the social conditions. What is quite obvious is that, all over England, you will find unions with apparently the same social conditions, the same rateable conditions, the same rate of wages, and in one you will find pauperism is 30 per cent. higher than in the other, and in every one of those cases you will find the proportion of outdoor relief given is much greater. The greater the proportion of out-door relief, the greater the proportion of pauperism ; you will find that in London unions. There is one London union with a rate of 67 per thousand, the average rate in London being 27 per thousand.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

3122. But, even so, are we going to have evidence from you, or from anyone else, as to the social conditions in these unions you are comparing now ?—That is a matter entirely for the Commission. I should think the Commission would find that evidence very important and very vital.

3123. You are not putting it forward ?—I am not putting it forward ; I am merely putting forward the Poor Law side.

Returns of deaths from starvation in London.

3124. It is now the custom, is not it, to give returns of the deaths from starvation in the Metropolis ?—Yes.

3125. Would there be any objection to our having copies of all those returns for, say, the last seven or eight years ?—If the Commission desires it, I think there will be no difficulty, and there certainly will be no unwillingness, to supply every reference to deaths by starvation which occurred from the very earliest times which are in these reports.

3126. I had in my mind your answer to a question yesterday : that since 1870 these deaths have decreased, and that previously they took place to a very great extent in unions where out-door relief was given ?—I do not think I said that ; I said a large proportion of the deaths from starvation were those of persons in receipt of out-door relief.

3127. You put it that way, I daresay. What I want to ask you is : since 1870, would you say that—since the time when Mr. Chaplin was President of the Board and the return was first issued ? This is a return which comes round to the Boards in London regularly every year ?—A return (Parliamentary Paper No. 289, Session 1904) was made to an address of the House of Commons of the number of deaths in the administrative county of London in the year 1903, upon which a coroner's jury had returned a verdict of death from starvation, or death accelerated by privation, together with any observations furnished to us by boards of guardians with reference to cases included in the return. The number of such deaths returned by the coroners was thirty-nine. We requested the guardians of the union or parish in which the death occurred to furnish us with such facts in regard to the deceased as were known or could be ascertained by the guardians or their officers. The purport of the information received in reply is included in the return. In only three cases was death ascribed solely to want of sufficient food. For the most part the deaths appear to have been due to disease consequent upon or accelerated by want or exposure, or both, and to self-neglect. In most of the cases either no application had been made for poor relief, or application was only made when the deceased was in a dying condition. In connection with one of the cases it appeared that the arrangements for dealing promptly with urgent applications were capable of improvement, and the guardians consequently initiated a better system. The cause of death does not appear to have been attributable in any case to neglect on the part of the guardians or their officers.

Effect of increase of "Shelters" in decreasing deaths from privation.

3128. I would like to have those returns put in, but is not it a fact that since 1870 General Booth's and the Church Army's and a whole crowd of voluntary doss-houses have been put up in London, and that, therefore, you would not expect, even apart from the Poor Law, so many people to die of starvation and privation in London as previously ?—I am afraid I cannot agree with you as to the utility of doss-houses and shelters.

3129. Is not it the fact that since 1870 you have had all these Institutions to which what are termed the wastrels of the Metropolis can go, whereas, previous to that date, you only had the Poor Law to which they could apply ?—My impression is that there was a considerable number of shelters long before 1870.

3130. There were some ?—I remember a report of a Committee of the House of Commons which was made in 1846, I think, in which the question of shelters is dealt with ; but I quite agree that the number of shelters has increased. Medland Hall is a place of old standing.

Mr. Chaplin's circular as to adequate relief to aged deserving poor.

3131. Mr. Chaplin issued the circular to Boards of Guardians urging them to give adequate out-relief to aged people, I think, in 1900 ?—That was so.

3132. Do you consider that out-relief to aged people leads to sweating ?—If they do any work, it has that tendency.

3133. Then, of course, the department is responsible, because they advised the boards of guardians to give out-relief to aged people ?—What the department says is : the board consider that aged deserving persons should not be urged into the workhouse at all unless there is some cause which renders such a course necessary, but they should be relieved by having adequate out-door relief granted to them. On many occasions I have been asked what that means, and I have answered that the relief ought to be adequate in every sense : it ought to be so adequate that there would be no necessity for the pauper working, because the adequacy has to be considered not only in relation to the individual pauper, but with regard to the welfare of the body politic. I may say that I am coming to that circular by another door, and you will have ample opportunity of dealing with it.

3134. May you give out-relief to able-bodied women ?—Do you mean in London ?

Out-relief to able-bodied women in London.

3135. Yes ?—Under the Regulation Order you can.

3136. To unmarried women ?—Yes, under the Regulation Order, but under the Prohibitory Order you cannot.

3137. Which order is in vogue in London ?—The Regulation Order.

3138. That we may give it to unmarried women ?—The word in the one order is "males," and the word in the other order is "persons."

Number of single women receiving out-door relief.

3139. Do you know whether it is the rule to give relief to unmarried women in London ?—In London, in 1905, there were 203 single women who received out-door relief.

3140. In the whole of the Metropolis ?—Yes, and in the whole of England there were 2,336, including 287 mothers of illegitimate children. The numbers of mothers of illegitimate children who got out-door relief in London is not distinguished.

3141. Would they be in good health, or sick ?—I do not know.

3142. It is rather important, is it not ?—I suppose the guardians had their reasons. We are precluded from interfering in any individual case, as you are aware.

3143. What I wish to get at is, whether boards of guardians are allowed to give out door relief to an unmarried woman in good health who is at work ?—In London I suppose so.

3144. There are only 203, so it is very easy to get the details of those ?—If they consider her to be destitute.

3145. That would only be sudden and urgent necessity. Perhaps I ought to postpone these questions, and ask them of the Inspector for London ?—He would know naturally more about the practice of his boards of guardians. We do not do it in the country, because we cannot.

3146. I suggest to you that they do not do it in London either, as a rule ?—You have the exact number, 203.

3147. Which is a very small number, of course. Whether these women were in good health or not you cannot say ?—I think no one would have that information, generally speaking.

3148. I can take it, for practical purposes, out-relief is not given to unmarried women in good health, because you say you do not do it in the country, and there are only 203 in London ?—There are a certain number of cases in the other Regulation unions. I fancy you would have more cases of that sort in some of the Lancashire unions than you would have in London, because there are a number of wage-earning women there in excess of the number elsewhere.

Out-relief to unmarried mothers.

3149. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do the mothers of illegitimate children get out door relief without remonstrance being made ?—It is forbidden under the Prohibitory Order. We have some cases where we are asked to dispense with that regulation by country boards of guardians. I am sorry to say those cases are getting much more frequent, and we do not deal with them with quite the severity we should do. As a matter of fact, you will find that will not be very much allowed in future.

Effect on wages of out-relief to widows.

3150. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Generally speaking, it is the out relief of widows, so far as women are concerned, that you consider sends wages down ?—So far as women are

concerned, they would be the main people who would interfere with the labour market—they and the old women who do charing and similar work.

3151. After all, there is a very large number of widows who get outdoor relief, is not there ?—Yes. Shall I give you the number of widows who get out door relief ? They are as follows :—able-bodied women, other than wives of paupers, widows, 2,931 in London, and 31,000 outside London, making 34,000 in all ; wives relieved on account of husband being in gaol, and wives of sailors, soldiers, and other non-resident males, 640 in London, 4,700 elsewhere ; making a total of 5,300. Those figures are taken from the half-yearly statement of pauperism.

3152. Your point is that giving these widows relief enables them to go to work for less wages than they otherwise would be obliged to ?—Yes.

3153. The alternative to out-door relief is to take the children to an Institution, is it not ?—Yes ; or, in many cases stricter investigation, or an order for the workhouse to the woman, would show whether she was able to maintain herself or that she had friends.

3154. Still, there would be the sweating done ?—No, she then would be much more inclined to make a good bargain with her employer, and say : "I am not going to work unless I get full wages." She could not afford to.

3155. Again, that is only a matter of opinion ?—My view is that in these matters you must be guided by general tendencies, and my view is that the general tendency of out-door relief to able-bodied women is to lower wages.

3156. That is, of course, your opinion on the subject ?—I wish to introduce the word "tendency."

3157. What I want now to ask you is, if a woman is left with five children, and you take three of them into the workhouse or into the school you relieve her of the burden of maintaining these three children, and she still can go to work at a low rate of wages, because she has not got to keep those three children. You have relieved her of those in exactly the same way as if you gave her out-relief, by relieving her of a portion of her burden. Where does the difference come in ? Why does the one lead to sweating and the other not lead to sweating ?—The woman who has the normal number of children to support is a free woman just the same as any other woman ; she can make her own bargain. The woman who is extremely poor and has out-door relief is not in that position ; but you must remember this, that is not the only reason why some boards of guardians take children into workhouses ; they do it for the sake of the children and for the sake of the test. When it comes to the actual point of whether the woman is helped in that way and kept on the labour market, the answer can only be, yes, she is helped.

3158. My point to you is that you help the woman in either case ?—Yes, you do.

3159. And if in the one case you are entitled to say it tends to sweating by helping her in a particular form, I want to find out how logically you can say it does not lead to sweating when you help her in another way ?—You cannot, but the reasons why are different.

3160. Of course the same thing applies, does not it, if people help her by charity, or if her relations help her ?—That again is a different thing.

3161. The effect must be the same ; you have relieved the woman of a certain amount of strain and stress ?—Yes, and you are right to do it out of your own money.

3162. You and I will not discuss that, because I hold quite another view as to what is our own money. Now as to Scattered Homes : In Sheffield, for instance, you have Scattered Homes in the town, and a child is not taken to the workhouse, but it is taken from its mother to a particular home ; given the mother is a respectable person, why should not you give her the money to keep the child ; where is the moral hurt to anybody in giving the woman the money, rather than giving it to another woman in the same street, to mind her children ?—I do not know the Sheffield practice, but I should say if it be as you state, the reason was, first because they desired to impose a test of some sort upon the mother, next because they are not satisfied that the children could be as well brought up by a woman who has to go out to work to make up her inadequate income, and therefore must more or less leave the children neglected ; they think probably it would be better to take those children and bring them up properly. That, I should think, was in their minds. I do not say whether I agree with it or not.

3163. You have a mother who is fairly respectable, and you have a board that believes in what is called strict administration, that is no outdoor relief, and yet they give indirectly outdoor relief, by putting the woman's children two or three doors away from her in practically the same street ?—Do you mean the result is the same as if they gave the outdoor relief to the woman ?

3164. Yes, just the same. That is always providing, of course, that the woman is a respectable woman. I quite agree you have to take children away from some mothers, but they are not all like that. What I want to get at is, where the moral hurt is in giving the mother the money rather than another woman, and whether you would not be preserving the home life better ?—I have stated the administrative reasons for doing it, which seem to me conclusive, although, as I have said before in the previous part of my evidence, I am no great believer in the system of taking children away from their mothers for other reasons which are not exactly economical. I think the extraordinary proportion of child paupers to the total rate of pauperism which exists in London might perhaps, be traceable to some practice of that kind. That is a matter for your consideration. In 1860 child pauperism accounted for 18 per cent. of the total pauperism of England ; at present it accounts for no less than 33 per cent.

Growth of child pauperism.

3165. The other point I want to put to you on that answer is that of course it may be that men die earlier, and therefore you have a bigger proportion of widows ?—Men die earlier ? I know the death rate of London has fallen in a most remarkable way.

3166. You are dealing with a set of years, are you not ?—Yes.

3167. On that we require to know whether there is a bigger proportion of widows now than previously ?—That, I should think, was a fact ascertainable without difficulty.

3168. You need that to form a correct judgment as to how that increase arises ?—Of child pauperism, yes.

3169. That is an essential fact in it ?—That sort of increase has not occurred outside London ; this is a London increase of child pauperism.

3170. As I understand this matter is coming up again, I will leave it there. For able bodied paupers you advocate a Test House for London in the Metropolis ?—Yes, I most strongly advocate a Test House.

Test-house for London able-bodied paupers.

3171. You advocate that for groups of unions, rather than to have one for individual unions ?—I should think, from my knowledge of London pauperism, that very few unions would have enough really able-bodied men for a Test House, so that it would be better to have a group of unions, and a Test House in the country.

3172. Is not it the fact with regard to the men called able-bodied under sixty, that the great bulk of them are not able-bodied ?—I should say emphatically so. There are three sorts of able-bodied in London and the country generally. There is the able-bodied, as we call them able-bodied ; there is the able-bodied because they happen to be under sixty ; and the able-bodied because the doctor puts them on No. 1 diet ; but as to any real definition of what is meant by able-bodied I do not know what it is.

Practical meaning of term "able-bodied."

3173. Will this all come up later ? It will come up in this way : I have here two diagrams (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (10 and 11)) with a curve showing the indoor pauperism clinging to the population curve all the way through. The able-bodied line is very much down, and then from a certain date it goes up. The red line on the second of these diagrams is the actual sick among the able-bodied. The number of sick able-bodied is increasing very fast.

3174. The point is that besides a Test House, a place where you would have really laborious work, you must have a place where only work that needs less physical exertion is carried on ?—Workhouse work.

3175. Would you advocate that in towns, or away from towns ?—It is very much cheaper, and much more

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

convenient, to have your Test House in the country, with a certain amount of land attached to it; I mean for a big town like London.

Mr. Chamberlain's circular as to municipal employment.

3176. With regard to periods of great distress, have you anything to do with the circular which has been issued by the President of the Board? Is that in your Department?—The circular as to municipal occupation issued by Mr. Chamberlain in 1886 came through my Department.

3177. Can you tell me what the effect of that has been?—I think I have not got the figures out actually statistically, but almost every year there has been a certain amount of municipal employment. We get returns about it from time to time, which the Commission can have.

Disfranchisement by relief.

3178. As I understand you are still in favour of disfranchising a man who in any way is assisted by the Poor Law?—Yes.

3179. What is the difference between assisting a man through the Poor Law and assisting him through another public authority?—In principle none, and in my view they ought all to be disfranchised, and more especially ought they to be disfranchised from municipal elections. When boards of guardians are elected by their own paupers, we may see a real break-down in the Poor Law, which has not happened yet.

Effect and value of Modified Workhouse Test Order.

3180. Have you had any experience of the Modified Workhouse Test Order?—I have not in my own district, because we have always done it without an Order, whether legally or not I do not know.

3181. Would it be better, instead of taking a man into the ordinary workhouse, to take him out of the town on to a labour colony, or as you would call it, a country workhouse, rather than the ordinary workhouse in a town?—There is a great deal of difference between what I mean by a labour colony and a country workhouse or a test house, and what is known as a farm colony.

3182. Do you think it is good that under the Modified Workhouse Test Order a man who has never been inside a workhouse should be taken into an ordinary London or urban workhouse?—I see no objection to it, if he is properly done by there. I see considerable objections to the making of another sort of institution which is not a workhouse, and putting that under the control of the boards of guardians.

3183. Do you think, with regard to a comparatively young man who has never been inside a workhouse, that it is conducive to the moral health of that man to go there at all? You know what a workhouse is, and you know the sort of life, and the sort of people who gravitate there?—These questions are always put to one in a question-begging way. The widow is always respectable, and she always has a very large number of children; the man is always a really hard-working, respectable man. I should say about the really hard-working, respectable man who is not a loafer and not hopeless (because, unfortunately, there are some morally good people who are hopeless from physical and mental defects) that he was not a case for the Poor Law at all. He ought not to be on the Poor Law. That man ought to be emigrated, or looked after by some charitable association, and I venture to think that in most cases he is, except in times of very great distress and depression.

3184. At any rate you do not think that it is good that an able-bodied man who, through misfortune, is out of employment should be dealt with under the Modified Workhouse Test Order?—No. To be brought into such a position by poverty must be a melancholy situation, and certainly I am sorry that any decent man should have to go into the workhouse.

3185. Your Department has just issued the Modified Workhouse Test Order?—It has been in force for a good number of years in Whitechapel.

3186. I understand that it has just gone round to all boards of guardians?—No, it has not.

3187. We have had it in London?—I think I should explain that that order is an alternative to the outdoor labour test, and it is only issued to meet special circumstances when the workhouses are full.

3188. Is not it also issued to deal with the best classes of people who go before the guardians?—I cannot say. I do not think historically that is the reason it was issued.

Modified Workhouse Test Order Whitechapel.

3189. I do not want to know historically. I want you to take the Whitechapel case, if you do not mind. Is not it true that that was adopted in Whitechapel specifically to deal with the best class of applicants for relief? This is a matter that is really well known; it is not a matter of opinion at all; this is a question of facts?—Facts are history. I do not know how it was introduced into Whitechapel, or why it was introduced, or on whose motion.

3190. (*Mr. Loch.*) Have you yourself had the question of Whitechapel before you?—No. I should have thought the sole reason for issuing the Whitechapel order was as an alternative to the outdoor labour test, which is open to grave objection. I know that in the country we have done it in many unions without an order for a number of years.

3191. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In point of fact the order was issued twenty years ago, and you had nothing to do with it, I think?—That is so.

3192. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) It is true it was only issued to Whitechapel in the first instance. It is only quite lately that the others have had it?—I should like to know whether Whitechapel made any use of it. I think you asked me the number of males and females who are indoor paupers in London who are in health; I can give it to you now.

Numbers and classification of able-bodied indoor paupers in London.

3193. I should be pleased if you would?—These are the figures of able-bodied in London: males in health 3,700; temporarily disabled, 2,900; females in health, 2,300; temporarily disabled, 2,500. The number of what I may call the sick able-bodied has steadily gone up. They were not divided in our statistics before 1891 or 1892, but they have been divided since. What is an able-bodied pauper is still in doubt. We first of all exclude those who are sick, but of the remnant how many are men who actually are able to do a day's work and earn their own living we do not know. That is a matter of opinion.

3194. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) What does "in health" mean exactly?—Not on the medical relief book, I should think.

Meaning of "able-bodied."

3195. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What do your medical officers understand by "able-bodied?"—The men who are on No. 1 diet, I think.

3196. You do not understand that an able-bodied man is a man "able to earn his living"?—No.

3197. Would not that be a better interpretation of the term?—The whole subject needs careful consideration. I gave you the other day the origin of it. It was in consequence of the first dietary table, when the Commissioners said anyone over sixty might have certain extras. That fixed the datum sixty. Then came the able-bodied temporarily sick, and in our statistics we made that another point, and then came the new dietary order under which the medical officer is to inspect each man as he comes into the workhouse, and state the diet on which he is to go, so that a man may be on able-bodied diet and not able to earn his living.

3198. Assuming that "able-bodied" meant something like "able to earn a living," would not that cover the case of widows with children who are, according to what I understand, not able-bodied; they are not able-bodied because they are not able to earn their living as they would be if they were not in a sense disabled by having to look after their children?—That is not the practice in this country.

3199. The widow is pauperised in a sense, when she ceases to be able-bodied: not being able to earn her living because she has to look after the children?—Your definition is "able to earn a living," but everybody who is able to earn a living is turned out of the workhouse in Scotland. He has got to go and do it.

3200. (*Dr. Downes.*) I think there has never been any actual definition of the meaning of "able-bodied" in the statistics of the Local Government Board?—No.

3201. With regard to the Dietary Order of 1900, I think the provision is: Any male inmate certified by the medical officer of the workhouse as a healthy able-bodied

person should be placed either on Class 1 or Class 1a for the purpose of diet?—Yes, that is the provision.

3202. Subject to that, the guardians have a free discretion as to which diet they will put the man on?—Yes.

3203. I do not know whether you are aware that a return has been obtained by the office lately of the number of men who, in the opinion of the masters of the workhouses in London, were able to do a full day's hard work on January 1st, 1906?—Yes, I remember that.

Number of "able-bodied" London paupers capable of earning their living.

3204. The replies are as follows: The total number of men who are on No. 1 diet is 3,720, and the total number of men on house diet other than No. 1 is 17,690. That first number I think you will find given as the total which is returned by the masters in answer to that question?—That return shows there are 1,597 who, in the opinion of the masters, were capable of earning their own living.

3205. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Out of how many?—Out of 3,720 nominally able-bodied. I have another return which was made in quite a large district, and they had 220 men who were supposed to be able to do a day's work; they were nearly all in three unions, and that was a district which included the potteries.

3206. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Not half on the No. 1 dietary are capable of doing a day's work?—Forty-three per cent.

Salvation and Church Army colonies.

3207. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You said yesterday that boards of guardians sent men to General Booth?—Yes.

3208. And they pay General Booth for looking after them?—Yes.

3209. Is not that only done with the approval of the Department?—Yes.

3210. No board of guardians can send men either to the Salvation Army or the Church Army without the sanction of the Board?—We have to sanction and approve.

3211. So that any evil effects the Department shares the responsibility of?—Yes.

Pauper lunatics.

3212. Of course, the unhappy lunatic ought not to come under the guardians at all?—On the whole, I would rather see him treated as a class by himself.

3213. That is because it is not his own fault, as a rule, that he becomes a lunatic?—There is no economical or administrative consideration involved; the man is a lunatic by the act of God.

3214. Sometimes from his own acts too?—You mean in the case of a drinker?

3215. And for other reasons?—Perhaps so. I often wonder, in the case of a man who goes mad because he drinks, which came first; his drunkenness or his insanity.

3216. Why should you not apply that to the man who loses his job by getting drunk?—That is a different thing. He does not become a lunatic; that is one of the necessary consequences or punishments.

3217. He becomes a burden to society?—He does, and he should be made a burden to himself.

Poor relief to unemployed and consequent disfranchisement.

3218. If a man, through no fault of his own, gets out of employment, because of a change in the methods of production, or for any other reason that he is not really responsible for, why should he be disfranchised?—I think the worst service you could be doing that man would be to do anything which might lead him to come on to the Poor rates, except in the case of the very last necessity.

3219. I am taking it for granted that it is the last necessity?—Then he must stand by his accidents; he must suffer for the general good of the body politic. According to my view, what you have to consider is, not this or that pauper, but the general good of the whole community, and the general good of the whole community is, I submit, that every obstacle should be put in the way of a man settling down into the status of a pauper—for pauper he is, whether he is disfranchised or whether he is not.

3220. Of course, a lunatic is, too?—I do not think I need answer that objection.

The right to relief.

3221. You may draw the distinction, but it does not seem to me that it holds. The only other thing I should like to ask in regard to that is: is not the spirit of the English Poor Law that every person, since the time of Elizabeth, who is destitute or sick has an absolute right or claim upon society for relief?—You may take it so, though I should not put it so myself, as I have indicated in the earlier part of my evidence.

3222. Is not that the basis of the whole thing?—Yes, the State is not going to allow people to starve if they make application for relief.

3223. And you compel the people who are not starving to support those who are?—You take their money from them by force of law.

Reasons for disfranchisement by relief.

3224. If that custom has grown up in England, why should a man who has paid his money and who reaches the age of sixty be disfranchised because, after forty or fifty years, he has to come on the rates?—For two reasons as I take it: because every available deterrent should be made use of to keep men from appealing to the Poor Law and for making them take thought so that they should not be obliged to appeal to the Poor Law; and secondly, I suppose, because the ultimate end of all election would be to get a decent body elected. I do not think that a board of guardians elected by its own paupers, or a municipal authority elected by the people who get municipal work from them every winter, is at all a body which would be likely to administer public affairs either honestly or justly.

3225. You would be in favour of the disfranchisement of all Civil servants?—I should.

3226. The whole body?—Yes.

The county as the poor-law area.

3227. (*Mr. Booth.*) I wish now to deal with the question of the size of the areas for Poor relief. The question of size is the question of the possibility of accessibility and the possibility of locomotion. It depends on the means of communication within the area. You said a county was far too large. It struck me that I would like to clear that up. A union to-day may be almost as accessible as a parish of a long time ago, and a county, under the conditions of motors of various kinds, is shrinking in its size as regards the possibility of accessibility?—Certainly, but the main condition is that every part should be accessible.

3228. You still think at present, with things as they are, with railways and tramcars, and so on, that a county is far too large an area?—I think some counties are too large.

3229. Assuming that the difference in the size is overcome or could be ignored, so that you got your area for administrative purposes as large as was convenient for administration, how many distinct institutions would be needed for classifying paupers?—It should be understood that my remarks about a county being too large were made with reference to a proposal that the country workhouses within one county should be amalgamated. It was merely with regard to the indoor relief.

Scheme of classification by institutions.

3230. My question is with regard to all institutions; how many different kinds of institution would be needed, if you had the area not restricted by accessibility, but merely considered with that object? How many different institutions would be needed to deal institutionally with indoor pauperism?—I think in country places that would be enough to have workhouses and sick wards and separate schools. In urban places I think the administrative convenience of division might make it necessary or expedient to have not only those two, but a special Test House for able-bodied paupers who require severe treatment as an alternative to locking them up in a labour colony, as they do in Belgium; and a separate infirmary or infirmaries for the acute and curable sick.

3231. You have not covered the case of lunatics?—Lunatics I proposed, and still would propose, should be a matter for another administration altogether—a county administration.

3232. Do you include imbeciles with lunatics?—As I said, I would put the whole of them under county administration, and subject them to the same inspection that other paupers are subjected to so as to ensure a proper classification of the different classes of lunatics among the various institutions available for their reception.

3233. There would be several institutions connected with the kinds of mental imbecility?—I should think several. I do not say the different institutions ought to be separate by being put on different sites, but a great deal of classification among that class is necessary for

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

efficient administration. I do not think workhouses are proper places for the feeble-minded. I think any arguments which apply to the separation of a lunatic from a workhouse should also apply to the feeble-minded. That is a matter which is under the consideration of another Commission.

3234. Do you mean that the feeble-minded would remain, under the Poor Law, in a separate institution?—I do not think it matters much, if they are all under the same inspection so as to ensure classification.

Out-relief inevitable.

3235. I was only really regarding the different varieties of institution. If you perfected institutional relief, would it come within the range of possibliity to abolish out-relief altogether?—I should like to say yes, but I think that, administratively speaking, you must have some out-door relief. No union has quite succeeded in abolishing it, and no country union has got even very near to abolishing it. There will be urgent cases, and there will be very exceptional cases. I think any board of guardians would fail to deal with it in that way.

3236. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Are you thinking of sudden and urgent distress as opposed to chronic distress or chronic relief?—Yes. I also had in my mind a certain number of cases that it would be difficult to move to the workhouse.

3237. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Would not there be a distinction drawn between the allowance system and out-door relief; it is the allowance system that has such a bad effect on the poor generally?—Yes.

3238. But sudden urgent necessity, I think, is recognised in all unions, even where out-door relief is practically non-existent?—I do not know that I am justified in saying it, but I have said, in the case of people who do earn no wages and do not have children and are properly cared for, the case against giving out-door relief resolves itself into what one may call the discouragement of thrift argument. The discouragement of thrift argument is a very important one, and with certain classes of the poor it is vital; but you cannot expect an average board of guardians, or indeed any average assembly of men, to take a step which appears to be harsh to the individual, because some possible good will result to the community from it, or even some evident good will result to the community from it, some thirty years hence. That is the difficulty of it.

Guardians permit the law to over-ride sentiment.

3239. Has it been your experience that a Board of Guardians may have been extremely unwilling to do something which they considered harsh when they thought it was within their power to do something less harsh, but when it was pointed out to them by their clerk, or someone in authority, that the law did not allow it, they have generally acquiesced; they have seen the importance of the principle which is embodied in the law, and have bowed to it?—That is about what happens.

3240. A question was asked whether there was any actual evidence with regard to the relation between the promotion of the development and encouragement of thrift, and the restriction of out-door relief and medical relief. I think this question occurred to Mr. Bland Garland, did it not, in connection with his union at Bradfield?—Yes.

Mr. Goschen's circular as to assisting persons not actually destitute.

3241. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) We dealt with Mr. Goschen's circular of 1868 on the last occasion. Towards the end of that circular there is a suggestion that when relieving officers are dealing with persons who, in their opinion, are not actually destitute at the time, it would be wise for them, if they still consider that some help is needed, that they should refer such cases to any charitable association which they think is fitted to deal with them?—Yes.

3242. That circular, like a great many other circulars, has not the force of a regulation at all?—No.

3243. It was a very important circular?—And had most important effects.

3244. It derives considerable authority from the facts that followed it. May I ask whether that suggestion in that circular has been embodied in any regulations since then?—No.

3245. I suppose that it is quite sufficient to justify a relieving officer, in the case of persons who are not absolutely destitute but are in need, referring them to some charitable association for assistance?—That is a very common practice, though not so common as it ought to be, and not one that is in any way enforced by any order or regulation of the board.

3246. My point was whether a relieving officer, having read that circular, would be justified in doing so?—He certainly would be justified in doing so, just as in a country parish he would be justified in going and telling anyone who acts charitably, if he knew of anyone who required that charity, or, what is more common, referring the case to the parish nurse, who is a charitable institution.

Objections out-relief.

3247. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I want to get your three objections to outdoor relief generally: Firstly, it is the discouragement of thrift; secondly, the interference with the labour market; and, thirdly, the general good of the community is thereby injured?—Yes.

3248. I want to put a case in order to get my mind clear as to the kind of outdoor relief you would not object to. It is the custom in a place I am connected with a good deal, with regard to old people who are past their time of work, who are invalided from work to some extent, to try and get something, firstly from the employer and secondly something from the charitable funds of the Church. Would you object to that being supplemented, if insufficient, by outdoor relief so as to make a complete means of livelihood?—In this or in that case one would find it difficult to raise an objection. If it were known to be the general practice, then you have the almost certainty that the employer would give a little less, and the other sources a little less, and the relief would be relied upon. When you ask questions of that sort I think it would be better if you were not to put a hard case, but to put the question more generally: To what class would you refuse outdoor relief? It is always easy to state a hard case, and of course you know the Poor Law maxim that one hard case lets in a flood of others, and so on. In London you can instance scores of cases which come on the ordinary relief list which, in my judgment, do not admit of any question: take a person living in lodgings with no furniture of his own; what is the good of giving that case outdoor relief? When you have got rid of those cases you find out that the cases such as you have cited are comparatively small. Then, perhaps, after having gone through the labour of clearing out the others, the board of guardians might afford themselves the luxury of giving relief to the exception.

Elected guardians incapable of properly administering out relief.

3249. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Am I wrong in the assumption which I made from your evidence that really the main objection which you have to out-door relief is that the guardians are not as efficient as they ought to be in administering the system of outdoor relief? That is what I gathered from your answer to question 2433?—Yes. I would go further and say, that men being as they are, you cannot expect any body of elected guardians to administer relief in the way which all experience, as I submit, shows to be the one which is in accordance with public policy. The difficulties are too great, as I think I showed in the quotation from myself which I read.

3250. Would that objection be removed if you found that the boards of guardians were subjected to certain appropriate and proper checks upon extravagant giving or inadequate giving?—There you have the whole difficulty which I put in my first day's evidence as to the relation between the local administration of the Poor Law and local government generally.

3251. (*Mr. Phelps.*) I quite follow you when you say that the great difficulty arises from the guardians, but is not the real difficulty the public opinion which is behind the guardians?—As I put it in another case, popularly elected guardians, elected by direct franchise, do reflect the common conscience of the community.

3252. Is it not dangerous to go too far ahead of public opinion?—It certainly is, especially in matters of Poor Law, because there is a profound ignorance of Poor Law principle among the bulk of educated men, and because it is so very easy to get popular sympathy for an individual case.

Unpopularity of the Poor Law.

3253. You will remember a passage in which Sir Henry Maine said the English people have never become reconciled to the Poor Law. Is it your experience, going about the country, that that is true?—I think there is something in it. I think, as a rule, that people are satisfied

with it, but there is a very critical attitude of mind all the time with relation to it, and from two sides: both from the economical side, who say, Why in the world does not my board of guardians do what I read they have done in Bradfield or Brixworth; and from the sentimental side, who say, A workhouse (most of them have never been inside a workhouse in their lives) is a most abominable place, and it is a cruelty to force—they always say force—people into it.

Increased public interest in the poor.

3254. Do you think that the interest taken in these matters by guardians has much extended to their constituents?—Of course, if you put your mind back for thirty years you will see that certain things have happened which do make it certain that there is a greater interest in these economic matters amongst people generally. For instance, Poor Law Conferences, meetings of the Charity Organisation Society, and articles that one reads in magazines—sometimes very poor ones—but all the same they would not be bought by the magazines, unless there was a sort of interest in the subject. All these things indicate a very considerable change during the period of the last generation. Places like Toynbee Hall, Trinity House and the Eton Mission are all matters of the last forty years.

Classification in institutions as a specific for out-relief.

3255. (*Mr. Bentham.*) What institutions do you think are necessary if outdoor relief is to be abolished? I think you only gave two institutions for urban unions?—Two for rural.

3256. Was it not three for rural. You said workhouses sick wards, and schools?—I said that in rural unions I thought the classification might stop at two institutions—the workhouse and the school.

3257. That is, a workhouse with sick wards and a school, those are the two?—I did not put in sick wards in the rural unions. I thought the workhouse and schools might be enough for rural districts, the workhouses with sick rooms.

3258. With regard to the urban unions, I think you missed out the children entirely?—I did not mean to. I thought I said, in addition, I would add a test house and separate infirmary.

3259. It seemed to me that was rather limited; it simply means a workhouse, test house, infirmary, and schools in urban unions. If outdoor relief is to be restricted to the narrowest possible limits, it seems to me advisable to specialise, as far as possible, with regard to the different classes of people who are given indoor relief. For instance, there are ways of dealing with the aged poor other than putting them into workhouses. Then there are special diseases, such as consumption, which might properly be treated in a separate institution; in other directions, it seems to me that institutions for special classes could be provided with advantage?—I can only say in answer to that, that in very large unions separate establishments may be extended for administrative reasons, but they are extremely expensive,

Provision for certain classes of paupers in voluntary institutions.

and, after all, you must remember that it is open to any board of guardians to subscribe to various institutions which would relieve them of certain special classes of their paupers. For instance, there is quite a number of cases in blind and deaf and dumb homes, epileptic hospitals, convalescent homes for the sick, training and industrial schools and other institutions; I think I am right in saying that last year we had 7,000 children in those sort of institutions paid for by the guardians.

3260. And your objection is one of cost, is it?—It is not necessary, I think, where you have access to a charitable institution by payment, for the board of guardians to have similar institutions of their own, unless they are very large.

3261. Unless they find it necessary, of course?—Yes.

3262. Between adopting institutions of that kind and granting outdoor relief, you can form no comparison which is the cheaper, can you? You agree with institutional treatment of all paupers practically, on broad lines, do you not?—Yes.

3263. If it became an alternative as to whether outdoor relief became popular simply because proper institutions were not provided for certain classes, you would be in favour of providing those institutions?—I should.

3264. (*Mr. Loch.*) There would be this alternative, possibly, to the guardians providing a large series of institutions which I take it is contemplated, namely, that public opinion should, as far as possible, be pressed, by charitable means, to increase the accommodation? The Local Government Board has authorised the guardians to pay for a particular case in that way, which creates something of an income, as I know in particular cases, in institutions which they want?—Nothing has been said about this particular point, I think, in the evidence, but the growth of the subscriptions by boards of guardians to various institutions has been quite remarkable, and that growth has been considerably fostered by the Local Government Board. I think the Local Government Board feels that the charitable nstitutions are a necessary complement of the workhouse institutions, and the growth, say, of certified homes for children has been quite remarkable. With regard to the other things I would only call your attention for a moment to the history of the provision for cases of phthisis. The problem now before us is whether the guardians should do that or the sanitary authority, or whether we should look to such institutions as the King's Sanatorium at Midhurst to do it. The whole matter is still unsettled. It is under the consideration of the Local Government Board, who will be able soon to give very full information with respect to it.

Charitable institutions as a supplement to the Poor Law.

3265. (*Mr. Bentham.*) That depends on local conditions?—Partly on local conditions and partly on public policy.

3266. You could not lay down one line that would go all over the Poor Law?—No, it depends on various matters.

3267. (*Mr. Loch.*) If it is possible to create voluntary institutions, the cases in which are supported by boards of guardians, that is well for the board of guardians administration and well for the public?—Certainly.

3268. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do not you find it is often the case that boards of guardians will hesitate to pay for a particular case in an institution because of its cost, knowing at the same time, there is really no other means to care for that person, whereas, if they had an institution of their own, the cost would not enter into it very largely?—I think it would follow from that that the cost of the institution of the guardians would be much greater.

3269. I quite agree with that, but still, at the same time, you have effected the object?—Yes.

3270. And the other way you have not?—As I have explained to the Commission, I think there are many reasons now why all local governing bodies, especially boards of guardians, should take much more interest in the question of expenditure than they have appeared to do lately. That is part of my evidence which is coming very soon, and I have that in my mind when I rather press the advantage of the sending of patients by boards of guardians to charitable institutions rather than for them to build them themselves.

3271. My point is that you cannot now treat every case in a deterrent way, sick or otherwise, as you did at one time, that is, that it is not advisable now to treat every case in a deterrent manner?—No, we had that out about the question of infirmaries.

Cause of unpopularity of the Poor Law.

3272. (*Mr. Nunn.*) With regard to Mr. Phelps' quotation from Maine, that English people would never settle down to the English Poor Law, is not it possible to draw a distinction, and say in regard to that portion of the Poor Law as to which the Commission of 1834 gave a definite answer—that is, the question of the able-bodied—the principle settled by their test, which has been followed for a couple of generations, the English people have been satisfied with; and with regard to many questions which they left undetermined and on which they gave no guidance, the nation has been non-content ever since?—I think myself that why the English people have not quite adopted the English Poor Law is, to a great extent, because of the extraordinary vitality of the parish idea. I believe that at the back of our heads we country folk think much more of our parish than we do of our union, and we rather resent the power of the union as against the parish. That was so in the early days, and I believe it is so still; even men who have had no actual experience of parish administration, who would not stir to attend a parish council, or even to vote for it, have still a sort of feeling that the parish is an area that should not be interfered with, and that it

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

should be more or less free. Of course, administratively speaking, they may be considered hopelessly wrong, but I think that is one of the reasons why the Poor Law has never been really welcomed by the English people.

Convalescent Homes.

3273. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) There have been some scandals, have there not, in reference to private convalescent homes?—I have heard of one.

3274. It has been pretty bad, has not it?—I am not going to say that.

3275. You have heard of one, at any rate. There is one Convalescent Home at Margate, does that come under you at all?—Where they are certified by us to receive pauper children they are under our direction.

3276. But only pauper children?—There is no sanction required with regard to convalescent homes which receive adults.

3277. You can only send people there as you send them to General Booth?—That is to say, with consent.

3278. Some of them are not satisfactory, at any rate?—I am not going to admit that. That is for the boards of guardians and their medical officers.

3279. I understand that the practice of giving subscriptions out of the rates to hospitals so that they shall take patients, instead of sending them to institutions belonging to the guardians, you approve of?—Yes.

Effect of guardians' subscriptions to hospitals.

3280. Is not that likely also to choke off subscriptions from the public? Is not it likely to lead to the result that people will feel they are paying for a certain number out of the rates and they might just as well pay for the whole?—I do not think so.

3281. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do not boards of guardians contribute to these institutions?—Yes, they contribute in respect of the use that they make of the institution.

3282. (*Mr. Loch.*) In most of these cases the money that is received from the guardians is a very small amount compared with the money received by the institution itself?—In some cases it is not, but in most cases it is.

3283. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It has relation to the numbers the guardians are proposing to send?—The Board's letter is usually to ask the guardians to state specifically what advantage they hope to get from the subscriptions.

3284. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Do they have to state the number of the people that they send?—Not to us.

Principles underlying Act of 1834.

3285. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think you wish now to say something or other with regard to Poor Law principles?—Yes. Why I wish to mention the question of Poor Law principles here is because I propose to go very shortly through the Poor Law history for the last generation, and to consider each step with relation to the question how far it infringed on what is known as Poor Law principles, which I take to mean the maxims which were laid down by, or which guided the early Commissioners, in introduciug the Poor Law Reform Bill of 1834. That Bill was so successful in its immediate operation, that it brought to the side of the Commissioners a considerable body of expert opinion which has been very much in the habit of quoting these principles up to the present day.

3286. Do you propose to tell us what those principles are?—I think they are well understood by the Commission. They are principles which are dependent on, and corollaries of, the original maxim, which was that the condition of the pauper should not be, or should not appear to be, more eligible than that of the independent labourer.

3287. I think you wish next to refer to some of the enquiries, Parliamentary and other, that have been made on matters connected with poor relief?—Yes.

Recommendations of Select Committee on Poor Relief, 1864.

3288. You take, as the first, the Committee on Poor Relief of 1864, I think?—Yes. The Select Committee on the Poor Law which sat in the year 1864 discussed the whole subject of Poor Law administration. It was they who finally decided in favour of the continuance of a central authority, and of the power of that central authority to issue general orders. They recommended that certain paid officers should be permanent, that the auditors should be appointed, not by the chairmen of boards of guardians, as they had hitherto been, but by the Poor Law Board. They made certain recommendations as to the religious rights of inmates of workhouses, as to the education of pauper children, as to classification in workhouses, and also as to casual and homeless poor in the Metropolis. A good deal of legislation followed from the Report of that Commission, but there is nothing in it whatever to show that at that time there was the slightest tendency to reverse or modify the policy of the original Commissioners.

3289. But the Report of that Committee deals rather with the details of administration than with the actual principles of administration themselves?—Yes. I should like to say that the whole of the evidence and the Report are of the most important character.

Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867.

3290. I think you wish now to make some observations with regard to the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867?—That was the beginning of a change in the administration of the Poor Law in the Metropolis which has not yet come to an end. The most convenient point of reference is the speech of Mr. Gathorne-Hardy in introducing the Bill. There had been various Reports as to the administration of relief in the Metropolis, the point which most concerns this Commission being that the workhouses were hopelessly inadequate to the needs of the population. The Bill, I think for the first time, introduced the principle of the Metropolitan Poor Fund or the equalisation of the rates over London for certain Poor Law purposes—a point that no doubt will be dealt with later on.

Mr. Goschen's circular, 1869. Co-operation between charity and poor law.

3291. Then, in 1869, a Minute was issued by Mr. Goschen, was there not, with regard to the co-operation between charity and the Poor Law?—The first of Mr. Goschen's most important Minutes was that one which called attention to the expediency of some organised co-operation between Poor Law and charity in the Metropolis. I think that the Charity Organisation Society was founded at the same date.

3292. Do you propose to say anything generally as to what the object of that Minute was?—The object of that Minute was to enable the guardians to deal with hard cases by means of charitable contributions, and to prevent overlapping by the exchange of information between charitable societies and the officers of the guardians.

3293. That is to say, the guardians, if they had hard cases, might refer them to the charity?—That is the object of the circular. It is quite evident that Mr. Goschen, who was a first-rate administrator, a first-rate statistician, and a first-rate economist, was very strongly in favour of a more rigid administration of the Poor Law. That was the first of the circulars which he issued when he was at the Board.

3294. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is there anything in the circular as to a reference by the guardians as a board to charitable bodies?—I think there is. You will find a copy of the circular in Sir William Chance's book.

3295. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The point is, is it not, that cases which would be referred to charitable organisations would be cases which the guardians could not deal with themselves, for instance, cases for the payment of rent and such matters?—Yes; they are all set out in the circular.

3296. Perhaps you would kindly refer to them?—Mr. Goschen says: "It may be well to add that boards of guardians cannot legally give relief (1) in redeeming tools or clothes from pawn; (2) in purchasing tools; (3) in purchasing clothes (except in cases of urgent necessity); (4) in paying the cost of conveyance to any part of the United Kingdom; (5) in paying rent or lodging, so that assistance rendered for any of these purposes will not interfere with the action of the guardians." That is to say, those purposes shall be paid for, or might safely be paid for, by charity, because they cannot be paid for by the guardians. The Minute continues: "The general principle to be borne in mind seems to be that the obligations of the guardians should not be curtailed, and that where the charitable associations consider it within their province to deal at all with persons on the parish lists, they should do so, not by affording additional means of income, but by supplying once for all such articles as do not clash with or overlap the relief administered by the guardians." That is in accordance with the Poor Law principle of all or none. The point of it is this: "A cordial understanding between the Poor Law authorities and the charitable organisations based upon arrangements

of the kind suggested, does not appear to be hopeless. It remains to consider by what means such an understanding can be brought about"—and then that point is discussed. "The first point is that there should be every opportunity for every agency, official or private, engaged in relieving the poor, to know fully and accurately the details of the work performed by all similarly engaged." Then, Mr. Goschen suggests means of communication between the two, the charitable authorities and the Poor Law authorities. He says: The Poor Law Board would be prepared "(1) To authorise the guardians to print weekly lists, containing the names and addresses of out door paupers, and the sums given in relief in each case; (2) to authorise any reasonable remuneration for extra work to officers whom the guardians may employ to carry out this arrangement; (3) to instruct their inspectors to facilitate the communication between the official and private agencies, where such interposition may be of any service, and to assist in systematising as far as possible relief operations in various parts of the Metropolis." What Mr. Goschen contemplated was that all the relief agencies should be systematised. He did not deal with the co-ordination of the whole Poor Law funds with the charitable relief funds of the country. That will be left, I have no doubt, to a future Mr. Goschen. And so it goes on. Throughout, the whole of it is what I might call strict Poor Law. For instance, he says: "One of the most recognised principles in our Poor Law is that relief should be given only to the actually destitute, and not in aid of wages." "The fundamental doctrine of the English Poor Laws, in which they differ from those of most other countries, is that relief is given, not as a matter of charity, but of legal obligation, and to extend this legal obligation beyond the class to which it now applies, namely, the actually destitute, to a further and much larger class, namely those in receipt of insufficient wages, would be not only to increase to an unlimited extent the present enormous expenditure, but to allow the belief in a legal claim to public money in every emergency to supplant, in a further portion of the population, the full recognition of the necessity for self-reliance and thrift." As for that, I think I will merely call your attention to the fact of the present enormous expenditure. I will come by and by to see what the expenditure was then and what it is now.

port by
. Wode-
se on
al work-
ses.

. Longley's
ence of
'khouses.

cular to
pectors,
1.

3297. That Minute was followed, was it not, by some circular to the inspectors?—At that time two things happened. There was a report on the country unions of England by Mr. Wodehouse, which is an extremely able report, that should be read by everybody who is interested in Poor Law, and there was a still more remarkable report upon London by Mr. Longley, which is the most uncompromising defence of the workhouse system that ever was penned. In 1871 a circular was issued to the inspectors; I do not think it was printed in a Blue-book, but I will hand it in (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (25)). It starts: "The large increase which has within the last few years taken place in the amount of outdoor relief has been regarded by the Local Government Board with much anxiety." I have a diagram here on which you will see a sharp line like a cone; that represents the rise in outdoor relief during the cotton famine. When the cotton famine was at an end, there was another sharp rise in outdoor relief, due probably, to a more lavish administration. Then Mr. Stansfeld caused this circular to be issued to the inspectors—as he says, in consequence of being alarmed by that rise in expenditure—instructing them to take the earliest opportunity of bringing the whole matter under the supervision of the guardians in their districts. He says: "The cost of outdoor relief in England and Wales in the year 1860 amounted to £2,862,753, whilst the outdoor relief for the year 1870 amounted to £3,633,061, being an increase of £770,308. The ratio of outdoor paupers to the population was, in 1860, 1 in every 27, and, in 1870, 1 in every 25." He then shows the great inequality of this increase in the various unions of the country. Where the administration was strict the increase was small, and where the administration was lax the increase was large. "Instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely of like variations in adjoining unions where the surrounding circumstances are similar and where the variations can be attributable, in the main, to no other cause than the different system of administration adopted by the guardians, both in respect to the objects of relief and the amount and nature of the relief afforded." The circular then goes on to make rather more specific recommendations as to the general rules which should guide the guardians, that being really the beginning of the rules which were subsequently submitted to the Board in 1877 by Mr. Pell and which used to be known as the Manchester Rules. Here is a further quotation from the circular: "The great object which you will have in view will be to induce the guardians in your district to adopt sound principles of administration in dealing with individual cases; and the Board believe that the more frequently those principles are discussed, and the application of them illustrated by the experience of other boards of guardians, the more conclusively will the advantages be recognised which always result from vigilant supervision and a strict adherence to the law. It is difficult to over-estimate the importance to an union of having the guardians well affected to the law which they administer, and nothing will tend more completely to create such a feeling than the conviction that the law, when well-administered, is calculated to diminish pauperism, whilst it benefits the ratepayers and the poor." That circular to the inspectors was issued in 1871, and it is presumed the inspectors acted upon it. You will see from the diagram (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (7)) the way in which the curve of outdoor pauperism fell between 1871 and 1877. Between January 1st, 1871, and January 1st, 1877, the number of outdoor paupers fell from 917,000 to 571,000. You will observe on this diagram that at the same time and throughout the whole history that we are dealing with, the curve of indoor pauperism clings till quite recently closely to the population curve, and that as the population goes up the in-door pauperism goes up, until, say, the year 1890, when there is a marked tendency to increase. In spite of that enormous drop in outdoor pauperism, the indoor pauperism did not increase between 1871 and 1877.

Effect of circular of 1871 on pauperism.

3298. In 1878 I believe a memorandum was issued by Mr. Sclater-Booth with regard to the administration of out-door relief, was there not?—The memorandum which was issued by Mr. Sclater-Booth called attention to the effect of the circular of 1871. It recapitulated the rules which were recommended in the circular, and claimed, rightly or wrongly, that the abnormal decrease in relief was due to the efforts of the inspectors and the change that those efforts had made in the administration of the guardians. Mr. Sclater-Booth says: The consideration and the application of these rules has not been without effect. In the year 1870–71, the expenditure on out-door relief was £3,663,970; in the year 1876–77 it had fallen to £2,616,465; thus showing a decrease in six years of £1,047,505, or 28·6 per cent. The number of out-door paupers on the 1st January, 1871, was 917,890; the number on 1st January, 1877, was 571,982; therefore, in the same six years, the out-door paupers decreased by 345,908 or 37·7 per cent." The circular then goes on to contrast the statistics of various groups of unions throughout the country and gives quotations from the inspectors reports. Even at the end of that time, as the circular points out, great differences existed in the various unions as to the proportion which pauperism bore to population. Thus, at the Atcham Union of Shropshire, the proportion stood as low as 0·9 per cent., while in the Wilton Union of Wiltshire it was as high as 6·8 per cent., or, taking larger areas, in the Metropolis it was 2·6 per cent.; in North Wales 4·8 per cent. in South Wales 4·1 per cent.; in a district of the midland counties 2·3 per cent.; and in the county of Lancaster 1·8 per cent. The circular goes on; "These remarkable figures are doubtless attributable in no small degree to differences in the administration of relief—some boards of guardians being vigilant and others lax." There, again, you have a circular issued in the year 1878, in which there is no trace of any departure from the original doctrines, as we may call them, of the Commissioners.

Mr. Sclater-Booth's memorandum, 1878.

3299. That is a memorandum made by Mr. Sclater-Booth and sent round to the various boards of guardians, I presume?—Yes; and possibly I might hand in that also. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (27).) The circular to the inspectors and Mr. Sclater-Booth's memorandum are very closely connected

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

3300. In 1884 the Representation of the People Act was passed; have you anything to say with regard to that Act in this connection?—I do not propose to do anything more than mention the fact; and then leave it to the Commissioners, if they see fit, to trace some connection between the passing of that Act and what happens to the Poor Law afterwards. It was followed by the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act.

Reform Act, 1884 and Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act.

3301. Have you something to say to us with regard to the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act?—I have already pointed out that in my judgment that Act was not at all in accordance with what I call, for the purpose of this part of my evidence, Poor Law principles.

3302. Then you do not wish to add anything?—No, beyond calling attention to the fact that that is the first time since 1834 where, so far as I have been able to discover, there has been a marked departure either in legislation or in administration from Poor Law principles.

3303. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do you remember at what period in the Session that was passed; was it not just at the end and just before the dissolution?—I forget.

3304. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Might I ask if you imply that one of these Acts was caused by the other?—I purposely said that I do not propose to make any statement on the subject.

3305. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act was in fact I think passed at the end of the Session, the date on which it received the Royal Assent being the 6th August; and there was a dissolution that same year, was there not?—I believe so.

3306. It followed, of course, from the passing of the Representation of the People Act that there should be a dissolution?—Yes.

Mr. Chamberlain's circular of 1886 as to municipal employment.

3307. The next thing which I think you wish to refer to is the circular which was issued by Mr. Chamberlain in 1886?—That again is merely an historical point.

3308. Perhaps you will say what the general effect of that circular was?—The general effect of the circular was that municipalities should undertake public works, and, as far as possible, employ on those public works needy men so as to prevent their becoming destitute. It is rather interesting to trace the history of that movement. So far as I know in England—we all know about France—this matter became of great prominence during the cotton famine, when the numbers who were thrown on the poor rates were enormous. In the report in 1865–66 of the Local Government Board it is stated, "It appeared highly desirable that the large bodies of able-bodied men who had been so long deprived of their usual employment should not continue to be relieved either in idleness or on the performance of a task of unremunerative labour, but should rather if possible have work at adequate wages placed within their reach which would enable them to obtain an independent livelihood." Sir Robert Rawlinson was sent down to Lancashire at that time to investigate the matter, and he reported that there was an actual necessity for a large amount of public work in the way of sewerage, road making, and so on. An Act was passed (the 26 and 27 Vic., c. 70) which authorised borrowing for public works for that purpose. The board at the time said, "We trust that in addition to the direct benefits of the measure, incidental advantages have been conferred on the district and that many sanitary and social improvements may have their origin in the crisis through which it has passed. The public works are popular with those who are employed and the moral effect of the work, in prospect as well as in action, has been very valuable in its influences upon the unemployed population." It may be worth while remarking there that what was evidently in the mind of the board at that time was the difference in the moral effect of the work between what I may call penal work (which has no result and is enforced by punishment) and useful work. They dwell on the fact that this was useful work. I have no doubt that that was the precedent on which Mr. Chamberlain's circular was based.

Essence of penal labour.

3309. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) There was a dissolution immediately after that circular, too, was there not?—Yes. I may say that in recent investigations in which I have been concerned as to labour colonies and so on, this point has arisen: We may hold that it is useful work, not penal work, as long as the work improves the land; but a time comes when the land has been dug once or twice, and there is no necessity for digging the land any more; then, in point of principle, the other digging, the unnecessary digging, though it is precisely the same labour as the first digging, becomes, in the economic theory, penal work, while the first was non-penal work. The first digging was not demoralising but elevating, whereas the last digging was pauper, penal labour and most demoralising.

3310. (*Mr Lansbury.*) That of course only means that all useless work is demoralising?—Yes.

Local Government Act, 1888; Effect on administration.

3311. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) That was in 1886; then in 1888 the Local Government Act was passed, was it not?—In 1888 the Local Government Act was passed and that is an important epoch, I think, for Poor Law administration; although it does not directly concern Poor Law administration, because it is from that date that the extraordinary increase in the cost of public relief begins.

3312. What year precisely are you taking now?—I am taking 1888, and if you look at the diagram you will see that rather interesting curve. The curve representing the rateable value crosses the curve of expenditure and we become gradually richer, that is to say, the means of meeting the expenditure become gradually greater than the expenditure; but after 1888 the curve of expenditure takes a marked turn upwards, which has been going up ever since (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (15).) That is a matter which I will deal with further in the next part of my evidence but, I call attention to it here because it is in some ways the most important point, as I think, of modern Poor Law development.

3313. Do you wish to make any observations on the Act itself?—No.

3314. It did not, of course, directly deal with the Poor Law?—It had nothing to do with the Poor Law at all.

3315. Except so far as it dealt with grants?—Yes.

3316. It had no very direct bearing on the Poor Law?—It had no direct bearing except this, which is a mere matter of opinion and a mere matter of impression. It did stimulate local government all over the country. I think there was more interest taken in boards of guardians after the passing of that Act than there was before. It woke people up, so to speak. I should say that these diagrams and the tables I am using, have been prepared by me and not by the statistical department, and, therefore, must not be taken in any way as the production of that department. I only intend to use them as illustrations which may enable the Commission better to understand my evidence.

3317. (*Mr. Booth.*) That is to say, we are to have the use of them as a Commission, but we are not to consider them as a formal part of the Report?—That, I think, would be the best way to treat them.

Select Committee on Poor Law Relief, 188

3318. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In the year 1888 there was a report, was there not, of a Committee of the House of Lords?—In the year 1888 there was a good deal of distress in London, and there was a Committee of the House of Lords, of which Lord Kimberley acted as Chairman. It was a strong Committee and took some very good evidence, that of Sir Hugh Owen among the rest. I have extracted from their report some of the sentences which bear most closely on the Poor Law. They say, "It is not the duty of guardians to administer charity in the sense of alleviating the lot of those who are poor but not actually destitute." That is an important passage, because it shows that up to then the aged deserving poor were not in their minds. Another passage is, "But we cannot too strongly insist on the disastrous results which are certain to follow from out-door relief, if not very carefully administered, and kept within narrow limits, not only in bringing heavy burdens on the ratepayers, but, what is far more important, in demoralising the working class by the discouragement of thrift and honest industry; and we draw attention to the evidence of the results of the policy of giving outdoor relief pursued in the City of London Union as compared with the opposite policy in St. George's-in-the-East."

3319. Did they make any important recommendation?—They made a considerable number of recommendations.

3320. Did they make any that were of importance for the purposes of this Commission?—With regard to destitution they did, and they also made recommendations which are comparatively insignificant in regard to smaller matters of outdoor relief. For instance, as to the small doles of inadequate relief—and this is important because it is no doubt one of the matters that led to the consideration of the question of adequate relief by the next Commission that sat, namely, the Aged Poor Commission—they say, "Such doles are eked out by slender earnings, in which latter case, as is pointed out by Sir Hugh Owen, to the extent to which the person, who is assisted in that way, obtains employment, there is no doubt there is a tendency to reduce the rate of wages for services of that particular character." Then they give certain recommendations as to stone yards, and they also recommend that boards of guardians should have powers to make bye-laws; but there is nothing in that report at all which introduces a new element into the Poor Law principle.

lect Committee on etropolitan spitals, 92.

3321. In 1892 there was a Committee of the House of Lords on Metropolitan hospitals, was there not?—Yes.

3322. Do you wish to say anything about that?—No; it is not directly a Poor Law matter. I have merely mentioned it in my notes of evidence, because it is a very important document when you come to consider the question of the expediency of making some modification in the existing Poor Law with reference to infirmaries. On the whole, the recommendations of the Committee and the report of the Committee are what the original Poor Law experts would have deemed to be sound.

Henry wler's cular as to uperism d distress, 92.

3323. In the same year I think Sir Henry Fowler, or Mr. Fowler as he was then, issued a circular with regard to pauperism and distress?—That, I think, was merely reiterating Mr. Chamberlain's circular.

3324. To all intents and purposes it was the same thing, was it?—Yes.

ect of al Government Act, 94.

3325. Then in 1894 the Local Government Act was passed, was it not?—The Local Government Act was passed, which revolutionised the method of election to boards of guardians and on which I have already given evidence, that evidence being to the effect that the Act had surprisingly little effect on the administration of the Poor Law.

ed Poor mmission, 95.

3326. Then we come to 1895, in which year there was the Commission on the Aged Poor?—Yes. There for the first time, as I read the history, you have the new element brought in; you have got the deserving poor. Up to then I suppose that sound administration was guided by the policy which was put in the most forcible way by John Stuart Mill, a passage from whose "Political Economy" I read yesterday. The report itself is almost what would be called in accordance with Poor Law doctrine, and there is a good deal of it which might have been written by the first Commissioners themselves. But there are sentences which do show a new point of view, as for instance this:—"We think, therefore, that boards of guardians should be recommended to make careful inquiries into the antecedents of destitute persons applying for relief whose physical faculties have failed by reason of age and infirmity, and that where it is found that such persons bear a good character, have made reasonable efforts, in accordance with their opportunities, to provide for their own old age, and have not been assisted from the rates (excepting temporarily and under special circumstances of illness or misfortune), outdoor relief should be offered unless the infirmity of the applicant, the nature of his surroundings, the need of personal care, or other substantial considerations, should make it evident that the relief given should be indoor relief." Then again, there is a recommendation that the aged deserving poor should, inside the workhouses, be classified and given certain other privileges. Finally, there is a strong recommendation that "The Local Government Board should call special attention, either directly or through their inspectors, to the evils of inadequate relief, and the necessity for careful and thorough investigation of each case with a view to the suitable grant of relief in accordance with clear general principles. Such action on the part of the Board would be of great value, and would be free from the objections attaching both to formal regulations on the subject, and to the intervention of the central department in individual cases." The Commission will note the change in the point of view.

3327. Then about 1896 there were, were there not, Parliamentary Committees with regard to want of employment?—Yes. I think there was a very heavy amount of evidence and two reports, and if I remember rightly—I have not the exact quotation here with me—there was a recommendation that persons who receive relief in exceptional circumstances of distress should not be disfranchised.

3328. There were two Committees, I think, were there not, one in 1895 and one in 1896?—There were two Committees and two reports, and very different reports they were, being from different points of view. But they were both interesting. They dealt with the question of labour colonies and such like questions.

3329. Then in 1899, there was a Cottage Homes Committee; do you wish to say something about it?—There was a Committee on the Bill for the introduction of Cottage Homes.

Cottage Homes Committee, 1899.

3330. That was a private Bill, was it not?—It was a Private Bill, which was referred to a Committee of which Mr. T. W. Russell was Chairman.

3331. What did that Committee recommend generally?—They go one better than the Aged Poor Commission. I think they dealt with the question of pensions, which, during all this epoch, which I may call the political epoch of modern Poor Law administration, was very much in evidence, one pension scheme following after another and one Bill after another. This is the point in their Report to which I desire specially to call attention: "Your Committee do not, however, contemplate that the aged and deserving poor, to whom Poor Law relief is a necessity, should as a matter of course receive such relief in the workhouse. The evidence would seem to show that, as a general rule, boards of guardians are in the habit of granting outdoor relief to the aged and deserving poor, and that it is the exception to relieve them in the workhouse. The exceptional cases are those where the infirmity of the applicant for relief, or other circumstances, render it practically impossible for him to live elsewhere than in an institution. Your Committee have no desire to discourage the granting of outdoor relief to the aged and deserving poor, though they trust that the alterations they advocate may have the effect of rendering the workhouse a place to which a poor person of deserving character, to whom the care that can only be supplied in an institution is a necessity, need not hesitate to resort." That is, you are to give outdoor relief to every aged and deserving poor person you can, but you are to improve the workhouse to such a point as to do away with the disinclination to enter the workhouse. Then they go on in another passage to say: "But while your Committee approve of outdoor relief being granted to the deserving aged poor who can properly live outside the workhouse, they cannot approve of the scale of payment which they fear is too commonly considered sufficient by boards of guardians." The report says a great deal more as to classification in workhouses, which is an expansion of what was said, and rather better said, by the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor. In this Report you have got right away from the original principles. I should like to say—the Report was made some time ago, and so perhaps I may say it—that I have carefully read the evidence given before that committee, and I cannot see what justification there is for the Report itself. The matter is one to which I call the attention of the Commission.

3332. The actual matter referred to them was the Cottage Homes Bill, was it not?—Yes. That was a Bill I think to enable parishes to provide what are practically almshouses for their poor. There was a great deal of evidence given against it, as there naturally would be. There are very obvious administrative objections to the proposal. The Report rejects the actual proposals of the Bill, but proposes a number of workhouse ameliorations, and inserts the passage which I have read to you, as to the giving outdoor relief—apparently by way of yielding something to the original proposal in the Bill.

3333. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there any official or other scale of outdoor relief?—No.

3334. (*Mr. Loch.*) In that particular case was the Local Government Board called upon to give evidence through its Inspectors?—Some of the Inspectors gave evidence; I gave evidence for one.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

Old Age Pensions Committee.

3335. (*Mr. Booth.*) Did I understand you aright to say that in your view the evidence did not justify the Report ?—Yes ; I suggest that it does not.

3336. (*Miss Hill.*) Has it been acted upon ?—Yes.

3337. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In the same year there was a Report, was there not, about Old Age Pensions ?—Yes.

3338. Do you want to say anything about that ?—That was on one of the Pension Bills. That is merely an indication of the sort of interest which was taken in the Poor Law matters in that decade, which I may call the political decade of Poor Law administration.

3339. Your point here is that you wish to call attention to the fact that about this time Bills were introduced for the purpose of establishing old age pensions ?—Yes.

3340. There were several Bills with that object, in fact, were there not ?—Several Bills and several proposals.

3341. Not Government Bills, of course, but Bills introduced by private members ?—Yes. There were Parliamentary Committees ; for instance, the one for which I went to Denmark and made a Report, which you will find in the Blue Book of that time, as to the Pension system there.

3342. But there was no Government Bill, I think ?—There was no Government Bill.

3343. Was there not a Select Committee with regard to the Aged Deserving Poor and Old Age Pensions in 1899 ?—Yes, that was in 1899 also.

Mr. Chaplin's circular as to aged deserving poor, 1900

3344. Then in 1900 there was Mr. Chaplin's Circular, which has been referred to several times ?—That Circular seems to follow as the almost necessary corollary to the Reports of the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor and the Committee on the Cottage Homes Bill. As I have pointed out in the early part of my evidence, the Local Government Board is in very close connection with the House of Commons and must of necessity pay great regard to the opinions of Members of Parliament. The Circular itself begins by adverting to a reply "which was given by the President to a question put to him in the House of Commons with regard to legislation on the subject of the recommendations made by the Select Committee on the Cottage Homes Bill last year." That does not tell quite the whole story, because if you read the Report of the Select Committee on the Cottage Homes Bill, you will see that it reiterates some of the recommendations which were made by the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor. The question which was asked of the President of the Local Government Board was, "Why the Government have not brought in a Bill to carry out the recommendations in regard to the Poor Law unanimously made by the Select Committee appointed last year to consider the Cottage Homes Bill, and whether the Government would now introduce such a Bill if an assurance were given that the Bill would be considered in an uncontroversial spirit." The President said that he had been anxious to deal with this question and had been unable to do so, but that he had prepared a series of regulations affecting the classification of inmates in workhouses with a view of securing separate accommodation for the aged and deserving poor." The Circular goes on :—"Although, as was pointed out, the moment is not propitious for legislation of the kind referred to, the Board think that it would be useful that guardians should be informed of their views, so that the hands of the guardians may be strengthened in dealing with these matters so far as existing circumstances will permit. The removal of imbeciles from workhouses was strongly recommended by the Select Committee, and its advisability has been repeatedly brought before the Board by guardians and others. But this question is one which must at any rate be deferred. The removal of children from workhouses, which was also recommended by the Committee, has been still more strongly urged upon the Board. It is a question on which public opinion is undoubtedly in accord with the recommendation of the Committee, and I am directed to urge upon boards of guardians to let no opportunity pass of carrying such an arrangement into effect. The opportunity will frequently arise when there is a question of enlarging the infirmary wards of the workhouse, or of increasing the accommodation in some other respect, and when it may be felt that the wisest course would be to provide the extra accommodation needed by removing the children altogether from the workhouse. In connection with this point the Board may observe that by the provision of cottage homes, by the hire of scattered homes, by boarding out and emigration, ample means are afforded by which children may be entirely removed from association with the workhouse and workhouse surroundings. With regard to the treatment of the aged deserving poor, it has been felt that persons who have habitually led decent and deserving lives should, if they require relief in their old age, receive different treatment from those whose previous habits and character have been unsatisfactory and who have failed to exercise thrift in the bringing up of their families or otherwise. The Board consider that aged deserving persons should not be urged to enter the workhouse at all unless there is some cause which renders such a course necessary, such as infirmity of mind or body, the absence of house accommodation or of a suitable person to care for them, or some similar cause, but that they should be relieved by having adequate outdoor relief granted to them. The Board are happy to think that it is commonly the practice of boards of guardians to grant outdoor relief in such cases, but they are afraid that too frequently such relief is not adequate in amount. They are desirous of pressing upon the guardians that such relief should, when granted, be always adequate." The Circular then concludes by making certain recommendations as to classification within the workhouse, including this one, "That considerably increased liberty should be granted to them, and greater facilities for being visited by their friends." That is a circular which I submit to the Commission is a necessary corollary to the reports which have been made to the House of Commons and to the Government by the Commission of 1895 and by the Committee of 1899.

3345. That finishes what you have to say as to the historical aspect of the matter, does it ?—Yes.

Local Governme Board Ci lar as to classificat in Work houses, 1

3346. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Was there not a circular issued in 1896 ?—I regret that I have omitted that. That was as to the classification in workhouses. It was immediately following on the Aged Poor Commission.

3347. Would you say that all boards of guardians who have honestly tried to follow the policy of the Local Government Board have, through these circulars, been led astray ?—No, I should not say anything of the kind ; but I admit to you at once that that circular has been very much misunderstood by various boards of guardians.

3348. They were led off the path of really orthodox Poor Law, as you understand it ?—It was a departure from the original Poor Law principles.

Statistics population rateable value and cost of po relief.

3349. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think you now propose to give some evidence with regard to expenditure generally, and that, first, you have some observations to make to us on the changes in the aggregate cost since 1850 ?—Yes. The salient point in the figures as to the cost of Poor Relief which I have here from the year 1850 to the year 1894 is that between 1850 and 1894 the cost increased but little in proportion to the increase in the population. In 1850 the cost of poor relief was £5,300,000, the population being 17,500,000. In 1892-93 the cost had risen to £9,000,000 but the population had risen to 29,000,000.

3350. Have you anything to put before us with regard to rateable value ?—The rateable value was £67,700,000 in 1850, and had risen to £157,700,000 in 1893. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (15).)

3351. So that the increase in expenditure fairly corresponded with the increase in rateable value ?—Yes, but rather to the advantage of the rateable value.

3352. What do you say as to the expenditure of the last three decades ?—The figures for the last three decades are remarkable. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (18).) In 1873-74 the expenditure was £7,660,000 ; in 1883-84 the expenditure had risen but slightly, namely, to £8,400,000 ; in 1893-94 it had risen again but slightly, namely, to £9,670,000 ; but in 1903-04 that £9,670,000 became £14,000,000.

Sanitary expenditu of Metro tan Asyl Board.

3353. Do those figures include anything which is not strictly Poor Law expenditure ?—They include a considerable sum which is not strictly Poor Law expenditure. I deduct both from the sum expended in 1873-74 and from the sum expended in 1903-04 the approximate amount of the expenditures of the managers of the Metropolitan Asylums Board on hospitals and ambulances for persons suffering from infectious diseases. In 1873-4 that figure

was £33,000, reducing the cost of Poor Law relief that I have given to £7,630,000; and in 1903–04 that £33,000 had risen to £646,000, showing an enormous increase in the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and reducing the true total of Poor Law expenditure in the latter year to £13,369,000. You remember that I gave it as £14,000,000 just now, but, deducting the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, you get the sum £13,369,000. The expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board was mixed up with the Poor Law expenditure for some years; it has now been taken out, and we find the sum which I have last given you is the official return of the expenditure on Poor Law relief in the year 1903–04.

3354. Is that figure arrived at by leaving out all the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, or only certain expenditure?—That only takes out the expenditure so far as infectious diseases are concerned.

3355. So that it leaves their asylum expenditure for imbeciles and also for defective children?—It leaves the expenditure for those two matters and their expenditure on the training ship and other homes for children. I may say that the whole of these deductions are more or less approximate. There are a certain number of fever cases which, in an ordinary union, would be provided for by the guardians, so perhaps it is not fair to take the whole of the expenses of fever out from the Poor Law expenditure; but on the other hand there are a great many imbeciles in the Metropolitan Asylums Board establishments who, outside London, would naturally be in the asylums. That brings me to the second deduction which I have to make.

Cost of maintenance of pauper lunatics in asylums.

3356. And that relates to the cost of lunatics in asylums, I think?—Yes. Included in what I might call the official sum, which we have now reduced from £14,000,000 down to £13,369,000, is the cost of maintenance of pauper lunatics in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals and licensed houses. That may be the cost which may properly be included in Poor Law relief, but it is not a cost the amount of which in any degree depends on the administration of the Poor Law authorities. The cost is incurred by the county authorities on behalf of the pauper lunatics, but that sum cannot fairly be included in any account of the true cost of the Poor Law relief as administered by boards of guardians.

3357. Except so far as they may send cases to the asylums, lavishly or otherwise?—Yes; but that of course would not be the case in London, because in London they have got the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund paying for the imbeciles under the Metropolitan Asylums Board. That expenditure which has been included in the Poor Law expenditure for lunatics shows a very remarkable increase indeed. In the year 1873–74 it was £830,000; in 1883–84, it had mounted to £1,143,000; in 1893–94 it had increased to £1,466,000, and in 1903–04 the increase was to the sum of £2,286,000. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (18 and 19).)

3358. Are buildings included in that cost, or in what way have you arrived at it?—Buildings are not included; this is simply the cost of the maintenance of pauper lunatics, which, to recapitulate, went up from the beginning of the period from £830,000 to £2,286,000 at the end of the period. Those sums, as I have pointed out, are spent not at the discretion or under the administration of the Poor Law authorities. In order to arrive at a fair estimate or a fair statement of what the actual amount of expenditure by Poor Law authorities is, it is necessary to deduct those sums from the gross total. Deducting the £2,286,000 from the total of £13,369,000, we get a total of £11,082,000 spent for the administration of the Poor Law.

3359. You have knocked off about £3,000,000 then?—Yes. I should like to say that the expenditure on the insane in asylums in the last three decennial periods was as follows: In the first decade there was an increase of £312,000; in the next decade there was an increase of £323,000 and in the last decade there was an increase of no less than £820,000.

Proportion of cost of lunatics to cost of poor-law expenditure.

3360. Do you wish to say anything about the percentage of the cost of lunatics as compared with the rest of the expenditure?—I have here a return (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (16)) which shows the percentage proportions of each class of expenditure to the total, for quinquennial periods. Going back to the averages between 1857 and 1860, I find that the maintenance of lunatics then amounted to 7·1 per cent. of the total Poor Law expenditure. That percentage rapidly increased throughout the whole period, and is now, in 1904, no less than 16·3 per cent. That is to say, the proportion of the total cost of Poor Law expenditure—taking the gross Poor Law expenditure as given in the returns—which is attributable to lunatics, has increased during forty-five years from 7·1 to 16·3. (*See* also Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (19).)

3361. Are you taking here lunatics in asylums?—I mean here the maintenance cost of lunatics in asylums. I suppose that if you were to add to that the cost of buildings, you would get an even more startling result.

3362. (*Mr. Booth.*) Do you say the cost of the buildings is not introduced in any form—neither as interest, nor as rent, nor in any other way?—That is so; these figures are simply for what we call maintenance.

3363. (*Mr. Loch.*) Further information is forthcoming I presume?—Yes. I can give you the amount sanctioned in each year on lunatic asylums, but that no doubt will appear in the statistical memorandum. I am now simply directing my attention to making such explanation as may be made of the reason of the very large increase of expenditure for Poor Law matters. I have reduced it from the apparent sum of £14,000,000 to what is a fair sum of £11,082,000, that is to say, I have now reduced the total increase in the true cost of Poor Law expenditure to an increase of £4,282,181, which is the sum arrived at by deducting the cost of lunatics and the non-poor relief expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board from both the figures of 1873–74 and the figures of 1893–94.

Actual increase in poor law expenditure since 1873–4.

3364. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Can you tell us what is the proportion of the increase which has occurred in London, and in urban unions, and in rural unions, respectively?—We now have to deal with what I claim is the true increase, namely, £4,282,181. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (18).) Out of that no less than £1,800,000, or 42·12 per cent. of the whole, is an increase which concerns London alone. The increase in the counties of Surrey, Middlesex and Essex, which include what I may call the suburban unions of London, is £446,000, or 10·42 per cent. of the whole; that is to say, London and the suburbs are responsible for 52 per cent. of the increase. Then there is another group of populous urban communities which is responsible for another 38 per cent. of this increase. Yorkshire, for instance, and Durham are responsible for £528,000, or 12·33 of the increase; Lancashire and Cheshire for £626,000, or 14·63 per cent. of the increase; and Stafford, Worcester, Warwick, Nottingham and Derby for £476,000, or 11 per cent. of the increase. That is to say, London and the suburbs are responsible for 52 per cent. of the increase; what we may call the populous urban districts are responsible for 38 per cent of the increase, and the rest of the country is responsible for, say, only 10 per cent. of the increase. Therefore, the startling increase in Poor Law expenditure is primarily a London matter, and it is secondarily a matter which concerns the large urban populous authorities; and so far as the country districts are concerned, there has been no appreciable increase except in the last decade. To avoid questions hereafter, I would like to give you the population of these communities per acre. In London it is 61·65, in Lancashire and Cheshire 2·8, in Yorkshire 1·1, in Stafford, Worcester, Warwick, Nottingham and Derby 1·28, in Surrey, Middlesex and Essex 1·76, and in the rest of the country 0·45. (*See* also Appendix Vol. I. (A), V. (9).)

Distribution of the increase between London, Urban, and Rural Unions.

Population per acre in London and elsewhere.

3365. Are you taking the whole of a county for this purpose, or only the urban parts of it?—I am taking the whole of the county. It might have been possible to get the urban parts, but it would have been too much trouble, I think. In London 4,613,000 people live; in Surrey Middlesex and Essex, including the metropolitan suburbs, 2,772,000 people live; and in London and the urban districts generally, which as I have stated are mainly concerned with this increase of expenditure, 21,498,000 people live. In the rest of England and Wales, which has not appreciably increased its expenditure, there are 11,879,000 people. Therefore, as I say, this increase in Poor Law expenditure primarily concerns London, and generally concerns only about two-thirds of the population of the country, which points to the fact, as I venture to anticipate, that such difficulties as may arise in connection with the increase in expense are London difficulties, and in a lesser degree urban difficulties, and therefore that the Poor Law administration and local government in the rest of the

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

country have nothing to answer for with regard to this question of the increase in expenditure.

Accelerating increase of expenditure in London.

3366. Could you split up that increase into periods?—I have here a table which splits this expenditure into decades for each of the union counties which I have enumerated. Roughly it shows, what I think is a most serious point, that the increase of expenditure in London goes on at an accelerating ratio. During the last decade, the increase in London alone was £1,000,000, that is to say, the expenditure in London in 1893–94 was £2,228,000, and it is now £3,240,000, which is a much faster rate of increase than is observable in any other decade you like to name.

Rate of increase in Urban and Rural Unions

3367. Can you give similar figures with regard to the urban districts and the rural districts?—I have them here on rather a long table. The salient point in it is that a good many of the country districts show an absolute decrease in the thirty years.

3368. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Do the figures relating to London include the Metropolitan Asylum Board's figures?—These do not include the expenditure of the Board on fever hospitals.

3369. Then they are the figures for paupers only, apart from the lunatics?—Yes.

3370. (*Dr. Downes.*) They do include part of the Metropolitan Asylums Board's figures?—They include the imbeciles in the asylums.

Expenditure of Metropolitan Asylums Board.

3371. And the children, and the training ship also, do they not?—Yes. It may be convenient here to give the Metropolitan Asylums Board's expenditure for 1890, 1900, and 1904. The figures for imbecile asylums and other Poor Law services are £195,000 for the first decade and £265,000 for the next decade, and the increase between 1900 and 1904 brings the figure up to £383,000 then. If you take the fever hospitals the figures are, for 1890 £161,000, for 1900 £551,000, and for 1904 £646,000.

Rate of increase of expenditure and of population in London.

3372. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is there anything exceptional in regard to the population of London in the last decade?—The population then increased at a lesser rate. On this diagram I have a curve which I should like to show to the Commission. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (17).) The curve is computed according to the percentage variations on the year 1900. The curve which represents expenditure since 1850, begins at 20 and ends at 120, which means that the gross expenditure of London has gone up six-fold while the population has only doubled. That by itself would be a figure requiring investigation, but as I have shown you, the expenditure goes up with an accelerating velocity.

3373. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Have you the rateable value on that diagram?—No, I have the rateable value of England and Wales (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. 15) on another. This expenditure curve is perfectly startling; you see how it goes up in the political period.

3374. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You are not including anything in this for buildings, are you?—No, except debt charges.

Proportion of increase in various classes of expenditure.

3375. With regard to the proportion of increase in each class of expenditure, can you give us any information?—Yes. In 1857–60 (cf. Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (16)) the percentage (of the total cost) of expenditure on in-maintenance was 17·6, and in 1904 it was 22·5, that is to say there was proportionately an increase of the cost of in-maintenance. Of course it will occur to everybody that one factor in the cost of in-maintenance is the price of provisions, so that what has to be considered in connection with the tables is the price of provisions (which we can get from the fiscal Blue Book). The out-door relief, which in 1857–60 was no less than 52·9 of the expenditure, has dropped in 1904 to 21·4, showing, as I shall further point out by-and-by, that the change has been from the cheaper form of relief to the more expensive form. Debt charges (which is the technical term for loans repaid and interest), which in 1857 were 3·5, rose rather irregularly and apparently in periods till in 1903–04 they were 9·3 of the total, that is to say, the percentage of the debt charge is nearly three times what it was at the beginning of the period. In the same manner, the salaries rose from 11·2 at the beginning of the period to 18·1 per cent. at the end of it. Those salaries are mainly in-door salaries, that is to say, they are accounted for probably by the extra number of nurses, medical officers and other attendants employed in workhouses. The in-door officers nearly doubled in 25 years, that is to say, they went from 5,000 to 9,000, the out-door officers in the same period showing a very much smaller increase—I think 1,000.

Increase in number of officers.

3376. Would you say as regards the officers, that it was rather an increase of their number than an increase in their rate of payment which has led to the increased expenditure under that head?—I do not know that; I should think it was both, especially in London. I think one of the reasons alleged by Mr. Gathorne-Hardy for the introduction of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was that the officers were not sufficiently paid. I have no doubt this increase has been due to both causes, but it is mainly due to the actual increase in the number of officers, especially nurses. The main sources of the increase are the maintenance of lunatics in asylums, which mounted from 7 per cent. to 16 per cent., the debt charges, which mounted from 3 per cent. to 9 per cent., and the salary charges, which mounted from 11 per cent. to 18 per cent.

3377. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Does any increase in the cost of buildings come under the debt charges?—Certainly. Mr. Kitchin will give you evidence as to that. I think it is notorious that all buildings cost more than they used to do; it is also notorious that buildings in London cost more than they do, generally speaking, elsewhere.

Increase in debt charges.

3378. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to debt charges, do they increase in recurring periods?—It would seem so; for instance, after the troubles with regard to London in 1866, there is a sort of epoch where the increase is very rapid; and from 1866, which I should think is the period you have in your mind, the debt charges increased from £180,000 to £291,000 in 1871, which is a very sharp increase.

3379. Are those the figures for London only?—No; these are the figures for the whole country.

3380. As regards the year 1904 the figures were very heavy, were they not?—The year 1904 showed an immense increase. They amounted to £1,308,000 in 1904.

3381. Could anything be suggested as the ground for that; what did it relate to particularly?—There was some Metropolitan Asylums Board building which had been going on in London. In connection with that, you must remember that there are assets, that is to say, if the Metropolitan Asylums Boards or if a London Board of Guardians buys a farm, they have got land which is an asset, and in some cases a convertible asset; it is not like a workhouse specially built *ad hoc*. There is no doubt that the growth of the separate infirmaries has been largely the cause of this increase.

Cost of abolition of "barrack" schools.

3382. Also the alterations in schools, and such things as that?—Yes. I think I have already told you that the cost of providing buildings for taking the children who were formerly in the large metropolitan schools where the districts have been broken up, was more than £700,000—all of which has been incurred in the last few years.

3383. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is that in London?—Yes.

Increased cost of sites and construction

3384. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Then there would be an increased cost in construction, would there not?—Yes.

3385. And also in the cost of the sites?—Yes, and that would apply through all urban districts, which, as I pointed out, are responsible for most of the cost. There is no doubt that they have to pay much more for their sites—considerably more for their land—than they used to do; but what we are dealing with now is not capital expenditure.

3386. Of course, if capital expenditure increases, the debt charge increases?—That is so. There is not the slightest doubt that this excessive rise in expenditure dates from all those schemes and ideas which were in men's minds some few years back, and now I suggest to the Commission that the bill is beginning to come in. "The oysters are eaten, and set down in the bill," as they say in the "Dolly Dialogues."

Comparative cost of London's indoor and outdoor paupers in 1873–4 and 1903–4.

3387. Has there been any change in the cost of London pauperism?—The change has been from the cheap out-door pauper to the expensive indoor pauper, and not only so, but that it has been from the less expensive indoor pauper to the more expensive indoor pauper. Summing up the situation, in 1873 there were

39,165 indoor paupers in the Metropolis, and it is estimated that the cost of their relief at £27 0s. 11½d. per head was £1,059,345. I may say that that is only an estimate based on what we judge was the cost per head multiplied by the number. They had also at that time 70,293 outdoor paupers, the average cost of whose relief was £5 7s. 3¾d. per head, or, £377,063, making a total for 109,458 paupers of £1,436,408. That was in 1873–74. This estimated cost includes, I may say, the cost of maintenance, the debt charges, rent, officers and everything. In 1903–4, instead of having 39,165 indoor paupers we had 71,474, with an average cost of relief of £39 12s. 4½d. per head, making a total of £2,831,711 for indoor paupers as against £1,059,345 in the first period; and we had 42,194 outdoor paupers at an average cost of £9 13s. 7¾d. per head, or £408,545, as against the 70,293 outdoor paupers at a cost of £377,063. This makes a total London expenditure of £3,240,000 for the last period, as against £1,436,000 for the first period, the number of paupers having remained very much the same. The outdoor pauper I am not so much concerned with, but you see that his average cost went up from £5 7s. 3¾d. to £9 13s. 7¾d. That is an approximate estimate of the amount of money given to him, and it also includes the proportion of salaries, debt charges, and so on. The approximate estimates, I may say, are based on the same principle for both periods. That rise in the rate of relief probably was to some extent due to the Board's circular as to adequate relief; I think there is no doubt that more relief was given. The cost of maintenance for indoor paupers is significant; the cost of the relief for outdoor paupers is based on a mean number and is not, I think, very dependable.

iations ost per d of don's or pers.

3388. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Have you got the cost of the maintenance for out-door paupers as compared with the cost for in-door paupers?—Taking the maintenance alone, that is, food and clothing, the figures for the in-door paupers, which are, I think, dependable, are these: In 1859 the mean number of indoor paupers in London was 19,450, and the cost per head was about £10; in 1869 the cost had risen to £11 17s. with an increase in the mean number to 36,000. It then remains pretty constant, although the mean number increased up to 1899, when it was 66,900, the cost per head being £13. In the last five years, while the mean number has increased to 71,000, the cost per head has risen to £14 11s.

lysis of eased cost oor relief London.

3389. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Can you say what is the burden of the increased cost in London?—The burden of the increased cost in London is the fact that whereas in the first period there were but 39,000 in-door paupers, in the second period there were 71,000 in-door paupers—which is not a very great increase, if any, on the population, but which is still a substantial increase in the figures for which the decrease of the out-door pauper from 70,000 to 42,000 did not at all compensate—more especially as it is the fact that the out-door pauper was better done by in the last period, when he cost £9 13s. 7¾d. per head instead of £5 7s. 3¾d. which was his cost in the first period. The in-door paupers within their own ranks show a sort of corresponding change, that is to say, the proportion of the more expensive sort of indoor paupers to the others is far greater now than it was thirty years ago.

3390. Can you compare it with rateable value and with population; have you any figures that illustrate that?—I have a table (cf. Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (18)) which sets out in some detail the change. Calculated per £ of the rateable value, the cost of relief, exclusive of the cost of maintenance of insane in asylums and of the expenditure on fever hospitals in London, which I have referred to before as being properly deducted in order to get at the true cost of relief, works out at 1s. 5d. in 1874; the cost then falls to 1s. 3d. in 1894, and rises again to 1s. 7d. in 1904. Calculated on population, the same cost appears to have been 8s. 6d. the in 1874, 10s. 4d. in 1894, and 14s. in 1904. The great proportionate increase in London is in the non-able-bodied adults and children. The non-able-bodied adults in 1874 were only 19,000; in 1904 they were 37,000, showing an increase of 18,000. The children have increased from 11,000 to 19,000, an increase of 8,000, (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (13)) so that I put it before you that not only have you a change from a great increase in the most expensive part of pauperism, namely, in-door pauperism, but that inside of that in-door pauperism you have a further change towards the more expensive classes—the non-able-bodied classes and children who require special attention.

3391. Would you state to us any other causes that occur to you as the grounds for the increase?—As I have said, in-door pauperism has increased, but it has not increased much more than you would expect from the growth of the population, until just recently, and I must say that the increase just recently is rather ominous. The sharp increase dates from the period of 1901, which is just about the time that increased comforts would be brought into the workhouses. Of course the decrease of the out-door paupers does not compensate for this increase, so far as cost is concerned.

Effect of decrease in London birth and death rate.

3392. Do you make any suggestions as to what may be deemed to be other causes for it?—Yes, I make one suggestion, which is this—that the London death rate and birth rate have both decreased very sharply. I suppose that would mean that in London the proportion of aged persons is steadily increasing; and, if so, I think my doctrine of the irreducible minimum would again have an effect, and a larger proportion of persons would be obliged to use the workhouse. I may say that between 1890 and 1903 the death rate fell from 21 to 15 per 1,000.

Increase of deaths in hospitals and Poor Law institutions.

3393. Then there is the great increase in infirmaries, is there not?—Yes, and that increase has the heaviest bearing on the question of expense. There seems to be in London an increasing tendency on the part of all the population to resort to institutions; and that is specially marked in the last few years. In 1895, 24 per cent. of the total deaths in London occurred in hospitals and Poor Law institutions; in 1900 that percentage had mounted to 28·5; and in 1903, to no less a figure than 32·8 in workhouses and hospitals—pointing, as I say, to a greater disposition on the part of the inhabitants of London to use institutions. The proportion of that percentage of deaths occurring in workhouses and Poor Law institutions mounted in the same time from 15·3 per cent. to 18·5 per cent.

Variations in child pauperism in London and elsewhere.

3394. Then, too, there is a greater increase in child pauperism, is there not?—The increase in child pauperism is quite remarkable. The in-door pauper children supported by the guardians in London are about a third of the total number of children receiving in-door relief all over the country, though the aggregate in-door relief of London is only about a fourth of that of the whole country, showing that the child pauperism of London is very markedly higher than the child pauperism of the rest of England.

3395. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Are you counting them apart from their parents?—I am only alluding to the in-door pauper children.

3396. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Those are deserted children, I suppose, mainly?—They would be mainly deserted children or orphans. I do not know the proportion of children of widows who receive relief in London workhouses; I think that might very well be ascertained.

3397. (*Mr. Booth.*) In the comparison between London and the country, are you omitting the out-door in London and the out-door in the country too?—Yes.

3398. The proportion of the out-door relief is greater in the country than it is in London; and, therefore, a comparison between the in-door children in London and the in-door children in the country is not a fair one, is it?—What I suggest is that there are relatively more pauper children in London.

3399. Unless you compare both the in-door and the out-door at the same time, that will throw your comparison out, will it not?—No doubt that would be so, if based on the in-door relief alone. What I say is that in London the proportion of children receiving in-door relief is one-third of the whole of the indoor child pauperism in England and Wales. In London in 1860 the in-door child pauperism was 30 per cent. of all the in-door paupers; it is now 25 per cent.; whereas in the rest of the country the in-door children are a fifth of the whole in-door relief, and the proportion of the indoor child pauperism of London to the child pauperism of the whole country has risen in the same period from 18 per cent. to 33 per cent.

3400. (*Chairman.*) It is only in-door pauperism you are now speaking of?—Yes. The object of this table is to show that there are indications that child

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

6 Feb. 1906.

pauperism in London, which is an expensive form of pauperism, bears a larger proportion to the total than it does in the country, and not only so, but that the proportion of child pauperism to other pauperism shows a marked tendency to increase.

3401. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Do you wish to say anything about the increase in the cost of maintenance during the last fifty years in London?—I have given the figures for the in-door paupers in answer to a question put to me by Mr. Patten-McDougall. I should like to call attention to one more thing in London. Statistics are difficult enough anywhere, but the London statistics—comparative statistics especially—are made yet more difficult by the fact that so many of the wealthier classes and the better-class workmen sleep outside London, and are there enumerated.

Cost of indoor relief per pauper in London and elsewhere.

3402. Coming now to the expenditure on in-door relief in London and the rest of the country, is there anything further you wish to say on that point?—The cost of in-door relief in London averages, on the mean number of in-door paupers, £37 18s. 11d. per head; that includes not only in-maintenance, but salaries, superannuation, debt charges, miscellaneous expenses and everything. The total of all those, divided by the mean number of in-door paupers in London, gives you that sum of £37 18s. 11d., whereas outside London the equivalent sum is only £25 2s. 1d. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (18).)

Need for space accommodation in Urban workhouses.

3403. Then, of course, in all workhouses there ought to be a certain amount of surplus accommodation; is that particularly wanted in Urban districts?—In urban districts you have a much greater risk of rapid fluctuations of pauperism, and therefore you should have a greater margin of unoccupied workhouse accommodation, which is expensive. You must not only have, or should have, a spare amount of accommodation in the gross, but you must have it for each class. Therefore, it is not prudent to fill up your workhouse to anything like the same extent in an urban district that it would be in a rural district; in other words, the margin of accommodation should be much larger and is much more important, I maintain, in urban districts than it is in the country. I will take three urban counties, excluding London, and three rural counties. The urban counties, Lancashire, Staffordshire and Warwickshire, in 1899 had 84 per cent. of their accommodation in the workhouses occupied, but in 1905 they had 92 per cent. occupied, which is too much; whereas in the three rural counties, they had 60 per cent. occupied at the beginning of the period, and but 70 per cent. occupied at the end. That is an illustration of the reason why the charges for pauperism must be greater in urban districts with a growing population.

Comparison of occupied accommodation in Urban and Rural workhouses.

3404. Can you give any instances of the subdivision of workhouse establishments in urban unions?—Yes. In the three urban counties I referred to I find that the establishments provided by Guardians in 1897 numbered 84, including 70 workhouses and workhouse infirmaries. In 1905 the number of establishments had increased to 106, including an addition of 17 infirmaries under separate administration, and 14 cottage homes.

Increased cost of voluntary hospitals.

3405. You told us of the increased cost of providing in-door accommodation: is it also the case that the increased cost of providing hospitals, which are not Poor Law institutions at all, is greater?—As far as maintenance is concerned, judging from Sir Henry Burdett's book, the cost of each hospital bed has gone up in a faster proportion than the cost of the workhouse in-door maintenance. I may say that everything has increased in price. Take the cost of schools: there is an enormous increase there. Then the cost of lunatics in asylums I have already shown is immensely greater than it was; even the national expenditure seems to go up.

3406. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Are there any figures to show whether that is the case with regard to gaols and prisoners?—I have no figures on that subject.

3407. Is there a difference between London and the country in that matter, do you think?—Probably not. You see the gaols are worked by the Home Office, and the administration is perfectly centralised.

3408. I think it would be very interesting to know whether a prisoner costs more in London than he costs in Stafford, for instance?—I am sure he does not.

3409. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Have you the figures before you as regards hospitals. Were they in 1868 £57 per bed, in 1887-89 £84 per bed, and in 1901 £104 per bed?—That return shows a much greater ratio of increase than anything we have in the poor law.

Increased cost of in-maintenance per pauper.

3410. (*Professor Smart.*) You have not given the figures for the maintenance per head of the in-door relief of the country; have you got those?—In 1849 it was £7. 17s. per head of the mean number of paupers relieved, it rose slightly till 1899, when it was £11 1s. per head, and in 1904 it amounted to £12 13s. per head, the last five years showing a very marked increase. I have here also a table which shows the effect of the true increase in the cost of relief, that is exclusive of the cost of maintenance of insane in asylums and inmates of the fever hospitals in London, first of all on the cost per head of population, and then per £ of the rateable value. The very heavy increase in London has resulted in a rise per head of population of from 8s. to 14s.; but as I have already pointed out, that figure is not very trustworthy. You must remember that a great number of the inhabitants of London sleep outside. So far as rateable value is concerned, the increase of the value in London has been so great that it has more than doubled in thirty years, and the increase of expenditure in the £. of rateable value has only been 2d., so that London is paying 2d. in the £ more for its Poor Law expenditure than it used to do. In England and Wales, the increase per head, excluding London, has been about one penny in the thirty years, and the decrease on the rateable value has been 2d. This table goes to show that the cost of the poor rate per head in the country is practically no greater than it was thirty years ago, and that in London the increase per head is very large—from 8s. to 14s.; but that is subject to the explanation that a good many of the inhabitants of London sleep outside. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (18).)

Analysis of increase.

ELEVENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 13th February, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled: and further Examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

12 Feb. 1906.

tropolitan mmon r Fund.

3411. (*Chairman.*) Now I think we have reached the evidence that you wish to give about the Metropolis; first of all, I understand that you would like to say something about the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund and its origin?—I think it important to remember that the Metropolitan Poor Fund was not started merely as a measure for the equalisation of rates, but that it was started so as to enable the poorer districts of London to provide the workhouse accommodation which was then obviously necessary. In the late sixties great complaints were made of the condition of the London workhouses and infirmaries; and to obtain the necessary funds for remedying the defect was, I think, the main reason for the introduction of the Bill by Mr. Gathorne-Hardy. This point is important, because it is an indication of one of the causes of the rise in London expenditure in the seventies; it led to the new workhouses and infirmaries which were then built.

gin.

rease in enditure n.

3412. Has there been a great increase in expenditure since then?—The amount which is chargeable among the various unions under the Metropolitan Poor Fund has increased from a comparatively trifling sum of £300,000 to an amount which is now nearly £1,600,000. In addition to that, the expenditure of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, most of which is raised by an equal rate from all London, has been very largely increased for poor law purposes. Only within the last few years a large number of cases of poor law sick children were put under the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and that board now have quite a number of homes for those children. I would like to hand in the half-yearly statement of the Metropolitan Poor Fund, as I think it will be of some interest to the Commission. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (23).)

tsh rges upon.

3413. You state that the rise has been from £300,000 to £1,600,000 during a certain period; I assume that during that period fresh charges in addition to the original charges have been imposed upon this fund?—Yes, and a great number of charges, involving in themselves comparatively small expenditure, have also been put on the Fund in recent years; for instance, the ambulance service of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which was, I think, the last item to be put on. If you like, I will give you exactly the repayments which are received by the guardians from that fund. In workhouses and infirmaries 5d. per day is paid for every inmate over sixteen years of age out of the Metropolitan Poor Fund. Then the guardians get from the Metropolitan Poor Fund the salaries and rations of those officers who are sanctioned by the Local Government Board. Then the schools receive from the Metropolitan Poor Fund the full cost of maintenance—you will observe that it is only 5d. per day for inmates other than children. The casual wards are entirely paid for out of the Metropolitan Poor Fund; also the cost of all medicines and medical and surgical appliances; and in addition there are certain payments with regard to the insane and indoor-poor.

3414. Would you describe those payments or charges as being outside the original object or purpose of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—I think they are charges in extension of the principle. When Mr. Gathorne-Hardy brought in his Bill, he said that he was not prepared to equalise the poor rates all over the Metropolis, as he foresaw that if he did that, a central management would be necessary, and that, in his opinion, would ultimately result in a great increase in the rate of expenditure. He therefore limited the charges which were to be cast on the Metropolis at large to certain fixed items of expenditure which he said could not be jobbed or made for the purpose. He considered that each union should still be responsible and chargeable with precisely those expenses of their administration in regard to which indiscreet or corrupt expenditure could occur; consequently, as a sort of check on the local authorities he chose practically to confine the payments to in-maintenance and to the salaries of those officers who were approved by the Local Government Board. It is within that principle up to now, that the charges on the Metropolitan Poor Fund have been extended.

3415. If you have said all you wish to say with regard to the charges of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, perhaps you would now tell us what, in your opinion, has been the effect as regards economy of administration?—In my judgment, the whole financial relations of London are not such as tend to economy in the administration of the guardians. During the year ending March 31st, 1903, which is the last year the figures of which I have been able to get access to, the expenditure of the guardians of London amounted to £4,435,000; of this the amount levied on the Metropolis as a whole was no less than £3,037,000, leaving to be borne by the several unions without equalization the sum of £1,397,000. Therefore, the guardians' expenditure, other than that levied on the rateable value of the whole of London, either through the Metropolitan Asylums Board, or the Common Poor Fund, or the County Council grants, was only about a fourth of the total. That fourth is borne by the different unions in very different proportions, but it is a question whether the local administration is not responsible for the difference in most of the most heavily rated unions.

Proportion of guardians' expenditure borne by Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

3416. Has the tendency been for the unions to try to shift on to the Common Poor Fund the charges which perhaps are on the line between the Common Poor Fund and the union rate?—The bulk of the Common Poor Fund is administered, so to speak, automatically—there is a payment of 5d. per head on each indoor pauper within the certified accommodation, for instance; but there is a charge where there is always a doubt, that is the charge with relation to the salaries. The salaries

Sanctioning by Local Government Board of salaries chargeable to fund.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

13 Feb. 1906.

are paid out of the Fund only for those officers who are sanctioned by the Local Government Board ; and there is a perpetual struggle on the part of boards of guardians to see how many officers they can have sanctioned, and consequently how much they can get from the Fund. That is a source of perpetual trouble to the Board, it is very expensive, and a good deal of friction arises from it.

3417. Have the officers so appointed to give their whole time to the duties connected with the Common Poor Fund ?—Not necessarily. We sanction any officer we like to sanction. We have to sanction all officers down to scrubbers and laundry maids, before the guardians can get the salary or the wages of the scrubber or the laundry maid put upon the Fund.

3418. I assume this leads to unnecessary correspondence and to a good deal of administrative friction ?—It does lead to administrative friction, although I cannot speak directly to that myself, but other witnesses will no doubt give you a great deal of information on the subject. I only know this about it, that we have a great deal of work thrown upon the department for which I am more immediately responsible. It is most unpleasant work, and most tedious. I have of course rather to discount what is told me by the fact that it is very tedious and troublesome work ; but, speaking generally, I have no doubt you will find that that part of our business does not work very well for the public good, nor do I think it works for economy. I had a case the other day where a Board wished to appoint a new laundry maid on the ground that its washing machinery was not up to date. That is a curious result of the existence of this Fund. The Board are quite alive to this question, but we are advised practically that very little, if anything, can be done without legislation. A very few years ago the Board tried to legislate with a view to getting these claims settled in a more simple manner, but the clause was thrown out by the House on the motion of a London Member.

3419. The sanction of the Local Government Board was, I assume, made statutory, in the belief that it would be a protection to the common poor fund ?—Yes, it was. In 1905, when some unions approached the Local Government Board and asked for a Departmental Committee to consider this matter, the complaining unions were only the receiving unions, and the unions who pay were quite contented with the present system.

3420. I assume that the real difficulty the Local Government Board have is that while they have authority given to them, they have not the necessary local knowledge to be able to adequately discharge their duties ?—That is a difficulty. As other witnesses will, no doubt, tell you, it is very hard for us to know what are the real wages of a scrubber in Poplar or Islington. They must vary. We do our very best with this fund, and I am sure that my colleagues do most conscientiously work it ; but as these sanctions cannot be given *ex necessitate rei* upon any settled principle, the result does not come out very satisfactorily. It is rather disheartening to receive a perfectly valid complaint that one union is getting a good deal more than it ought to have on any conceivable ratio ; and what is more, the difficulty becomes greater as the guardians build more and more institutions. I think Mr. Lockwood will confirm that.

3421. Is this the only case now under the Poor Law administration of Great Britain where the Local Government Board have these peculiar cases to deal with ?—Yes ; and London is the only place where such an immense proportion of the expenditure of the guardians is found from sources outside their own union.

Proposals to extend scope of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

3422. I understand that proposals are being constantly made to extend this common poor fund ; what is your opinion on that point ?—Proposals were formulated in 1905, and suggestions were made for the extension of the Fund ; some of which are quite trivial as, for instance, suggestions that infants under three should come on to the Poor Fund, and so on. There have been three proposals made which have a good deal of importance. The first one, and the most daring one, was that all charges paid for by the guardians should become chargeable to the fund, which meant that there should be local administration, but payment from all over the Metropolis. That had, of course, very little to be said for it, from the economic point of view. Then there was a proposal that all buildings should be paid for out of the poor fund ; it appears to me that the objection to that proposal is that it would certainly raise the cost of buildings, which, as I think, is already much too high, and it would be another inducement to the guardians to give in-door relief instead of out-door relief. A certain amount of encouragement to take the latter course is no doubt beneficial, but I do not think it would be wise to go much further than we have gone in London in that direction. In London out of every 1,000 of population on January 1st, 1904, there were 16·4 in-door poor and 9·6 out-door poor. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (13).) In England and Wales the average for in-door poor per 1,000 of population was 7·8, and for out-door poor 15·9 ; the highest average of in-door poor in any county other than London being 9·1 ; so you see there is a very much larger ratio of in-door pauperism in London than there is anywhere else in the country. There are indications that in-door relief may be subject to abuse, as out-door relief undoubtedly is.

3423. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Do the in-door figures you have just given us include the figures for lunatic asylums and fever hospitals ?—No, they do not.

3424. (*Chairman.*) Has there been any proposal to put out-door relief on this fund ?—There was a proposal to put out-door relief on this fund. That is a proposal which would lead to results that would be, perhaps, a little startling. I have prepared a table which shall be in the hands of the Commission in a day or two, showing what the effect would be on the payments made by the several unions if out-door relief were made a Metropolitan poor fund charge. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (22).) From that table it appears that Poplar, which now has to raise out of its own fund £34,000 a year for out-door relief would, if the charge were equalised, only have to raise £5,200 ; or, to put it in another way, out of every £500 that Poplar spent in out-door relief, £490 would be found by the Metropolis at large. The table deserves careful consideration, because it is full of surprises—at least to me. For instance, the arrangement suggested would, on the figures for the year taken, have resulted in a loss of £1,000 in St.-George's-in-the-East, and £2,700 in Whitechapel, which are two strictly administered unions ; and would secure in the same year a gain of £11,600 to Bermondsey and £29,000 to Poplar, two districts in which out-door relief is freely given. The comment on that is that guardians may by unwise administration increase their out-door relief to any extent, and it appears to me that the extension of the Metropolitan Poor Fund to out-door relief would give them the most direct inducement possible for doing it.

Financial effect of charging out relief to Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

3425. Is there anything further that you would like to say as regards the especial characteristics of London ?—Perhaps I might just say this that, coming fresh to the study of London, the points that strike me most are these : Here you have this enormous aggregation of human beings without any means of what I should call real local self-government—the people do not vote, for instance ; and of that you will get evidence (I think strong evidence) from various persons, notably perhaps from Mr. Bailward. Then the people do not know their neighbours, and when they are elected guardians, as they may be by an accident, no less than three-fourths of their expenditure is found by an area wider than the area that elects them. You have none of these conditions existing anywhere else. Statistics are difficult enough in themselves, but a point that must always be borne in mind when you are looking at London statistics is that when you have a large part of the population working in London, but living outside and not enumerated in the London census, you get surprising results. The non-resident population makes London statistics more difficult than any other statistics, because it has to be taken into account as affecting the rateable value and pauperism. You will find unions like the Strand and the City of London, producing statistical results which are quite remarkable. In the City of London you will find that the cost of the Poor Law relief per head of population is 60s., which is much larger than anywhere else in England. I give that as a sort of caveat, when you are considering London statistics. Another thing that strikes me, on looking through the Census returns, is that there is no town in the United Kingdom where the proportion

Special points in considering Poor Law in London.

of casual labourers is anything like as high as it is in London. You will also find the most curious results if you take the figures which show the number of electors in proportion to the rateable value. In the East End you will find an enormous number of electors for a comparatively small rateable value; in other parts of London you will find the direct opposite. I venture, not knowing London at all, to put those facts before you, as being just the points that have struck me most in my investigations as far as they have gone.

blems of ndon urban ions.

3426. Have you paid any attention to unions just outside London, such as East Ham, Edmonton, and Tottenham?—Personally I have no direct knowledge of them, and for your evidence about all those you must therefore go to others; but I do know enough about them to know that they present a problem of very great difficulty. The first thing I had to do when I came to the Local Government Board was to deal with a proposal to break up the Edmonton union, which is a union of 570,000 inhabitants. What are you going to do with that mass of population, many of whom work in London, although forming a separate Poor Law entity just outside London? It is the same with West Ham. Then take a place like Croydon, which has a large rateable value, with a large and increasing population, and with a very strong corporate existence. Croydon is very unlikely to wish to be absorbed into London, and come under the Metropolitan Poor Fund. However, those are questions on which I can give the Commission very little information of any value.

or Law ildren.

3427. That, I think, concludes your evidence so far as the Metropolis is concerned, and I think you would like now to say something about the history of the administration in connection with children under the Poor Law?—I should say that this part of my evidence is fortunately very much shortened by the fact that I am able to refer the Commission to another book of Sir William Chance's, called "Children Under the Poor Law," in which you will find a complete historical account of child-pauperism in England, together with much other information very conveniently set out. As to the history of the administration, it starts practically from the year 1848, which was the first year in which guardians received a Parliamentary grant for the teachers. From the very first, the subject attracted a good deal of attention, and you will find many references to it in the early Reports of the Commissioners. Perhaps to me the most interesting allusion is to the Atcham union, where, as they were not able to get a schoolmaster, they appointed a practical agriculturist of good moral character to look after the children—and apparently he did so with great success.

William ance's hildren der the or Law."

aching at cham.

or Law ools.

3428. Can you tell us something about the present practice as regards Poor Law schools?—Workhouse schools, that is to say, schools inside workhouses, are practically at an end. I may say that the county councils pay a proportion of the salaries and emoluments of industrial trainers on the certificate of our general inspectors.

unty uncil grant industrial iners.

3429. What is the proportion which the county councils pay?—They pay two-thirds. It is one of the few remaining old-fashioned grants.

3430. And the remainder falls on the unions, does it?—Yes.

3431. Did the county do it before county councils came into existence?—No. It was paid directly by the Treasury before county councils came into existence. The money still comes from the same source, that is, it is paid out of the Local Taxation Grant.

yal mmission Education l orkhouse ools.

3432. I believe a Royal Commission on Education made some suggestions on the subject?—Yes. There was a Royal Commission on Education which attacked the whole system of the then workhouse schools which had been in existence say, ten years, since the grant was paid. Their assistant commissioners were of opinion that workhouse schools were the direct cause of pauperism, and so far as I have been able to discover the only defender among the assistant commissioners which the workhouse schools had was Mr. Fraser, who was afterwards Bishop of Manchester.

3433. (*Mrs. Webb.*) What date was the Commisson to which you are referring?—The report of the Commission came out just before 1860. Then, as now, there was a most heated controversy about schools, and people formed themselves into factions, and one faction could see no good in the plan of education advocated by the other faction. I read in the reports of the Commissioners that no less a man than Nassau Senior was charged with purposely leaving out evidence from letters so as to make his side good. That sort of thing went on. I will say this for my Department; I look upon the education of pauper children as the most difficult, the most interesting, and the most successful part of our work. From even those early days, the Poor Law Board as it then was, exercised what I conceive to be the wisest policy, that is to say, they allowed all systems to grow up alongside each other and have a fair trial. They were the only people who appeared to believe what you hear stated always—it is a common tag at Poor Law conferences—that "Whate'er is best administered is best." The Poor Law Board of that date and the Local Government Board of to-day are apparently the only persons who manage to preserve calmness enough to adopt that maxim.

Policy of Central Authority as to Poor Law children.

3434. (*Chairman.*) Subsequent to this Commisson on Education there was a Select Committee of the House of Commons which dealt with the subject, was there not?—A Select Committee of the House of Commons investigated the whole subject at great length, and their report was ordered to be printed in 1864. I might say that a return as to pauper children was granted in 1862, and that there was another return issued containing the reports of the Poor Law inspectors on the subject.

Select Committee of 1864.

3435. What was the system which the Select Committee reported on?—The proposal of the Education Department was that the whole country should be covered with district schools, and Mr. Tufnell, who was the protagonist of that party, thought that the schools should be built to accommodate about 1,000, and that country unions should be forced to combine in order to build them. The inspectors of the Local Government Board and guardians generally said that there was very little fault to be found with the existing system, which was that of having schools actually inside the workhouses, because they had abundant evidence to show that the children educated in those schools turned out well. The Select Committee on Poor Relief (which was the title of the Committee of 1864) took, on the whole, the view that the existing system was sufficiently good. They say "Making reasonable allowance for the low condition, physical, moral, and mental, of a large proportion of the children when they first enter workhouses, and for the necessarily frequent changes in their admission and discharge, the state of workhouse education is upon the whole satisfactory in its character and result. The Committee think that it would be inexpedient, and in many cases impracticable, to enforce the general establishment of district or separate schools; but they are of opinion that schools entirely distinct from the workhouse should continue to be encouraged as being attended with beneficial results to the children, and affording the most effectual means of separating them from the other classes of paupers."

Education Poor Law children.

Select Committee of 1864.

3436. I believe that while boards of guardians opposed the establishment of district schools in the country, advantage was taken of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund to start some in London?—Yes; somewhat later five or six of these district schools were started in London, whereas in the whole country not more than two or three were started. That appears to me a very good illustration of what I said on the first day when I gave evidence here, which was that sound local administration is a check on the extravagances of the Local Government Board or on the extravagances of Parliament. If the central authority, and what we may call the educated opinion of that day, had had its way the whole country would have been studded with schools of about a thousand each, at a huge cost, and with results probably no better than we can show to-day.

Metropolitan district schools.

3437. Was there not a Boarding-out Order about 1871?—About the seventies there was a general misgiving as to the sanitary condition of these large schools, and Mrs. Nassau Senior made a report to the Local Government Board of that day as to them. She reported strongly against the aggregation of children in large schools, and in favour of boarding-out. I should say that no one should consider her report without also considering the rather violent reply which Mr. Tufnell made to her at the time; the two should be read together.

Report by Mrs. Nassau Senior, and Mr. Tufnell's reply.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

13 Feb. 1906.

3438. You have alluded to Mr. Nassau Senior's views; which system was he in favour of ?—Mr. Nassau Senior was in favour of district schools. He was the eminent economist who wrote a great part of the report of 1834; he was, I think, the father-in-law of Mrs. Nassau Senior.

Mr. Nettleship's report as to ophthalmia.

3439. Now we come to the introduction of the boarding-out system. There was some difficulty, was there not, in connection with the children's eyes; did they not suffer from ophthalmia ?—Yes. Mr. Nettleship, who was an eminent oculist, made a report as to ophthalmia in the London district schools, in 1874. Just about that period people were very much alive to the whole question of the treatment of children. It was very shortly before that—I think about the year 1866 or 1867—that the cottage home plan of building in small blocks was introduced.

Origin of cottage homes.

3440. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Who initiated the cottage home system ?—Mr. Andrew Doyle was the man who took a great interest in cottage homes. He went to Mettray and saw Count de Metz's buildings there; they were buildings broken up into small homes. I think that was the origin of our cottage homes. The first ones built were built in South Wales, at Neath.

Children sent to public elementary schools.

3441. (*Chairman.*) I think after the introduction of cottage homes the Education Act was passed ?—Yes, the Education Act made a very great difference to our Poor Law workhouse schools. The system of sending the children out to the public elementary schools spread with great rapidity, and now at the present time, there are about 17,000 children, living in Poor Law establishments who go to the public elementary schools—that is, half the total number of our children who go to school at all attend the public elementary schools.

3442. Has that system answered ?—I think it answers admirably. It is cheap, it is efficient, and the children are distinctly happier than they used to be.

3443. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Do they live in the workhouses or in separate homes ?—Sometimes they live in workhouses and sometimes they live in separate institutions. I will give you the exact allocation of the children by-and-by.

Subsequent careers of pauper children.

3444. (*Chairman.*) I suppose that, previous to the Education Act, pauper children were the only children who were compelled to go to school ?—That was so, and perhaps the great success of our children was, to some extent, due to that. The earliest return that we have showing what became of pauper children was one which was made on the motion of Mr. Henley, whom your Lordship will remember as Member for Oxford. That return showed very satisfactory results.

Mr. Henley's return.

Boarding-out Orders.

3445. In 1877 was there not a Boarding-out Within Unions Order ?—In the early seventies there were Boarding-out Orders first outside the union and then inside the union.

Departmental Committee on Workhouse Schools.

3446. Then I think there was a Committee in 1894, was there not ?—There was a Committee in 1894 which reported in 1897.

3447. That was a Departmental Committee for inquiring into the metropolitan schools, was it not ?—Yes.

3448. Was it purely an educational committee ?—It dealt with the whole system.

3449. Then it was departmental in the Local Government Board sense, you mean ?—Yes. Mr. Mundella was the chairman. That committee was appointed by the then President of the Local Government Board, mainly, I think, because there had been attacks or statements made as to the prevalence of ophthalmia in these schools. I believe that the ophthalmia was the real reason why the committee was granted.

3450. What was the purport of its report ?—The purport of the report was to condemn the schools altogether, to make recommendations for the breaking up of the school districts, and for the establishment of a body other than the guardians for governing the pauper children of the metropolis.

3451. Are we to understand that the Committee attacked not only the schools in workhouses, but also the district schools ?—They attacked the district schools in London. It was a metropolitan committee; we must not forget that.

3452. Was it an inquiry confined to the children in the metropolis and not generally applying to the country at large ?—That is so.

3453. Was any reply made to the objections which that committee raised against district schools ?—The report was received with a storm of indignation. The metropolitan managers and the metropolitan guardians and many other people objected to the whole report. You will find a complete history of the agitation against the report of the committee in Sir William Chance's book, "Children under the Poor Law."

Sir William Chance's "Children under the Poor Law."

3454. About that time was there not a report by Dr. Stephenson on the ophthalmic condition of the children ?—Yes. That was a very remarkable report indeed. Dr Stephenson was, I believe, called before Mr. Mundella's Committee, but he had not then the complete knowledge of the ophthalmic condition of the London school children which he had afterwards. The report as to the breaking up of the district schools was based to a very large extent on the assumption that the worst form of ophthalmia was extremely prevalent, and that it was a necessary consequence of what they called the aggregation of the children. Dr. Stephenson's report is extraordinarily clear and well worth reading. He found out that, so far from trachoma having increased in the schools, it had decreased, since the date of Mr. Nettleship's report in 1874, from about 40 per cent. to something under 5 per cent. He also found that in his opinion the spread of this disease was due to the admission of children suffering from it. He also showed that the number of cases of ophthalmia varied directly with the poverty of the unions from which the children came; and that ophthalmia was not a necessary consequence of what the Committee called "aggregation." He said, "So far as I am able to form an opinion, the aggregation of reasonable numbers in a well kept and properly arranged school is likely to do no harm."

Dr. Stephenson's report on ophthalmia.

3455. To which body was that report made ?—The inquiry was undertaken at the request of the Local Government Board, and the report was published in 1897.

3456. That is nearly ten years ago; has time confirmed Dr. Stephenson's opinion ?—I think so; but as to that you will receive further evidence.

3457. Would you like to give your opinion on the controversy which arose out of the report of the Committee ?—I have read that report and I have read the evidence carefully, and I am bound to say that the way in which everything that tells in favour of the large schools is ignored is most remarkable. There is not a word in that report of the very weighty testimony which was given to the effect that practically all the children educated in those schools were dispauperised and did well in after life. Witness after witness is quoted in part, and the material or qualifying part of his evidence is left out. Thinking it over, it appears to me that at the back of the report there was some sardonic humorist who wished perhaps to test the credulity of the people or to expound his view as to the value of a Departmental Committee for getting at facts.

Criticism of Report of Departmental Committee on Workhouse Schools.

3458. I believe the report of the Committee, whether it was based on sound evidence or not, was supported largely by public opinion, was it not ?—The report of the Committee was in many respects valuable—I think everybody will agree to that—and in a great many respects was simply carrying out movements which had been already begun; but as to that Mr. Lockwood will give you better evidence than I can. It was very strongly supported by an influential body called the State Children's Association, and was, I think I may say, in parts very willingly accepted by my board. The appointment of the Central Metropolitan Authority was, however, dropped. The other most important change recommended was the breaking up of these large schools. The Committee having reported in that sense, and it being quite evident that the opinion of the House of Commons and current opinion just outside the actual managers was in favour of the breaking up of these schools, I suppose the Local Government Board had no choice but to decree their extinction. But we cannot forget that that breaking up cost the metropolis three-quarters of a million in solid money; and there must be I think, to anyone who looks at the evidence as to the dispauperisation of the children educated in the old schools, some little misgiving as to whether the children educated in the new schools are going to do quite as well

as the old ones. There is just a doubt whether there may not be in small cottage homes where the children are mixed and not classified according to age, certain moral mischiefs which might well be guarded against in the larger schools and there may be a doubt—and a strong doubt too—whether the industrial training, which is to my mind the main consideration, will be as good in these small homes as it was in the large ones. On that point I would refer you to the most interesting report* which was made by our London inspector, Miss Stansfeld. It is a short report, but it is very much to the point.

3459. What is the present distribution of the children, first in London and then in the provinces?—Generally the distribution of the children is continuously in the direction of smaller homes instead of in large schools, and continuously in the direction of the extinction of the old workhouse school. This information had better be handed in in the form of table (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (12),) perhaps; but I may say that in London on January 1st, 1905, there were 13,334 children, of whom 2,495 attended public elementary schools, being housed in Poor Law establishments, thirty-two attended workhouse schools (those would be exceptional cases where there were sick children, and so on), 5,213 attended separate schools, that is to say, schools for one union, and 3,273 attended the district schools, while 1,630 were under the care of the Metropolitan Asylums Board; these figures showing that practically all the London children of school age are out of the workhouses. In the country workhouses and infirmaries there are 18,707 children; in district and separate schools there were 4,300; in cottage, scattered and separate homes there were 10,000, and then there were some in other establishments under the guardians' control, making, altogether, a total of 33,000. Of these children there were 24,000 who were of school age, 14,957 of them attending public elementary schools, 817 attending workhouse schools, 5,750 attending separate schools, and 785 attending district schools, including the "Exmouth." Then there were, besides those, over 7,700 children in homes, not directly under the control of the guardians but paid for by the guardians. The whole process is in the direction of the individual treatment of each child, and in the direction of splitting up large institutions.

3460. Next, you wish to deal with certified schools and uncertified institutions, I think?—Yes. There has been a very large growth of those, and very useful they are. They are to my mind perhaps the best illustration of charity working in co-operation with the Poor Law. Good people start these homes, we certify them, the guardians pay for the children going there and we inspect them. There were no less than 262 of those institutions in England last year with accommodation varying from six children up to 900—I am thinking of one of Dr. Barnardo's.

3461. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You have just mentioned 7,700 children as being in other homes; were they in these institutions you are now speaking of?—Yes, they were in the certified institutions. There were also another 3,000 in uncertified institutions, sent by consent of the Board or by direction of the medical officer. There are also nine training ships, and the Local Government Board encourage the sending of the boys to the training ships very much.

3462. (*Chairman.*) Do they work well?—They work very well.

3463. I suppose a considerable proportion of those boys go into the Mercantile Marine service?—Yes, they do.

3464. I think you have noticed that there is a tendency to aggregation?—Yes, though the houses may be smaller the institutions are larger. That is a very natural tendency. If you have a great number of children together you can do them better, you can give them better swimming baths and a better gymnasium and a better industrial training. I would like to point out that the Local Government Board are blamed from time to time for permitting this aggregation. The State Children's Association protest against it, but it is, under the circumstances, almost inevitable. We are not the only ones who have that difficulty to face. Canon Barnett when he came before the Vagrancy Committee gave most striking evidence on the point, which I should like to put before this Commission. He said, in answer to a question that was put to him, that in his experience "no one does quite so well as a boarded-out child, considering the class he comes from and the difficulties he has to start with. Dr. Barnardo, who speaks with unique experience, says the same. Dr. Barnardo has broken up some of his institutions and now boards the children out. . . . . Dr. Barnardo, speaking to me the other day, said, 'If I were starting again I would not start an industrial school of any sort,'" which was a very strong opinion in favour of boarding out. Canon Barnett was asked "With regard to Dr. Barnardo's preference for boarding out over institutional treatment, are you aware that he is extending his accommodation at Ilford"—that is a cottage home school for girls—"to 2,000?" to which Canon Barnett replied:—"Yes, he is bound to; but I will tell you why. He has got to raise his money and he is obliged to appeal to people through their eyes."

3465. What is the ultimate object in view for these children who are thus aggregated?—They should be going out to service by the time they are fourteen.

3466. At what age do they go to school?—They begin at the ordinary school age, which is three years—which I think should be raised to seven years, but three is the school age now in England. School age for children.

3467. In those homes they would be over three years of age before they are sent to school, would they not?—Yes. They become a new class at three; they then become "children of school age."

3468. Are children boarded out at the same age as they are sent to school?—Yes. Boarding-out age.

3469. What have you to say about the apprenticeship of pauper children, which I think is your next subject?—Apprenticeship has practically died out, and there are very few of the children who are apprenticed now. The regulations of the Local Government Board on the subject are antiquated, and not suitable to the present conditions. They would have been revised long ago but for the fact that cases of apprenticeship have now become rare, except in certain instances where a child is a cripple or something of the kind. What is important about it is the fact that we now recognise that the premium paid for apprenticeship may in certain cases be paid as a sort of allowance to the child when he is learning his work to enable him to get his own living; and that we sanction in certain cases. There have been proposals to extend that system considerably, as, for instance, that children shall be allowed to live in workhouses or in schools and go out as half-timers at the mills to learn a trade. That proposal has been made especially in the north of England in connection with the textile industries. It is a very interesting point, and it was quite lately considered. We managed to get the opinion of trade unions on the point. They were dead against it. One said they viewed it with detestation; another one said they scouted the idea; another one said it would be most distasteful on the grounds that it would be a way, as he thought, of lowering the rate of wages, and that in times of strike the children would still go on working—in effect, that they would not work with the rest of the trade union. All those objections are quite sound, it seems to me, as far as they go; anyway, the system has not been brought into practice, though it has been very much advocated. Apprenticeship of pauper children and proposed extensions of system.

3470. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you remember how many boards of guardians have got sanction for that system?—I do not, but I believe there was a case at Keighley.

3471. (*Chairman.*) To whom would the half-timers' wages go?—The half-timers' wages would go to the guardians for the maintenance of the children. As you know there is a statutory prohibition against employing paupers for hire.

3472. Now I think you wish to speak to us about the fishing trade?—Yes. A good many boys are apprenticed to the fishing trade at Grimsby and other places. Mr. Berrington, who was one of the assistant secretaries of the Board of Trade, and myself held an investigation into the whole subject at Grimsby a few years ago. The facts were these: There was great loss of life at that time, and there was a great deal of justification for the criticisms that were passed on the then system of apprenticeship to the fishing trade; but I was always of opinion that those objections could be met, and that it was an impossible thing to stop the fishing trade altogether as a means of apprenticing pauper children. It is exactly suited for a certain type of boy. The rough boy who is Apprenticeship of pauper children to fishing trade.

* Cd. 237—1899.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

13 Feb. 1906

no scholar, and has plenty of pluck, and does not mind hardship, has his exact *metier* there, and if his life is a little dangerous, his rewards are very great. Only the other day I saw a letter from a boy who was in one of the workhouse schools in my district in which he apologised to the master of the workhouse for his early marriage, and enclosed a cheque for £10 to be expended as a treat for the school children of that workhouse. It was a very interesting letter to me. Before that boy was twenty-two he had made over £600.

3473. I think the general impression is rather that putting young boys to an occupation of this kind renders them specially liable to ill-usage?—That is so, but you see they have got a Board of Trade agent there who is a great protector; and then, when you have got a lot of boys together, they make a public opinion; and if a skipper is cruel to an apprentice that skipper has a rough time of it.

3474. On the whole, then, do you think that that is not a serious objection?—Carefully watched I think that apprenticing him to the fishing trade is a most valuable means of disposing of a certain type of boy.

3475. Who makes the selection; does the boy have anything to say as to his trade, or does that rest entirely with the guardians?—If he is apprenticed he always has to consent.

3476. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In practice the boy consents to anything, does he not?—No, not with regard to the fishing; boys very often refuse to go to that. With regard to ordinary businesses the boy has a choice.

3477. (*Chairman.*) Do you think the consent of the boy is any real check?—Yes, because he is brought back again before the indentures are completed and finally signed; he has a trial trip.

3478. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Are the boys only sent on that trip in the summer?—I cannot say exactly how it is done now. If you will read our report, you will find that we went into the matter pretty fully; but there have been considerable changes since, and the Board of Trade will tell you all about those.

Emigration of pauper children.

3479. (*Chairman.*) Your next subject is emigration; there are certain rules made by the Local Government Board in connection with emigration, are there not?—Yes, a very important branch of the Board's work in connection with children is that of emigration, which is nearly always to Canada. Last year I think 450 children were so emigrated, and the year before 374 children, at a cost of some £5,000. You will see a complete and very excellent account of the Local Government Board's relation to emigration in the evidence of Mr. Lawrance (who is in the Local Government Board) which will appear in the report of the Agricultural Colonies and British Settlements Committee, which will be issued in two or three months I think. Very briefly, the system is this: The Guardians write and say they wish to emigrate such and such a child through an agent—the Waifs and Strays Society, Dr. Barnardo's, or any of the various well-known agencies in Canada. We then make certain inquiries about the child, and the matter is referred in case of any difficulty to the Agent-General for Canada. We then get a cheque from the Guardians for the inspection of the child while it is in Canada. That is a new arrangement and a most beneficial one; the Guardians pay as much as £10 for the inspection of a very young child, paying less and less as the child gets older. The consent is then given and the order is issued and the society takes the child out. The children are regularly inspected by officers of the Canadian government, and I will bring with me when I next come here, the books showing the exact information which we get from Canada with regard to each child. That information is carefully sifted and where necessary it is forwarded to the Guardians for their observations where anything requires to be done. Complaints have been made that it is many months before those reports reach the Guardians. That is so, and it is a matter of great difficulty to avoid it; but you must remember that long before the report reaches the Guardians, as a rule, everything that has been necessary has been done for the child by the Canadian Government agent on the other side. I think I may safely say that the child is amply protected, and that the system now works very well indeed. The Guardians do not take full advantage of it, and they do not send as many children as one would suppose they would; there is a sort of feeling that the best children are wanted in England.

Procedure in regard to Canada.

3480. How long has that system been in force?—I think it has only been perfected since 1898. I have written myself to our general inspectors calling their attention to the details of this Canadian inspection, and I think you will find that probably more children will be emigrated. Emigration is very suitable for a certain class of children.

3481. Is Canada the only Colonial Government with which this arrangement has so far been made?—We do emigrate children to other places. For instance we have sent three to New Zealand and some to South Africa; but Canada is so much more suitable—the fares there are so much cheaper and the arrangements are so much the more perfect that practically Canada has monopolised the whole.

Variation in numbers boarded-out children.

3482. Now I think you have something to tell us about the number of children boarded within and without the unions?—I have merely to call the attention of the Commission to certain facts and I will put a Table in if it seems good to you. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (12).) I have a list of the numbers boarded out in every year from 1894 to 1904, from which it appears that the numbers boarded out outside the union were in the first year of the decade 1802, and in the last year of the decade 1792, showing a slight fall. A more considerable fall would have been shown if we took the years before 1894. The children boarded-out within the Union were, in 1894, 3,613, and in 1904 6,780. Therefore the boarded-out children beyond the Union is a stationary or declining number, and the boarded-out children within the Union are increasing somewhat rapidly.

Extension of boarding-out order.

3483. Has there been any recent change in the orders on the subject?—We have issued a new order for boarding out outside the union, raising the rate of maintenance and also empowering Guardians to board out children who are adopted under the Poor Law Acts 1889 and 1899. An order of the same sort is under consideration for boarding out within the union.

Adoption of children by guardians under Poor Law Acts 1889 and 1899.

3484. What were the Poor Law Acts of 1889 and 1899?—Those were Acts which enabled Boards of Guardians to adopt children, that is to say, to put themselves *in loco parentis* in the case of any child who appeared to be neglected, and to assume all the responsibilities of the parent, subject to an appeal by the parent to the magistrates. The Act has made a very considerable difference in the administration of the Guardians with regard to children, and has tended, I think, to bring a certain number of children into institutions. In 1902 we had a Return of the number of children adopted under these Acts; I have the Return here, and it shows that more than 350 unions had taken action under the law, and that the number of children so adopted was more than 7000.

Subsequent careers of pauper children.

3485. You have had a very long experience, so perhaps you can tell us what is the result of the training and education of pauper children; does any considerable portion of them in after life come back under the Poor Law?—There is a consensus of testimony from the very earliest times that whatever may be the defects of our Poor Law schools they have at least this one merit that they have dispauperised the children. If they had not done so the result would have been that in our workhouses we should have had a large number of able-bodied paupers, because, if the children brought up under the Poor Law came back into the workhouses, they would do so in the able-bodied period of life. If workhouse schools had failed, as they were said to have failed, is it not obvious that we should not have had the remarkable decline in able-bodied pauperism which we have had? In spite of that general consideration, and in spite of the special investigations to which I will allude later on you have it continually repeated that there is a pauper taint which never can be got rid of, that once a pauper always a pauper and that the Poor Law Education is a feeder of pauperism. Only the other day I saw a statement by a gentleman who was, until the last election, a member of the House of Commons, and this is what he says: "For many generations the Poor Law schools have been nothing but forcing houses for paupers. Paupers have been turned out machine made to one pattern." You may imagine the enthusiasm with which some of us who have devoted

much of our lives to improving and perfecting the system of pauper education receive statements like that.

3486. (*Mrs. Webb.*) May I ask whom that statement was made by?—Mr. Louis Sinclair, the late member for Romford.

Henley's rn 1860.

3487. (*Chairman.*) I think there are some returns now that you want to refer to, are there not?—Yes. The first one is Mr. Henley's Return of 1860.* That was very favourable to the schools generally, as it made out that about five per cent. of the children came back. That is a creditable enough Return when you consider what some of those early Poor Law schools must have been.

3488. Do you think that Return is reliable?—Yes, subject to investigation. I am going to put before you a suggestion later on for making a Return of that sort more conclusive and less open to criticism.

l
kworth's rn, 1896.

3489. There is another Return on the subject to which you wish to call our attention, is there not?—There is a later Return† which was made in 1896 on the motion of Lord Warkworth. That Return was for the Metropolis alone. It showed the number of male or female inmates of metropolitan workhouses or infirmaries who had been educated in workhouse schools and district or Poor Law schools. According to this Return, taking boys and girls together the daily average number of children attending metropolitan separate or district Poor Law schools was in 1875, 8383; in 1885, 11,004; and in 1895, 11,747. The number of inmates of metropolitan workhouses and infirmaries in June 1896 who had been educated at Poor Law schools was 435. The number out of the 435 inmates so educated who had become chargeable through sickness or permanent mental or bodily infirmity was 232; therefore the number who had not become chargeable through sickness or permanent mental or bodily infirmity was 203, which represented about five in every thousand of the actual number of adult inmates of the workhouses and infirmaries dealt with in the Return. These, I think, are the only two general Returns on this branch of the subject which I can put before you.

3490. (*Miss Hill.*) The first Return showed that about five per cent. of them came back, and the second Return five per thousand; therefore the second Return was more favourable?—Yes.

3491. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) The first Return, Mr. Henley's, however, was for the whole country, and the second, Lord Warkworth's, for London alone?—Yes.

3492. I should think that the country schools would not always compare very favourably with the London schools?—I will come to that later on.

ort by Davy

Mozley 77.

3493. (*Chairman.*) Now I think you wish to refer to a joint Report which was made by you and Mr. Mozley in 1876?—Yes. That Report was published in the Local Government Board's Report of 1877. Mr. Mozley, who was an inspector of workhouse schools, and myself, took, as I think you will believe when you read the Report, a great amount of pains to find out what became of the children who were educated at the separate schools for Manchester at Swinton. That Report is wholly satisfactory, and I should like to quote you a sentence from it:—"If a boy in the upper or middle classes fails in an examination or leaves his first employer, he is not usually at once considered to have utterly failed in life. But if a pauper child leaves his first place for a cause which may after all be the fault of his employer, who is alone left to tell the tale, and is then lost sight of under a stupid and mechanical system of visiting, he is promptly written down as a discredit to his school, and is perhaps printed in a blue book as a striking instance of the evil results of pauper school training." I adhere to that exactly now as I did when we wrote it.

Law ren and ty cil arships.

3494. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would it be possible to get any information as to the number of county scholarships taken by pauper children; I believe none are taken in London?—You will find in Sir William Chance's book on "Children under the Poor Law" instances given of many children who have won prizes for technical education.

3495. There is now about £4,000 a year given in London in these scholarships, but no pauper children at present have taken them I believe?—I cannot speak as to that.

3496. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Was there not one case last year?—If the Commission pleases I will arrange that some one or other of the inspectors shall look up these modern points.

Procedure on dismissal of Poor Law child by first employer.

3497. (*Chairman.*) Supposing a boy after leaving school is put out to employment and loses his first employment, is there any machinery attached to the Poor Law which would find him other employment?—If the visiting of the children is properly done the persons who have to keep their eye on that child would find another place for him. In some cases the guardians have made actual arrangements with working boys' homes, and so on, to take in children who have lost their first berth and to look after them till they find another situation.

3498. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is the employer bound to communicate the fact to the guardians if he wishes to dismiss a boy?—In every decently administered union that is one of the conditions of taking the child.

M.A.B.Y.S. Society.

3499. (*Miss Hill.*) And in the case of a girl you have the M.A.B.Y.S. Society, have you not?—Yes, in London.

Mr. Murray Browne's report.

3500. (*Chairman.*) You now wish to mention a Report on the country unions by Mr. Murray Browne, I think?—Yes. Mr. Murray Browne made a Report on the country unions, and two years before that one of the schools inspectors had done the same thing. He took a certain number of selected unions and traced the children. Mr. Murray Browne kept the old Eton School Lists, and he was very fond of saying that he was quite sure that the ordinary pauper school did not turn out as many failures as a big English public school, and he was ready to demonstrate that with numberless instances.

Evidence of general inspectors as to subsequent careers of Poor Law children.

3501. I think you have found other evidence to the same effect which has been given by other inspectors?—There are three instances that I have been able to extract from the Blue Books. Mr. Lockwood says, in the 22nd Report of the Local Government Board, speaking of the number of people in fifty-four workhouses who had been educated at pauper schools:—"It will be seen from this return that on a given day there were, in fifty-four workhouses with a total of 5,550 adult inmates, sixty-seven men who in childhood received a workhouse education, but of these twenty-four only can be set down as responsible failures, the destitution of the remaining forty-three being caused by mental or physical infirmities which would in any case prevent their being self-supporting." In the 25th Report of the Local Government Board Mr. Baldwyn Fleming speaks to the same effect—"Out of 784 workhouse inmates there are, according to the above returns, about thirty children who may be fairly counted as failures. Then in the 24th Report of the Local Government Board I say this:—"It is frequently alleged with much assurance, and in spite of clouds of witnesses to the contrary, that children who are educated at a workhouse school generally return to the workhouse and make it their home; and past experience makes it probable that the allegation will continue to be made and to be believed. . . . Misrepresentations of this kind must be endured, however mischievous they may be." That return is pretty much to the same effect.

Visitation of boys and girls in service.

3502. Now we come to the question raised by Miss Hill, namely, what is done in the case of the girls?—There is the Association for Befriending Young Servants, the secretary of which, Miss Poole, undertakes the visiting of the girls for, I think, most of the unions, and her Report is published in the Board's Annual Report. I might say that there is another institution of the same sort which has been started lately for the visiting of Poor Law boys.

3503. (*Miss Hill.*) Do you know whether that institution confines itself to London?—I do not: I only heard of it the other day.

3504. (*Mr. Booth.*) Does that visitation take the place of inspection by the guardians?—I think they undertake the charge from the guardians, but you will no doubt hear Miss Poole, and by this time she may be able to give you some valuable and much needed assistance in comparing the future of girls educated in different institutions, whether, for instance, the scattered home girls do better than the other girls. I may say that about the best

* H.C. 496—1861. † H.C. 308—1896.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

13 Feb. 1906.

Warren Farm School, Brighton.

system of inspection of children sent out from workhouses I ever knew was that at the Warren Farm schools at Brighton—an institution which I do earnestly hope some of the Commission will visit. The work was undertaken by two lady guardians, who did it most extraordinarily well and kept every single return. There are 300 children in the school and the buildings are inferior, but we have never had for years to send a child to a certified home or to board one out or to send one to a training-ship. We have got the name of every boy who has been there for many years. Seven out of ten of the boys can play a musical instrument; they all have a chance of learning to draw; and for the ones that can play we have a continual demand from the colonels of regiments, who value those boys as recruits. The last boy we sent out before I left the district earned 12s. 6d. his very first week as a finisher, I think they called him, that is making boots on piece-work. We have quite a farm there and a good many cows, and a boy I knew very well, who was a sort of half-baked lad, but who knew cows well, in a very short time was getting 18s. a week as a boy in a milkman's place.

Visitation of scattered homes.

3505. (*Chairman.*) Do you wish to make any statement on the visiting of Poor Law girls and boys in scattered homes?—I should like to mention one more of the schools that I have been interested in. That was at Chatham, in the middle of an urban population. Everybody knows what sort of folk the Chatham people are. The boys as they played in the yards were right under the infirmary windows, and right under the windows of the lunatic wards. They did not go out to school, but they had a master and a matron who knew their business. I investigated pretty carefully the circumstances of those children who had been sent out to service, and I can say that practically they all did well. What struck me most was that year after year those boys used to win the Association Football Challenge Cup of the Boys' League at Chatham, and they used to come pretty near to winning the cricket cup. I have seen those boys, pauper boys of inferior parents and suffering under every disability, beat at football the sons of the Royal Engineers. Draw your own conclusion as to the training those boys must have had to make up for heredity.

Chatham school.

Appointment duties, and salaries of district medical officers.

3506. (*The O'Conor Don.*) I think you mentioned the other day that you have not in England, as we have in Ireland, dispensary districts?—We only have them in London.

3507. What do you do in substitution for them in the country?—We have Poor Law medical officers, to each of whom is assigned a district of suitable size. They attend upon the poor people who are either upon the permanent poor list or who have an order from the relieving officer or the guardians which entitles them to medical attendance.

3508. Do they attend the poor at their homes?—Yes.

3509. Is there any particular place where the poor can go and meet the medical officer?—No, not generally speaking.

3510. What is the usual size of these districts?—We have to sanction them, and we take great care that they are not too large. We have some regulations on the subject. However, in sparsely populated districts, it would be impracticable to insist upon the same sort of size for each district. The size contemplated by the regulations in ordinary circumstances is an area not exceeding 15,000 acres in extent, nor with a population of more than 15,000.

3511. What do you call these doctors—parish doctors?—District medical officers.

3512. Are they appointed by the guardians?—Yes.

3513. What is about their usual salary?—The salary varies with the district. We always try to get an adequate salary.

3514. What would be the range?—It would be from £10 to £150, generally speaking. In a few urban districts the medical officers devote their whole time to their duties, and then the salaries are larger.

3515. Have you any under £100 a year?—There would be some.

3516. How do they manage with regard to the drugs if there is no dispensary; how is the medicine got?—The medical officer makes his arrangements just as he would for his private patients.

3517. Does the doctor give the medicine, or does he give a prescription which is taken to an apothecary?—A doctor who is a district medical officer would, I take it, in nearly all cases do his own dispensing.

3518. Have these medical officers the right to superannuation?—Yes, under the new Act.

3519. Is any portion of the salary paid out of the Imperial Exchequer?—No, not now.

3520. Then it is all on the rates?—Yes, but then you see the rates are assisted by the Exchequer grant.

3521. Was it at any time a special charge upon the Imperial Exchequer?—No, I think not.

3522. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There was a grant, was there not?—There was a special grant *ad hoc*, but we never controlled these salaries through the grant, as we controlled the salaries of medical officers of health.

Grant towards salaries district medical officers Ireland.

3523. (*The O'Conor Don.*) In Ireland half the salaries are paid out of the Imperial Exchequer; have you nothing of that sort in England?—Not for the Poor Law service.

3524. Do you think it is a good system to have a portion of the payment made out of the Imperial Exchequer?—There are many objections to it, among others the objection to the constant supervision necessary, and the objection that there is a tendency to extravagance. You may remember that the system was very much attacked by Lord Randolph Churchill some years ago. I might add that the district medical officers must be resident in their districts, and that the Board take a great deal of pains to ensure, as far as they can, that these officers shall be accessible to the poor.

Merits of relief in and relief money.

3525. Turning to another point in your previous examination, you mentioned to us that out-door relief was sometimes given in kind and sometimes in money; which do you think is the best system?—I am not quite orthodox about that. The doctrine is that relief in kind is a self-acting test of destitution, as it has been called, and that it is less likely to be abused than relief in money. Speaking for myself, I think on the whole that if a man can be trusted to receive out-door relief at all he can be trusted to have it in money, and if he cannot be trusted to have it in money he had better get an order for the workhouse. It is only in exceptional cases that I should advocate the giving of relief in kind, as, for instance, when there is sickness in the house which requires some particular form of food. It always presents this other difficulty to my mind: under the orders of the Board half the relief must be given in kind in the case of out-door relief given to an able-bodied man. When that half was fixed the price of bread was very much higher than it is now. Those men do not want all that relief in kind; what they want is some money to pay their lodgings.

3526. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would you be in favour of giving milk?—I think so, in the case of children. That would be an exceptional thing. I am more in favour of leaving that matter entirely to the discretion of the guardians, than of taking the old line.

3527. (*The O'Conor Don.*) You do not think it leads to economy to have it in kind rather than in money?—I do not. The difficulties of distribution are very considerable, as I have pointed out.

Proporti Poor La children workho schools.

3528. Turning now to your evidence of to-day, are the children in country workhouse ever sent out to the ordinary day schools of the neighbourhood?—Nearly all of them are. Out of the whole 59,000 children who are on the books I think there are only 800 children now who are in schools inside the workhouse.

3529. Then nearly all of them join with the other children in the ordinary schools?—Over 17,000 do.

3530. Do you think that is a good system?—It is an admirable system, and one which the Board has advocated for many years. It has enabled us to go on with existing workhouse schools in many a case where we should have had to shut those up and go to the expense of building separate schools.

Clothes by work house children

3531. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In regard to the clothes worn by those children, is there not some distinction made; is it not the case that in some districts the children go to school in ordinary clothes, and in some they go to school in special clothes?—More than ever the intelligent matrons are dressing the children like other children. I should like to add this, that I think when the Commission

go to see for themselves some country workhouses they will be struck, as I am, with the goodness of the matrons to the children and to the old people.

3532. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) I think you said there were only 800 children who were not going to the ordinary schools?—Who are at schools inside the workhouse.

3533. There would be a larger number than that who are going to schools belonging to the guardians—schools that are under the Poor Law?—About 16,000.

Provision of drugs.

3534. (*Dr. Downes.*) Following up The O'Conor Don's questions as to drugs, there are one or two points which might perhaps be cleared up. I believe that in many unions the guardians find the expensive drugs?—They do in the workhouses, and I think they find cod-liver oil and some other things for the out-door poor.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

13 Feb. 1906.

3535. That is for the district medical officers?—Yes.

3536. In some cases they have arrangements, have they not, with a chemist to make up the medicines prescribed by the district medical officer?—That is probable, but I cannot recall a case of the kind.

3537. I think you may take it from me that it is so. In some of the larger unions they find all the drugs and have a dispenser, do they not?—They do in London. That would only be done in the very large unions.

3538. It is also done in a few unions in the country, is it not?—Yes.

Mr. Brook Kitchin, called; and Examined.

Mr. Brook Kitchin.

13 Feb. 1906.

3539. (*Chairman.*) You are the architect of the Local Government Board?—I am.

3540. How long have you held that post?—I have been architect to the Local Government Board for four years, previously to which I was assistant architect for eight years. I have been at the Board for twelve years.

Functions of Architect of Local Government Board.

3541. You have handed in a memorandum epitomising the nature of your work. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (A).) This Commission are very much interested in ascertaining what checks on expenditure the Local Government Board have over the local authorities. It seems to me that your ordinary work would not in any sense be of a contentious character, but where it was contentious it would arise from one of two sets of circumstances, either where the proposals put forward to you were not up to date, or, on the other hand, where they would be in your judgment extravagant?—That is so.

Relations between Architect's Department and boards of guardians.

3542. Would that roughly epitomise the two classes of special work that you have to do?—Yes, I think that would very roughly. The relationship is a very amiable one between the architect's department and the boards of guardians with whom we come into contact, and we are very desirous that it should always be so. We rather hold ourselves open to be a kind of department to give as much assistance as we can to boards of guardians, and not to interfere unnecessarily with their work. Where we do come into contact with them, is generally when they want to spend too much money and we feel it is our duty and it is desirable that there should be a check placed upon their expenditure. That is, I think, the main cause of contention that arises between us and boards of guardians. There are also minor questions: questions of the suitability of buildings and the type of buildings to be put up, and the number of buildings and similar kindred questions. There are sometimes contentious matters arising in connection with loan periods, but none of great importance. On the whole, I think I may say our relationship with boards of guardians is a very amiable one.

Cases of inadequate schemes submitted to architect.

3543. I suppose the number of cases in which the proposals made did not seem adequate, are few?—Yes. Of course, that does not concern us so very closely as it concerns the inspectors of the board. The question of adequacy of accommodation is a question that is generally in the hands of the general inspectors of the board or the medical inspectors of the board. If it appeared to us that any scheme was inadequate in its accommodation, we should at once point it out.

3544. In dealing with proposals which are inadequate you have the advantage of the advice, experience and opinion of the inspectors?—Yes.

Cases of extravagant schemes submitted to architect.

3545. Turning to the question of cost, which seems more difficult, you have I suppose, to rely more on your own opinion and the opinion of your department?—We would rely entirely on our opinion in the matter of cost.

3546. Assuming that the plans of a building came forward, the cost of which you thought was disproportionate to the object, you would object to them or point out your reasons for thinking them extravagant?—Yes. If it appeared to us to be unusually expensive, we should report to the board that the plans were expensive.

3547. Do cases often occur where you have to make that class of report?—They are very frequent. In fact, I may say that almost every case that comes before us is criticised and dealt with from the point of view of reducing the scope of the scheme in order to reduce the expenditure, not always because it appears to us to be an extravagant plan, but because it appears to us very often that there might be a reduction.

Increase in cost of buildings.

3548. I suppose that the cost per pauper of housing accommodation is steadily rising?—Yes, it is rising very steadily indeed, and it has risen ever since poor law buildings were constructed. I have a statement * here which I shall be pleased to hand in, if it is of any value, which would show the price per bed in various poor law institutions from a quite early period.

3549. I think that would interest the Commission very much?—I have it in different schedules of subjects, that is to say, I have one for infirmaries, I have one for workhouses, and I have one for cottage homes. I handed one in at the Vagrancy Committee on the costs of vagrant wards. I have also the cost of some outside institutions for the purposes of comparison with poor law institutions, which I think might perhaps be of interest to this Commission, and I should be pleased to hand those in. I have also the cost of some few, I have only been able to get four, reformatory schools which have been erected in late years under the Home Office, and for the purpose of comparison it is rather an interesting statement, although it is on a very small scale. I may perhaps mention that the cost per head of the voluntary schools at Exeter built under the Home Office was £106 per bed; an industrial school built at Birmingham was also £106 per bed for 150 children; a school under the local authority, that is the school board, in South Wales, for 100 children, cost £155 per bed; and a small school under the local authority at Brighton cost £220 per bed.

Cost per bed of various non-poor law institutions.

3550. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Does that mean the local education authority?—Yes. That is rather an interesting statement because though, as I said, the instances are very few, it shows that there is rather a large increase in the cost under the local authority compared with the cost under a voluntary management. The first two cases which were £106 per bed were voluntary management; the last two cases, which were £155 and £220 per bed, are local management.

3551. (*Chairman.*) In making your comparison you have only taken the cost per bed; have you any data for estimating the class of accommodation provided at that cost in each case?—No, these voluntary schools do not come under us at all. This is a statement taken out from the Home Office inspector's report for 1902 and 1903, and that is all I have got. It is simply taken out of that, and those are all the particulars I have. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (B).)

Special reasons for increased cost of buildings in London.

3552. I assume in London certain special considerations may affect the cost of buildings. For example, if a building has a very fine frontage in a big central street, I suppose some allowance would be made for that fact if the elevation was of a somewhat more expensive character than buildings of that kind usually are?—Yes, some slight allowance is made for that. It sometimes happens that the land owner has put certain clauses into the agreement of purchase or in the lease of the land which necessitates a building of a certain amount of pretention—perhaps I ought not to say pretention.

* *See* papers handed in by Mr. Davy, C.B. (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (2 to 5).)

Mr. Brook Kitchin.

13 Feb. 1906.

Architect's practice with regard to elevation, ornamentation, &c., of buildings.

3553. The building must be devoid of ugliness?—Yes, that is the way I should like to put it. That, of course, has a slight effect upon the cost, but I think I may say that the elevations of buildings are not a very material matter in the cost of buildings either in London or in the provinces. We are very careful to see that the elevation is kept very plain, and we at once strike out any superfluous ornament or any superfluous materials or any materials as to which a change might render the building rather less expensive.

Enforcement of architect's objections to guardians' schemes.

3554. Have you had any cases where a local authority has been recalcitrant as regards the suggestions or views of the architect's department?—Yes, generally they are rather recalcitrant.

3555. I meant by recalcitrant, where you have failed to enforce the wishes of the department?—There are cases where we have compromised. As a rule, they fall in with and meet us in any reasonable recommendations that we make, and I think as a rule, although there are exceptions, they are quite willing to take reasonable steps to reduce buildings if we say they are too expensive. If we point out they are too expensive, they will consider it and they will bring it down wherever they can. On the other hand, we do have cases where boards are very obstinate, and once they have made up their mind to carry out a building in a certain manner, it is very difficult to get them to alter that opinion.

3556. The only power you have, if ultimately you cannot come to an agreement, is to advise the Board not to grant the loan?—Yes, I think that is the extreme power that we have; to withhold the sanction of a loan, and that is a course that has been taken in extreme cases.

Proposal to inspect buildings in course of erection.

3557. You have had a long experience, four years as head of your department and eight years in a subordinate capacity; assuming that you had power to alter the regulations, have you any suggestions to make by which to give yourself and your department more control over local authorities?—Yes. We have not very much control over local authorities on the whole, and I think if we had power to examine buildings during the course of construction we should perhaps have rather a greater control over the excess expenditure which so often arises in connection with poor law buildings. At the present time, directly the scheme has passed from the architect's department, it has passed out of it altogether, in a great majority of cases; we very often never hear of it again. We do not even know whether the building has actually been built or not, unless it happens that I go down into the district and see it, and we have no information as to the progress of the building or as to the actual completion, or as to whether the money spent has been properly spent upon it. Those are matters that are left entirely in the hands of the local authorities.

Procedure when cost of buildings exceeds sum sanctioned.

3558. Assuming that you give your assent to a building and that the cost of construction very largely exceeds the estimate, what power have you then?—They would apply to the Local Government Board for sanction for the additional expenditure.

3559. I assume that constantly occurs?—Yes, that occurs very frequently.

3560. I presume it is as a rule very difficult for the Local Government Board to do anything else than assent to the additional cost?—Yes, it is very difficult indeed, the money has been spent, the work has been done, so what can the Board do?—They can only surcharge. I fancy that is the only step they can take, and then we know, I think, pretty well what happens when there is a surcharge; it is eventually sanctioned unless there is fraud or something of that kind.

3561. Your suggestion is that you should have more power during construction or after the plans have been sanctioned?—I think if we had more power after the plans were sanctioned we should be in a better position to deal with these excess expenditure cases. The Board, too, would be in a better position.

Existing checks on expenditure.

3562. Otherwise do you think, looking to the difficulty there is in controlling local authorities, the system of check works fairly well?—I do not think it does work very well. I do not think there is enough check upon local expenditure upon buildings. We can only check the expenditure after it has been spent. That is what it amounts to, we cannot check the actual expenditure. Of course there are cases where we are able to check expenditure, where boards of guardians come to us properly to obtain sanction to the expenditure before the money is spent, but in a very large number of cases the money is spent before the Board knows anything about it, and then it cannot be checked.

3563. You have no suggestions to make as regards the procedure preliminary to the sanction of a building, but your suggestions relate to what may occur afterwards?—Yes.

3564. To put it in another way, you think the system works fairly well as regards the sanction and checking of the original expenditure?—Yes.

Proposal to inspect buildings in course of erection.

3565. But not with regard to the dealing with any excess which may afterwards arise?—Yes, that is so. There is practically nothing to prevent an excess arising. As I say, if an officer were to go down and examine the building during its construction and examine the accounts, and have statements put before him as to the money that had been spent on the building, there would be some check.

Extra staff needed.

3566. Would that necessitate a large increase of staff?—Yes, it would necessitate a travelling inspector of some sort.

3567. Not more than that?—That would depend a good deal upon whether every building that was erected had to be inspected, or whether certain buildings only. Of course there are a great many small cases which really might be left entirely in the hands of the guardians and their advisers to deal with.

3568. A comparatively small increase of staff would give you this additional check, assuming you had the power of stopping the excess?—Yes. It is difficult to say exactly what staff would be required, but some increase of the staff would be necessary in order to deal with it.

3569. You cannot anticipate what amount of building would be in progress at a certain time?—That is so.

Non-Poor Law work of architect.

3570. (*Sir Samuel Provis*). This Commission is only concerned with Poor Law work, but you have other duties besides those connected with the Poor Law, I apprehend?—Yes, we have a considerable amount of work in connection with bye-laws and local Acts, in connection with Public Health matters, such as the erection of isolation hospitals, mortuaries and kindred subjects; also a certain amount of work in connection with the housing of the working classes and general questions that arise on sanitary matters in connection with buildings come before us.

Local Government Board's check on Poor Law and other buildings.

3571. The statutory requirements with regard to the works to be carried out, say, under the Sanitary Acts and the Poor Law Acts are different, are they not? There is a good deal more need for supervision in the case of plans for a workhouse than there would be for a work which is carried out by a sanitary authority?—Certainly. The architect's department is much more closely in touch with the Poor Law administration of the country than with the sanitary administration of the country (under the Public Health Acts).

3572. It is the case, is it not, that, speaking generally, the consent of the Local Government Board would only be necessary to a building put up by a sanitary authority, if a loan was required?—Yes, that is so.

3573. But in the case of a Poor Law building their sanction would be necessary, although no loan was required?—Yes.

3574. Have you any opinion as to whether it is necessary that quite as much distinction should be made in the two cases? For instance, supposing that the sanction of the Local Government Board were required for all plans for Poor Law buildings, is it your view that their sanction need be also given to the actual expenditure, although it may not be for the purpose of a loan?—In the case of Poor Law buildings I think it is necessary that it should be. Our inspectors and the Board generally are so closely in touch with Boards of Guardians that it seems to me that it would be absolutely essential that all expenditure should be sanctioned whether by loan, or whether by order or letter of the Board.

Cause of increased expenditure on buildings.

3575. The attention of the Commission has been a good deal drawn to the increase of expenditure in connection with Poor Law buildings. Is it your view that

unnecessary buildings are proposed by boards of guardians, or that the increase of cost is to be attributed to the greater expenditure proposed on particular buildings?—I think it is due chiefly to the expenditure on particular buildings. Of course the number of buildings that comprise an institution such as a workhouse has very largely increased in the last fifty or sixty years. Formerly, in 1836 or 1837, when the Poor Law Commissioners were first encouraging local authorities to build workhouses, their idea was to build simply one building, and that is what was done; one building was built, and in it all classes were put. Now in 1906 if a new workhouse has to be built, it comprises anything from twenty to forty detached buildings, and we find, I think, that the tendency is to increase the number of buildings more than to increase the class of buildings that is put up.

3576. These separate buildings are for separate classes, are they not?—Yes.

ect of sification expendi- e.

3577. What occasions there being so large a number of separate buildings?—The tendency has been ever since Poor Law buildings began to be erected to divide up the accommodation, to divide up the indoor paupers. First of all, the sick were divided up, and then the able-bodied became divided into different classes. Then the sick became divided again into such classes as maternity classes and special cases; foul cases, itch cases, venereal cases. All this was tending to divide and segregate the indoor pauperism, and it was all tending very much to increase the cost. Then, again, of course there were further developments in divisions: the children were taken away: people were received in separate buildings: nurses were taken out of the main building and housed in nurses homes, and so on and so on. With each dissection, or whatever you may call it, the cost went up, and the larger the number of buildings that were put up the greater the cost; and that tendency has been increasing ever since Poor Law buildings began to be put up.

scussion of posal to empt rkhouse ildings m local e-laws.

3578. You tell us in paragraph 11 of your Memorandum that workhouse buildings are not exempt from local bye-laws. Would it, in your opinion, be desirable that they should be?—No, I do not think under the present system it is desirable that they should be exempt. We depend very largely on the local authorities to check matters of detail in Poor Law buildings under their powers under the Public Health Act by which they get their bye-laws. I think if they did not come within the scope of the bye-laws, it would throw a very great deal of responsibility on the Board in the matter of a lot of details.

3579. Such matters as the thickness of walls?—The thickness of walls, and the sizes of timbers, the height of floors, the construction of roofs, and such matters as that, as well as sanitary details.

3580. Supposing there were the supervision or inspection during the actual construction of the building which you were referring to just now, would that at all affect your view?—In that case, we should have a better opportunity of judging of details, and it might be possible then, I think, to allow buildings of this kind to be exempt. Of course they very nearly are exempt. If we were a Department of State, they would be exempt, because they would be sanctioned by a Department of State, but as it is, they are not. If they were under the Home Office, I take it they would be exempt from local bye-laws, but that, as I say, increases the responsibility.

ifficulties central thority pervising tual rection of ildings.

3581. Practically, would you think there would be a good deal of difficulty in supervision by the central authority of the erection of local buildings?—It would have to be a general supervision. Of course it could not be a very detailed supervision; that would have to be left still to the local architect. It would not dispense with the local architect; he would have to be responsible for all details, and we should inspect with a view of seeing whether they were carrying out the plans in accordance with the Board's approval.

3582. It would be an inspection rather than supervision?—Yes.

dvantage inspection building couse of ection.

3583. What were you contemplating as precisely the result of the inspection? Was it that you thought the Board would be in a stronger position to refuse an application for a further loan for the excess cost?—Yes. I think it would have the tendency of making boards of guardians more careful in the matter of excess cost, and of avoiding extras.

3584. So that the excess cost would be reduced?—Yes, I think it would have the effect of checking the excess cost.

Mr. Brook Kitchin.

13 Feb. 1906.

3585. You tell us in paragraph 19 of your Memorandum that fifty years are allowed for the purchase of land; if the guardians asked for sixty years, would they get it?—Yes, I think the policy of the Board is to allow sixty years where boards of guardians ask for it or press for it. Period of loans for purchase of land.

3586. Sixty years being the maximum period allowed by the Statute?—Yes, that is so.

3587. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Do you think it might tend to economy if you had model plans in your Department which were sent to the guardians to use?—We have had some experience of model plans. We have issued model plans for isolation hospitals, and I take it on the whole it has had the effect of reducing the expenditure. We have also issued model plans for cottage homes,* but we find that it is rather difficult to get local authorities always to agree with a stereotyped plan from a central authority. I think sometimes they take it as perhaps a little bit of offence to have plans sent to them when they have their own local experts to advise them. We have had one or two cases where there has been a little friction over model plans. Possibility of "model plans" for workhouse buildings.

3588. Supposing it were the universal practice, and they had to show reasons for departing from the model plans, it might work smoothly perhaps?—Yes, but it would not be possible to do it, I think, in the case of workhouses, because there is such an enormous variation in the size of workhouses. A workhouse for a small number is such a very different thing to a workhouse for a large number that there would have to be a very large number of plans in order to cover the whole ground. There would always be the difficulty of selecting the right plan, and whatever stereotyped plan was made, it would be certain not to meet all the requirements of each particular union.

3589. You think it could not be easily modified?—It could be done in detail, and we are doing it in detail. A memorandum has been prepared which I think perhaps the Board will issue giving plans of infirmaries of different sizes and for different purposes. There are seven or eight different plans, and the idea is that any board of guardians who want assistance or intend to build an infirmary shall have a copy of this sent to them, and they shall build up their infirmary on these model plans if one particular plan does not suit them. That is not done at the present time, but I hope it will be done in the case of infirmaries. In the case of workhouses, I think it is rather more difficult. Official memorandum with model plans for infirmaries.

3590. Would you say with regard to such institutions as infirmaries and consumptive sanatoria, that the scale of expense is very much set by what has been done by voluntary institutions? Does it follow them pretty closely?—The rise in the cost of hospitals of that kind follows the rise in the cost of general hospitals, but it is very much lower all through. Comparison of cost of Poor Law and voluntary hospitals.

3591. It is much lower?—Yes, the cost of Poor Law infirmaries is much lower than the cost of general hospitals.

3592. Would that be in the construction or in the appliances and furnishing?—General construction, and largely in the amount of cubic space per bed and the amount of floor space per bed; that is all on a much larger scale in the general hospitals; also in the style of the buildings. The style in the general hospitals is very much better than the style of the workhouse infirmaries.

3593. It is the case, is it not, that in workhouse infirmaries there is better accommodation for nurses, and so on, than there is sometimes in the hospitals?—Yes, that is so. There has been a great improvement and development in the housing of nurses in workhouse infirmaries of late years, and that, I may say, is tending very much to increase the general cost of Poor Law infirmaries.

3594. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) How far is this increase in cost due to the increase in wages? Do you state that in the Return you are going to give us?—I have a diagram here which shows the fluctuation of building materials and the fluctuation of wages. This one of wages has been very roughly drawn out, but I could have it drawn out more carefully; it gives the rise from 1887 to the present day, and from 1887 it went up step by step without any diminution till it reached its present rate. The increase on the percentage is from 84 to 100 in less than twenty years. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No VI. (C and D).) Effect of cost of wages and materials on increased cost of buildings.

* *See* paper handed in by Mr. Davy, C.B. (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (2).)

Mr. Brook Kitchin.

13 Feb. 1906.

3595. (*Dr. Downes.*) That is wages ?—Yes.

3596. Have you got materials ?—The fluctuation in materials is shown by this diagram. It gives six different building materials, wood, slates, iron, lead, bricks, and Portland cement. It shows the rise for the ten years 1895 to the present day, and you will see from this table that there was an enormous rise in 1900, and that it subsequently fell in nearly all these materials.

3597. (*Mr. Bentham.*) What locality are those prices for ?—These are London prices.

Effect of public inquiry into proposed loans.

3598. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In your opinion would a public inquiry as regards these loans be of any influence in restraining extravagance ?—It might have this effect that it would bring the matter more closely before the persons who had to pay for it, but whether they are sufficiently keen on the point to take any notice is a question that I am not able to answer.

3599. It might lead, might it not, to their supporting your view, or that of whoever held the inquiry, as against that of the local authority ?—Yes, it might in that case. It would make it very much more difficult to deal with Poor Law buildings, or the sanctioning of Poor Law buildings, if every expenditure had to be the subject of an inquiry.

Consultation of central authority as to choice of local architect.

3600. Every big expenditure ?—Yes.

3601. Are you ever asked to advise as to the choice of architects ?—Yes, occasionally.

3602. Would it be a good thing, in your opinion, if your Department were more frequently consulted ? The difficulty that occurs to me is this ; supposing a board of guardians find themselves faced by the necessity of building a new infirmary and no member of the board had had any experience of building infirmaries at all and they all felt they must have a really good architect to do it, they do not know whom to go to, and very often it might be that some local person is given the job and he has never built an infirmary in his life ?—That is what very often happens. It would be difficult for us to settle who was to be the architect, because whoever was appointed architect the guardians would not be satisfied unless he was a local man, or a great many of the guardians might not like the particular local man.

Attitude of central authority as to competitive plans.

3603. Are you ever asked to decide as between competitive plans supposing the guardians advertised a premium and so on ?—Yes, but we never do.

3604. You decline that ?—Yes, we decline to have anything at all to do with competitions, because we do not consider any advantage is gained by a competition. It usually ends in a waste of money.

Proposed appointment of clerk of works by central authority.

3605. As regards what you told us about the check on local expenditure, would not it be a good thing in the interest of the ratepayers that you should appoint a clerk of the works in order to keep a strict and watchful eye over the materials and so forth ?—If it were possible to do so it would effect a check, but there are probably thirty or forty, or even more, Poor Law buildings being constructed at one time, and it would mean a very large staff of clerks of the works in order to check them all.

3606. (*Dr. Downes*). Might not the appointment of a clerk of the works by the central authority very greatly diminish the responsibility of the local authority ?—Yes, it would. Anything that went wrong would at once be thrown upon the hands of the central clerk of the works. Of course that is always the way with local government; if anything goes wrong it is the central authority that is to blame and the guardians get all the credit for success.

Scope of proposed inspection of buildings while being erected.

3607. In the case of any inspection of the works during the progress of the works, should you regard it as important that that inspection should be limited to questions of cost, or to deviation from the plans, for the reason that if it is not so limited it might also diminish local responsibility ?—Yes, I should certainly limit it to such subjects as would not limit the local responsibility.

Public inquiries into proposed loans.

3608. With reference to the question which has been asked as to a public inquiry, could you tell me if it is the practice of the Board in the case of other departments, such as those dealing with health or municipal expenditure, to hold such inquiries in the case of large expenditure out of loan ?—Yes, I think it is invariably the case in the other departments.

3609. With regard to the plans which come before you, is it your experience that the cost in the first instance is very commonly under-estimated ?—Yes, it is very commonly under-estimated, particularly if there is a competition; then it is more under-estimated than ever.

Under-estimation cost of buildings

3610. So that the guardians in the first instance are, as far at the estimates before them go, not fully aware of what the thing is going to lead to ?—No, not as a body.

3611. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Do I understand from that that certain members of the board are, and some are not ?—Some of them are sufficiently knowing, I think, to know that the cost is under-estimated, and cases have come before the Local Government Board where guardians have kept the estimate as low as possible in order not to frighten the ratepayers.

3612. (*Dr. Downes.*) Eventually those guardians come for an additional loan ?—Then they come for an additional expenditure loan; the building has been built, as they get money enough in hand in many cases to carry out the building (for the contractor is not paid his last instalment until the building has been finished some months); by that time the money has been spent and they have been to the Board and got their additional loan.

3613. It becomes very difficult for the Board to deal with such a case ?—Very difficult.

3614. Does not all that tend to keep the ratepayers very much in the dark as to what the actual cost of the buildings is ?—Yes. The ratepayers seem to me to be entirely in the dark with regard to the cost of buildings. I do not know whether they mind that.

Nature of plans asked for by central authority first instance

3615. With regard to the plans themselves, is it the practice of your Department, in the case of all large schemes, to get pencil plans or sketch plans in the first instance, if possible ?—Yes, one of our objects is as soon as possible to see the scheme, or to get an idea of the scheme, before the guardians have elaborated it to any extent, so that we can express our opinions at an early period ; and it is very much easier we find to get a scheme modified or reduced when it is in a pencil or initial stage than when it has been produced after laborious meetings of the board of guardians and when, after a number of resolutions, they have come to regard the thing as their adopted child. It is difficult then for the Board to come in and cut the scheme up.

3616. So that it is not necessary for boards of guardians to draw up expensive plans in the first instance ?—No, we should certainly discourage that as far as possible.

3617. Do the plans give you the details of such things as costly fittings ?—No, the plans show the details, but not the actual character of the details.

3618. So that large expense might be incurred in details of which you have no intimation whatever ?—Yes. That is so, particularly in infirmary work, where details are very expensive.

Nature of estimates furnished to central authority.

3619. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You would have an estimate of the cost of these things ?—We have an estimate, of which I propose to put in a copy, which divides up the cost into various sections, but the general cost of the building, which is in one item, would cover a great deal of detail which would not be shown, such as sanitary work. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (E).)

3620. (*Dr. Downes.*) We have already had your opinion of the value of the estimates which you receive ?—Yes. I think I might say that there has been a tendency to improve the estimates in late years. There has certainly been some improvement and greater correctness in estimates.

Proposal to restrict loan to amount of original estimate.

3621. Do you think it would tend to more accurate estimating if the loan were as far as possible restricted to the original estimate ?—Yes, I think it would make architects, or boards of guardians through their architects, careful to get to the actual cost more precisely.

3622. They would in that case be compelled to pay their excess expenditure out of the local current rates ?—Yes.

3623. In so doing the ratepayers would be made aware possibly of how much the cost had come to ?—It would bring it home to the ratepayers.

3624. The power of the Local Government Board to absolutely refuse sanction to a loan is rather a difficult one to exercise, is it not, where the buildings are urgently required ?—Yes. That is an element of great difficulty with the Board, where the Board have, through their inspectors, been rather pressing a board of guardians to undertake certain building operations. It is a very difficult or a delicate matter, at any rate, for the Board to cut up a scheme, or to interfere to any large extent with a scheme which has been introduced under such conditions.

3625. Have you found much increase in late years in such matters as laundry fittings ?—Yes, there have been great improvements and a large number of patent fittings of all sorts for laundry and kitchen work and hot water apparatus—new patent systems which have been adopted. All that, of course, is tending to raise the cost of Poor Law buildings.

3626. Do you think that expenditure is becoming excessive ?—I think the expenditure on hot water systems is becoming very heavy, but it is always put forward in those cases that there is going to be an appreciable saving on coal and stoking and things of that sort.

3627. (*Mr. Bentham.*) It is on appara us matters principally now ?—Yes.

3628. (*Dr. Downes.*) Have you any facts to show whether that anticipation is well-founded or otherwise ? —No, we are quite in the dark at present as to that; it is quite theoretical.

3629. You have told us that the increased demand for classification has been one principal cause of the increase of cost of Poor Law buildings; has there been any material alteration in the requirements of the Local Government Board as to the points to be attended to in the construction of the individual buildings themselves ? —No, there has been very little modification in the Board's memorandum.* There have been certain things withdrawn from it. All the matters relating to children have been taken out of it and certain matters relating to the construction of dormitories for four rows of beds were taken out of it. Beyond that the memorandum is practically the same as it was when it was issued in 1868. The cubic space per bed for all classes of workhouse inmates remains now practically as it was in 1868. That was settled after the sitting of the Cubic Space Committee.

3630. (*Mr. Bentham.*) The cost of buildings would be increased by withdrawing the four row provision ?—Yes, the cost of building has been increased by the withdrawal of that paragraph allowing four rows of beds.

3631. (*Dr. Downes.*) I do not know whether you are aware of the reason for the withdrawal of that paragraph. Was there not a report of the Cubic Space Committee of 1868 condemning more than two rows of beds in a dormitory ?—Yes. I think one of their recommendations was that no ward should be erected in workhouses (that was London workhouses) with more than two rows of beds and, though workhouses continued to be erected on that principle for some years, it was not till about 1897 that the Board definitely put a stop to the construction of wards that had four rows of beds. In my evidence before the Vagrancy Committee I was asked the question about the relative cost of two rows and four rows of beds. I was asked if it was a material difference and I said I did not think it was. I have investigated the subject a little more fully since that Committee sat, and I am rather inclined to think that it is rather greater than I thought at the time, and there is an appreciable difference between the cost of buildings built with four rows of beds and buildings built with two rows of beds. That has been brought home to me rather clearly by a comparison between the last workhouse in 1892 that was built on the four row principle (that was the workhouse at Camberwell) and the following workhouses which were built on the two row principle, which were Bermondsey, Greenwich and Brentford. The cost of the Camberwell workhouse, which, as I say, was the last of the four row workhouses, was about £119 per bed, and the cost of these later workhouses, which came on about 1898, were from £276 to £287 per bed. Of course the difference is not due entirely to the change in the system. There was much stricter classification and division of the buildings, and the cost of building had increased a good deal, and the cost of sanitary requirements and that sort of thing had increased; but I think the difference must be accounted for to some extent by the fact that the four rows of beds were forbidden at that time.

3632. Could you give an estimate of the percentage of increased cost in a given block of buildings between the two rows and the four ?—I have not it with me, but I could hand in a statement showing that if you wish.

3633. I think it would be a more sound comparison, would it not, than a comparison between the workhouses you have named ?—There are a good many points of difference in those workhouses ?—Yes, the later ones were a good deal more elaborate in many ways.

3634. Have you taken into account the difficulty of ventilating a broad ward as compared with a narrow ward ?—The ventilation used to be much the same. I do not think they formerly took any different steps to ventilate the four rows of beds workhouses than they do now to ventilate the two rows. In fact, the ventilation of two rows of beds wards now is a good deal more elaborare and scientific than the ventilation of the four rows of beds was in the days when they were building on that principle.

Ventilation of wards.

3635. You are probably acquainted with Mr. Napier Shaw's report ?—Yes, I have seen that report.

Mr. Napier Shaw's report.

3636. He deals with that question ?—Yes. This only applies to workhouses and inmates in health; it does not apply to sick inmates.

3637. Precisely. Should you consider it advantageous if detailed information as to plans and the complete cost of new buildings were published from time to time, so as not only to afford information to the various boards of guardians who may wish to put up such buildings, but also to bring public criticism to bear ?—Yes, I think it would be of considerable advantage, though it would be rather a laborious undertaking. The architect's department brought out a volume of that kind on the construction of laundry buildings a short time ago. That was one class of buildings that we happened to be rather in want of information about, and I thought it would be advisable to have some particulars, so we brought out a report on laundry buildings. It is not a public report, but it is there for anybody to have who is interested in the subject, or who wants information on that kind of work; and that has been a great help to us in many ways. To undertake it on a very large scale, of course, would mean a very great deal of work. It would have to be very correct; it would not do to have any mistakes in it at all.

Publication of information as to plans and cost of new buildings for guidance of guardians.

Official report on laundry buildings.

3638. You would not be able to undertake it with your present staff, I imagine ?—No, I would not undertake it with the present staff.

3639. What would it mean in the way of additional staff ?—It would mean an additional architect. I do not think it would mean more than that. It would mean one more added to the staff.

3640. With reference to a suggestion that such plans might be exempt from local by-laws, not only would that tend to diminish the local responsibility, but would it not also lead to much greater complication in the plans themselves; for example, you would have to have the footings of all the walls shown, the thickness of all the walls very carefully determined, matters which are now regulated by the by-laws themselves ?—Yes, unless we left that in the hands of the local authority. We want the local authority to be the local governing body, and those are matters which might very well be left in their hands whether they were the subject of by-law operations or not.

Proposed exemption of workhouse buildings from local bye-laws.

3641. (*Miss Hill.*) It seems as if the surcharge was a very difficult way of dealing with any excess of expenditure, because it is so very difficult to enforce ?—Yes, I do not think it has ever been enforced.

Possible checks on excess expenditure.

3642. Has any alternative to it ever been proposed except the one which Dr. Downes mentioned just now that the amount of excess should not be contributed as a loan ?—No, I think that the only penalty the Board have ever inflicted is to curtail some portion of the loan, or not to allow a loan at all.

3643. With regard to the excess over the estimate there is no different way of dealing with it; no other penalty has ever been suggested except that of making it payable out of the current rates ?—That is the only penalty that has been suggested.

* For memorandum, see paper handed in by Mr. Davy, C.B. (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (28).)

Mr. Brook Kitchin.

13 Feb. 1906.

3644. It is now in the power of the Board to do it, if they choose, by simply refusing a loan?—Yes, that has been done, and it is being done in cases now much more frequently than it was.

3645. (*Professor Smart.*) You mentioned infirmary and hospital plans as being under the Local Government Board; are those workhouses only?—Infectious hospitals are under the Local Government Board.

3646. But not infirmaries and hospitals generally?—No, they are not.

Responsibility of central authority as to costly infirmaries.

3647. (*Mr. Bentham.*) We are told that the cost of infirmary buildings ranges from £100 to £400 per bed; I take it that all those plans have been sanctioned by the Department, and those costs are based upon the estimates?—Those plans have all been sanctioned by the Department, but the cost has not entirely. The actual cost cannot be said to have been sanctioned by the Board in the first instance; that is to say, a great deal of the actual cost of these infirmaries has been due to excess expenditure, sometimes it is as much as 30, 40 or even 50 per cent. on the original estimate.

Extent of excess expenditure over estimate.

3648. I thought the figures we had given us were the estimated cost and not the actual?—No, these are the actual cost. I am not quite sure which figures you refer to, but all the figures which I propose to hand in are, except in the case of hospitals under construction at the present time, the actual cost including excess expenditure.

3649. You do not always get the actual cost, do you?—Yes. We issue an order; an order is issued by the Board for the excess expenditure, and for the original expenditure.

3650. Even if a loan is not asked for for the excess?—Yes.

3651. (*Miss Hill.*) You sometimes have as much as 50 per cent. excess?—There has been as much as 50 per cent. in certain cases; it is rather exceptional.

Responsibility of central authority for costly buildings.

3652. (*Mr. Bentham.*) There is a great difference in the cost of similar buildings which have received sanction by the Department?—Yes, there is.

3653. On what ground is that excessive cost, that disparity in cost, sanctioned? Is that purely a matter of compromise?—Do you refer to the Poor Law buildings.

3654. Yes, Poor Law buildings entirely?—That is due mainly to local circumstances such as the rate of labour, cost of material, and the style in which guardians do things. Of course we find that in the urban districts the style is generally rather better than the style in the rural districts. Influences such as the effect of bye-laws sometimes make a difference in the cost.

3655. You have power to refuse to sanction these buildings, but in some cases probably they are sanctioned when you think the cost is excessive?—Yes, they are sometimes sanctioned in spite of our having pointed out that the cost is, in the opinion of the Board, excessive.

Return of plans to guardians for amendment.

3656. When a scheme is laid before the Department, are the plans sometimes returned entirely to the board?—Yes

3657. That means new plans have to be prepared?—In some cases it means new plans, and in some cases it means a modification of the existing plans.

Effect on remuneration of local architect.

3658. The architect would be able to charge on the rejected plans a certain percentage, and also charge on the revised or new plans?—Yes.

3659. Does that often occur?—Yes, it has occurred in several cases, and very notably in a case that came before me quite recently in London, in which a board of guardians proposed to spend, I think it was, £52,000, and the ratepayers in that case objected through a municipal association, and after some correspondence I was sent down to see whether a cheaper scheme could not be devised; I went down and found that the scheme they proposed was a very first-rate scheme, a west-end scheme I might call it, and I thought they might get a cheaper scheme that would carry out all that was wanted, and we drew them out a cheaper scheme. I think Mr. Davy referred to this case. The effect was that a reduction of something like £15,000 was made. The scheme was adopted in some kind of form by the guardians, and the reduction was effected. In that case, of course, the architect is paid upon the original scheme, and he is also paid for the new scheme.

3660. Does that not point to, not necessarily more power over boards of guardians, but more inspection in the way of assistance that might be given to boards of guardians, at a particular stage of the proposed expenditure?—Yes, I think it points very strongly to it.

Collaboration between central authority and guardians on inception of building scheme.

3661. Inspectors are very usually, though not always aware of proposed expenditure on the part of a board of guardians, are they not?—They are not always aware of it.

3662. They are not always asked by boards of guardians to give any advice?—No, not on the scheme generally I think, but very often they are consulted. In a very large number of cases it is initiated entirely by boards of guardians amongst themselves.

3663. You think your Department might be of very great assistance to boards of guardians on the inception of a scheme if you had assistance in order to do it?—Yes, if they would be willing to consult us. Of course there is a certain amount of jealousy between boards of guardians and the central authority. I think there are instances where they would rather dislike to come to the central authority for assistance on the assumption that they can do it just as well themselves with their own advisers.

3664. Have you any suggestion to make that would remedy this feeling between the boards of guardians and the Department?—No, it is, I think, only a feeling that can be swept aside by encouraging, as much as possible, interviews, conferences and intercourse between the central authority and boards of guardians and local authorities. I find that by meeting boards of guardians here in London or in the provinces we get a great deal more business done, and we get on to very much better terms than by any quantity of letter writing or correspondence. I think that by contact we can brush away to a great extent that feeling of envy or enmity, or whatever it may be that sometimes exists between boards of guardians and the central authority.

Effect of informal conference with guardians.

3665. If orders were issued to boards of guardians insisting on their acquainting the Architect's Department with any proposed extension of their buildings, and then a special inspector were to be sent down from the Architect's Department to consult with the Board, do you think that would be of any assistance?—The Board's local general inspector is generally cognisant of anything that is going on in the matter of building, and it is always competent for him to suggest that the Board's architect shall come down and advise at an initial stage; and that sometimes happens.

Collaboration between central authority and guardians on inception of building scheme.

3666. I think it is very seldom, is it not?—I do not know that I should say very seldom—perhaps not very frequently.

3667. Then you do not give assistance in detail in drawing a scheme for the guardians before they employ the local architects?—They might come to me before they employed the local architect; and there are cases where they have come, and we have given them a great deal of help I may say; we have sometimes gone so far as to draw out sketch plans for them to work on; and wherever that has been done, it has always ended most satisfactorily. We have come into contact with the board of guardians and we have improved the relationship immensely.

3668. Is it your opinion that all is done now in that direction that can be done?—No, I think a great deal more can be done in that direction; and I should like more to be done.

Cases of insufficient expenditure on building.

3669. (*Mr. Phelps.*) You have spoken almost solely of the influence you have to exert to save expenditure; have you any instance in your mind where you have had to urge boards of guardians to greater expenditure?—Do you refer to the architect's department, or to the Board generally?

3670. I was thinking of your department—where buildings were being put up on too small a scale, for instance?—There are cases where buildings have not appeared to be sufficient, or not to be of the right kind, where we have had to interfere, and where the cost has, as a result, been increased, and of course there are a great many cases where we have rejected plans because they are not sufficient or adequate, where the guardians have rather taken advantage of that to cover up a defective estimate. We have found that happen in several cases.

3671. On the whole, in the building department, it is extravagance rather than economy that you have to complain of?—It is extravagance we aim at checking more than economy.

3672. Is that extravagance, should you say, more seen in the infirmary department than in other departments?—Yes.

ndard of t for rmaries.

3673. What is your standard of judging with regard to infirmaries?—We can only judge by the cost per bed, for the purposes of comparison.

3674. Do you compare that with hospitals of which you are cognisant?—Infirmaries and hospitals are the same thing.

3675. I mean hospitals outside the Poor Law?—No, we do not consider those.

3676. Is yours a moveable standard, do you think, with regard to hospital accommodation in cost?—It is a rising standard.

3677. That is to say you now acquiesce in a large number of things which ten years ago you would have regarded as luxurious?—I think I must say yes to that. We allow the authorities to put in things now, which, as you say, ten or twenty years ago were not invented, very likely.

3678. Does not that point rather to diminishing the interference of your Board than increasing it?—Not necessarily to the desirability of it.

3679. Is it not the fact the guardians are rather ahead of the Board in providing what is necessary, or was thought at a later stage to be necessary, for the accommodation of the sick?—I think they are.

dvan- s of eased ral rol over l build- schemes.

3680. Is it not also in your knowledge that with the possible exception of the kind of relief given, the putting up of new buildings interests guardians more than any other part of their work?—I think it is.

3681. Of all the indoor management, that is the part which interests them most perhaps?—Yes.

3682. Do you think if your interference were much increased it would diminish a great deal of that interest?—Yes, I think it would; I think there would be less local keenness about the construction of buildings.

3683. Supposing the scheme which Mrs. Bosanquet mentioned was adopted of sending out model plans, would you not very often lose suggestions which come from local architects which would not come to the department, perhaps, except from outside?—Yes, we should. There might not be such a ready development as there is now, owing to the large number of experienced persons who are advising and drawing out plans, and that kind of thing for these buildings.

3684. That is to say, practically progress in these things involves a considerable field for experiment on the part of the guardians?—Oh, yes, enormous; there has been enormous progress.

3685. Take for instance, laundries; something was said about the increased cost of them. Is it within your knowledge that the decrease of able-bodied labour in workhouses has made that essential?—Yes, that has been a very important element, of course, in the use of machinery.

ular em of al wards.

3686. Take again casual wards. The variety of schemes adopted with regard to casual wards leads to constant expenditure, does it not?—There is only one system, the cellular system, that is adopted at the present time.

3687. That is being gradually substituted, you mean, for other systems?—No, that is the system in force at the present time, the system of cells.

3688. It is not universally adopted?—Yes, I think so.

3689. Surely not?—So far as the Board is concerned, it always has been pressed upon boards of guardians. There are cases where they have built on the ward principle, but only in very small cases where there is quite a small number of vagrants.

ection of ting lings.

3690. Have you any authority with regard to existing buildings?—Are you ever called in to inspect those?—Yes, I am called in occasionally, if the general inspector of the district wants any architectural advice, I might be called in to help him or to report upon the buildings.

3691. And to urge boards of guardians to make improvements, alterations, and what not?—If that was the object of my visit, and if I saw that it was desirable, that would be the line that I should take very likely.

3692. You do not find such advice resented?—Oh, yes, sometimes it is not taken very pleasantly.

Nature of extravagance in Poor Law buildings.

3693. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) What are the things that guardians are most extravagant in?—That is difficult to say. It is the whole standard of Poor Law buildings that is so very expensive: the infirmaries, for instance.

3694. Judged from an ornamental point of view?—No, from a hygienic point of view, a medical point of view, and a sanitary point of view; everything is at a very high standard. It is the result of slow progress and evolution. It has gone up and up by steps.

3695. Do you think they are better than the ordinary modern hospitals?—No, I think in very many cases they are every bit as good as ordinary modern hospitals, but the cubic space is always a good deal less in the poor law buildings.

3696. What I really want to get at, take whatever infirmary you like that you have in your mind, is this: what is the particular thing that the guardians have, in your judgment, been extravagant in? It cannot be in cubic space?—No, it is not.

3697. What I want to get at is, whether it is in ornamentation?—I did not intend to say that guardians always were extravagant, but there are cases where guardians are extravagant. It is sometimes in the style and finish of wards that there is unnecessary expenditure; sometimes we find that a larger amount of cubic space is proposed to be given than is wanted, or a larger number of detached buildings are being erected than we consider necessary, or that rooms, for instance, for nurses, are larger than are necessary, or rooms are higher, or that the machinery is of too expensive a character.

3698. Would not all that be settled by the medical people rather, the size of the rooms, and so forth?—No, there is practically a standard size for rooms, and unless there were some peculiar circumstances the medical adviser would probably not have anything to say upon that point.

3699. What you have said is rather general, is not it? I want to get hold of something definite. Have you any case in your mind? I do not care whether you give us the name of the place at all. The point is just where you think any considerable amount of money was wasted?—The case that I referred to just now where there was a saving of £15,000 on the cost in the re-construction or the extension of an infirmary. The guardians proposed amongst other things to build an entirely new nurses' home. They had already got one, and in the scheme which I prepared for them we made merely an addition to the existing home, and that saved a large sum of money. They also proposed to provide, I think I am right in saying, an entirely new operating theatre with anæsthetic rooms and recovering rooms, while they had already got a little operating room in the infirmary which was admitted by the medical officer to be quite sufficient for his purposes. Then, again, they proposed to build a new committee room: that we thought was unnecessary because there were rooms which might be used for that purpose in the infirmary. We considered that the boiler house and the laundry were too large. They proposed a separate residence for the steward, a separate residence for the engineer, and a separate residence for the porter, and we saw that by a certain amount of modification of the existing arrangements a great deal of this expenditure could be saved. It was all rather tending to extravagance.

3700. Of course the architect would be responsible for the building part of it, but would not the medical officer be the gentleman who would be the adviser to the guardians as to the nurses' home, and the operating theatre, and so on?—Yes. In that case, I went down in company with one of our medical inspectors before I reported to the Board, and we conferred together on the subject, and also with the medical officer of the institution.

Dependence of guardians on their architect.

3701. Are not boards of guardians very much in the hands of the architect whom they call in, and of their own officers who are advising them, as to the alterations?—Yes, I think they are very largely.

3702. You think it would be advisable, whenever there is a new institution required, that the guardians should send to the Local Government Board and ask for an architect to be sent down, and then let him draw the plans; or

Mr. Brook Kitchin.

13 Feb. 1906.

rather, I will put this question first. What is the percentage that is paid to an architect ?—Five per cent. is the ordinary commission.

3703. Therefore, the bigger the outlay, the better for him ?—That is so.

Proposal that central authority should supply architect for all buildings.

3704. Do you think it could be worked so that your Department should be called in for all new buildings, or add tions to buildings, to supply the necessary plans for the approval of the board of guardians, just the same as any other architect ?—It could be done, but it would be very difficult, and it might be very unpleasant for the Central Board to draw out a set of plans (of course they would have to be in a very rough sketch form) for the approval of the board of guardians. It is rather reversing the order of things.

3705. It is only supplying an architect ?—Yes, but in cases where the feeling between the Local Government Board and the local authority was not of the best, where the terms were not of the best, it would be a great opportunity for the local authority to be very disagreeable to the Board and say nasty things of their architect.

3706. I know, but after all it is true that with all the disagreeable things you have to say of boards of guardians, on the whole they are fairly reasonable with you ?—Yes, I think on the whole they are perfectly reasonable.

3707. It is only in a minority of cases that you really get cross with each other ?—Yes, but it would be extremely difficult if the board of guardians rejected the plans of the Local Government Board.

3708. It would not be rejecting the plans of the Local Government Board. I am suggesting that you supply the architect who should not be paid a 5 per cent. commission, but who should go down really to consult with them like an ordinary architect does now, and between them hammer out the plans ?—That is a position that of course would be more possible ; for the central authority to supply a kind of expert architect merely to advise the boards of guardians.

3709. And to draw plans ?—And to work in conjunction, perhaps, to a certain extent, with the local architect.

3710. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would not it rather do away with all forms of criticism if the Local Government Board itself supplied the architect as to whose work it was afterwards to certify ; then it appears to me there would be no criticism ? (*Mr. Lansbury.*) The point I want to get out is that architects are human beings, and when there is 5 per cent. on a big job going, the bigger the job is made (that is the trend of the evidence this afternoon) the better for him. I only want to suggest that if the Local Government Board sent down an architect who did not depend on the 5 per cent. commission, the unhappy guardians, who are not all architects or builders, would not be swindled as they very often are, now they are in the hands of architects. An architect comes along and says : this is the way a certain thing ought to be done, and then as a rule, as you know, it is you against the other architect, and the unhappy board of guardians are between the devil and the deep sea, as it were ?—If any system of that sort were adopted, the central authority's architect could only carry the matter to a certain point. He could only act in the capacity of an advising architect. I do not think he coul l go further than that. Directly he began to draw out plans it would immediately throw the whole of the responsibility on to the central authority, and you would at once do away with a large element of local government.

3711. I am suggesting to you that it is in the drawing out of plans where the waste comes in, if there is any waste ?—It is in the early stages, as I said before, that we like to see the plans in order to check in the initial stage the likelihood of large expenditure where we can. We cannot always do it.

3712. You would not be in favour of taking the whole thing over ?—No, I do not think so. It would be centralisation on too large a scale, I think.

Nature of excess expenditure over estimate.

3713. Now about extras. Can you tell us what the extras generally consist of ?—Such things as fittings very often lead to extras—special classes of fittings. A sum is put down in the architect's estimate for fittings, and then boards of guardians very often go round and see fittings in various institutions, and they pick out all the best, and, of course, fittings are very expensive. They are mostly patents which have to be paid for, or special forms of construction which are also expensive. Fittings are the items which lead very largely to excessive expenditure. Foundations are another item which are frequently put forward as an excuse for extra expenditure.

3714. Of course with regard to foundations you would be able to test whether it was a legitimate thing or not, would you not ?—You cannot ; after the building has been built, it is very difficult.

3715. I suppose the architect would have to give you particulars ?—Yes, in the case of excess expenditure he would have to give particulars of all the items which made up the excess. Of course we have no means of checking that.

3716. Would it always be true that the best would be the cheapest even in fittings ?—The best is sometimes the cheapest.

3717. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you find that expensive wood and artistic tiling enters into it ?—Yes, that enters into it ; glazed tiling in laundries and boiler houses, and places of that sort, and sanitary conveniences, is a large item in the cost of new workhouses and infirmaries ; and paving is an expensive item, and sometimes leads to excess.

3718. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You would not say that infirmaries and workhouses are built too ornamentally, would you ?—No, not at all.

Limitatio number o children a commodat on one sit

3719. I do not know if this is in your Department, but is it the fact that the Board, in the case of children, has laid it down that only a certain number of children should be accommodated on a certain site, that is to say, they made the unit of children in one instance 300 ?—Yes, that is so.

3720. That will have led to a good deal of extra expense in building ?—That would have tended to raise the cost of buildings for children.

3721. You have to duplicate very many things. Officers' quarters, and that sort of thing ?—Yes.

Analysis "cost per bed" per child.

3722. In the case of the cost of institutions for children, is not it true that when you work it out per bed that cost includes the provision very often of an elementary school, a technical shop, and a whole lot of things, besides the mere board and lodging of the children ?—Yes, in the case of the schools that were erected in consequence of the dissolution of the school districts the cost includes an enormous amount for administrative buildings, such as boiler house, laundry, gymnasium, school building, infirmary, perhaps an isolation hospital, officers' quarters, a house for the master, and a house for the resident matron.

Return as cost of dis lution of school districts.

3723. Mr. Davy told us that the breaking up of the school districts cost three-quarters of a million. Would it be possible to have a Return put in to show how that is made up, how much was for the provision of board and lodging for the children, and how much for these other things you have just named ?—As far as I am concerned we can give the costs of the buildings which were erected subsequent to the dissolution of the school districts. This is a table which gives the expenditure on cottage homes, receiving homes, and homes of that kind, subsequent to the disolution of the school districts. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (F).)

Availabili of central authority architect advise guardians locally.

3724. Would your Department go down, or send down, to examine buildings under construction if they were asked by boards of guardians ?—Yes, if the Local Government Board sent an architect, he would go down and examine.

3725. My point is if a board of guardians asked you to go down and see the work in progress, would you do that ?—Yes, if there was some reason for it.

3726. Without any reason would you ?—No, I think not.

3727. Here again I would point out that the board of guardians are in the hands of their architect ?—Yes.

3728. Whereas if they had y u to call in, they would have an outside authority equal with the man who was bossing them ?—Yes. Of course I would do it if there was sufficient time to do it, but if all boards of guardians suddenly sent for me to go and look at some buildings in the course of construction, I should have rather a bad time of it.

3729. If you had in the office a staff of sufficient strength to do it you would not object ?—No, I should not object.

Proposed exemption of workhouse buildings from local bye-laws.

3730. Did I understand you to say that you thought guardians' hospital and workhouse buildings, and that sort of thing, ought to be exempt from bye-laws ?—Under the present system by which the Local Government Board deals with Poor Law buildings, I do not think it would be possible to exempt them from bye-laws because so much is left, on the strength of the local bye-laws, to the local authorities to deal with.

3731. Is there anything really to be gained by exemption, supposing you had it ?—There might be some cases where the bye-laws would require something which was rather more substantial than the Board would consider necessary.

3732. Do you think that what would apply to a private building would not apply to a workhouse ?—No, a private building would be a domestic building, and a workhouse would be a public building, and the requirements would be more stringent in the case of a public building, especially in London.

Interest of public in local inquiries as to loans.

3733. Does anybody ever attend a public inquiry as to financial loans ?—It varies very much. I do not hold many public inquiries, so I have not had very much experience in the amount of interest taken, but I think in many cases where there has been some kind of agitation there is a good deal of interest taken. I think if it were known more than it is that a public inquiry was going to take place there very often would be a keener interest taken.

Publication of plans and cost of new buildings.

3734. You said that you would be in favour of detailed plans and costs being published, and you thought the ratepayers would take more interest in them if they were ; is not it the fact that every board of guardians publishes a report as to their work, and in most of the public libraries, at any rate in towns, you can always see what guardians are spending, or any one who is interested enough to go and read it ?—Yes ; I think if they are anxious to find out there would be no difficulty in finding out what the guardians were doing or spending.

3735. Do you think if your department published it in a book it would be any more likely to be read than these other things are ?—A great deal is published in the Local Government Board's Annual Report, but I do not know that the public reads that at all.

Comparison of excess cost on public and private buildings.

3736. Is not it true that private people too have extras on the buildings they put up ?—Yes, it is ; but there is a good deal of difference between the methods a private person adopts and the methods a public body adopts. In the case of an undertaking by a private person the cost is the reigning factor, in fact the cost governs the undertaking ; in the case of a public body very often I think the undertaking entirely governs the cost.

3737. It is true, is not it, that, whoever they are, the people who are on the board of guardians have to pay their share of the rates, and that in a small way they are spending their own money too ?—If they are paying rates ; but they are not always paying rates.

Guardians' interest in building schemes.

3738. That is a matter perhaps that we had better not argue. You said that you thought that the work the guardians were most interested in was the building. Is that really true ?—I see them more from the building point of view than any other, and it always appears to me that once a board of guardians has undertaken building operations it is very keen and very interested in the work ; but whether they are most interested in out relief, or subjects of that sort, I am really not in a position to say.

3739. You only see a few of them in any case, do not you ?—I see the building section of boards of guardian as a rule.

3740. You see those who are in favour of the building, do not you ?—Yes, and sometimes I see those not in favour of building.

3741. You do not go down and see the whole board ?—Occasionally I do.

3742. I took it down at the moment, and I thought it rather a severe criticism on boards of guardians, that the only thing they were interested in was building.?—Not the only thing, by any means ; but building work is extremely interesting work.

3743. I know a board that is interested in a very big building scheme just now, but I do not think there are three men on the board who take a real interest in it ?—That may be so.

Authority for sanction by central authority to new buildings costing over £50.

3744. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you tell us by what statute or order your relations with boards of guardians are regulated?—They are regulated mainly I believe by the statutes and the consolidated orders. I think that is really what the Board act under.

3745. They lay down that any building that will cost over £50 must be submitted for the sanction of the Local Government Board ?—Yes.

3746. Whether it involves a loan or not, simply as an expenditure ?—As an expenditure, not as a loan.

3747. Simply as an expenditure ?—As an expenditure upon improvements or repairs, or works of that kind. A new building, I take it, would be submitted.

Cost of Poor Law and prison infirmaries.

3748. Mr. Lansbury asked you to compare the relative accommodation of hospitals and Poor Law infirmaries. Have you ever compared the relative accommodation between Poor Law infirmaries and prison infirmaries ?—No, I have not been able to do so.

3749. You do not know about that ?—No, I do not know what the actual cost of prison infirmaries is.

Analysis of increased cost of buildings.

3750. Have you any tables showing what is the increase of cost, not owing to the differentiation and classification of the paupers, but owing to the actual increase in the cost of building materials, during the last thirty or forty years ?—Yes, I have a table which I propose to hand in on that subject, and I have also a table on the other subject to which you referred which gives a rough estimate of the amount which is spent on sick accommodation as compared with other classes of accommodation. That is rather interesting, as it shows the very large amount that is spent in proportion upon the sick in workhouses. Thus, in 1904 there was an expenditure of £752,000, and of that amount some £329,500 was spent upon the sick and £73,000 was spent upon the able-bodied and aged and infirm ; the rest was spent on children, lunatics and workhouse administration, so you see nearly one half the expenditure of that amount was in respect of the sick. This is only a rough statement. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (G).)

3751. Would it be possible to circulate the memoranda and forms mentioned in section 20 of your memorandum. You mentioned (F) as being one which you would circulate ; I think all of them would be useful ?—I think all of them could be.

3752. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Except C. That is not settled yet, is it ?—No, that is not issued.

Return as to cost of dissolution of London school districts.

3753. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) I have just seen this return. I understand that the return, as I have it, gives various unions. You start with Whitechapel, and there you give a total cost. So far as I remember they have not an elementary school attached to the Home at Grays belonging to Whitechapel. Could you amplify this, so that it would be a comparison between the unions in which you would show the accommodation of each, and what each particular place cost ?—That is included in a separate form that is going to be put in. That will be carefully looked into. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (F).)

3754. For instance, in that Home you have at Poplar you have got it as twenty-nine children at a cost of £14,210, but as a matter of fact it is 100 children that are accommodated in consequence of that improvement. If this Return is printed as it is, it would look rather bad for Poplar ?—That was not intended to be handed in as it is ; it is going to be verified.

Ornament as an element of cost of buildings.

3755. (*Mr. Booth.*) A great deal has been said about the cutting out of unnecessary ornament in order to save cost. I rather gather from what you said that that would not be a very large percentage or part of the cost of any of these things ?—No, it is rather the exception that we have to cut down the character of the design.

3756. In addition to that, do you consider that successful architectural effect depends much on what is called ornament ?—No, it depends, in my opinion, mainly on proportion.

3757. Therefore, without increase of cost, by good proportions you may get an effective building ?—Certainly.

TWELFTH DAY.

Monday, 19th February, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY, C.B., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.
19 Feb. 1906.

3758. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You have not mentioned either Mr. Balfour's Underfed Children Order or Mr. Long's scheme for the unemployed in your set of papers?—I did not propose to volunteer any evidence with regard to those two points.

3759. We came down very close to that, it seemed to me?—The reason I omitted to deal with this in my evidence in chief was that both the Act of Parliament and the Order are very recent, and I personally have had very little experience in dealing with the question administratively. I therefore thought that possibly the Commission would much prefer to hear other witnesses who have a greater knowledge of the matter than myself, or would possibly wait until both the Act and the Order had been running some time longer.

3760. I thought that as most of the things you were telling us about were historical, these might have come in to finish it?—I stopped my history at the year 1900.

3761. I suppose some one else will tell us about the Underfed Order, and the reason which led up to its being issued, which is really what I want?—I have not prepared evidence on the point, and probably I am not the person, although I may be later on.

Details of return as to cost of abolition of "barrack schools" in London.

3762. The only other point I wish to ask you about is with reference to children. You were telling us the amount of money that was spent, and you handed in a return showing a total of £723,911. I want to call your attention to the figures ascribed to Poplar there with regard to the cost of cottage homes built as a result of the dissolution of school districts: the figure that you have put down there for the Receiving Home at Poplar is to accommodate 29 children at a cost of £14,210. That should be 100?—Instead of 29?

3763. Yes. You may take it from me that that is correct?—I will have that corrected.

3764. As to the receiving home and scattered homes for Camberwell, you say there are 559 children: do you mean there that that is children for the receiving home and the scattered homes?—This return was handed to me by the architect's department, and I have not gone into the details.

3765. I should like to ask that both these returns be taken back and gone into, because I think that at any rate they are rather misleading in the form they are put before the Commission?—You want the number of children revised?

3766. Yes: for instance you have there receiving home and scattered homes; as a matter of fact there are a number of scattered homes at Camberwell, and what I rather think you have got here is only the figure so far as it refers to the receiving home, that is the £20,000?—Would there be any capital cost with regard to the scattered homes?

3767. Yes, but it is doubtful whether you have got it there. The receiving home would be a different thing altogether from the scattered homes, and would probably accommodate 100 children, and the scattered homes would probably accommodate 20 each?—There is evidently a mistake somewhere in the return. I will go into this personally with the architect and take care that the statement is revised.*

3768. I want now to refer to statement No. 3: I asked Mr. Kitchin to make a return, I am not quite certain whether he will be able to do it, but if this return is to be of any value at all it ought to be a comparative one?—Which one do you refer to?

3769. The one showing the cost per bed exclusive of site, also of cottage homes. You have not given us any particulars there for Whitechapel at all. What I would like to get is the actual cost of the particular things set out there; the elementary school, the isolation block, and those sort of things?—I will note on the table what you want.

3770. I do not know whether the advice that was given to boards of guardians on the dissolution of school districts, as to the kind of buildings that were to be put up, would come in your department at all?—There was a letter, I think.

Letter of central authority as to class of buildings for children.

3771. Will that letter be put in?—I can have it put in. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (30).) I think what is in your mind is this, that the question of the circular should be introduced with reference to the cost.

3772. Yes, because one of these returns deals with receiving houses; has not the Board rather pressed on the Metropolitan boards of guardians to erect receiving houses rather than take children into the workhouses?—They have.

3773. Therefore, of course, that has entailed considerable outlay on the part of boards of guardians?—If you ask me generally whether a good deal of this outlay is not due to the specific recommendations of the Local Government Board, I will say yes.

3774. I would like to put it in that way. You do not deal with the Metropolitan Asylums Board at all, do you?—No, except financially.

3775. Except as to the Act of Parliament constituting the Metropolitan Asylums Board and your Board's order calling it into being?—I have not dealt with that in detail.

Classification by "desert."

3776. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With reference to your answer to Question 3326 with regard to the deserving poor, I see you say that the 1895 Commission on the Aged Poor first introduced the idea of deserving as an element in giving relief?—It first brought it into prominence.

3777. That principle of graduating relief according

* Subsequently revised. See Paper handed in by Mr. Kitchin, Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VI. (F).)

to the deserving nature of the persons relieved has been extensively acted upon with regard to the aged poor, has not it ?—Yes.

3778. I notice that in Woolwich, for instance, there were three classes of aged persons, some who were lodged in an agreeable villa, then there was a second set who were lodged in a drawing-room in a workhouse, and a third set who were lodged in the indiscriminate wards ?—What date was that ?

3779. At the present time. Is that principle encouraged by the Local Government Board ?—Under Mr. Chaplin's circular it was distinctly encouraged.

3780. Is it now encouraged ?—Yes, we still advise classification.

3781. According to deservedness ?—Yes.

3782. Is that exclusively confined to aged people ?—Yes.

3783. You would not recommend it with regard to adult women, for instance. Would you recommend classification with regard to deserving character ?—Do you mean character or conduct ?

3784. I meant rather deservedness from personal history ?—I do not think that that has ever been recommended.

3785. It would not be recommended ?—In point of fact it seems to me that that question of classification by conduct or character has never been really brought to a head ; it has been left vague.

3786. It has only been recommended definitely as regards the aged poor ?—In Mr. Chaplin's circular.

3787. With regard to able-bodied men who are given employment, has it been recognised at all by the Local Government Board that they should be dealt with according to past character in different farm colonies, one more or less penal than the other ?—No, that is to say we have had no circular or specific recommendation to that effect.

3788. But there is a tendency, is not there, now to do that ?—There is a considerable tendency to do that.

3789. Do you think that, on the whole, is a good tendency ?—Administratively there are advantages in it, of course.

Financial effect of policy of central authority as regards children and sick.

3790. As regards your suggestion that the first real departure from the 1834 principles of Poor Law relief was the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, surely the legislation with regard to children in the sixties was also a departure from the strictly Poor Law principle ?—You will find that discussed in the 1860 Committee, I think, but I should say myself that that was a sort of exception which tested the rule.

3791. You have the fact that the increase in the cost of pauperism in London at the present time is due mainly to the increased cost of child pauperism, and the increased cost of sick pauperism ?—Yes, the two taken together.

3792. The increased cost of pauperism, which is one of the reasons for this inquiry, is more due to the legislation and orders between 1860 and 1870 with regard to children and sick than it is to the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act ?—Yes. How far the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act has really affected the number of paupers is uncertain. That is a point which would need special investigation.

3793. But with regard to the sick and children, it is quite certain that that has enormously affected the cost ?—Very largely.

Distinction between "certified" and "uncertified" institutions.

3794. With regard to the certified and uncertified institutions which are mentioned in Question 3460, I am sorry to say I do not quite understand what is the distinction between a certified and uncertified institution to which you can send paupers ?—If the institution has been certified by the Local Government Board, guardians can send paupers there without sanction in each case, whereas if the institution has not been certified they have to get sanction in each case.

3795. The sanction of the Local Government Board ?—Yes.

3796. That sanction would not be given unless you had inspected the place ?—Yes, it might be given on the general facts of the case. For instance, we sometimes get letters from guardians to say there is such and such a child who is rather difficult and they know a good institution for it, and they send to the Board the annual report of the Institution, and if we are satisfied that the guardians are exercising a wise judgment, we sanction. There are over 1,000, I think, in uncertified institutions, and I think that number includes those sent there by the medical officer. On the medical officer's recommendation guardians can send to convalescent homes and special hospitals.

3797. Without the Local Government Board's sanction ?—Yes.

3798. There are some homes which the guardians can use without the permission of the Local Government Board ?—Yes.

3799. Who inspects the certified homes for you ; one of the general inspectors ?—Yes, the general inspectors inspect them.

3800. The general inspector of the district ?—Yes.

Sandgate homes.

3801. There are some homes which I dare say you know of ; they are rather notorious, Mr. Jones' homes at Sandgate, for instance ; who certified those ?—Those were never certified.

3802. Those are uncertified ?—Yes.

3803. There are a large number of paupers there now ?—The people who go there go on the recommendation of the medical officer as being sick.

3804. So that you can have two or three homes with a considerable number of paupers, not certified or inspected by the Local Government Board ?—Yes.

3805. The Sandgate homes are used exclusively by paupers ; it is not a question of an exceptional instance ?—I am not sure of that. I have had the Sandgate homes under consideration several times.

Return as to paupers in certified and uncertified institutions.

3806. Can you send any class of pauper ?—There is a special return* with reference to those homes.

3807. I should like it. I was down at Sandgate and was struck with those homes. With regard to persons sent to certified institutions, are all paupers eligible ; children and old people are ?—They are nearly all children's homes ; training homes, as they are called.

3808. And convalescent homes ?—I do not know any certified convalescent home ; I cannot recall one at this moment.

3809. Are there any places for able-bodied certified, are farm colonies certified ?—Yes ; we give a certificate and inspect them from time to time.

3810. Is it possible to have a return of those certified homes ?—Yes, I think they are in the Blue-book, Roughly speaking, you will find that about 90 per cent. of the people in certified homes are children who are sent there for special training. There are a great number, and an increasing number, who take children from the guardians. For instance, there are two places which I think some members of the Commission might very well visit ; Mrs. Campion's Home at Hurstpierpoint and the Duchess of Richmond's Home at Lavant ; between them they practically take all the bigger girls out of the Sussex workhouses and train them and find places for them.

3811. Is there any available list of uncertified places like Jones' to which paupers are sent ?—One could be made if the Commission required it.

3812. It would be rather important to find that out as to uncertified homes ?—Yes, I should think we have it in the office. I will find out.

Half-time apprentices.

Keighley

3813. With regard to your description of the apprenticeship scheme, and what you said as to the North of England, that some of the half-timers live in the workhouses and work in the mills, you mentioned Keighley as one which had got that system ?—Yes, some years ago the Keighley people, if I remember rightly, did get a sanction to allow that.

3814. When that sanction was given, was that by a special order ?—No, it would be simply by a letter ; we raised no objection.

* H.C. 323—1904.

3815. That would be the sort of thing that would be dealt with simply by a letter?—Yes.

Apprenticeship to fishing smacks.

3816. With regard to apprenticeship to fishing smacks, is that done by a general order?—No, that would be done under the apprenticeship order, subject to the regulations of the Board of Trade, who manage the details.

Paupers in labour colonies.

3817. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Did I understand you rightly that you certify labour colonies?—There are only two; Lingfield and Hadley; we do not inspect them or certify them, but we allow guardians to send there, which is rather different. We do not give a formal certificate.

3818. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Does that apply to Starnthwaite, too?—Yes, that would apply to Starnthwaite.

3819. That is an epileptic colony, and they have able-bodied there too?—Yes, like Lingfield. We have never given a certificate to Lingfield. It would be a place to which medical officers could send. I have always inspected Lingfield myself, and I considered it would be better not to give them a certificate. Lingfield now has a certificate from the Education Department.

Effect of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund on number of officers in London.

3820. With regard to the salaries of the officers in London workhouses, I think you said that the present system led to the appointment of unnecessary officers?—I do not think I went so far as that. I said it had a tendency to increase the number of officers.

3821. You think that it has really increased the number of officers that the Local Government Board has been asked to appoint?—That is a matter for investigation. I think you will find in London the number of officers bears a higher ratio to the number of paupers than anywhere else?

3822. If the salaries had not been paid out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, fewer officers would have been appointed?—That is probable, but I do not say the officers are unnecessary.

Apprenticeship Order of 1898.

3823. That is what I gathered from your evidence. With regard to apprenticeship there was an order issued, was there not, on February 15th, 1898, which rescinded all previous orders on apprenticeship questions?—No, I do not think so.

3824. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is not the case this, that originally regulations with regard to apprenticeship were in the Consolidated Order?—Yes.

3825. But there was no power under that order to assent to departures in particular cases?—That made the difficulty.

3826. Then the order of 1898, to which attention has been called, provided that departures might be made in particular cases?—Yes.

3827. It did not rescind the old order?—It did not rescind the old order, but it freed the hands of the Local Government Board.

3828. It provided that in any case in which it seemed desirable, a departure might be made from those regulations?—Yes, that was it.

3829. (*Mr. Bentham.*) As I understand it that really rescinded all previous orders, did it not?—No.

3830. It says in the last paragraph: "We do hereby rescind the orders secondly above referred to except so far as such orders may have been acted upon"?—The "orders secondly above referred to" were not the general apprenticeship regulations, but orders enabling in special Unions the Board to assent to departures from the general regulations. These now became superfluous.

3831. Now that the position is made clear with regard to all previous orders, it is within the power of the Local Government Board to assent to any departure from the Apprenticeship Order that is laid down in the Consolidated order?—That is it.

3832. Does that mean that the Local Government Board have power to make a new order with regard to apprenticeship, abolishing the in-maintenance of apprentices?—I should think that could only be done by general order.

3833. The Local Government Board have power to issue a general order now with regard to apprenticeship?—Yes.

Constitution and tenure of office of boarding-out committees.

3834. Do you attach any importance to industrial training?—I do, a good deal.

3835. With regard to boarding-out children within the union, I take it the boarding-out committees are formed usually from members of the boards of guardians, but not exclusively so?—Yes.

3836. And should the members of the committee cease to be members of the board they would still continue members of the boarding-out committee?—They might.

3837. There is nothing to prevent them, is there?—No.

3838. Can the board of guardians strike them off?—No, the committee once constituted is independent.

3839. That gives rise to this possibility: That the boarding-out committee within the union may become a body entirely independent of the board?—Yes.

3840. Do you think that is desirable?—No, I do not think it is desirable.

3841. (*Mr. Booth.*) How long does their appointment last?—Apparently a committee once appointed can co-opt their own members, and continue to administer.

3842. Interminably?—Yes; the guardians might withdraw all children, and bring the committee to an end, but short of that they can do little.

3843. (*Mr. Bentham.*) That then defeats the object of boarding-out within the union?—Yes; I have never known such a case, although I have known cases where there has been slight friction.

Control o certified institutio

3844. I think you rather approve of the idea of sending children to certified institutions?—Yes, but I do not mean children in the gross, I mean that certified institutions are most useful for individual children, children who want special treatment or care of some kind.

3845. I think you said there were 7,700 at the present time in such institutions?—That is about it.

3846. Considering that the guardians are actually responsible for paupers of all classes, and they have no control of the institutions mentioned in your report, do you consider the Local Government Board has itself a sufficient control over these institutions to justify an extension of their use?—We have complete control in so far as we can withdraw the certificate at any time.

3847. That is the only control you have?—The only direct control.

3848. They are not bound to send reports to you from time to time?—They are bound to send periodical reports of the sickness, signed by the medical officer.

3849. Sickness only?—Yes; so that the Board gets from every one of those institutions a periodical return showing the exact number of children suffering from specified diseases.

3850. There have been scandals with regard to such institutions, have there not?—There may have been. I cannot recall one at this moment.

3851. Was not there one in the north of England, in Lancashire?—Yes, I remember that, now you mention it.

3852. Were reports sent of the condition there?—I suppose they were, but I was not then inside the Board. I only know of that case. You are alluding to the case of a certain Roman Catholic orphanage?

3853. Yes. That was discovered accidentally, was it not?—I do not know. The Lancashire inspector will be called, and I expect he can tell you about it.

3854. Is it not a fact that the bulk of the income of some of these institutions is derived from payments by guardians?—Yes, I should think some of them were very largely dependent upon the payments of guardians.

3855. This is a case in which an extension of the system of placing special classes of paupers in such institutions would result in irresponsible persons administering public funds, would it not?—They perform certain services for the guardians, and the guardians pay for those services. The guardians can inspect their children there, they can withdraw their children; we inspect the certified homes once a year, and can withdraw our certificate.

3856. You think that is quite sufficient supervision?—I think so. The troubles with certified homes are of rather a different character. Some of them are very small, and they entail a great deal of troublesome inspection, which is perhaps rather excessive, considering the number of children that are lodged in the institution.

omparison
f cottage
d scattered
omes.

3857. Have you any particulars with regard to the cost of scattered homes *versus* cottage homes, that is grouped homes?—No, I have not.

3858. Are comparative figures published?—I do not think there are any published.

3859. Taking the Camberwell system *versus* Poplar, they are two separate and distinct systems, are they not?—I understand so, but I have never been to Camberwell, and I have never been to Poplar. The London inspector will, no doubt, give you all the information you wish for. I might just say this, because this applies to all England; if you build a cottage home there is a heavy debt-charge, if you hire a scattered home there is no debt-charge.

3860. But that charge really only represents a rent?—The debt-charge represents a rent, but that is precisely the reason I mention it, because the accounts would have to be adjusted accordingly.

3861. But rent is paid for premises that are hired?—Yes.

3862. If the buildings are economically put up, the annual cost of those buildings should not be more than the sum paid for the hire of premises?—The point I was rather indicating to you was this, that if you build your cottage home the debt-charge would probably be greater than the rent you would pay for an existing building.

3863. Probably to the extent of the repayment of the loan, but a comparison could be got at by deducting the repayment of the loan?—Yes.

3864. But no such comparison has been made?—All I was indicating was that you would have to consider the rent and debt-charge, and not just lump them.

'ect of
etaries
der, 1900.

3865. Has not the new Dietary Order put more power into the hands of the medical officer?—Yes, for classification purposes.

3866. Has that, in your opinion, led to extravagance in dietary?—I do not think so. I have not seen indications of it.

3867. I will not say extravagance, but more expensive dietary has been ordered?—I do not think we have any figures showing what the increased cost, if any, of the new dietary was. We may get it in individual unions, but as a whole (I am only speaking as a whole) I do not think we could give it to you.

3868. The medical officer deals with children under three, and all sick persons, does he not?—Yes, and I think he always has done.

3869. The guardians really had a power with regard to the diets prior to the Dietary Order?—Not for sick and children under three, I think.

3870. There was nothing to prevent them, was there?—If I remember rightly it was always within the discretion of the medical officer, he could always recommend extras.

rkhouse
ounts.

3871. Does the question of workhouse accounts come within your department?—The workhouse accounts go before the auditor.

3872. Do you see any objections to the accounts being made up yearly, ending at the same day of the year as the parish accounts and other accounts?—You will find the whole subject very fully discussed in the Report of a Departmental Committee on Workhouse Accounts of which I was chairman. I will hand you a copy of that Report,* and you will see that that question as to the date of closing accounts is dealt with, and specific recommendations are made.

3873. Do all auditor's surcharges come before your department?—No, they go to the audit department, they only come to me in special cases.

3874. (*Professor Smart.*) You have told us a good deal of the use made of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund; would you kindly tell us what that fund is?—I think Mr. Adrian told you what the fund was.

3875. Perhaps you could tell us in a word or two?—You will have another witness who can tell you all about it.

ration
ne
ropolitan
mmon
r Fund.

3876. I should like a word or two of explanation now?—The Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was established in 1867; one of the chief objects of it was to relieve the poorer unions of the metropolis from a portion of their heavy rates, and to enable them to provide proper workhouses, which were then very much wanted.

3877. I suppose it is a uniform rate on all occupiers in the metropolitan area, is it not?—After each half-yearly audit the district auditor certifies the amount actually expended by each union in respect of the expenses which are to be repaid out of the fund. I have told you what those expenses are.

3878. How is the fund raised?—The auditor's certificate is given on the statement prepared by each union of the several payments made during the half year, and the repayment expected; that is known as the claim. The claim is sent to the Local Government Board, and is strictly examined by the receiver. All questions are settled, and a certificate is given as to the amount. The provision in the Act is this, "The Poor Law Board shall from time to time assess on the several unions and parishes in the metropolis the amounts of their respective contributions to the Common Poor Fund, in proportion to the annual rateable value of the property therein comprised."

3879. The rate differs for each union, it is not a general rate all over London?—It is a general rate. I think you will understand it better if I give you an illustration. The unions are on the basis of rateable value. Some unions would receive from the Fund, and some unions would have to pay into the Fund, because the charges as certified by us, or by the receiver, as being repayable from the Fund would, in some cases, exceed, and in some cases be less than, the contribution on the total rateable value; and the difference is paid to the receiving unions.

3880. It is only paid in the form of a difference, it is not first raised and then distributed?—No.

3881. That is quite separate altogether from the ordinary Poor Rate?—Yes, it is Poor Rate, but it is allocated differently.

3882. What are the separate Poor Rates in London; are they levied on unions or on boroughs?—They are levied on unions.

3883. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Who administers the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—There is a receiver, Sir Hugh Owen, and he finally decides the claims.

3884. (*Professor Smart.*) Do you think it would be too much for us to ask for a return of all the Poor Rates levied in London by the different boroughs?—I think we have got them. It is given in the Poor Rate returns. Amount of poor rates levied in London.

3885. Are those handed in—I mean the actual rates per head?—Those will be handed in by another witness, I think. There is no difficulty about it whatever.

3886. (*Miss Hill.*) I suppose those individual children who are removed to certified schools have, to a certain extent, come under the influence of volunteers as well as the official representatives of the guardians?—The certified homes are run entirely by charitable volunteers Good effect of certified schools.

3887. Is it your experience that that is a considerable gain to the children?—A very great gain to a certain class of children.

3888. That would be a great reason for continuing that organisation for separating certain children, at any rate, from the regular Poor Law Schools?—Yes. I will give you an illustration of the sort of work which these homes do; a home with which I am acquainted takes in children who have been boarded out to give them some special industrial training before they go out to service. That is supplying what may be a defect in the boarding-out system.

3889. That should be a very valuable complement of the Poor Law?—Most valuable.

3890. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Taking the two divisions of our work, do you think that the administration of poor relief has had much effect upon employment in England? Take, for instance, the Act of 1834, do you think that that did much to relieve congested districts and distribute labour?—Yes. I am glad you have asked me that question, because it occurs to me that one of the most interesting effects of the Act of 1834 was its effect on emigration. If you read Hansard from 1820 onwards you will see that every year, I think without exception, there was a debate in the House of Commons with regard Effect of Act of 1834 on employment and emigration.

* Cd. 1440—1903.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.
19 Feb. 1906.

to emigration; there was a continual talk of the congested state of England, that England was not able to carry its own population, and it is curious to observe how public opinion at that time was divided in much the same sort of way that public opinion is now. You had the Malthusians who said: it is no good emigrating people, because the gaps you make will be filled up instantly by a growth of population; you had men like Mr. Wilmot Horton, who was afterwards Governor of Ceylon, who advocated emigration for the benefit of the Colonies; you had men like Sir Robert Peel, who took a calm view of it, and said that emigration should be carefully regulated and confined to British Colonies; then you had the view which was expressed by Mr. Sadler, to the effect—what was the use of emigrating Englishmen when you had so many millions of acres of land uncultivated in this country? So it went on, occasionally the Government gave a grant, sometimes it did not. After 1834, after the operation of the new Poor Law, you hardly find emigration mentioned. You find in the Commissioners' Report a great deal about migrating, say from Sussex to the North. There was an interesting account of the migration of some people from Sussex to Derbyshire, but of the general congestion of the country you hear nothing, and even the local congestion which the Committee admitted, and which they provided for in the Act of 1834, disappears.

3891. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Was not there a very large emigration after 1834 apart from the talk about it?—There was large emigration no doubt, and schemes like Wakefield's and Godley's schemes, but they were for the benefit of the Colony. My point is that emigration to relieve congestion was the burning question, and either local congestion, which was admitted by the members, or general congestion, which they never did admit, is gone.

3892. Would not that be explained to some extent by the fact that a very large premium was put upon emigration afterwards by private enterprise, and the Colonies encouraged it enormously by bounties? They may have solved the question themselves by bounties?—They may have done, and I agree that that probably had a considerable effect, but the pauper emigration was probably not emigration of the same class, it was emigration of people with small capital who were ready and willing to go, and were helped to go.

3893. The fact that prior to 1834 all the Australian Colonies were penal settlements, or mostly so, or at any rate they had that stigma, and that afterwards when they had responsible Governments they went into a very large bounty scheme of emigration, would account for the decay of the talk about emigration?—It may have affected it to some extent, that I quite admit, but the emigration paid for by the guardians as a means of relieving the Poor Rate had practically come to an end.

3894. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do you think that the migration from one part of England to another was caused by the modification of the law of settlement mainly?—No doubt it had an effect.

Effect of law of settlement on mobility of labour.

3895. Do you think at the present day the law of settlement operates at all against the mobility of labour?—I do not think it does. I think as we have got rid of the able-bodied class we have got rid of that great evil.

Effect of Poor Law on wages.

3896. Do you think the greater attractiveness which Poor Law relief has now is exercising an influence on wages?—Yes, that is my own opinion—on earnings.

3897. Do you think that wages would rise were it not that the necessity of providing for their old age is taken off people's shoulders?—I am sure that would be the tendency. As you are aware, I put that forward tentatively as a subject for the investigation of this Commission.

After-careers of pauper children.

3898. Do boards of guardians make any addition to the classes of skilled labour in the country, do you think?—I do not follow you.

3899. I mean as opposed to unskilled labour. Do the children who leave workhouse schools compete in the skilled labour classes?—Yes, I should think that the good technical education which is given to workhouse children has a tendency to raise them into the ranks of skilled labour.

3900. You would not be surprised to find cases of people who had become artisans and skilled labourers in the best sense?—I know many such cases.

3901. The great majority would fall into the ranks of unskilled labour, I suppose?—I hesitate to say that, because you see so many of them are disposed of by going into the army, and we do not trace them afterwards.

After career of migrants in England.

3902. Do you know if one can find on record anywhere an attempt to trace the future of the people who have migrated from one part of England to another? Mr. Girdlestone took a great interest in that movement at one time?—I do not think so. We have not heard of that movement for a long time.

3903. You do not know whether there is any statement or history on record?—I am not aware of it.

Indoor relief to widows' children.

3904. Is the taking of children on the part of guardians a growing habit?—Do you mean under the Act of 1899: the Guardianship of Children Act?

3905. No, I am not thinking of that. I want to know is it common for boards of guardians to say to a widow, "We will relieve you by taking a certain number of your children into our school"?—It is very uncommon outside London. It is very seldom done, I think. It is never in rural districts.

3906. Not in the districts that you know?—No.

3907. Do you think that is a good system?—It has its advantages, but I have misgivings about it

Effect of Poor Law on parental responsibility.

3908. Do you think you could express any opinion upon the effect on people's minds: how far it relieves them of what ought to be a burden upon them of which they wish to get rid, and how far it acts as an attraction?—I should say myself that what is in its favour is this, that it is nearly always beneficial to the children. I should think the main danger of it is, especially when you have very well organised and well equipped schools, that so far from being a test, that form of relief may gradually come to be sought for by the mothers.

3909. That is just the question I want to ask; have you any experience of that?—I have no specific experience, but I am very much impressed, I must say, with the growth of child pauperism in London.

3910. Do you think that the agencies there are now, for relieving parents of the care of their children, operate in that direction?—Yes, there must be that tendency.

3911. What safeguards would you suggest in the cases under the Poor Law?—The safeguard which probably would be the most effective is one which I do not think any one can suggest, and that would be that the quality of the schools should be lowered: that is, of course, out of the question. I think the only other safeguard I can suggest, which seems to be more practicable, is very careful supervision by the boards of guardians. I should like on that question to show you a chart which I lay on the table, which shows the indoor pauper children, the growth of the pauper child class, and their separation from other classes of indoor paupers. You will see the most extraordinary rise in the separation after 1890. Those are the children that are separated in separate institutions. You see the curve goes straight up. (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (12).)

3912. (*Miss Hill.*) Surely up to now there has been no sign, I should have said, that the widows were at all anxious for the children to get into the schools. It has acted much more like the offer of the House to the able-bodied labourer, I should have said. I do not know what is coming, but at present in London certainly I do not think it is at all an attraction?—There is just this, one has to look at all the possible causes; it may be one of the causes of the growth of indoor child pauperism, especially in the Metropolis. I should like to say this: it is often alleged that if you relieve parents of their children (I am now thinking of the vagrant class) you will have all the vagrants coming and giving you their children to take. My experience is not that at all. My experience is that these people, even in the direst poverty, cling to their children; I do not say it is always from good motives, but my impression is that that is the fact.

Effect of personal influence on education of children.

3913. (*Mr. Phelps.*) With regard to the three systems which have been discussed so very much with regard to the treatment of children; the large school, the cottage home and the boarding-out, I suppose we might assume that the two important things in training of this kind are method and personal influence?—Yes.

3914. The importance of personal influence would

vary enormously with the size of the home or school, would it not?—That would not be the first consideration which would strike me. I think what would strike me would be that it would vary so much with the character of the superintendent.

3915. What I mean is this rather, that if you take boarding-out, the personal equation is far more important there than it is in a sense in a large district school, where the inequalities would cancel one another out more?—If you have small institutions, you always run greater risk in the officers than if you have large ones.

3916. That is what I want to put to you. Do you think that is an evil which is sufficiently probable to be a factor in deciding between the systems?—To my mind it would be one of the most important factors.

3917. Have you any experience of widespread mischief arising from that source?—No, but I have often observed indications of it, and there the point which I put before you as to the permanency of tenure of officers becomes very important. You may wish to get rid of an officer because you feel that he is not quite good enough for his post, but he may be too good to be summarily dismissed; then the children suffer.

3918. On the other hand in a large establishment, the standard which is set throughout by a good superintendent will raise and lift all the subordinates, will it not?—That has been my experience.

3919. The same individual left to himself in a smaller establishment might be very much less efficient?—Certainly.

Boarding out failures.

3920. In boarding-out, where the personal influence comes in most strongly, do you think the number of failures is tangible?—I should certainly say it was tangible. Time alone will show whether there is a marked difference in the results from boarding-out, and the other means for educating pauper children.

Functions and control of certified schools.

3921. (*Dr. Downes.*) Do not certified schools furnish a means of dealing with special cases which an ordinary board of guardians would find a difficulty in dealing with?—Yes, that is their main advantage.

3922. They can deal with cases which are not numerous enough in an ordinary union?—Perhaps that question might well be answered by quoting from the classes of cases that do go to these certified schools; blind, deaf and dumb, epileptics, idiots, and, I may add, children who require special care because they are refractory or naughty children.

3923. The schools are, I think, for children, but the word "school" is extended by a subsequent Act of Parliament to any institution established for the instruction of deaf, dumb, blind, lame, deformed or idiotic persons?—Yes.

3924. Have not the guardians powers of inspection of certified schools?—Yes.

3925. I believe that there have been occasions when the Local Government Board has ordered a public official inquiry into circumstances connected with the schools?—Certainly.

Growth of old-age pauperism in London.

3926. Turning to London, have you considered the age of paupers in receipt of relief in London; whether the proportion of old people is exceptional?—I have here a statement of the number of paupers of sixty-five years and upwards, in which it shows that on the winter count in 1892 the percentage of the total indoors above sixty-five was 31·9; in 1900 on the same count, that number had grown in the eight years, to 36 per cent. Rather remarkably in the summer count the numbers for the corresponding years only go from 31·7 to 32·4 showing that the workhouse is largely used by old persons in the winter. There is a somewhat similar growth in the outdoor paupers, though not to the same extent, showing that pauperism is getting older and consequently more expensive.

Effect of imbeciles and child pauperism on cost of buildings in London.

3927. With reference to the rise of child pauperism in London after 1890, to which you have drawn our attention, are you aware that that led in about 1893, to a very considerable deficiency of accommodation in schools for children in London?—I was not aware of it.

3928. I do not know whether you considered that as one of the causes which led to expenditure in building, a little later on in that decade?—I have no doubt it was.

3929. There was also, I think, a deficiency in accommodation for imbeciles, which also led to some of that building?—There was evidently a great increase of expenditure.

3930. I do not know whether you have drawn our attention, or referred in any way, to the Report of the Committee in 1892, on Metropolitan Hospitals?—Yes, I have referred to that report.

3931. They referred in that report to the want of co-operation between hospitals, dispensaries, and Poor Law infirmaries?—Yes, they did.

Co-operation between Poor Law and other hospitals.

3932. They do not make any definite recommendation, I believe?—They put the point with a good deal of force and then make absolutely no special recommendation with respect to it, a fact which probably gives some indication of the difficulty of the subject.

3933. Do you consider that that is a matter which should engage the attention of this Commission?—Certainly.

Ins and outs.

3934. You are aware there is a class known to all Poor Law administrators as the Ins-and-outs?—Yes.

Danish restrictions on paupers' right of discharge.

3935. Have you anything to say to us on that subject, or can you make any suggestions as to any way of dealing with them?—The Commission is quite certain, I think, to get a good deal of evidence on this point, but it may be convenient to them to have put before them a solution of the difficulty, which I do not suggest should be adopted in England, but which I am quite sure is worth their consideration. I got it from Denmark. By one of the specific provisions of the Danish Poor Law Reform of 1892 it is enacted that no inmate of a rate-aided institution shall be allowed to discharge himself without the consent of the governing body; but that provision is supplemented by the fact that everybody who is an inmate of an institution earns, or is paid, a certain small sum in the week. Part of that sum is considered as deferred pay, and as time goes on each inmate will have in his possession a sum which in Copenhagen, when I looked into the matter there, was about 5s. He could then present himself to the governing body, and the custom was that he should be discharged, so that you see there was an alleviation of any hardship that might arise under the main provision.

Earnings of Danish paupers.

3936. (*Mr. Booth.*) What was the total sum he had to have?—If I remember rightly, he had 3d. a week, if he behaved himself, and 2d. of that was deferred pay; when that 2d. amounted to 5s. he could go. That was the most complete method of dealing with the difficulty that I have ever come across, but it involves a very large interference with the principles of the English Poor Law, where, as you know, workhouses are purely voluntary institutions. I think the matter is one which the Commission might well consider. With regard to the question as it is now, as to Ins-and-outs, I think you will find there is a remarkable difference between unions and unions, as to the extent to which they are troubled with this class. I can only attribute that difference to the characters of the masters of the workhouses and the guardians. I think if a master really is a man of some firmness of character, and some tact, he meets the trouble to a very considerable extent, but the trouble exists, and may, I think, be very well considered in connection with the larger scheme which I have put before you.

Effect of local administration on "ins and outs."

Vagrant "ins and outs" and suggested remedies.

3937. (*Dr. Downes.*) I believe this class of Ins-and-outs tend very much towards the vagrant classes?—They go in and out until they go out as vagrants.

3938. I believe we have had evidence before another Committee, that some of them actually do, at one period of the year, lead a vagrant life, and at another period of the year use a particular workhouse as a convenient resort?—At certain periods of the year there is an exodus from the workhouses for fruit picking, hopping, and other purposes which are not quite so legitimate.

3939. Should you be in favour of bringing this class to some extent within whatever provisions may be made for the vagrant classes on the lines of the Report, which will shortly be issued; that is to say, that assuming that places of detention are provided for the vagrant classes, would it be possible to bring this kind of pauper within that definition?—If you have compulsory detention of habitual vagrants after the plan which is followed in some continental countries, even under the existing law, I

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

19 Feb. 1906.

think a good many of the Ins-and-outs might be brought within the definition of the incorrigible rogue, as defined in the Vagrancy Act of 1824. That would be another solution of the Ins-and-outs difficulty.

Proportion of able-bodied "ins and outs."

3940. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) What proportion do you think there are of the Ins-and-outs which could be called able-bodied?—Not many.

3941. Is it a big number, do you think, or very small?—Speaking for outside the Metropolis I should say a very small number would be able-bodied.

3942. But in the Metropolis?—That I do not know; you had better ask Mr. Lockwood.

Guardians' adoption of children of "ins and outs."

3943. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Have you any policy to recommend as regards the children of confirmed ins-and-outs, as to whether the guardians ought not to adopt them?—I think the guardians ought to adopt them, and they do adopt them to a very great extent. I think the extent to which the guardians have made use of the Guardianship of Children Act is very remarkable and very satisfactory.

Technical education of pauper children.

3944. You have spoken once or twice as to the excellence of the technical education given in certain schools connected with boards of guardians; would you kindly tell me which school strikes you as being particularly good—technical education is the term used?—I think the best technical education I have ever seen given is at the Warren Farm School at Brighton. It is a barrack school of about 300; but let me say that by technical education I mean education in any art, even if it is agriculture.

Warren Farm School, Brighton.

3945. But is that what is ordinarily understood by technical education?—What I mean by technical education is education in an art which will enable the boy to earn his own living, or, what is more important, will make him not afraid to sweat.

"Ins and outs" and effect of suggested remedies.

3946. (*Mrs. Webb.*) The Ins-and-outs problem would be quite as serious if they were all able-bodied?—It would be more serious.

3947. It is not their being able-bodied that makes it serious, but their being Ins-and-outs?—Yes.

3948. (*Miss Hill.*) If the children were adopted by the guardians, that would leave the parents entirely irresponsible and free, would not it? It would not be coupled with any disability to the parents?—Unless the existing law were supplemented in the way that Dr. Downes intimates may be possible.

3949. Did I gather that those Danish people who had been detained could claim to go out when they had accumulated their 5s.?—Not under the Statute, but it was the practice.

Homes for boys leaving the workhouse.

3950. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I believe that in certain unions in London there is considerable difficulty in finding work for the boys when they leave the schools, other than the Army and Navy, owing to the fact that they have nowhere where the lads can live when they leave the workhouses?—That is a difficulty which is not confined to the Metropolis, and we have, to a certain extent, as I pointed out the last time I gave evidence, allowed the premium which is paid for apprenticeship, to be paid in the shape of some allowance, where the child was in the light of an apprentice.

3951. Even then you would have a difficulty in finding a suitable home for him unless he was actually living in his master's family?—That is always a difficulty.

The Working Boys' Homes.

3952. Do you think it could be met at all by an extension of the Working Boys' Homes in London?—Yes, the Local Government Board encourage that. As to that, Mr. Lockwood will give you better evidence than I can.

3953. Do these Working Boys' Homes exist anywhere except in London?—Yes, I think in Lancashire they are found useful.

3954. They are always voluntary institutions?—Yes.

3955. They may be quite self-supporting?—Yes, I think they are; I think the object is that they should be.

Type of "ins and outs."

3956. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I should like to ask whether a number of the ins-and-outs, whom you have in the workhouses, in England, are not, just as they are in Scotland, people who are temporarily incapacitated from alcoholism, and come in for two or three days and leave, and are not able-bodied, in the sense that they are not fit to earn their living, when they come to the workhouse?—I should think practically all the ins-and-outs were of that character.

3957. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is it solely because of that character that they become Ins-and-outs: that is the point, I believe?—I should not think so. I think your point rather was that they used the workhouse as a sort of place where they could recover their thirst.

3958. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Recover from their temporary debauch. A large section are of that character?—I think so.

3959. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Do you say that of London?—I do not say anything with regard to London workhouses, but the sort of waster who goes as an in-and-out in the country is practically always like that.

Return as to amount and cost of non-settled relief.

3960. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) You told us at Question 2547 that you would try to find out the number of persons in receipt of non-settled relief. Could you also give us, say for each union, the amount which is paid in respect of non-resident relief. I ask that because I understand that those who favour the abolition of the law of Settlement found it upon the cost of non-settled relief and non-resident relief, the result being that the one is a set-off to the other. I ask that, in giving the return which you will give us of those in receipt of non-settled relief, you will supplement it by giving the number in receipt of non-resident relief?—I am afraid I spoke under a misapprehension. There do not appear to be any figures in the office on which to base such a return.

The *pros* and *cons* of relief stations.

3961. Further on, in answer to the Question 2748, you said that you objected to relief stations?—Yes.

3962. Would your objection to these relief stations be removed if a relieving officer were always present when aliment was paid?—Only in part. The existence of a relief station enables the relieving officer to shirk his duty, which is to visit at the houses of the paupers themselves.

3963. On the other hand, is it not a convenience to the pauper himself to come to a relieving station which may be nearer his home, than the single place at which the relieving officer is to be found?—Yes, it sometimes is a convenience to know where to find the relieving officer, but I think that could be got over in other ways.

3964. Is not the main consideration that the person should be relieved as simply and as easily, and with as little trouble as possible to himself, if he has to come for his aliment?—I think the main consideration is that the relief should be sufficient for his wants, and I do not think that it is safe to leave an outdoor pauper unvisited, because he may want additional relief, or relief in a different form from the mere money payment.

3965. Your view is, and the practice is, that the relieving officer goes to the house of the pauper and hands over the aliment there?—That is what I think he should do.

3965. Does he do it?—He does not where they have relief stations. The point is this, that if the relieving officer has to pay at the pauper's own home the guardians are certain that he has visited that place, whereas if you have relief stations, you cannot be certain that he has the pauper really under supervision.

3967. May not that put an undue burden on relieving officers; if they are supposed to give the aliment once a month, or once a fortnight, and they have to visit the pauper on each occasion, when they give aliment? That would make a very great deal of work?—In some cases I have no doubt additional relieving officers would have to be appointed. I have also pointed out there are exceptional cases where we must have relief stations.

Cost of education of Poor Law children in special and ordinary schools.

3968. In regard to the boarding-out of children, and the other systems of relieving them, of which you have spoken, can you give us a return of the relative cost of the boarding-out where the children go to the ordinary schools, and the cost of the Poor Law schools which have been established in each union?—You mean the whole cost, not the mere cost of administration.

3969. The whole cost?—There is a good deal of information about the cost of maintenance in the half-yearly return. I think you will probably find many

more figures which may be useful in the statistical memorandum.

3970. I want to contrast the cost of the system, as pursued in England, with the system which is adopted in Scotland. It is not easy to do so, because in Scotland the system is to board all pauper children outside of the workhouse, and they have their education in the ordinary schools of the parish. Accordingly, the system there is a very different one, and it is very difficult to contrast the one with the other; but if it were possible I should like to know what the actual cost of the education of pauper children is as between the different systems of which you have spoken?—I think a return could be prepared, and it would be a useful one.

3971. I have a report here made in 1870 by Mr. Henley, who was deputed to go to Scotland to enquire into the boarding-out of pauper children in Scotland, and I want to ask you a question on this. He concludes his report by saying: "Those who are not well acquainted with the different habits and modes of life of the working classes of both countries must be careful not to draw a too hasty conclusion that what is good in one country must necessarily be so in the other. The nations, though happily united, retain their distinctive characteristics. Scotland, as I have before mentioned, possesses a class of crofters, or small occupiers; they are undoubtedly the best foster parents, but they are almost unknown in England, except, perhaps, in Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham. The food of the people in the two countries is very different, oatmeal being commonly kept in the house in Scotland and used with milk; baker's bread, purchased weekly or oftener, is the staple food in many parts of England." Does the distinction still stand which Mr. Henley draws there between conditions in Scotland and England, and the fact, as he puts it, that you find very much better foster parents and guardians in Scotland drawn from the class of small farmer?—I should say it did. I should say that is as true to-day as when it was written. You have more people in Scotland proportionately who would make good foster parents, but whether those people would take the children of course I give no opinion upon.

3972. You say so not speaking from experience, I suppose?—No. I mean the best end, as they say in the North, of our English peasantry do not like to take boarded-out children.

3973. Why?—I do not know; there are many reasons.

3974. May not that be due to this, that there is too much inspection, and that the foster parents are not trusted to do their best by the children without constant and repeated investigation and inspection?—That has been repeatedly alleged. I have no doubt you will get evidence as to that.

3975. You think that may be to some extent an explanation?—It may be.

3976. In the case of foster parents being selected, they are selected, I understand, by a committee of the board of Guardians?—No. You mean boarding-out outside the union?

3977. I am afraid I am not able to discriminate between the two. Take boarding-out outside the union?—Then what happens is that a voluntary committee is formed, and the Local Government Board sanctions that committee, and they make an agreement with the guardians to find homes for the children and look after them, subject to inspection by one of our Lady Inspectors. That is the procedure outside the union.

3978. There is a Lady Inspector of the Local Government Board whose duty it is to inspect the boarded-out children outside the union?—There are three of them.

3979. Can you tell us what the proportion of these boarded-out children is to the child pauperism of the country?—There are 1,700 so boarded-out outside the union and about 6,200 boarded-out inside the union. The total child pauperism of the country is 59,000.

3980. Can you say what the percentage is of the whole. In Scotland there are boarded-out 90 per cent. of the children who are in our poorhouses, but I suppose in England the proportion is nothing like that, is it?—No, the proportion would not be more than about 16 per cent., I think.

3981. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Would it be possible to have a return put in of the exact proportion of children boarded-out, and in other ways?—I think I have already put that in.

3982. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is not the boarding-out within the union rather different to boarding-out outside the union?—There are quite different regulations. If a child is boarded-out inside the union, it is inspected by the Relieving Officer and the Medical Officer. Different regulations as to boarding-out within and without the union.

3983. One other point is, that only orphans or deserted children can be boarded-out outside the union, is not it?—Either within or without the union there is the same prohibition.

3984. Until quite recently there was only one kind of boarding-out so far as the metropolis was concerned, and that was outside the union?—That would be so far as the metropolis is concerned, but the orders were issued about the same times; two orders were issued in 1889.

3985. In London it is rather scattered homes than boarding-out, is it not?—I do not suppose that there is boarding-out within the union in London, only in country districts. Scattered homes in London.

3986. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) It is only orphans and deserted children who are boarded-out, not children separated from their parents?—Or, under the last order for boarding out without the unions, children adopted by boards of guardians. Scope and objects of boarding-out system.

3987. Is not one main object which ought to be aimed at, when you are boarding-out children, to relieve them as far as possible from all taint or stigma of pauperism?—That, I believe, is one of the reasons alleged by the advocates of boarding out.

3988. Do you think that is achieved by a very drastic system of inspection?—I should say that a drastic system of inspection must affect it; but then I would recall to your recollection the evidence that Mr. Crooks, who is the Member for Woolwich, gave with regard to boarding-out children in certain villages, where, as he put it, boarding-out became the main industry of the village. That, I have no doubt, you will hear of later. *Pros* and *cons* of inspection.

3989. It is the case, I believe, that a great deal of the boarding-out is done in villages, and not in country districts. Places which are mere small towns or villages are mainly selected for boarding-out?—I do not think so. I think the boarding-out committees take foster parents wherever they can get them.

3990. With regard to Question 3,479, where you are speaking of the emigration of children to Canada and elsewhere, that, of course, involves the removal of these children out of the jurisdiction of the board of guardians?—Yes. Procedure and incidents of child-emigration to Canada.

3991. At the same time, I think you say they retain certain powers of inspection over them?—They arrange with the Canadian Government to do the inspection. I should like to lay on the table a most interesting document which is the last return of the inspectors of the Canadian or Provincial Governments, with a summary of the results.

3992. The legal hold of the board of guardians must cease directly these children are removed from England, must it not?—Yes, it is transferred to the other side.

3993. Has that not been considered an objection to their being so removed?—No, the guardians part with their responsibility on conditions, to which conditions the Canadian Government and the Provincial Governments are parties.

3994. That has been done by arrangement with the Canadian Government?—Yes. The Local Government Board are in communication, in any doubtful case, with the Agent General of the Canadian Government. Last year I think the number emigrated was something over 550, but we do know what becomes of the children, as I think you will agree, if you look at the reports which I have put on the table.

3995. May I ask whether boards of guardians publish from time to time any account or history of pauper children, and what becomes of them? I ask that because it is sometimes done in Scotland. I hold in my hand a list of children and lunatics boarded by the Parish council of Glasgow, which is very complete, giving a full history of each of the children and what becomes of Proposed inquiry into number of adult paupers who have been educated in Poor Law schools.

Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.

19 Feb. 1906.

them?—That is not generally done; it is only done by certain boards of guardians. What becomes of each child is the main question, and that is the question which is so often forgotten by people who are wrangling about the relative merits of barrack schools, district schools, and cottage homes. They never stop to really ask what becomes of pauper children. I suggest to this Commission that they should have a census of every workhouse, every gaol, and every lock ward in the country, and find out how many of those persons allege that they are, or can reasonably be supposed to have been, educated in the Poor Law establishments. They will find, if that census gives them much the same result as former censuses, perhaps 400, 500, or 600 persons who allege that they have been so brought up; the life history of every one of those persons should be traced. Here is an opportunity once for all of ascertaining whether or not pauper schools are manufactories of pauperism. I throw that out as a counsel of perfection.

Published records of Poor Law children.

3996. I gathered from you, I do not know whether I am right, that some boards of guardians do publish statistics regarding their children?—Occasionally. I think they do in Bradford.

3997. I have here a full record which gives the name of the child, the date when it is supplied with clothing, the date of its birth, its religion, the date when boarded-out, the name of the guardian, the address of the guardian, remarks, and its future history?—By "guardian" there you mean what we should call foster-parent?

3998. Exactly. If you could procure for us a similar return it would be useful?—I could get you any return that is published by boards of guardians, but it would be impossible to get returns from all boards of guardians. I will find out where there are such returns published and let you have them.

3999. Are you aware what the percentage of failure is amongst these children? Have you any statistics about those who do not succeed in life?—I gave those in my evidence on Tuesday.

Certified schools and institutions.

4000. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think we are not quite clear as to the exact position of certified schools. It would be well if we brought out the facts a little more clearly. The schools are certified, are they not, under the Poor Law Certified Schools Act of 1862?—Under 11 and 12 Victoria.

4001. That only enables the Local Government Board to certify schools for children?—Yes.

4002. It does not enable them to certify institutions for adults?—No.

4003. Before any place of the kind is certified, it is necessary that it should be inspected and a report made to the board, who thereupon certifies it?—Yes.

4004. With regard to the children that may be sent there, they are not necessarily limited to blind, or deaf and dumb, or children suffering from some disability. There are, are there not, a considerable number of children sent for other reasons—to Roman Catholic Schools, for instance?—Yes.

Power to send children to certified schools on religious grounds.

4005. There is a power, is there not, to direct that a child shall be sent to a certified school on religious grounds?—Yes, and that power has been exercised.

Non-certified schools.

4006. There is a power, is there not, for the guardians, with the consent of the Board, to send a child to a non-certified school if it is blind or deaf and dumb?—We are always consenting to children going to non-certified places.

4007. That is to meet particular cases?—Yes, special cases.

4008. Under another Statute the guardians may subscribe, with the consent of the Board, although the children sent are not blind or deaf and dumb?—Yes.

Limit to class of institutions which may be certified.

4009. The power which the Board have of certifying the school does not in any way apply to any other institution intended for adults, such, for instance, as a labour colony?—No.

Sick adults in uncertified institutions.

4010. In the case of the sick, the guardians may, may they not, on the advice of the medical officer, if they consider it necessary for the treatment of the case, send a pauper to a place which is not certified, and which is not under regulation in any way?—Without our consent; we have nothing to do with it.

4011. That is not infrequently done?—That is quite common.

4012. (*Mr. Booth.*) I understand from the answer which you made to a question of Dr. Downes that an adult blind or dumb person could be dealt with in the same way as a child?—They proceed under a different Statute.

Difference procedure sending children adults to uncertifie institutio

4013. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In the case of children of this class there is an express statutory provision that the guardians may send them to uncertified schools with the consent of the Board, but in the case of adults, of this class, they may be sent without the sanction of the Board. As regards other classes I think what happens is this, that the guardians enter into an agreement to subscribe, and the Board assent to that subscription?—That is what we do. The guardians make a contract, as they can do on the recommendation of their medical officer, with the keeper of a convalescent home, or whatever it is, to take in their paupers.

4014. (*Mr. Bentham.*) They may not previously have subscribed to that institution.?—Not necessarily.

Power of central authority veto send of adults uncertifie institutio

4015. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) The Local Government Board have no power of interference?—We might prohibit the admission of paupers, I think.

4016. I have in my mind the institution at Sandgate, which I used to know a good deal of. I understand that boards of guardians have sent people down to one of those institutions at Sandgate, and the Local Government Board has no power of interfering at all?—It is entirely a matter between the guardians and the keeper of the home.

4017. Those homes might have been conducted so badly before that there had been a scandal in the district?—Yes.

4018. Is that indoor or outdoor relief?—That is indoor relief.

4019. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In each of those cases sent to Sandgate would a medical officer's certificate be required that those people should be sent to an institution?—I think the auditor would require one before he passed the expenditure.

4020. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) It is a fact that some medical officers in London have reported very favourably on the condition of those homes?—Yes; I do not go into matters of that sort.

4021. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Just now we were speaking of the power of the Local Government Board to certify certain institutions; there is also a power, is there not, in the case of any institution in which paupers are received, for the Board to prohibit the reception of paupers into such institutions?—There is.

4022. That, I think, is under the Poor Law Relief Act, 1849?—Yes.

Operati Metrope Commo Poor Fu

4023. Perhaps we might make a little clearer what is precisely the operation of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund. The fund is constituted in this way, is it not—contributions are raised from the whole of the Metropolis in accordance with the rateable value?—Yes, that is so.

4024. Every Metropolitan Board of Guardians is entitled to make a claim upon the fund in respect of certain classes of expenditure?—Yes.

4025. A statement is presented to the auditor at the half-yearly audit, showing in detail what is the claim of any board of guardians on the fund, and he certifies the amount, does he not?—He certifies the amount actually expended by each union in respect of expenses which are payable out of the fund.

4026. Then those claims are sent in to the Local Government Board, who, in that way, ascertain what is the amount of the total claim upon the fund in respect of that particular half-year to which the claims relate?—Yes.

4027. Having ascertained that, they determine what will be the amount of contribution required from the several unions to meet the total claim?—Yes.

4028. They do not actually receive the one sum and pay back the other; but should they find that in respect

to one union there is a balance in favour of the union, then that sum is paid to the union ?—The balance over is paid.

4029. In the same way, in any case in which there is a balance due from the union, after deducting the amount to which that union is entitled, the union pays over that balance ?—Yes; and so the unions are divided into receiving unions and contributing unions.

4030. The expenditure which may be charged upon the fund is prescribed by Statute, is it not ?—Yes.

4031. And the Local Government Board have no power to add to, or in any way to determine what classes of expenditure shall be charged on the fund ?—That I have already pointed out.

ctions of al ernment rd as to ropolitan mon r Fund.

4032. The expenditure which is chargeable on the fund may be divided into two classes, may it not, namely, expenditure which is automatic, such, for instance, as the payment of 5d. per day in respect of every adult pauper in the workhouse; and expenditure which is determined according to the number of officers, or whatever it may be, which is peculiar to the particular union ?—Yes. The first sum is automatic, but the second is subject to a check.

4033. In the second class of cases, which is not automatic, the sanction of the Local Government Board is required to prevent undue charges being made on the fund, I think ?—That is, undue charges in respect of the salaries of officers.

4034. And some other things too—for instance, vaccination expenses ?—Yes.

4035. The Local Government Board exercise, do they not, a great deal of care with regard to the scale of salaries ?—The most minute care.

4036. And—I am speaking now of the more important officers—have a maximum beyond which they do not allow a charge to be made on the fund ?—That is so.

4037. That is with the view of preventing there being an undue charge made on the fund, is it not ?—Yes.

ervision eaching Poor Law ools.

4038. You have told us that the inspectors inspect the industrial training in workhouses where industrial trainers are employed; there is also, is there not, the case of teachers in Poor Law schools who were formerly inspected by the school inspectors of the Local Government Board ?—Yes; those schools are now inspected by the Board of Education.

nt for hers' aries in r Law ools.

4039. There is a grant, is there not, payable by the county council in respect of the remuneration of those teachers, and that is dependent upon the reports of the inspectors of the Board of Education ?—That is so; formerly it was dependent upon the reports of our education inspectors, but now it is dependent on the reports of the inspectors of the Board of Education.

inistra- of rding-out hin and hout the on.

4040. With regard to boarding-out without the union, the boarding-out committee is not a committee of the board of guardians, but is an independent committee consisting of persons approved by the Local Government Board, is it not ?—That is so.

4041. The names are submitted to the Board, who approve of the particular committee ?—Yes. *Mr. James Stewart Davy, C.B.* 19 Feb. 1906.

4042. If any alterations are made in the committee, the Board's assent is necessary ?—Yes.

4043. That committee enters into relations with the board of guardians—it agrees with it, for instance, for certain things—but it is quite independent of the board of guardians ?—It can make an agreement with the board of guardians, but it is independent of the board of guardians altogether.

4044. When you come to boarding-out within the union, you have two systems, have you not; first of all, you need not have a boarding-out committee at all, need you ?—That is so.

4045. The Boarding within Unions order contemplates that as an ordinary state of things when there would be no boarding-out committee ?—That is so.

4046. In that case the agreement with the foster parents is entered into by the guardians ?—The agreement is entered into directly by the guardians, and the inspection would be done by the officers of the guardians.

4047. But there may be a committee set up in the union, and the committee would then be in the same position with regard to boarding-out within the union as is the boarding-out committee outside the union ?—Yes. Where there is a committee there are powers in the Boarding-Out Within the Unions Order to dispense with the inspection by the relieving officer and the medical officer—a provision to which I for one object.

4048. (*Professor Smart.*) I suppose an increase of expenditure in itself is no evidence of an increase of burden, because if the population is not increasing, the wealth may be increasing, or if the wealth per head is not increasing, the population may be increasing ?—Yes.

4049. If the population be increasing and the wealth be increasing, it is the ratio between the one increase and the other which alone can determine whether the burden is increasing or not ?—That is evidently so.

Relative growth of Poor Law expenditure, rateable value, and population in London and elsewhere.

4050. I think you have prepared a chart bearing on this point ?—I have prepared a chart which I should like to hand in which shows the cost of poor relief, the rateable value, and the estimated population. From that you will see that up to about 1890 the rateable value was increasing faster than the expenditure, that is to say, the burden on the property of the country was decreasing, but since that date the expenditure takes a sudden turn upwards, and it is now increasing apparently at a greater ratio than the rateable value. For instance, the cost of relief (excepting the insane in asylums) in 1874 was 5s. 9·7d. per head. It decreased till 1894, when it was 5s. 3·3d. per head; and then in 1904 it had increased to 6s. 7·7d. per head—a distinct increase in cost as regards population. With regard to the rateable value, it was 1s. 2·5d. in the £ in 1874; it fell to 11·7d. in 1884 and 11·8d. in 1894; and then it rose to 1s. 1·7d. in 1904, showing a slight increase in the rate per £ of rateable value.

4051. Will you put that chart in ?—Yes. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (15).)

Mr. Henry Lockwood, called; and Examined.

4052. (*Chairman.*) You are a general inspector of the Local Government Board, your district being the Metropolitan district, I believe ?—Yes. *Mr. Henry Lockwood.* 19 Feb. 1906.

4053. You have occupied that post for some time, have you not ?—Since February, 1894.

4054. Previous to that were you also engaged in Poor Law inspection ?—Yes. I began as assistant inspector to Mr. Fleming in the northern district; I was subsequently assistant to Mr. Longley, and after that to Mr. Hedley in the Metropolitan district; then from 1879 to 1881 I held Mr. Peel's district which was a district comprising five Midland counties; from 1881 till 1894 I was in the eastern counties district; and since then I have been in charge of the Metropolitan district.

istance nspection ondon rict.

4055. The Metropolitan district being a very large and populous district, you have certain assistance given to you; will you describe to the Commission what that is ?—I have one medical colleague, Dr. Downes, and three assistants, one of whom is a lady. The duties of the assistants are to inspect and report on the several institutions in and connected with the district. Their reports are given to the inspectors—myself and my medical colleague—who advise what action should be taken respecting them, whether they should be reserved, or what extracts should be sent to the guardians or the managers concerned for their consideration, or for their observations, as the case may be.

Assistant inspectors and their duties.

4056. Is the work of the assistant inspectors confined to visiting and reporting on institutions ?—Mainly so; but they may occasionally have some special work which either myself or my colleague may think it desirable that they should do.

4057. The demands on your time must be considerable, so would you please tell us to what portion of your duties you specially devote yourself; is it to attending the meetings of the boards of guardians ?—I devote myself

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

19 Feb. 1906.

more to attending the meetings of their committees than the meetings of the whole boards of guardians, because the greater part of the work in which I am particularly concerned and interested is done by committees.

4058. Therefore, do you delegate to the assistants the actual inspection of the institutions?—Yes.

4059. Do you ever inspect any institutions yourself?—Yes, occasionally.

Duties of lady inspector.

4060. The duties of the lady inspector, I understand, relate to the children's department, is that so?—They are mainly to inspect and report on the girls, and infants, departments in the separate and district schools, on the female side of the workhouse, and more particularly with regard to nursing and maternity wards and the nursing arrangements in the separate infirmaries.

4061. I suppose the institutions which have to be inspected are numerous?—Yes, they are.

Number of institutions to be inspected.

4062. Can you give us any figures relating to those?—Yes. The institutions which we inspect comprise fifty-four workhouses, thirty infirmaries, two sick asylums, fourteen separate schools, four district schools, twenty-seven receiving homes for children, six groups of scattered homes (namely, twenty-six houses in connection with Mile End, five in connection with Whitechapel, forty-two in connection with Camberwell, six in connection with Croydon, four in connection with Richmond, and five in connection with Lewisham), forty-three certified homes (of which twenty-one are for Roman Catholic children), and twenty-two Metropolitan Asylums Board institutions, including the training ship.

Institutions of Metropolitan Asylums Board.

4063. Are the institutions connected with the Metropolitan Asylums Board under you for the purposes of inspection?—A certain number of them are. I do not myself—and, as a routine business the assistant inspectors do not inspect and report upon the fever hospitals; but the training and the remand homes, the homes for certain other classes of children, and the training ship, are visited and reported on by them.

Committees of guardians.

4064. There are, I understand, including the three districts of Croydon, Richmond, and West Ham (which are outside the Metropolitan area), thirty-four boards of guardians in your district?—That is so. As I have already said, the Poor Law work of the guardians is, for the most part, done by committees, such as relief committees, work house and infirmary visiting committees, school committees, finance committees, settlement committees, and general purposes committees; and occasionally other special committees which are appointed for particular purposes.

4065. Is it your object to try to establish uniformity in practice amongst all these boards of guardians?—I do not know that I have ever gone so far as to say that that could be done: but my desire might be so stated.

Difference in administration of boards of guardians.

4066. Then there is a great difference, I take it, between the practice of these boards?—Yes, there is a very considerable difference.

4067. How would you describe these differences; could you, for instance, give us one particular union whose work you thought was rather a model?—Comparisons are admitted to be somewhat odious sometimes. I have necessarily to keep on reasonably good terms with all boards of guardians, and I am afraid if I were to enter into comparisons I should find myself getting disliked.

4068. Is the difference geographical—I mean to say, does one system prevail in certain parts of London, and another system in certain other parts of London?—I think the difference could not be said to be geographical, because, assuming that a limited out-door relief is an end to be desired, you will find that limitation in certain western unions or parishes, and also in one or two eastern unions or parishes.

Increase of indoor accommodation and relief in London.

4069. The tendency of modern times has been to largely increase the size of these institutions, has it not?—Yes. It may be said that the in-door accommodation for the Metropolis is very appreciably greater now than it was, say, fifteen years ago.

4070. Mr. Davy gave us some figures in which he showed I think, that while the amount of pauperism in the Metropolis was about 26 per 1,000 of population, 16·6 of that pauperism was in institutions and 9·4 received out-door relief; and then he gave figures for the rest of England, where the proportions were reversed; have you anything to put before us on that point?—I have called attention to the relative increase of in-door and out-door relief within the last few years in one of my reports; for instance, in the report for 1898-99 I say: "A comparison of the returns of Metropolitan pauperism in the first week of January for 1889 and 1899 and certain intermediate years is interesting as indicating a more or less steady increase in the numbers of in-door poor, with a concurrent diminution in the recipients of out-relief."

Age of indoor paupers.

4071. Would the bulk of those receiving in-door relief be over sixty years of age and under sixteen?—I do not know that I could say the bulk would be over sixty, but I think I may say that probably the bulk would be over fifty. Perhaps I did not quite understand the question. If it means that a large proportion of the inmates of workhouses are over sixty, I think you will find that, as compared with the total number of inmates of workhouses, the proportion over sixty will not be very considerable. What I am trying to say is that of the inmates of workhouses the larger percentage would be over fifty.

4072. My object in putting the question was to obtain from you indirectly what were the ages and the positions of those who made up this increase of pauperism in institutions. If there has been a check on out-door relief, would it not follow that the greater proportion of the increase of paupers in institutions would be persons who, from their age (being too young or too old), were supposed to be unable to support themselves?—I think that would be so; but I also think that of late years the age at which persons, I will not say are unable, but find it difficult to support themselves, has fallen lower. Therefore, as I say, I should put the age of what one would call aged and infirm paupers (although they may not be classed as such in the returns) as somewhat lower than sixty or sixty-five.

4073. Do you think, then, that of recent years the tendency has been to lower the age at which people are able to support themselves?—Yes. Here again, perhaps, I may quote from my report for 1898-99. I said then, referring to the possible operation of what is occasionally alleged about trade unionism and employers' liability, "To what extent the two latter are responsible for the increase is a question as to which it would be rash to offer a decided opinion, but it is generally admitted that of late years there has been observed an increasing number of workhouse inmates who, though perhaps incapable of earning a full wage, could not reasonably be classed as "infirm through old age or other cause," and it is possible that the comforts and indulgences now generally afforded to the in-door poor may, in some cases, at least, offer inducements to remain chargeable rather than to renewed effort to earn an independent living."

4074. It would appear that a larger proportion of children and old people are entirely maintained by the poor law in London than in other parts of England?—That is so, I think. I should perhaps, add as regards the children that at school age they are not in workhouses, but are for the most part in schools or receiving homes; they are kept now separate from the workhouse.

4075. Still, they are maintained at the cost of the rates?—Yes.

Contribution by relatives towards cost of indoor poor.

4076. And no contribution towards their maintenance is made by their friends or relatives?—In the case of the children, no; but in the case of a good many of the inmates of infirmaries there is a contribution made.

4077. In addition to this general increase of institutional pauperism in London, there has been a certain increase of out-door pauperism of recent years, has there not?—Yes.

Increase in out-relief and its causes.

4078. Have you any remarks to make upon that?—It is an admitted fact, I think, that there has been a remarkable increase in the course of the last three or four years. There are, no doubt, more than one contributory cause to that. Possibly administration has had something to do with it. Then, I think, one may consider that during the past three years things have happened which have had their effect upon the labour market generally; for instance, what has been aptly called the backwash of the South African War, and then, coming on the top of that, the disturbance to our sea-carrying trade by the Japanese War; the latter has, I think, particularly affected the East End of London,

where a considerable proportion of the population are employed in and about the docks.

4079. Would you say that, during the last three or four years, the pressure on a certain class of the population has increased ?—I think so.

4080. That is one contributing cause; side by side with that, has there been any change in administration ? For instance, has it become more lax than before as regards giving relief ?—Possibly, there has been a certain, we will call it, laxity, in giving relief in certain districts.

ntrifugal ect on uperism of rict ad- inistration a par- ular area.

4081. In your experience, when a union is strict in the administration of out-door relief, is the effect to drive the paupers into other unions ? Have you any evidence, or has anything come to your notice sufficiently substantial, to enable you to express any opinion on that point ?—I certainly have no conclusive evidence that strictness within one area will result in the persons who consider themselves to be suffering from the strict administration migrating. I do not doubt for a moment that it occurs to a certain extent, but I do not think it occurs to any considerable extent.

4082. Sometimes relief is given in a district, and then for various reasons it comes to an end; have you ever been able to trace what becomes of the people from whom that relief has been suddenly taken away ?—I do not know that I have. I do not know whether you are referring to the case of St. Olave's ?

4083. Perhaps you would just state what occurred in St. Olave's, because that is, I think, rather a peculiar parish, both as regards its rating and its methods of relief ?—It is an old story now, for it relates to the last real winter that we had, which was in 1895. In my report for that year I reported at length on what happened in St. Olave's Union. Here are the figures relating to the stoneyard, which was opened on January 5th, 1895. On that day there were thirty-one men employed in the stoneyard; on January 12th, there were 671; on January 19th, there were 858; on January 26th, there were 1,279; on February 2nd, there were 1,740; on February 9th, there were 2,548; on February 16th, there were 2,702; on February 23rd, there were 3,239; on March 2nd, there were 2,940; on March 9th, there were 3,703; on March 16th, there were 3,179; on March 23rd, there were 3,140; and on March 30th, there were 2,814. After March 30th they gave notice that the stoneyard was to be closed, and on April 6th there were only 74 men in the yard. As I subsequently commented, it appears inconceivable when the number was reduced from 2,814 to 74 in one week that the balance could "suddenly cease to need relief had their circumstances while receiving it been those of real destitution."

bour yard St. Olave's.

4084. The period at which there was this great contraction of relief was at the end of March and the beginning of April ?—Yes. The frost had broken then; it is only right to say that.

4085. All these men were, I assume, resident in the union ?—They were assumed to be. It is only right to say that the stoneyard was opened in a great hurry, and that when it was first started there was no possibility of making proper investigation and inquiry, and that the provision for overlooking the men and seeing that they did their work was insufficient. My experience of that year, I confess, prejudiced me very greatly against labour yards, doubting as I do their deterrent effect.

jections outdoor our yards.

4086. Would you amplify your objection a little ?—I think they are objectionable in this way. If a stoneyard is opened, as in this case, you almost immediately get a considerable number of what one may call the undesirable class, who are quite content to earn just enough to keep them going for the week and no more; and you cause to be associated with them a more respectable class to whom, I think, association of that kind may be regarded as a hardship; in other words, it is not deterrent to the class of person whom you really wish to deter from receiving relief.

4087. And it is an easy means of subsistence to those who are accustomed to the particular work given to them ? —Yes.

4088. May we take the administration of St. Olave's union as described in your report of 1895-96 as an example of the lax administration of which you disapprove ? —Yes.

4089. Are there any other cases of the same kind ?—In the same year and in the same report, there is a reference to the stoneyard which was opened at West Ham, in which I ascertained that "Of 1,200 men so relieved during the first three months of 1895, 244 had resorted to the stoneyard for a consecutive number of years as follows:—For ten years, four; for nine years, fifty-three; for eight years, twenty-one; for seven years, twenty-five; for six years, fifteen; for five years, thirty-seven; for four years, forty-five; for three years' twenty-seven; and for two years, seven. In more than one instance, three generations, father, son, and grandson were simultaneously receiving relief in this form." My point is that it is not deterrent to the person whom, as I say, you wish to deal with severely, and on the other hand, the decent man with a family and a home hesitates to take advantage of it.

Labour yard at West Ham.

4090. The parishes of Edmonton, Tottenham, and West Ham present some very peculiar features, owing to the rapid growth of population, I believe ?—Yes, the growth of population there is enormous. I cannot speak of Edmonton and Tottenham from personal knowledge, but I know a good deal about West Ham.

4091. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Edmonton and Tottenham are not in your district, I think ?—No, they are not.

4092. (*Chairman.*) In West Ham there is a vast and continuous increase of population, and I understand the great majority of them are practically of the same class ?—Yes. I should imagine that the average income in the West Ham union is lower, probably, than in any other union or parish in my district, with the exception of Poplar, perhaps.

Special difficulties of West Ham.

4093. And the increase of population outruns the increase in the rateable value, does it not ?—I think it does.

4094. Have there been any special difficulties in West Ham in the administration of relief ?—Yes. They have had considerable difficulties for many years, owing mainly to the fact that they have had a rapidly increasing population, of which a considerable percentage, at all events, were of the poorer class—that is, the class who are likely to be more rate-consumers than ratepayers, so to say. They have consequently had a more or less continuously overcrowded workhouse and over-crowded schools. They have now been obliged to resort to a labour yard. Their labour yard is, I think, as well-conducted as a labour yard can be; but even so, as the weeks go by, one sees the numbers so employed increasing. They began, I think, with 500, and the last return showed 940. I have no doubt that, so long as it continues open, the numbers will increase week by week. The difficulty is that their circumstances are such that they find it almost impossible to offer in-door relief to any considerable number.

4095. Being a new district, has it any endowed charities or any large organised charities ?—So far as I am aware, it has comparatively few, but I cannot speak from personal knowledge to that.

4096. If the district is exceptionally poor and that is one contributing cause to its increase in pauperism, is the administration such as you would approve of, or is it in your judgment unduly lax or too rigid ?—It certainly has not been too rigid, and I think it has on occasions been—I will use a tender word, and say over-indulgent; but things are improving there now.

4097. In a very poor district like West Ham, where there is possibly at all times a considerable amount of indigence, I assume that the tendency of the average elector would be, on account of his condition, to elect guardians who would be favourable to rather a generous policy ?—Naturally that is so.

4098. So that you have there two contributing causes—in the first place, you have the natural poverty of the neighbourhood, and in the second place, as a consequence, the tendency of the electorate to return guardians who would be liberal in dealing with the district ?—That is so.

4099. Have you any difficulties in getting boards of guardians like West Ham to accept your advice or to be guided by your suggestions ?—I may say that they listen to my advice and promise consideration; but they do not necessarily follow it. I frequently find, not only in West Ham, but in other districts, that individuals will agree with me in what I think, but collectively they prefer their own methods to mine.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

19 Feb. 1906

4100. Is the public opinion of the locality in favour now of rather a lax administration?—Speaking of West Ham, I think it is a not uncommon story that, when the cost of pauper relief has risen to a very considerable extent, then those who have to pay for it are aroused to a sense of the desirability of some reform; and I think that is beginning to make itself apparent in West Ham.

4101. Let us assume some change is necessary; are there the elements in West Ham which would be strong enough to carry out that change if the district were left to itself?—I should almost think there would be. I think already they have a leavening on the board of people who desire to restrict out-relief and to be more generally discriminating in its administration; but of course at the present moment it is a very difficult thing for anyone to inaugurate reforms there, because there is no doubt a considerable amount of genuine distress owing to the lack of employment.

Other places similarly situated to West Ham.

4102. I take it that the difficulties which have to be faced in West Ham would also be found in places like Tottenham and Edmonton?—I think so.

4103. I suppose we may assume that they are largely due to the fact that they are, so to say, limbs of the metropolis in which a very small proportion of the population are well-to-do people of independent means?—That is so. Both in Poplar and in West Ham it is almost impossible to get accurate statistics, but I imagine there is a larger proportion in both those unions of people whose work is in its very nature casual and intermittent, than probably in any other two areas in my district. The work at the docks is, I believe, in its very essence casual. It depends on the ships that may be there, and so on, and as far as I know the dock companies cannot take on a certain number of men and say, we will give you settled employment for three months, or whatever it may be; it all depends on what work there is to be done.

Casual labour in London.

4104. We hear much of the great amount of casual labour in the metropolis; what forms of work would you classify as casual labour, other than that connected with the docks?—I should say that a great deal of the labour that is employed by borough councils is casual labour. No doubt they have a certain staff permanently employed, but they probably call in to assist their regular staff men who take on jobs when they can get them, and who are not permanently employed.

4105. Is there a large amount of casual labour floating about London in consequence of London having a very great residential well-to-do population?—I think there is no doubt whatever of that.

4106. This sort of labour would, I assume, tend to congregate near to London, where houses were comparatively cheap and where there was a rapid communication between the locality and London?—That would be so. The very fact that London continues to increase in every direction continues to attract a certain number of the class who are known as bricklayers' labourers and so on; and I imagine that very few of those who come to work in London, having once got there, do otherwise than remain.

Difficulties of aggregation round London of large impoverished communities.

4107. Would you say that the creation and development of these large and somewhat exceptionally poor communities outside London is one of the special difficulties in the administration of the Poor Law?—Yes. You may take it that what may be called the marginal unions and parishes in London have an increasing population of greater or less poverty, as the case may be, whereas in the unions and parishes in the centre of London the population, if it does not actually diminish, is stationary, and consequently they have less difficulty in administering the Poor Law. That circumstance shows that figures do not necessarily accurately represent the facts, because in a return which I think Mr. Davy handed in, you will see that the proportion of pauperism to population in the City of London is higher than in any other area in the metropolis; that is because of the small number of the sleeping population. I think the Strand comes next in that respect. They both happen to be unions in the inner circle of the metropolis, with an increasing rateable value, and a population which is either stationary or diminishing.

4108. There are certain parts of London where out-door relief has gone up very much of late, are there not?—Yes. There has been a very considerable increase of relief, for instance, in Poplar.

Increase of out-relief in various part of London

4109. And in other parts of London, too?—Yes. I have a return here for the week ending 3rd February. The total number of persons relieved in the parish of Paddington, both in-door and out-door, was for that week 2,432, as compared with 1,808 in the corresponding period of last year. I expect you will find that the whole of the increase is accounted for by the opening of the labour yard; they have stone-breaking, wood-chopping, and so on there. Assuming there are 200 men in the labour yard, you have generally to multiply that by five for their wives and families, and I think you will find that that will probably account for the increase in Paddington, which we may hope will be temporary.

4110. Are there any other illustrations you would like to give us?—Fulham may be regarded as exemplary, inasmuch as it is one of the few parishes showing a diminution, their total for the week ending 3rd February being 1,820 as compared with 2,122 last year. It is the same with St. George's, the figures being 3,648 this year as compared with 4,012 last year. My own parish, St. Pancras, I see shows a slight increase, namely, 5,924 as against 5,873.

4111. (*Mr. Booth.*) What exactly are the periods compared in those figures?—I am quoting from a return of the number of paupers in London, excluding lunatics in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals, and licensed houses, and patients in the fever and smallpox hospitals under the management of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, on Saturday, 3rd February, 1906, as compared with the total number of paupers of the same class on the corresponding day in 1905. The return says these figures are for the Saturday, but as a matter of fact they are made up on the Friday night. Going down the districts, in the western district you will see there is an increase, while in the northern district there happens to be a slight decrease; then in the central district there is an increase, and also in the eastern district (but not so large as it has been); and for the southern district there is a slight decrease. Poplar, I am sorry to see, has begun to go up again; for three weeks there was a diminution, not only in the numbers week by week, but as compared with the corresponding period last year; this return shows that there are now 400 more of them.

Ratio of in-door to out-door paupers in Poplar and elsewhere.

4112 (*Chairman.*) Just taking Poplar as an instance, what is the number of out-door paupers there as compared with the number of in-door paupers?—There were 3,800 in-door paupers and 7,000 out-door paupers on 3rd February.

4113. That reverses the condition which generally prevails throughout London, where the in-door paupers are double in number those receiving out-door relief, does it not?—Yes. In the great majority of cases in London the in-door numbers exceed the out-door numbers. I do not know whether this would be an opportune time for mentioning it, but it has been suggested, I know, that the practice prevailing in Poplar is calculated to induce people to flock into the district in order to participate in the relief. I have here a return on that point which is not, so to say, up-to-date, as it relates to as long ago as September. The guardians required a return to be got out of those whose families were chargeable to the union on out-door relief during the week ending 30th September, and it works out as follows:—Under one year's residence in the parish, 27 families; under two years' residence, 80 families; under three years' residence, 112 families; under four years' residence, 77 families; under five years' residence, 188 families; under ten years' residence, 511 families: under twenty years' residence, 774 families; under thirty years' residence, 550 families; under forty years' residence, 355 families; under fifty years' residence, 127 families; fifty years' residence and over, 229 families.

Return as to alleged attraction of poor population by la administration in Poplar

4114. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) How was this return tested; was it just made out from these people's own statements?—I do not know; the clerk of the guardians gave it to me.

4115. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) May I say that the information was very carefully tested?—Of course I will take that from you.

4116. (*Chairman.*) The return shows the number of families who were in receipt of relief and the duration of their stay in the borough?—Yes. The point of the return is this—and I am assuming of course that it fairly represents the facts—that out of the total of 3,028 families there were only twenty-seven who had been under one year in the union.

4117. (*Mr. Nunn.*) What would be the general conclusion that you draw from that table?—That though possibly the system may induce persons to remain in the union, so far as it goes it does not indicate any general rush into the union to participate in the relief given, as I think.

4118. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Do they remove from Poplar under the Poor Law Removal Act?—Yes; they have now a special Settlement Committee, which meets every week I think.

4119. (*Dr. Downes.*) Taking that figure which you have just given us of 774 families who had resided you said under twenty years in the union, do you mean that they had resided over ten and under twenty years?—I am afraid I cannot tell you. I read the document as I received it, and in the document it is stated simply as "under twenty." I presume that would include in some cases a residence of eleven years, say. I think you may take it all the way through that it is between the two periods, really.

History of Poplar labour colony at Laindon.

4120. (*Chairman.*) You can give us some information concerning the Poplar farm colony, can you not?—As regards the Laindon colony, for many years past each recurring winter, as most of us know, we have heard the cry of distress through want of employment, and concurrently with that, there have been a number of remedies suggested, but the one more persistently suggested perhaps than any other is summed up under the sentence "Back to the land." Finding that Mr. Fels had offered the Poplar Guardians the use of a farm on what appeared to me to be advantageous terms, that is to say, they did not require any immediate outlay for the site—I thought this was a good opportunity to see whether anything could be done in the direction of getting paupers, or, as we call them, "poor persons," back to the land. On one day in November, 1903, I think it was the 12th, I, Mr. Fels, Mr. Lansbury and one or two other guardians went down to see the farm. The farm is of about 105 acres, and it was then about one-third grass, the rest having been arable, but it was practically derelict. The soil varies from a lightish loam to the very stiffest clay you can conceive. Having seen the farm, and having ascertained what the guardians proposed to do, I thought it was desirable to advise my Board to approve of the experiment. I may say that one thing we found, which is common to many farms in Essex, was that there was a very inadequate water supply. On the farm were certain substantial buildings, such as a very good barn, cow-houses, stables, and the house in which the farmer then lived, which was partly of brick and partly of wood. His wife, who naturally, as far as I could understand, was not very keen about leaving the place, was disposed to give us not the most encouraging account of things generally, and particularly of the water supply. As a matter of fact, there was only a shallow well, and of course what would suit a small family on a farm would not be sufficient for 100 men, we will say. There was the question, how the water should be provided. I said, somewhat rashly perhaps, "We will at all events try and get this farm into the possession of the guardians." I really forget whether I suggested it, or whether it occurred to somebody else at the time, but any way it was decided that by way of supplying themselves with water they should build a dam at the part of the farm which adjoins the railway under which a culvert ran from I think, two or three converging ditches. The erection of this dam provided a good deal of work for the 100 men who were first sent down. I forget exactly when, but in the spring time of 1904, 100 men were sent down to Laindon and were employed in various ways—as I say, a good many of them in making up this dam and a good many others in digging over that part of the land which was suitable for the purpose, but which at the time was over-run with squitch and so on. When exactly it took place I am not sure, but later on they sent down an additional 50 men. The men were housed in iron buildings, which it happened the guardians were able to procure at a reasonable price; one, I think, was on the site of the Poplar and Stepney Asylum, and another happened to be at the time in one of the Government Offices' yards here. By the assistance of Humphreys & Co. we were able to erect buildings sufficient to accommodate 100 men and provide them with day-room accommodation and cooking accommodation also. So they started. Later on, as I say, they sent down fifty men who were being relieved under what is known as the Modified Workhouse Test Order. These men were for the most part housed in the original barn, which was made, in my opinion, quite suitable for that purpose. In May, 1905, twenty of the men left England for Canada. Of course they may come back, but up to the present time as far as I know none has returned. I want to make it clear that the 100 men who were sent down originally were gravitating for the most part into the condition of what is called, "Ins-and-outs." I am prepared to contend that in my opinion, having disposed so far as we know up to date satisfactorily of 20 per cent. of a group of workhouse Ins-and-outs, that is quite sufficient in itself to justify the enterprise as an experiment. It has been suggested to me that they might just as well have walked into Poplar Workhouse and taken the men to Canada out of that, instead of going to the expense of having a farm. I cannot agree to that. My own conviction is that the work they had to do, the air and other things combined, did put into them a certain amount of physical and moral backbone which I feel perfectly satisfied they never could have acquired had they remained in the Poplar Workhouse. So far is good. When we get further I shall have to relate what to me was a most painful experience, and it was disheartening to my mind to the last degree. The guardians were in communication with a man at Evesham—I do not know whether he would object to my using his name, but we will call him Mr. I——who has considerable market gardens in the neighbourhood. He said he would be willing to take half-a-dozen men, selected by the guardians, whom he would be prepared to put to work, and, if they turned out satisfactorily, to permanently employ. They sent six men down, and I confess when I heard that this was going to take place I was very much interested in it and I thought it was, perhaps, the most hopeful thing of the whole scheme. I regret to say that within three or four months all the six men had returned to Poplar. Since they have returned to Poplar, the guardians have dealt with them in a very drastic fashion—I do not know whether it is strictly legal, but I am bound to say that I have considerable sympathy with them; they have absolutely refused them relief of any sort or kind. However, unfortunate as this is it has this advantage, that it teaches us something; that is, that if you are to endeavour to get that class of men back into settled employment on the land, it is necessary to deal with them individually. I say this, because I have read a very interesting Report by one of the guardians on the history of these six men. I am open to correction, but I gathered from that Report that they purposely sent six men down together, because they thought they would feel less strange in a strange village and that companionship might be helpful. It seems that this association, to some degree at all events, led to their general dissatisfaction and ultimate return. I believe their employer said that while they were at work he had nothing to find fault with them as to their capacity for work and so on; but, unfortunately, they no sooner had money in their pockets than they spent it in a way which resulted in their not being as punctual at their work as they ought to have been, and in other ways behaving in an unsatisfactory manner. So as I say, unsatisfactory and disheartening as the experience is, we may learn something from it, as indicating, as has been said more than once, how necessary it is to deal with men of this class individually as far as possible. It further justifies what the Superintendent of the farm said to me when they were first deciding what should be done with the men. He said: "If you are to deal with these men at all it is absolutely necessary to so arrange that they shall be sent somewhere entirely away from their old surroundings; if you do not do that, they will never be able to resist the temptation of reverting to their old habits." One other lesson we have learned and a useful one, as I think, from the farm colony, is that it is quite possible to adequately provide accommodation

Mr. Henry Lockwood.
19 Feb. 1906.

Emigration from farm-colony to Canada.

Experimental drafting on to market gardens of men from farm-colony

Small cost accommodation on farm-colony.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.
19 Feb. 1906.

for healthy, able-bodied men at a cost that works out, I think, to under £14 per bed, instead of spending £140, which is the very least that you can provide a bed at for able-bodied men in workhouses in London. So we have two useful lessons from the Poplar experiment. It is true that they have now down there a certain number of men who have been in receipt of relief in some way or other for some considerable time, and it is difficult to say what can best be done for those men. All that can be said is that at all events they have a better chance, as I think, of reclamation by working at Laindon than they would have had if they had remained in the workhouse at Poplar.

4121. Is the farm colony still going?—Yes.

4122. How long were the men there before they went to Canada?—I think they were there about a year. I believe the majority of them went down in the Spring of 1904 or a little later, and I think they started for Canada under the auspices of the Salvation Army in May, 1905.

4123. Is Laindon the only farm colony connected with the unions of London?—It is the only farm colony that has been attempted so far. Perhaps I ought to say with regard to the dam that it resulted most satisfactorily. They have got a very large tank—I forget how many thousands of gallons it holds—but as a matter of fact they have had a quite adequate supply of water the whole time for 150 men. I should like to emphasise that point about the possibility, as demonstrated by the Laindon farm experiment, of providing quite sufficiently for able-bodied men at a tenth the cost which has ordinarily been found necessary.

Question of dietary at Laindon.

4124. I think your next point is that there is no simple method of checking an extravagant dietary?—Yes. I am quite prepared to take all my share of the responsibility for the dietary at Laindon when it was first started. It has been said that men were bribed to go down to Laindon, because they were going to get such excellent and luxurious food. I was aware of the fact that this dietary was in existence, but the last thing I wished to do at the time was anything which would in any way interfere with the experiment as such, and so it started. As an illustration of how difficult it is when a board of guardians have made up their minds in a certain direction to bring about any alteration, I may mention that there has been a correspondence with regard to this dietary which is not completed now; since February, 1905, there have been letters passing between the Local Government Board and the board of guardians, and when in April the guardians wrote defending their dietary, they were supported, we were told, by the medical officer, who attended the colony, who said that he thought this excessive dietary, as it was considered, was no more than was necessary or reasonable for men working hard, as these men were, in the keen air of Essex. In the meantime I had on two occasions discussed the question with the guardians and the Farm Committee, and, as I think I said just now, I found that individuals agreed with me that they might alter the dietary without doing any particular harm to the men, but that collectively they thought it best to hold to the dietary as it was. I may say, as regards the dietary, that there were certain things that particularly took the public eye. In articles that have been written on the subject in the Press, they have talked about jam and eggs, and have wanted to know what men like those wanted with jam and eggs. It is not for me to say what the nutritive quality of jam as compared with butter or margarine may be, but certainly it is a great deal cheaper. I discovered that only the other day when travelling up from Limehouse with a boy who had been selling newspapers. He told me his mother, his sister, and himself lived together on about 18s. a week. I was returning, as it happens, from the Poplar Workhouse Committee, and I thought I would ascertain something from him about butter. So I asked him: What butter do you eat, or do you eat margarine?—He says, "We don't have no butter at all. We have jam; jam is much cheaper and there is more goodness in it than ever is in butter." I find as a matter of fact, that you can buy very good jam at a price which works out at 4½d. per lb., whereas I believe the cheapest margarine is 6d. To return to the dietary, I have had three discussions on the subject with the Guardians, and I am free to confess to failure to convince them as to the desirability of an alteration. My colleague, Dr. Downes, has recently had an interview with them, and I am inclined to think that probably he will prove successful where I have failed, because he was able to produce a very cogent argument in his own person, as one who for a month had subsisted on food costing him 2½d. a day, without any appreciable harm.

4125. Is the dietary still in force?—Yes, but it has been modified somewhat from its original luxury, as I will call it.

Excess cost of Laindon dietary.

4126. Does it cost the ratepayer much more than the ordinary fare?—It does. The auditor reported that £300 worth of material had been supplied to the inmates or the colonists more than was provided for in the order.

4127. Did the auditor surcharge that?—No, he did not; he reported it. The Board wrote to tell them that under the circumstances, in order to avoid a disallowance they would sanction this excess, but on the understanding that the board of guardians would, with the least possible delay, provide a dietary which should be within the four corners of the order. But I confess, assuming that the auditor later on find it necessary to disallow and surcharge, that I do not know precisely whom he will surcharge. I can only suppose that he will surcharge the superintendent of the branch workhouse for having supplied these goods which were outside the order; but supposing that is the only way, I think it is rather unfair on the superintendent, who cannot very well do otherwise than carry out the instructions he receives from his board. I believe the guardians might be got at, if a resolution were passed determining to continue the dietary which they have been told is not provided for in the order, and that possibly the persons who voted for that resolution might be surcharged with the amount.

General success of Dietaries Order, 1900.

4128. Is this the only case of the kind that you know of?—With regard to the dietary, yes; this is the only case in my experience that we have had any trouble with. The fact is that the new dietary order contains such an enormous number of alternative meals that guardians as a rule, have found no difficulty in providing a dietary suitable for the inmates of their workhouse or other institutions, as the case may be.

4129. And at a moderate cost?—Yes.

Pros and cons of compounding for rates.

4130. I think you wish to say something to us about compounding for rates?—I am afraid I cannot say very much about that. It is a matter that does not ordinarily come within my purview, but I have made inquiries on the subject, and the conclusion that I have arrived at so far, is that the rating authority has to determine by which system it will be likely to recover the larger percentage of its rates. I am speaking here of a subject that I do not pretend to have mastered, and it is only what I have gathered from two or three members of borough councils who know something about the rating in their various areas. It comes to this, that they have to calculate whether it is better to collect from the owner, and pay him or give him a rebate in consideration of the trouble he saves them in making himself responsible for the rates of his property, whether occupied or not; or whether they will increase their staff to an extent which will enable them to collect directly from the tenants themselves. In the latter case, I have no doubt that they will probably miss a good many, because, where you have weekly tenants, it would be almost impossible for collectors to find a large percentage of them at home, say, on the day when they went to collect the rates.

4131. They have only looked at the matter from the point of convenience, and in order to see what the financial effects would be?—Yes.

4132. Have they considered it from the other point, of its effects on the ratepayer?—I think not. I think everybody admits that it would be exceedingly desirable that all persons who have to pay rates, should so pay them that they would have some knowledge of how the rates were going. I have heard two views expressed with regard to compounding. A person who perhaps may be himself an owner of property of this sort will say that in making himself responsible for his property, whether occupied or not, 25 per cent. is not at all an unreasonable rebate, and, as a matter of fact, the tenants, if he raises their rents, know from him that the reason is that the rates have gone up. On the other hand,

we hear it said that if the rates go up 2d., the landlord puts his tenants' rents up 6d. in order to cover that rise.

Proposed extension of scope of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

4133. We have had a good deal of evidence about the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund; are you in favour of extending its operations?—I may say at once that a return which was made out at the instance of the keeper of the Common Poor Fund (a copy of which was, I think, furnished to you by Mr. Davy) seems to me to be conclusive against its being extended to cover out-door relief.

Effect of administration on on pauperism.

4134. Have you anything to add to what you have already said with regard to the effect of administration on pauperism?—No, except that certainly administration has a very considerable deal to do with the amount of the cost of relief—out-door relief particularly.

4135. Putting it the other way, where there has been strict administration in giving relief, have you noticed any untoward consequences?—No, I cannot say I have.

Co-relation between out-door and in-door relief.

4136. Now we come to your next point; an increase of out-door relief in your judgment, I believe, leads to an increase of in-door relief?—Yes, and I have referred to that in one of my reports. It is certainly a mistake to suppose that you will diminish the numbers or the cost of in-door relief by embarking on what one may call a determined out-relief policy; in my experience the tendency is rather the other way.

4137. In close connection with out-door relief is the question of medical relief; on that have you any opinions to express to us?—I am rather sorry now that I mentioned that in my *précis*, because it is really a *fait accompli*. I see that there are proposals now likely to be brought forward to increase the numbers of persons who will be entitled to relief without disfranchisement.

Medical relief as an inducement to pauperism.

4138. In what quarters are those proposals brought forward?—I see from to-day's papers it is intended that legislation, if necessary, is to be proposed, whereby all children attending school are to have medical assistance free of charge. On the question of putting medical relief into a different category to that of ordinary relief, I think everybody who has watched the administration of the Poor Law—and I am thinking more particularly of the country now than of London—knows that the application for medical relief is very often the first step which familiarises the applicant with that sort of dependence which everybody desires should be avoided as far as possible.

4139. May I assume that the thread by which people are drawn into becoming in-door paupers is, first, medical relief, and then out-door relief, and that the increase of the first leads to an increase of the second, and, in your judgment, to an increase of the third?—I accept that. I think you may put it in that way.

Fittings of Poor Law infirmaries.

4140. Have you anything to say as regards the fittings and establishment of Poor Law infirmaries?—Yes. In my reports I have said that the arrangements for the medical attendance and the nursing and the surroundings generally of a Poor Law infirmary are as good as in many, if not most, of the public hospitals. There has no doubt been a tendency of late years, particularly where, as in many cases, the infirmary is entirely separate from the workhouse, to dissociate relief in the infirmary from all connection with Poor Law relief. Although strictly speaking, in-door medical relief disfranchises—or I thought it did—equally with relief in the workhouse, it seems, from information I have had recently, that whether or no relief in an infirmary should disfranchise, depends a good deal upon the view taken by the revising barrister for the time being. No doubt there are instances in which the revising barrister has allowed the vote of a person who was actually receiving medical relief in the infirmary.

Revising barristers' divergent views as to disfranchisement by medical relief.

4141. I understand you are in favour of classification, but that your idea is that classification should be by institutions and not within the institutions themselves?—I think in reply to that, it would be sufficient for me to refer you to what I have said in my reports, extracts from which I put in (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (A).)

Proposed classification of institutions in London.

4142. Assuming that your idea of classification by institutions were to be adopted, would it not be necessary in London to increase the unit of area?—Not necessarily, I think. My idea would be that in any new scheme for classification you should provide, what certainly does not exist now, suitably equipped institutions, to which you would send the so-called able-bodied, and that in those institutions means should be provided for what I may call graduated tasks of work.

4143. Assuming the unions were to remain of the same size as they are now, would that not necessitate in certain unions the erection of fresh buildings?—Yes.

Instances in London of workhouses for more than one union.

4144. Whereas if you combine two or three unions, they would in the aggregate have enough buildings?—Certainly; and that would be my idea. There is a scheme on foot now promoted by the St. Olave's guardians for accommodation of that sort. My idea originally was that there might be, we will say, three workhouses of that sort, providing two for the south of London and one for the east and north-east, and that they would be jointly managed by the guardians who would be sending paupers to them. I am bound to say that my experience of combinations of that sort has not been a very happy one, that a single board will, as a rule, manage their affairs better than a joint board. I may say that I had almost achieved what I desired as an experiment some years ago, when the Hackney Guardians were about to build their new workhouse. I got them to promise that they would provide something rather more than they would want for their own particular needs, with a view to their receiving from the other unions paupers of that class, just as the Kensington test workhouse, as it was called, used to receive cases. But unfortunately it fell through. They found that it would cost them a good deal too much money, and so it has never taken place. I think that probably the only way in which provision for the able-bodied of that sort could be made would be by a combination or grouping of unions and parishes together.

Proportion of genuinely "able-bodied" paupers.

4145. I think you do not quite agree with the existing definition of "able-bodied"?—I do not object to it, because I think perhaps it is desirable that it should be retained, but I think that to the ordinary public it is misleading. I have not had occasion to get particulars recently, but it is conceivable that at present we might here and there find in workhouses a larger percentage than usual of really able-bodied men, because of the fact that there is a good deal of genuine difficulty in getting employment in London. On all ordinary occasions I believe that my estimated percentage of the actually able-bodied amongst those classed as able-bodied is not too low.

4146. And that percentage is what?—That is about 5 per cent.

4147. That is to say, only 5 per cent. of those returned as able-bodied are in your judgment really able-bodied?—Yes. I am basing this view on my experience of what number of the able-bodied class the medical officers of workhouses in London would agree to certify, as men to go to the Kensington test workhouse where they had only one task, breaking stones, for instance. I take it that a man to break stones must be able-bodied.

Children comprised in statistics as to "able-bodied."

4148. Is it not the case that in the statistics of out-door relief an able-bodied man's children count as able-bodied?—Yes.

4149. But in the statistics of in-door relief they would be classified separately?—Yes.

4150. So that your 5 per cent. is the actual number of able-bodied individuals in the class?—Yes. With regard to the nature of the task, my own conviction is that you do not require a very severe task for dealing with the class of person whom you wish to protect against himself. All you want is something which will keep him continually employed.

Return as to ins-and-outs in certain London unions.

4151. I think now you have a return of the in-and-out paupers that you wish to hand in?—Yes. I have here three lists relating to Poplar, the City of London, and Kensington, of persons who may be fairly called In-and-out paupers, because they are persons who the guardians have by resolution declared shall give 168 hours' notice before they are allowed to leave the workhouse. The return which I have for the City of London is a comparatively old return, inasmuch as it relates to 1901. To show that Ins-and-outs are not all necessarily young and able-bodied people, I might mention that this list for the City of London contains the names of persons aged respectively 68, 38, 66, 66, 69, 55, 71, 66, 57, 66, 66, 54, 72, 72, 41, 81, 64, 66, 58, 77, 74, 69, 33, 53, 67 and 28. The poor

Mr. Henry Lockwood.
19 Feb. 1906.

person who was 81 was Julia Blumsun; she is since deceased, but in that one year she had been in-and-out 163 times. Out of the number on this return I think only five were under 50 years of age. The Poplar returns show a somewhat younger set of people. The following are the ages of the men in the Poplar Workhouse this month, who are required to give 168 hours' notice prior to discharge: 40, 49, 58, 41, 39, 46, 58, 54, 55, 56, 34, 24, 48, 38, 53, 58, 23, 55, 34, 49, 24 and 43. The one who was aged 40 has been in the house since 1884, and in the course of that time he has been in-and-out 593 times. The third return that I have is from Kensington, and on that list the youngest is 47 years of age and the oldest is 79, and she is a woman who has been in-and-out twelve times during the year ended Midsummer, 1905.

Case of chronic "in-and-out" pensioner pauper at Kensington.

4152. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Have you got any other In-and-out return?—Those are the only ones I have, but if you give me time I could get returns from every one of the workhouses and will put in a Summary.* Might I before leaving this subject mention a case which is certainly not singular, though I do not say it is typical. It is the case of a man whose initials are C. D. He is a pensioner in receipt of 12s. 10d. a week. He is a Roman Catholic and has two children, and he or his children have been in-and-out of the Kensington workhouse eight times since the 5th August. As his children are Catholics they have to be sent to the Roman Catholic schools, and the cost of sending them and fetching them to and from the schools on the several occasions has amounted to £4 8s. 1½d. There are not a few cases of that sort where men trade upon the condition of things in this way—they come in-and-out practically as they like, and give an immense deal of trouble, and cause a great deal of expense to the particular union or parish in which they happen to be settled.

4153. (*Chairman.*) That man you say is in receipt of a pension?—He is in receipt of a pension of 12s. 10d. I may say that I suggested to the clerk that, inasmuch as in other cases they have attached the pension—and they do attach a portion of this man's pension—the question was whether they ought not in the interests of the children to adopt them under the recent Act; but I gathered from him that they had at present not sufficient evidence before them, in their opinion, to justify them in doing it.

4154. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is he able-bodied?—Yes.

4155. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is he a widower?—No, he is not a widower. His wife is living, but apart.

4156. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Did she leave the children in his care?—I do not know the particulars, but she left him, and the children have been with him since.

4157. (*Chairman.*) If you could find us three or four more such cases it would be very instructive?—I will endeavour to do so.†

THIRTEENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 20th February, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. THOMAS PITTS, C.B., recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Thomas Pitts, C.B.
20 Feb. 1906.

Departments of Local Government Board dealing with audit questions.

4158. (*Chairman.*) We are anxious to have some evidence as regards the supervision of the audit of Poor Law accounts; I understand that you have the general superintendence of the departments which deal with matters arising out of the audit of those accounts?—Yes. This business forms part of the work of two separate departments of the Local Government Board. I say it is part of their work, because the business is not confined to the accounts of Poor Law authorities, but extends to the accounts of all other authorities under audit by the district auditors appointed by the Local Government Board.

4159. I suppose in certain cases that that includes municipal accounts?—It includes the accounts of boroughs under the Education Acts in all cases, and in a few cases it includes all the accounts of a municipal corporation.

4160. Perhaps you will explain shortly what is the nature of the business of each of these two departments?—Generally speaking, one of them deals with the auditors' reports as to the manner in which the accounts are kept and as to irregularities on the part of the accounting officers. It also deals with all questions as to the form in which the acounts are or should be kept, and further, it checks the work of the auditors, so as to secure that all accounts are duly audited at the proper time. The other department conducts the correspondence as to the appeals to the Board against disallowances or surcharges and allowances by the auditors in the accounts audited; it also deals with applications under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, 1887, for the sanction of the Board to expenditure, so that it may not be disallowed by the auditor at the audit. That, briefly, is a statement of the respective duties of the two departments I have referred to.

Return of number of disallowances and surcharges made by auditors.

4161. Do the auditors make many disallowances or surcharges in the accounts of Poor Law officers?—I have had a statement prepared on that subject, relating to three years. It gives the number of disallowances and surcharges in the accounts of the Boards of Guardians and their officers. I find that last year the auditors disallowed or surcharged 432 items in these accounts, 230 of them being in the accounts of officers; in the year 1904, there were 555 such items, of which 296 were in the accounts of officers; and, going back ten years, to 1894, in that year the number of items disallowed or surcharged

* Summary subsequently sent. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (C).)

† Mr. Lockwood in a subsequent communication stated that "further inquiry, I am glad to say, has not furnished any other cases of pensioner 'Ins-and-Outs' with families."

was 427, and 256 of those were in the accounts of officers. The number does not seem very large when one considers that there are upwards of 650 unions, and that the number of accounting officers is probably over 4,000.

ifference tween dis- owance d - charge.

4162. What is the technical difference between a disallowance and a surcharge?—A disallowance is the striking out of an illegal item, or of expenditure that has been incurred without proper authority. A surcharge is the charging of a certain person with an amount that has been disallowed, or an amount that has been lost through his negligence or misconduct, such as failure to collect a sum that was due.

4163. If a sum is disallowed, somebody has to pay it?—Usually, that is so. The disallowance would be followed by a surcharge in the case of an illegal payment having been authorised by a member or members of a local authority.

e sequelæ a disallow- ce.

4164. But a disallowance is not always followed by a surcharge is it?—Not always. I may give one instance. It is not followed by a surcharge in the case of an officer's account, as the effect of disallowing a payment is to increase the balance against the officer; in other words, the effect of striking out an item of payment entered in the account increases the balance which is due from the officer. The term "surcharge" is not applied to a case like that.

4165. (*Miss Hill.*) It is practically the same thing, though done under another name?—In effect that is so; but I was asked for a definition of the technical terms, and the technical term "surcharge" does not apply in the case mentioned.

4166. (*Chairman.*) In the case where a disallowance takes place, and there is no surcharge, I gather that they could settle amongst themselves as to who is to pay?—There might be an appeal against such a disallowance.

4167. I am assuming that there is no appeal?—If there is no appeal, the amount has to be paid as required by statute. There are many cases in which the amount is paid—in fact it is paid in the majority of cases.

4168. (*Mr. Bentham.*) May not the officer continue to owe the amount until he either dies or leaves the service?—No. I will read you the statutory provision on the subject: "The person from whom any money is certified to be due shall, within seven days, pay or cause to be paid such money to the treasurer of the guardians of the union or parish."

4169. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) But supposing he does not pay?—Then the auditor takes proceedings to enforce payment.

4170. Against whom?—Against the person from whom the money is due.

4171. Supposing the guardians write it off?—This would be illegal. They would probably put themselves in the position of being surcharged for doing so.

4172. What would happen then?—In that case proceedings could be taken by the auditor against the guardians to enforce the surcharge.

mber and eral result ppeals to al vernment rd against litors' isions.

4173. (*Chairman.*) Are there many appeals against the auditor's decision?—I have taken out the figures for the same years that I mentioned just now. In respect of the disallowances or surcharges made in 1905, fifty-six appeals have been received from guardians, and a few more may come in; in 1904 there were sixty-nine appeals from guardians, and in 1894 there were fifty-eight such appeals. It will be seen from these figures that rather more than a fourth of the total number of disallowances and surcharges in the guardians' accounts were appealed against.

4174. And the appeal is to whom?—To the Local Government Board.

4175. Or to a Court, I presume?—The appeal may be to the High Court, but I am dealing now with the number of the appeals that have been made to the Local Government Board. In regard to the disallowances in the accounts of officers of the guardians, there were fifty-six appeals against last year's disallowances, and there may be a few more to come; in 1904 there were fifty-five such appeals, and in 1894, fifty-seven. These numbers amount to rather more than a fifth of the total number of these disallowances and surcharges.

4176. What was the result of those appeals?—In the great majority of cases the auditor's decision was found to be correct in point of law, but usually the Board considered that it was fair that the disallowance or surcharge should be remitted. I will read the enactment under which the Board exercise the power of remission. Sec. 4 of the Poor Law Audit Act, 1848, provides as follows:—If the Board "shall find that any disallowance or surcharge shall have been or shall be lawfully made, but that the subject matter thereof was incurred under such circumstances as make it fair and equitable that the disallowance or surcharge should be remitted, they may, direct that the same shall be remitted, upon payment of the costs, if any, which may have been incurred by the auditor or other competent authority in the enforcing of such disallowance or surcharge."

Statutory authority for Board's power to remit disallowance or surcharge on appeal.

4177. (*Mr. Booth.*) Are the appeals made always in the first place to the Board and only afterwards to the Court, or are they made in the first place to the Court?—It is an alternative appeal; there is not an appeal first to the Local Government Board and afterwards to the Court on the same disallowance.

Alternative appeal to High Court or Local Government Board.

4178. (*Chairman.*) It is not a duplicate appeal, then?—No, it is not.

4179. (*Mr. Booth.*) Were there many appeals to the Courts, alongside of these appeals to the Local Government Board which you have mentioned?—Speaking from memory, I should say there has not been an appeal to the Court in a case of a disallowance or surcharge in the accounts of guardians for twenty years or more. Quite recently there was an appeal raising a question with regard to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, but the decision of the auditor appealed against in that case was rather different in character from the decisions that I have been referring to just now.

Infrequency of appeals to High Court.

4180. (*Chairman.*) There is another gentleman at the Local Government Board who has to do with audits, and who, I understand, is Inspector of Audits, namely, Mr. Burd?—Yes.

Functions of Inspector of Audits.

4181. Where do his duties end and yours begin? Can you draw a line between the two?—He superintends the actual work of the auditors in examining the accounts. One of his duties is to visit the auditors at their work; he goes to all parts of the country and sees the actual work of audit in progress.

4182. He is therefore responsible, I suppose, for the decisions that are made?—No.

4183. Is it only the auditor who is responsible for the decisions at the audit?—Yes.

4184. Does the appeal come up through the Inspector of Audits?—No

4185. Does it come to you?—It is addressed to the Local Government Board, and is dealt with, as I have said, in one of the departments which are under my supervision.

4186. I take it that the inspector is really what I may call the chief executive officer of the Audit Staff and you are the officer of the Local Government Board to whom the appeals come?—The reports of the auditors also come to me through one of the departments referred to. Mr. Burd superintends the staff of auditors, but not the work of these departments.

4187. Therefore, as regards the actual working of the audit, Mr. Burd will be able to give us more direct evidence than you can?—As to the actual working of the audit on the spot, certainly.

4188. You have told us that in certain cases the surcharges and disallowances are remitted; do the sums that are surcharged or disallowed vary very much?—Yes; they range from very small sums to rather large sums.

Variations in amount of items disallowed or surcharged.

4189. It is very difficult, I suppose, to enforce a surcharge if the sum involved is of great amount?—The Board have declined to remit in some cases where large sums have been in question. I might mention a recent case; I think one example will be sufficient to illustrate what I mean. The guardians of the Oldham union incurred

Refusal to remit disallowance in Oldham case.

Mr. Thomas Pitts, C.B.

20 Feb. 1906.

law expenses amounting to over £500 in resisting actions brought against them by collectors of poor rates for their salaries as approved by the Local Government Board, which the guardians had refused to pay. The auditor surcharged the amount of those costs to the guardians on the ground that the actions were improperly defended ; the Board upheld the surcharge and refused to remit it. The guardians, therefore, in that case had to find the money, amounting to something over £500.

Source from which surcharge paid.

4190. Did they have to find it individually among themselves ?—How they found it I do not know, but they had to pay it.

4191. Was it paid out of the rates ?—No. They would have no right to do that.

Persons against whom surcharge can be made and questions arising from practice followed.

4192. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Whom do they surcharge ; is it the whole of the guardians, or only those who sign the cheque for the improper payment ?—I have not a note of the course that the auditor took in that particular case, but I have an impression that he surcharged all the guardians who were responsible for the payment that was made.

4193. Would that be the case in the event of payment having been made by a cheque signed by two of the guardians and the clerk ?—Usually in a case like that the auditor surcharges those members of the authority who signed the cheque. But he is not limited to that procedure ; he may select any members of the authority who have been responsible for the payment—who either have directed the payment or authorised it—and surcharge them.

4194. Then in the case I put, the two who signed the cheque and the clerk would be liable in the first instance ? —Not the clerk.

4195. Is he, being an officer, specially exempt ?—Yes.

4196. Could the two who signed the cheque in that event have recourse against the whole of the guardians, or how is it worked out ?—That is a point that does not come before the Local Government Board. I am not prepared to express an opinion on the question whether there is a legal remedy against the rest of the guardians

4197. Has there been any complaint by those guardians who have signed cheques merely as a matter of machinery to carry out the resolution of the board of guardians to make a certain payment ? Has there been no protest, if they were the people who were found liable ? —I have heard of complaints of that kind being made.

4198. But you do not know with what result ?—We do not know how they adjust matters in a case of that sort. An intimation has been given to the auditors that so far as practicable, they are to avoid any cause of complaint of that kind by selecting as large a number of guardians to surcharge as they can.

4199. Has the question of the liability of the whole board of guardians for the action of the two who formally signed the cheque never been settled ?—It has not come before the Local Government Board to be settled, so far as I am aware.

4200. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Does not a greater responsibility rest on those who vote in favour of such a resolution, than on those who may have voted against it ? Supposing one member had voted against the illegal expenditure, would he not be less responsible than those who had voted in favour of it ?—Before making a surcharge the auditor gives notice to the persons whom he proposes to surcharge, and those persons can attend the audit and show cause against being surcharged.

Notice of surcharge to persons concerned.

4201. Would that be a valid cause ?—I should say that an auditor who had before him a guardian who showed that he had objected to the payment being made, would probably not surcharge that person.

4202. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) He would not be responsible because he would not have authorised the payment ; would that not be so ?—Yes, but there have been cases where a guardian has said that he signed the cheque by inadvertence, and that he had been opposed to the expenditure. I understood the question to relate to such a case.

Liability of guardian who had not voted for the payment disallowed.

4203. Mr. Nunn's point is that, where a payment is proposed to be made and a guardian votes against it, therefore, he did not authorise that payment, because he voted against its being made ; in that case he would not be surcharged, would he ?—Not if he had not signed the cheque.

4204. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I would put it, even although as a matter of routine he had been one of the guardians who signed the cheque ?—I thought that was the point in your mind. I answered the question on that assumption.

Auditor's procedure hearing cause against disallowance or surcharge.

4205. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is it not the fact that on these appeals to the auditor, the auditor simply does not hear anything, that is to say, it is only a matter of form to appeal to the auditor ? The auditor sends out a notice, and says, if you want to appeal against it, you can appear before me on such and such a day ; but is it not the fact that he simply does not hear what the people say ? He tells them, I think, so and so, and there is an end of it. He has surcharged, and no matter what they say, that is his decision ?—I should be surprised to hear that that was so ; but as I have already intimated, I do not attend the audits, and therefore, I do not exactly know what takes place at them.

4206. (*Chairman.*) Mr. Burd could explain to us the actual working of the audit, and what is done at the audit ?—Yes ; he could tell you what the auditor does during the course of the audit.

Auditor's duty as to contracts.

4207. Perhaps you could answer this one question : Do the auditors look into contracts ?—It is part of their duty to do so.

Limited powers of High Court on appeal against auditor's decisions.

4208. If an appeal is made to a court of law, I suppose the question simply is whether or not the action taken by the auditor is legal ?—Yes ; the court has power to determine the question of legality.

4209. Has it no power of remission ?—It has no power of remission.

Auditor's practice as regards contracts.

4210. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) You say that it is part of the auditor's duty to look into contracts ; would you kindly tell us a little more in detail what that means ?—I think you had better put that question to Mr. Burd when he comes to give evidence. He is in a better position than I am to inform the Commission about what takes place at the audits. I may say that it is the duty of the auditor to see that the amount that the guardians have paid is not excessive.

4211. Assuming that he discovered that an excessive price had been paid for a commodity needed for the workhouse, would he be justified in surcharging the board with having made an extravagant contract ?—If he was satisfied that the price was an excessive price, I think he would be justified in doing so.

4212. This is a most serious point. Is that often or seldom the cause of surcharge, or have you never known it done ?—Judging from the appeals I have seen, I should say that it is an objection that is not often taken.

Objections to yearly audit of guardians' accounts.

4213. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the keeping of accounts, the union accounts are now made up half-yearly, to March 25 and September 29 ; is there any reason why those accounts should not be brought into line with the other accounts of other local bodies which are made up to the end of March each year ?—This could not be done under the existing law. The making up of the accounts annually would increase the difficulties of the auditors in finishing their audits within a reasonable time after the end of the period for which the accounts are made up. I think that is the chief administrative objection to the suggested change from a system of half-yearly accounts to a system of yearly accounts made up to March 31.

4214. Is that purely on the ground that it would take them longer to audit the books ?—No ; it is on the ground that the auditor's whole time is taken up with the auditing of the accounts of the authorities in his district. If he has to do the work within the year and all the accounts are annual accounts, nearly a year may elapse before some of the accounts will be audited.

4215. Does that not always apply to the last half-year ? —The interval does not exceed eight or nine months at the outside, I think.

4216. If it does not take any longer to audit the accounts for a year, then they would not be longer in going round from one union to another ; so that it would not delay matters if the accounts were audited for the twelve

months ending March any longer than they are delayed now when the accounts are audited for the half-year ending March?—But under the existing arrangement one half-year's accounts would have been audited in the meantime.

4217. Unless it takes longer to do the whole year, that would not make any difference; and I take it that it would not occupy much more time to audit a year's accounts than a half-year's accounts?—My point is that if you have the accounts audited for a half-year, the auditor will audit the accounts from March to September, before the end of the year, and the next audit will be of the accounts for the half-year from September to March. As you suggest, I think that there may be a delay of perhaps eight months in auditing those accounts; it may be so, but meanwhile the accounts for the first half-year will have been audited.

4218. I do not suggest that there would be any delay; I suggest that they might be made up to the end of March each year, and then there would be no more delay than there is at the present time in finally making up the books for the year?—We will assume that the accounts are all made up for a year to March 31, say, in the year 1905; the auditor has to complete the audit of those accounts before March 31, 1906. That being so, some of those accounts will remain unaudited until the latter part of March, 1906, and there will be just upon twelve months' interval between the date to which the accounts have been made up and the date on which they will be audited.

4219. Does that not apply to other local bodies—the education authorities, for instance?—It does apply to some of those whose accounts are made up annually; but it would apply, still more so, I think, if the auditor were not enabled to get on with the audit of some of the authorities' accounts in the first half-year and do half of the work then.

Probability of action being taken on report of Committee on Workhouse Accounts.

4220. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) I think there was a Departmental Committee on Workhouse Accounts, was there not, some three years ago?—Yes.

4221. They presented a report, did they not?—Yes.

4222. Is there any probability of that report being acted upon in any way, as regards the simplification of workhouse accounts, for example?—I think many of the officers thought the system recommended in the report would not be a simplification, and there has certainly been considerable objection to the carrying out of the recommendations of the report. At the same time, the matter has not been lost sight of, and I hope that before long, something may be done in the way of reducing the amount of book-keeping.

4223. There are a good many boards of guardians and inspectors, are there not, who recommend a simplification of some of the workhouse accounts if possible?—I think there has been reason for simplification since the issue of the Workhouse Regulation Dietaries and Accounts Order, 1900, which required the keeping of some additional books. It was intended, when that order was issued, that it should be followed by another dealing more comprehensively with the question of book-keeping.

4224. Do you anticipate that some action in that direction may be taken shortly?—I hope so.

4225. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) In England it is the auditor who has the power to surcharge, I gather?—Yes.

Power of Scottish Local Government Board to surcharge.

4226. In Scotland it is the Local Government Board who have the power to surcharge. I should like to ask you whether you know of cases where boards of guardians have resented this power which the auditor has, or whether you have found it work, in your experience, quite smoothly so far as boards of guardians are concerned?—The Local Government Board have received representations that irritation has been caused by some of the disallowances and surcharges made by the auditors.

Results and working of English system.

4227. But, on the whole, would you say that the system works well, so far as you are aware?—I should like to see the number of disallowances and surcharges reduced. I think that sometimes the auditors make disallowances and surcharges that we should be glad to see not made. One way of avoiding such cases is by resort to the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, 1887. The number of disallowances has no doubt been considerably reduced since that Act was passed.

The Local Authorities (Expenses) Act.

4228. That is an Act which I think empowers the Local Government Board to sanction certain expenditure?—Yes.

4229. Where it has been disallowed?—No, but in order to prevent its being disallowed. If the Local Government Board have sanctioned expenditure, the auditor cannot disallow it. I think in England that rather takes the place of the Scottish procedure; I should say it is probably the better plan in the case of England.

4230. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Does that Act apply, unless the guardians ask specially for the sanction of the Local Government Board?—It has been considered that there must be an application from the guardians or their officer.

4231. (*Mr. Bentham.*) That is, for a sanction to the expenditure?—Yes. If the auditor takes objection to an item of expenditure on the ground that it was illegally incurred, then, if application is made to the Local Government Board before the audit closes and the Board sanction the expenditure, the auditor passes it as a matter of course.

Number of disallowances and surcharges reversed on appeal.

4232. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Are there any figures showing what proportion of those disallowances and surcharges are reversed by the Local Government Board, as distinguished from remitting them?—I find that in 1904 there were seventeen decisions of the Auditors reversed on appeal, fifteen in the accounts of guardians and two in the accounts of officers of the guardians.

4233. Could you say whether a considerable proportion is remitted?—I do not find that I have the number of the cases in which remission was refused, but as I think I have already stated, remission is granted in the great majority of cases.

Practice as to remission.

Number and nature of sanctions given under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act.

4234. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) As regards the power which the Local Government Board have to sanction expenditure, can you tell us generally in what circumstances that sanction is given?—It is difficult to describe the cases generally: the number of cases is large, and they vary much in character. Naturally, they are cases in which remission would be granted, if a disallowance were made.

4235. Could you give us the number?—I can give you the number, but the circumstances vary so much that it would be difficult to tell you the kind of case in a brief answer to a question.

4236. What is the number of cases in which sanction has been granted in the terms of the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act?—The number of items in the Poor Law accounts of guardians and their officers which were sanctioned last year was 653; in the previous year, 655, and in 1894, 499.

4237. Were those cases where the expenditure probably would have been held to be illegal, but for this sanction which was given by the Local Government Board?—Yes. It may be assumed that in most of them the auditors would have disallowed the expense as illegal. The sanction is often given after the expense has been incurred—after the payment has been made, in fact.

4238. Does that not go to show that the fact of the Local Government Board having that power must tend to make a local authority less careful as to its expenditure?—I cannot say that it does. The Local Government Board are not bound to give these sanctions any more than they are to remit disallowances.

Continuing expenditure not sanctioned under Local Authorities (Expenses) Act.

4239. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It is the practice, is it not, of the Local Government Board to refuse to continue to sanction expenditure under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, supposing the expenditure itself is continued?—Yes.

4240. Therefore that acts as a deterrent to the local authority not to renew it?—Certainly.

Refusal of guardians to sign cheques as a result of surcharge.

4241. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) With reference to the surcharging, has any difficulty been experienced in getting members of a Board to sign cheques, because of the liability that they may incur in that way?—I remember one case in which a local authority was at first rather irritated at the auditor's action, and passed a resolution that they would not sign cheques, but I think that resolution was soon withdrawn, and the Local Government Board heard no more of the matter.

Mr. Thomas Pitts, C.B.

20 Feb. 1906.

4242. Is that the only instance within your knowledge?—I only remember one instance of the kind.

Nature of regulations for auditors.

4243. (*Chairman.*) Are the regulations under which the auditors carry out their duties embodied in Acts of Parliament?—In the case of the accounts of guardians, they are partly contained in the regulations of the Local Government Board and partly prescribed by statute.

4244. Of course the Local Government Board have no power of revising that part of the regulations which is contained in the statutes?—No; they can supplement the statutory provisions, but they cannot revise them.

Question of over-technical nature of audit.

4245. Do you think that the provisions under which the auditors have to work are too technical? I put that question because you stated that you would like to see less surcharges. In your judgment, do the auditors make too technical a use of their power?—There has been a tendency in that direction, I think, in some cases. It is difficult, however, to leave a discretion with the auditors, because if that were done, one auditor would probably act on one view and others on another.

4246. Put it in another way; assuming that the audit is a check on extravagant and improper expenditure, do you think the audit could still be made effective if some of the more technical parts of the regulations were relaxed?—Yes; I think that perhaps an extension of the principle of the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act might be found workable and might be desirable.

Proposed differentiation between technical and other surcharges.

4247. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Could there not be a simple division made between the purely technical surcharges and those of other kinds, so that the technical surcharges might be remitted almost as a matter of course without going through all the formalities that would be necessary in the case of the other surcharges?—I am in favour of something of that kind being done, but it is the fact that most of the cases of the kind that you have indicated are met by the sanctions given under the Local Authorities (Expenses) Act. If an auditor comes across an item the objection to which is purely technical, he probably makes arrangements for an application to be made to the Local Government Board for their sanction before he concludes the audit.

4248. Have you any particulars as to the number of technical surcharges that have gone through the whole range of surcharge, remission, etc.?—There is no record kept in which the cases are distinguished in that way, so I am afraid I cannot give you the number.

4249. (*Chairman.*) A surcharge or a disallowance ought to be a rather serious matter, ought it not?—Yes.

4250. Would you think that the gravity of a surcharge or a disallowance is somewhat diminished by its being occasionally made on purely technical grounds?—That is my own opinion.

4251. Therefore I assume that you would be in favour, if it were practicable, of some revision of the regulations?—Yes.

4252. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) But it does not depend entirely on the regulations of the Board, does it?—No. I am assuming that the Chairman in referring to the regulations meant to include those contained in the statute as already mentioned.

4253. (*Chairman.*) Inasmuch as a portion of the regulations are statutory, it would not be in the power of the Local Government Board at present to make any such revision?—There must be an amendment of the law in order to enable the statutory provisions to be relaxed.

Object and scope of Local Authorities (Expenses) Act.

4254. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The Local Authorities (Expenses) Act was really intended, was it not, to meet that sort of difficulty Mr Bentham refers to, namely, where there was a technical objection and not a substantial objection to the payment, that then the auditor might report to the Board that there was this technical defect—we will suppose that some formality had not been observed—and then that on the application for the Board's sanction the sanction might be given, and all the expenditure following on a disallowance might be avoided. That was the very object of the Act, was it not?—That is my impression, and certainly the Act has been administered as if that had been its object.

4255. (*Mrs. Webb.*) The Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, as I understand, does not apply at all to continued new expenditure which has become obviously necessary, but which is not sanctioned by law; or has there been such a case of continued new expenditure which has been sanctioned under the Act?—The Local Government Board have considered that the Act was not intended to authorise them to give repeated sanctions, so as to enable illegal expenditure to be continued. They would sanction the expenditure on the first occasion in order that there might not be a disallowance or surcharge, but after that they would not continue to sanction similar expenditure.

4256. (*Chairman.*) Are there special regulations as regards Poor Law administration which are not applicable to other local authorities?—Yes. I think Mr. Burd has included them in a memorandum which has been printed.

4257. Does he as Inspector of Audits deal with local authorities other than Poor Law authorities?—Yes. Nearly all of the auditors who audit the accounts of the guardians audit the accounts of other local authorities also.

4258. Then we shall get that information direct from him?—Yes.

4259. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Could you tell us how long it takes for an average audit in a big London union?—I think that is a question you had better put to Mr. Burd, who is responsible for seeing how the auditors occupy their time.

4260. That would show whether the audit was a real audit?—Do you mean whether the auditors spend enough time on their work?

4261. Whether they have enough time to go through all the out-relief books, the house books, and the expenditure generally?—I think you must ask Mr. Burd all such questions, please.

Auditor's discretion to surcharge whole board of guardians.

4262. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In cases in which fraud is discovered on the part of officials, is the board ever surcharged?—That would depend upon whether the board of guardians had been so lax as to facilitate the fraud.

4263. It would be within the judgment of the auditor then?—If he thought that the misappropriation of money had been due to laxity on the part of the officers' employers, I think he might consider the question of surcharging them.

4264. Is that frequent?—No, I should say not.

4265. You do not go beyond the officer?—Generally speaking, in the case of a guardians' officer the auditor does not go beyond him.

Return as to result of disallowance and surcharges in Poor Law accounts.

4266. (*Mr. Bentham.*) According to the report of the Local Government Board for 1904-05, there were last year 1,654 disallowances and surcharges made in the accounts of the boards of guardians and assistant overseers; could we have any return as to how those 1,654 items were actually dealt with, showing what proportion of them were technical?—Do you mean a return showing the course taken in individual cases?

Cases of payment of disallowance without appeal.

4267. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You could not give the subjects unless there was an appeal made?—I can give the number of cases in which the disallowance or surcharge was satisfied by payment without appeal, but the Department may not have details as to the subjects in those cases. Taking the 202 cases in which disallowances and surcharges in the accounts of the guardians were reported as made during last year, the items were paid in 146 cases without an appeal to the Local Government Board, and so the matter never came before the Board in 146 cases. It was admitted apparently in those cases that the auditor's objection could not be appealed against, and the amount that he certified to be due was accounted for.

4268. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Can you give the amounts in the 146 cases you have mentioned where the people have paid up without any trouble?—The total amount was £1,278.

4269. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Could you tell us what is the nature of the payments that have been held to be illegal, so far as they have come before the Board?—Yes, in the 56 cases in which there were appeals.

4270. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) What would be the total amount that was remitted?—The fifty-six appeals related

to a sum of £919, but I cannot say at this moment what the disallowances and surcharges remitted amounted to.

4271. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is there not a book published called "Casson's Local Government Board Appeals," which gives all the appeals and the circumstances?—I think that the firm of Knight & Co. did start a publication of that kind, but I do not know whether it has been kept up. The publication is, of course, not an official one.

turn as to ult of peals to cal vernment ard.

4272. (*Chairman.*) Would you try to give us the best return you can. There will be no difficulty, I understand, at all about the cases on which there was an appeal?—There will be no difficulty in regard to those cases, because the Local Government Board have a record of every case in which an appeal is received.

4273. You might put the information in two or three columns showing the amount, the nature of the appeal, and the decision; and if you could supplement that by a short statement showing the total amount of the disallowances and surcharges against which there was no appeal, and noting anything remarkable about any of them, I think that would add to the value of the return?—I think I could give you the figures for the year 1904; some of the appeals against decisions in 1905 may not have come in yet.

4274. One year would be as good as another for our purpose, I suppose?—Yes. I will try to get you the information desired. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. IV.)

tepayers' ht to end audit l inspect oks.

4275. (*Dr. Downes.*) I believe a ratepayer has a right to attend an audit?—Yes.

4276. And has access to certain books at reasonable times?—Yes, for a few days before the audit; and the auditor may allow a ratepayer to inspect the books during the audit.

tus of e-paying ited pany as audit.

4277. Would that right extend to a limited liability company in any way?—If the company were paying rates, they could send a representative to attend the audit. I believe that some railway companies do, as a matter of fact, send their representatives to the audits.

Mr. Thomas Pitts, C.B.

20 Feb. 1906.

4278. And have they a legal *locus standi*?—I think so, if the company are ratepayers.

Ratepayers' right to inspect contracts.

4279. Could a ratepayer demand to see a contract?—The provisions on the subject in the general order of 14th January, 1867, are in these terms: Art. 32. "The clerk [to the guardians] shall three clear days before the day appointed for auditing the union accounts deposit the half-yearly statement of the accounts of the union, together with the relief order book and ledger, in the board room of the guardians union, or such other place as the board of guardians may appoint, and shall permit the said statement, book, and ledger to be inspected, examined, and copied by any ratepayer or owner of property in the union in the presence of the clerk or some other person approved of by the board of guardians, at any reasonable hour in the daytime when the board of guardians shall not be sitting, after the said statement, book, and ledger shall have been so deposited, and previous to the day appointed for the auditing of the accounts of the union." There is no reference to contracts in that article. Art. 40 of the order provides that "the officers of the union * * * who by law are bound to account to [the] auditor, shall attend at the time and place appointed by him for the audit of their accounts, and shall submit to the auditor all books, documents, appointments in writing, contracts, bills, orders for payment, receipts, and other vouchers containing or relating to their accounts * * * and the same shall at the time of the audit be open to the inspection of any owner of property or ratepayer interested in such accounts, but to such extent and in such manner only as will not, in the judgment of the said auditor interfere with the audit."

4280. The form of tender is prescribed by the Order of 1877 I think—but I am not quite sure of the year?—There is an order that prescribes the form of tender, but this is a matter that does not come before me in connection with the subject of audit.

FOURTEENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 27th February, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*)
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. HERBERT PRESTON-THOMAS, called; and Examined.

4281. (*Mr. Booth.*) We are much obliged to you for the valuable memorandum you have prepared, which we have decided to put in as your evidence, without thinking it necessary to bring out all you have said in it by any series of questions. We are much obliged to you, also, for the statistics which you have prepared, which will be of considerable use and guidance to us. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VIII. (A) and (B).) There are a few general questions I will ask you now, which are more or less in amplification of the evidence put in. With regard to paragraph 5, has Devonshire suffered much from agricultural depression?—Not nearly so much as some other counties. For instance, in Suffolk in 1879, which was the palmy time of agriculture, the gross rateable value of land, excluding houses and so on, was, £1,508,569, but it had gone down in 1903 to £743,772. On the other hand, while in Devon in 1879, it was £2,028,808, in 1903 it had only gone down to £1,597,058. In point of fact, in one the depression had meant a fall of 50 per cent., and in the other it meant a fall of not much more than 20 per cent.

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

crease in eable ue of land Devon and folk.

4282. Is that due to the different character of the agriculture or the grazing?—Largely. It is very much more pastoral in Devon, and more arable in Suffolk; and there are other reasons.

4283. I shall not pursue those questions further now,

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

because I propose to ask you some detailed questions about various portions of the county. On Clause 13, has there been any effect on the membership of friendly societies, that, is as I understand it, as to the effect of tightening up the relief under the Poor Law?—That has been so. I have made inquiries in various parts on the subject, and I am told that friendly societies are making progress. I may mention that in the one district of Exeter, where the diminution of pauperism has been larger in the last eight years than anywhere else, friendly societies are now particularly flourishing. There are no less than 6,000 members of the recognised friendly societies, besides a large number of members of quite small associations for more or less the same purposes; and it is believed that the stricter administration of relief has had an excellent effect on those societies.

Success of Friendly Societies in Exeter and elsewhere.

4284. On the whole, those societies are extending in their work and prospering throughout the district?—Very much so. Of course it is difficult to say what enables people to belong to friendly societies, and what makes them flourish in one district and the other. My point at present is that improvement in poor-law administration has had a beneficial effect on such societies in Exeter.

Parsimony of guardians' administration in West of England.

4285. Speaking in a general way, are the guardians, or are they not, generally inclined to extravagance?—They are not; and a difficulty is, that in London, for instance, and in some other districts, one important function of the Local Government Board may be to cut down proposals for spending, whereas in the west it is all the other way. We have to try exceedingly hard to get most of the guardians to spend money for the most necessary purposes, so that we have to push them to spend, and not to curb their extravagance. I can give you numbers of instances as to the difficulties I have had in getting an infirmary built for the sick, or something of that sort. It is generally done in the end, but the reluctance of the farmers has to be combated. They always look at every penny they pay in rates very keenly, and they come in and oppose expenditure of all kinds.

Inspection of lunatics in workhouses.

4286. We shall, no doubt, be glad to have instances; and you will have an opportunity of mentioning them as I go through the more detailed investigation which I propose to follow after these general questions. With regard to imbeciles in the workhouse, what inspections are made on behalf of the Lunacy Commissioners?—A periodical inspection is made by an assistant commissioner; I do not think it is quite regular from year to year in every workhouse. The Lunacy Commissioners have not made recommendations relating to the effect of the presence of imbeciles on other people, except to a very small extent. Once or twice I have found reports where they have specified a violent or mischievous imbecile as one that ought to be removed to the lunatic asylum, but other reports have been confined very much to one matter, a very important matter no doubt, the possibility of fire, and means of escape in case of fire. Sometimes they have pushed their recommendations in that respect to a very high point indeed. Probably the best way for you to get information on the subject would be to ask for a copy of their reports for a particular period.

Reports of Lunacy Commissioners.

4287. The reports are not very exhaustive in their character, are they?—They are not very personal in their character, and not very detailed.

Objections to lunatics and imbeciles in workhouses.

4288. Would you imply from that that the inspection is not all that it should be, or that the report does not cover it?—I am not prepared to criticise the inspection; but what has come very painfully before me in various cases is the enormous harm that may be done to the comfort of various people in the workhouse by mischievous imbeciles, by imbeciles with offensive characteristics, and so on, and I am quite sure that a large part of the comfort that modern improvements have procured for inmates of workhouses, especially old people, has been neutralised to a large extent by the constant association with mischievous, offensive, and nasty imbeciles. It is not a nice thing in your old age to have to live with idiots. It is all very well where the imbeciles are kept quite apart, but in most of the small country workhouses they are not, and cannot be kept apart. If you have half-a-dozen imbeciles of each sex, you cannot ask the guardians to have a separate male officer for the half-dozen male imbeciles, and a separate female officer for the half-dozen women. Even in the larger workhouses where they are in special wards, there is nothing improving about their treatment. They are kept there as long as they live, I suppose; but there is no chance in a workhouse of those who are improvable receiving the treatment which they would receive in a proper institution of the kind. Of course the great difficulty has been one of expense. Lunatic asylums have been built at such enormous cost that everyone is afraid of spending more money for institutions of that sort under the county councils. Then there is another point, that a good many of the imbeciles are useful in the workhouses: they pump, and they scrub, and do this, that, and the other, but this consideration ought not to be allowed to outweigh that of the comforts of other inmates. Under section 24 of the Lunacy Act of 1890, it is necessary, in order to legalise imbeciles being sent to the workhouse, that there should be a certificate that it is not necessary, either for his own convenience or for the convenience of others, that he should be kept separate. That is disregarded in scores of cases. I have known people's lives made miserable because there are imbeciles who really ought never to have been sent there, who ought to have been sent to lunatic asylums, or to some institution specially for them. What I should like, without the extraordinary expense of building new asylums, is this: there are constantly places, like a disused prison or a disused county school of some sort, which could be got cheaply, and run cheaply without a very extensive staff, and without an expensive outlay on bricks and mortar. I am quite sure that if we require that county councils shall build big places for them, or add departments to the lunatic asylums (unless they are cheaply built to satisfy only moderate requirements) eight or ten years hence we shall still be having these idiots worrying people in workhouses.

Disregard of Sec. 24 of Lunacy Act, 1890.

Proposed segregation of workhouse imbeciles.

4289. You would like to see the workhouses relieved entirely of them?—Absolutely; since the statutory attempt to differentiate between "convenient" and "inconvenient" imbeciles has broken down in practice.

4290. And you would like to see them treated in institutions suitable for them?—Yes, and have it made a county charge entirely.

Conditions in Clutton Union.

4291. I would now like to take you to the map, of which you have a copy, and ask you a few questions with regard to each union. I will commence with the western end of Somerset. I notice that Clutton has reduced its pauperism considerably, but still it is rather high?—Clutton is the most unnecessarily pauperised union in my district. It is composed partly of farms where the wages are, according to Mr. Wilson Fox's return, higher than in most other unions; and it is composed largely of collieries where the wages are high, where employment has been pretty constant, and yet its pauperism is enormous. It has very little old age, which is a most important point.

4292. I see it is only 64 per 1,000. I notice that the pauperism, although high, is a great deal lower than it was in 1885?—It is lower than it was in 1885. The Local Government Board did something. We had been remonstrating constantly as to their administration; they had quite an insufficient staff of relieving officers; and at last the Board took the unusual step (a step which, until a few years ago, had not been taken) of requiring them to appoint an additional relieving officer.

Appointment of additional relieving officer on order of Local Government Board.

4293. Do you remember in what year that was?—That was three or four years ago. The composition of the board of guardians is exceedingly unsatisfactory. There have been various guardians who have had relations in receipt of relief. In some cases fathers have been in receipt of outdoor relief while the sons have been sitting on the board. Various guardians there, more than in most other places, I believe, are sent there to distribute outdoor relief; and that is their platform.

Relief given to relatives of guardians.

4294. The industry there, apart from agriculture, is mining?—Yes, coal mining.

4295. Are the earnings irregular?—No, the earnings have been generally steady. There have been certain interruptions, and certain amounts of short work, but I should say the earnings are habitually pretty good. They have a Conciliation Board, by which they prevent

interruptions by strikes. Some time ago they wanted more wages, and at first it looked like a question of a strike; but the matter was adjusted, and they got, if I remember rightly, a rise of 5 or 10 per cent.

lure to over loan ef.

4296. So the industrial conditions are satisfactory, leading to prosperity?—Quite excellent. Now and then relief is given on loan, but the amount recovered is comparatively trivial. So, too, as regards contributions by relatives. Occasionally a son is ordered to pay perhaps a shilling a week towards the out-relief of his father, he pays for a little time, and then he falls into arrear, the debt accumulates and accumulates, and finally it is often wiped off. But it is fair to say that there has recently been improvement in this respect.

4297. The decrease in pauperism in the last ten years has been due, at any rate in part, to the increase of the number of relieving officers forced upon them by the Local Government Board?—In part, but I would not lay very great stress on that, because that has been comparatively recent.

4298. Has there been any material change in the constitution of the board in the last twenty years?—Not of late years, except that a few guardians have been impressed very much with the fact that they were quite unnecessarily pauperised, and have taken the line that their administration ought to be stricter; that has been I think, the chief reason of the change. Until the year 1897, as I have said in my statement, no comparative statistics and no circulars were sent round to the different unions, so that they did not know much what was being done elsewhere, and when, from the regular statistics that I sent them, union A began to see that union B had only, perhaps, three-quarters of the number of paupers that union A had, they began to ask themselves why; and they began to reform their ways a little. They had nothing to go on before, and I think that that has been exceedingly useful. I send them round an annual circular, and an annual table of statistics with particulars of the pauperism of all the unions in the district.

et of ulation of parative istics.

4299. That was your action?—That was not done before I went there in 1897.

4300. You called their attention to the comparatively good and bad results of the administration of their unions?—Quite so. I have done that annually, sometimes contrasting two neighbouring unions and their pauperism, asking why it was that such and such a union had a large amount of pauperism, whereas its next door neighbour had a comparatively small amount. I have insisted on that in my annual report, which I have found great advantage in circulating.

4301. I suppose it is only a comparison with other unions in your district, not with other parts of England?—No, except that, broadly I have contrasted the smaller pauperism of England generally with that of the Western Counties. I never compare individual unions inside with individual unions outside.

4302. When did you commence this plan of furnishing statistics to guide them?—Directly I took the district. I had done the same thing in my previous district.

4303. In what year was this?—The beginning of 1897. I went to Devon in December, 1896, and in the middle of my first year I sent round a table of statistics, the local papers took the matter up, and the guardians began to know, for the first time really, that they were an extraordinarily pauperised district, and they were much surprised to hear it.

4304. One cannot but notice the remarkable change which occurs in your period; there was little or no change in the previous decade?—It had been very constant before; I think the change was principally due to their receiving statistics, and so on, which they had not previously received.

4305. I have the figures before me for twenty years, would you say that industrially the first ten years of that twenty were just as satisfactory as the second ten years?—Very much, with some exceptions in the town unions, of course, I am speaking now of the agricultural unions. There have been some differences in Plymouth and one or two other towns. I do not think there has been a change of any importance anywhere else.

litions in ne on.

4306. I pass to Frome. There the industries are more manufacturing. There is a certain amount of manufacturing industry at Frome, is there not?—They have one or two collieries, and a few factories.

4307. What is the nature of the factory business?—A good deal of woollen cloth is made, and there is a card manufactory. The factories do not occupy a large part of the population. With that exception, I do not think very much goes on there except agriculture. Frome is the centre of a good agricultural district, and the collieries.

4308. So there is a considerable variety of industry. The character is various, because there is agriculture, mining and manufacture?—Yes, but the manufacture is what, in a manufacturing district, would scarcely be called manufacture; it is on a small scale.

4309. It would all conduce to general prosperity?—Certainly.

4310. And here again the pauperism is still high?—It is high.

4311. It is not so high as it is in Clutton, but still it is high?—It is high.

4312. Can you offer any explanation of that?—No, in Frome they have a very shrewd chairman who has done a good deal to check unnecessary relief. The old-age figure is rather high.

4313. It is seventy-six?—Directly you get at all above the seventies it seems to make an enormous difference. I did not realise, till I made a table for my report four or five years ago, all the effect of there being an exceptionally large proportion of the very oldest people who cannot fend for themselves, and therefore have to be provided for at the cost of the rates.

4314. Curiously enough, the proportion of out-door to in-door relief is much greater in Clutton than it is in Frome?—That is so.

4315. In spite of the larger number of old people, there seems to be less out-door relief given; however, you do not recognise anything very particular in that. Have they a sufficient number of relieving officers there?—They have a very fair number at Frome.

4316. You have nothing more to say particularly about Frome?—No.

Conditions in Shepton Mallet Union.

4317. Then Shepton Mallet, which is just to the west of Frome. Is there anything particular there? I find there that there is agriculture, but there is a town; what is the town?—A small town, a centre of the cheese industry, with one or two large breweries. It is pastoral, and I think why pauperism is so high there is a question of administration very largely.

4318. Pauperism is quite high there; it is as high as it is at Clutton?—Pauperism is high; but I think that the guardians will do better, probably, in the future than they have done in the past. There have been certain personal and other reasons.

4319. There is not the quantity of out-relief, for instance that there is at Clutton?—No, but there is too much.

4320. These three, throughout, show a very great improvement during your period of inspection, and we may hope that experience will be carried further?—I hope so. Sometimes I rather despair about Clutton; but in the others it will certainly.

Old age statistics for Wincanton and Axminster.

4321. The next one I have here is Wincanton. That is particularly agricultural and rural, is not it?—Yes. Quite lately they have taken the thing in hand and have made a considerable advance, just in the last two or three years. They are still very high indeed; they have a very large proportion of old age. The old age figure there is eighty-one.

4322. Almost the maximum?—Almost. I think Axminster is absolutely the maximum; it is ninety-four, which is extraordinary.

Pauperism and administration in Wincanton.

4323. The remarkable thing about Wincanton is that the pauperism was rising and reached its maximum about 1895, before you came. It was higher in 1895 than 1885, and since your period it has been reduced very materially?—It will go down in future. They have a very active chairman—a blind chairman, who is exceedingly able and is keen on out-door relief not being given indiscriminately.

4324. The administration is good?—The administration is fair.

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

Term of office of chairman of board of guardians: its effect on administration.

4325. Do the chairmen remain for a long period in charge?—Yes. There are two plans in vogue in my district. One plan, which I think is a very bad plan indeed, is that the chairman only serves for one year. The effect of that is that, just as he begins to know his work, off he goes; and, if you have a succession of chairmen, you do not have any continuity of administration, and it works badly. Of course you have the precedent of mayors. A mayor is only mayor for a year, as a rule, but then a mayor has much less control over the action of his municipality than the chairman has over that of the guardians. There are difficulties the other way. Sometimes a chairman goes on year after year; he may be a capital chairman at first, but he gets old. He becomes incompetent, and no one likes to wound him by suggesting that he should retire. Now and then when an election comes he says: "I have served long enough, so I had better give place." They say to themselves "No, this will pain him;" and for personal reasons he stays on, even if he is quite incompetent. I have known various cases of that sort, in which great harm has been done to administration by people being kept on through kindliness. Of course, where they only serve for a year they consider it a sort of honour to do so, and if a man is not made chairman it is a snub on him, so it goes right round, and in some cases you have incompetent men as chairmen, because it becomes their turn. What I should prefer is a sort of middle course. I should like to see the chairman appointed for, say, five years, and incapable of being re-appointed at the end of the fifth year until after an interval. Then when you elect a chairman that year, if your last chairman is an excellent one and you want to re-appoint him, let some one be put in who will fill the gap and who will resign after the first of his five years, and you can put your old chairman in again. I think much harm has been done by chairmen who really know nothing about the work. It takes a very long time to learn all the principles and the details of poor law administration, even with a very competent clerk, and I should be very glad to see chairmen have, on the one hand, a longer tenure of office, but, on the other hand, not an indefinite term of office, so that you cannot get rid of the old ones.

4326. Does it rest with each board to decide what term they will elect their chairman for?—Every chairman is appointed for one year, but there is no restriction whatever upon the appointment of the same man again and again. You may do that, or appoint somebody else. Those are the two practices.

4327. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Does the fact that a chairman of a district council is an *ex officio* justice of the peace make the ordinary guardian more anxious to serve as chairman, and has it, therefore, influenced this particular mode of appointing them by rotation?—In a very large number of cases the chairman of the district council and the chairman of the board of guardians are not the same person. In many cases they are, and that has an influence; but it does not apply to the guardians as guardians, because the chairman of the board of guardians is not a justice of the peace by virtue of his office.

4328. Is the chairman of the district council usually made one of the board of guardians?—Very often, but by no means invariably.

Conditions in Yeovil Union.

4329. (*Mr. Booth.*) The next union on my list is Yeovil. There are manufacturing industries there of some kind, are there not?—There is a great deal of gloving there, and an enormous lot of money goes into the houses at Yeovil. The head of the family may be a labourer on the land, but his wife and his daughters, do some gloving; sometimes at the factory; sometimes at home.

4330. There is work for all?—There is plenty of work—any amount of work there—and the pauperism ought to be very low. I have frequently told them they ought to be one of the lowest pauperised unions in the whole district. I have my own suspicion why it is, but I should not like to put it forward definitely. I may make this suggestion to the Commission; that, where you find a particular union having a very large rate of pauperism without anything to account for it you should take measures to ascertain what particular influences are at work there. For example there is a great amount of drinking connected with some trades, and I have heard it asserted that this is so in the gloving trade. I do not know of my own knowledge whether that is true or not.

Suggested inquiry into drink statistics in particular unions.

4331. The leather trade has a bad reputation generally, I believe?—I believe it has; I have heard that assigned as a reason for the high pauperism of Yeovil; but I cannot say. I have also heard it contradicted. That is a thing that deserves inquiry. If it is not that, all I can say is that I do not know what it is.

Conditions in Yeovil Union.

4332. Does the industry there include the tanning and dressing of the leather?—I think not, or only to a small extent. It is glove making proper.

4333. Is that industry concentrated in the town of Yeovil?—Mostly, but it extends a good deal to the villages outside as well.

4334. So that the pauperism there is very unsatisfactorily high, although it has been reduced a little?—It has been reduced somewhat, but it is much too high.

4335. While we are passing through these unions, I shall be very glad of any particulars on the following points; are any board of guardians too unwieldy; how are they composed; are there any lady guardians; and any information you can give us as to how they transact their business. I do not want to burden you with attempting to give information on all those subjects for every union, but if we come to a union with regard to which you would like to make a remark on one of those points, if you would yourself call attention to it, it would come in very appropriately as we pass the union. Other questions, which are your own suggestion, I think, are: how do they choose their officers, especially the master, the matron, the nurses, the relieving officers, and so on; what is the effect of the Superannuation Act; and are relief stations necessary? Does the Brabazon Society conduct operations in any of the workhouses; and does the boarding-out answer well? Some of those questions might be best dealt with last of all, but others you might deal with most satisfactorily as you pass a union which is representative?—I will do that if you please.

4336. Yeovil is unsatisfactory and somewhat unexpected, unless you have something to say about the administration which would point to this rather high pauperism?—I have nothing special to say about the administration. I think there is some extraneous influence that has to be found out; that I can only speculate on.

4337. Which might be drink?—Yes, it might be.

Conditions in Langport Union.

4338. Langport is an agricultural district, but there is a town in it. Is Langport itself a town?—It is a very little town indeed; it is scarcely more than a large village. It is all agriculture there, and not very flourishing agriculture, because it is subject to floods very much. It is a very low-lying district. It is a small concern altogether.

4339. But they have a high rate of pauperism?—They have very high pauperism.

Conditions in Wells Union.

4340. We come now to Wells. There is another point I should like you to refer to if it arises, and that is whether there are endowed charities which may have an effect one way or other upon pauperism. I was thinking that Wells, being a Cathedral town, might be subject to that kind of influence. I do not want to trouble you with endless questions, but if you come to a place where you find that endowed charities affect the question, we should be glad to hear it?—I am afraid I have no actual particulars. I have from time to time looked at the return of endowed charities, in relation to particular cases, but I could not generally answer as to them. It is a matter of figures, which would require an amount of preparation which I have not gone through. I know, however, that the endowed charities of Wells are unusally large.

4341. As a matter of fact, the pauperism of Wells is not only reduced, but it is comparatively low?—Wells has one or two capital lady guardians who have been most useful, and it has an excellent chairman; altogether it is very well administered, and probably will improve in that respect.

4342. Wells is a Cathedral city surrounded by an agricultural district?—A very small Cathedral city. It is surrounded by pastoral farms; very little arable. Street, a little town in the Wells Union, is devoted to the leather trade.

4343. Is there much resident wealth?—There are a pretty good number of large country houses.

4344. Do the people of that class—retired people—take part in the local administration ?—No, not much. In that particular board of guardians there are not many people of high education, about half a dozen; a large number are farmers and tradesmen; but they are a sensible lot, they are businesslike, and they do their work well. They have turned a very old workhouse into a quite tolerable modern workhouse, and they have made various improvements. They have put their children in scattered homes, and carried out various things. They are a good board, decidedly.

ifferent es of ardians.

4345. As a general thing, in your district, do the boards consist of people of various classes acting together ?—Various classes, and now and then we have considerable contrasts. In the country the bulk are farmers, with a squire or two, some clergymen, and perhaps one or two retired officers, and a few persons of small education, who are small tradesmen, and so on. There are all sorts of classes.

4346. Do they work well together ?—Yes, very well together.

4347. There is no cleavage according to class in the principle that they would wish to adopt ?—I am not sure that I can generalise as to that. It is not always the highest board of guardians socially that is the best board of guardians for administrative purposes. For instance, I think one of the best of my boards of guardians now is in Exeter itself, but it has by no means a large proportion of what you would call the upper class socially. It includes a colonel, a prebendary, a Catholic priest, and one or two ladies of some cultivation; mostly the members are tradesmen, but tradesmen of a very good class, and they have done wonders in improving both their relief administration and their workhouse; whereas in one or two other districts which I have in my mind, where the position of the guardians, from a social point of view, is very much better, they do not manage their business nearly so well as Exeter.

ue of opted rdians.

4348. Are they all elected, or are some co-opted ?—None are co-opted at Exeter. Now and then one or two are co-opted elsewhere. Sometimes a man is beaten at the polls, and if he is a very useful man they co-opt him, and perhaps there is some man who has taken considerable interest in the matter but does not care to stand for election, who is also co-opted. In my district there are few co-opted guardians.

4349. Are they valuable ?—Generally, because unless they are people who take a strong personal interest in the Poor Law, they do not take the trouble to let themselves be co-opted, nor would the guardians care to co-opt them.

ue of formity dminis- ion.

4350. Does persistency in the policy of administration depend upon the position or class of the guardians ?—Yes, largely.

4351. I gather, from what you have said about the chairmen, that you would regard a persistently administered policy as a good feature ?—As very important indeed.

ditions Axbridge on.

4352. We will now take Axbridge. As far as I understand it, that is mainly a residential district ?—Yes, it has Weston-super-Mare in it, which is a sort of Brighton for Bristol. It is a popular watering place. It is year after year increasing rapidly, and the Axbridge board of guardians is a good one.

4353. Is Axbridge a town ?—A very small town, little more than a village.

4354. So that Weston-super-Mare has the principal population ?—Yes, and it pays the greater part of the rates.

uence of rman on inistra-

4355. Is there anything particular to say about the board of guardians there, their administration, or their methods ?—Not much. They have a most excellent chairman, one of the best in my district, in the person of Colonel Long. This place shows the importance of the chairman. They had a chairman some time ago who though a most worthy man had not quite the special qualities required, and they used to take hours over their proceedings. Colonel Long, going into every case thoroughly, and doing the whole business much better, gets through it in less than half the time. The more I see of Poor Law meetings, the more I am convinced that it is of the greatest importance to have a methodical and able chairman with knowledge, tact, and decision.

4356. You consider the administration of Axbridge fairly satisfactory ?—Fairly satisfactory.

4357. But the proportion of out-relief is very great ?—I have been worrying them for some time to appoint another relieving officer for Weston, and they have had a division on it once or twice, but they will not do it yet. It is not quite a case in which I think there are grounds for asking my board to compel them. It very often happens, if you compel people to do things they do not like, they do not do them very well after all; and I hope to be able to persuade them in time. But they have not quite enough relieving officers, and, therefore, their cases are not quite enough inquired into. With that exception, which, of course, is important, they do their business well.

Paucity of relieving officers in Axbridge Union.

4358. In spite of the large numbers of out-relief, the total percentage of pauperism is fairly low ?—It is fairly low.

4359. You think it might be reduced by greater care in the administration of out-relief ?—I think so. The relieving officer for Weston, which is the most flourishing place, but has the greatest amount of pauperism, really cannot go into all his cases thoroughly, because he has too much to do. I have not much doubt that before long I shall get an appointment made, and things will be better.

4360. There is probably a good deal of irregular charitable giving there ?—A good deal, as there is at all watering places.

Conditions in Bridgwater Union.

4361. Will you now turn to Bridgwater, please. That is a port, is it not ?—It is upon the little river Parret, and small vessels do get up there; but its shipping trade is not on a large scale.

4362. Is there fishing there ?—Not much. It is a town which serves as the centre for a considerable agricultural district, and no doubt some coal and some fish and various things come in there.

4363. There is a considerable population ?—Yes.

4364. And the rest of the place is agricultural, is it ?—All agricultural, except the small town of Bridgwater itself.

4365. Have you anything to say about the administration of relief there ?—I think not.

Conditions in Taunton Union.

4366. The next place is Taunton. At Taunton there is a certain amount of manufacture. What is the character of the industry there ?—They have a few collar factories; I am afraid I cannot say what else, but it is a tolerably flourishing town. About half the population of the whole union is in the town, and it is much the most strictly administered of all my unions.

4367. It has much the lowest rate ?—Much the lowest rate. They had carried out most of their reforms before I came there. When I went to the West that was almost the only union where there was any rigidity of administration at all, and there they had taken the thing in hand very thoroughly.

4368. The great change happened between 1885 and 1895 ?—Yes. The clerk to the Taunton guardians at one of our Poor Law conferences read an excellent paper, giving particulars of what they had done there, and how their relief had been reduced.

Effect of strict administration in reducing pauperism.

4369. The figures of the paupers were reduced from 1,140 to 513—rather more than by half ?—Yes. The figures are striking. The amount spent in out door relief in Taunton in 1868 was nearly £10,000—£9,955. In 1871 it was over £9,000. In 1881 it was close on £6,000. In 1891 it had dropped to £3,400; and in 1902 it had dropped to £1,957. Therefore, between 1871 and 1902, it had dropped from £9,000 to less than £2,000.

4370. Has the policy of administration been persistent throughout the whole of that long period ?—It has been increasingly rigid. They were pretty careful at first so as not to create hardships to the old paupers on the list—not to strike them off roughly, but to conduct the reforms gradually, and they really do apply the House test; when applicants come they offer them the House in various cases. In the frequent cases of women with illegitimate children, who are inclined to apply freely for orders for the doctor, or orders for the House, the late chairman used to appeal to the parents of the girls, and not to give these orders as a matter of course; altogether

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

he reformed the procedure in a great many ways, and I think the result has been very beneficial.

4371. Do they act according to rules laid down amongst themselves?—Yes; they have a certain code of rules, and it is in their absolute discretion as to any case whether they will or will not give relief, or what kind of relief it shall be. In the last resort they must give to each case an order for the house generally, but they can appeal to the parents that their daughters ought not to be sent to the workhouse.

Code of rules as to giving relief in Taunton.

4372. Was there any change in the policy connected with the change in the mode of election of the guardians when it came in 1895?—I think not.

4373. So that that is extremely satisfactory and an example of good administration?—That is a very good example of rigid administration and good administration. I have taken the trouble, as I have in various other cases where there has been strictness, to ask clergymen and different people likely to know: "Is any hardship caused by this system"? I have been told of one or two particular cases, and I have asked as to them. For instance, one clergyman at Taunton said, "I had two cases where the guardians refused relief, where I thought the people ought to have had it; in one case I was convinced afterwards I was mistaken, and in the other I got further information, which I put before the guardians, which they had not had in the first instance, and relief was given." He was the rector, or vicar, of one of the largest parishes in Taunton, and he said that, with those two exceptions, he had had no experience of any hardship arising from the guardians' policy.

Absence of hardship under strict administration.

4374. Is there any special organisation of charity to cover that?—I do not know. There are a good many endowed charities; I do not know exactly what philanthropic societies there are, but I have no doubt there is something of that sort there.

4375. To revert to what you told us about Friendly Societies flourishing, would Taunton be a place which illustrates that?—It is particularly flourishing. I have some particulars about it here. In the Taunton Union there are 5,700 members of Friendly Societies, while there are 40,000 industrial insurances.

Flourishing Friendly Societies in Taunton.

4376. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Would that be for death?—I am not sure. I am quoting the clerk's words in the paper which he read before the Poor Law Conference.

4377. Have you any figures previous to that?—No, I have not.

4378. (*Mr. Booth.*) We come now to Chard. Chard again has some manufacturing?—There is one large collar factory, and some lace manufacture, but, speaking generally, it is agriculture and nothing else, I think.

Conditions in Chard Union.

4379. The rate of pauperism is very high there?—The rate of pauperism is high.

4380. Have you any explanation to give? It has been reduced, I see, especially during the last ten years, enormously reduced; is it on the way to being still further reduced?—I am not sure that it is. I am afraid I cannot explain why. I cannot bring any charge against the administration.

4381. You do not even say it is unsatisfactory?—No, I will not say distinctly that it is unsatisfactory.

4382. We will now pass to Wellington. There seems to be some manufacture there?—Yes; it is the great centre for making serge for the Navy; there are Fox's factories, which are very large concerns indeed, and there is some other serge maker there.

Conditions in Wellington Union.

4383. They give regular employment?—They give very regular employment.

4384. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Might we ask whether these factories are for men or for women when they are mentioned. (*Mr. Booth.*) You said there was a collar factory in Chard?—That gives employment for women.

4385. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) And in the serge factories?—I know both are employed, but I cannot say the relative proportions of men and women.

4386. (*Mr. Booth.*) The result may be that the women are more regularly employed than the men?—I think there are more women. I have not been over those factories, so I hesitate to say definitely.

4387. You do not know whether irregularity of employment is one of the troubles there?—I think not; I understand it is very steady employment there.

4388. I meant with regard to the men employed in the factories, whether they were irregularly employed?—No, I understand employment is very regular there. Sometimes there are difficulties in get ing workmen. I have one instance here and it is worth mentioning. I brought it before the Vagrancy Committee recently. A man found great difficulty in getting hands; he wanted half-a-dozen unskilled labourers. He was a man in the town dealing with wood. It was perfectly unskilled labour, a little sawing, perhaps, but mainly moving wood, and he could not get labourers. He offered 18s. a week, which in that part of Somerset, an exceedingly cheap place, is a very fair wage, and he offered permanency of employment. He could not get men; so he went to the workhouse master, and he said: "Have you got any tramps here that will do some work?" The answer was "Lots of tramps, to-night, sir; about twenty of them." "Very well, do you think any of them will do some work?" He said "We might try." They went to the tramps' ward and said "Why are you people on the road?" "Cannot get any work, sir," the regular thing. "Do you want some work?" "Yes, we should like some work very much, we have been looking everywhere for it, and could not get it." He said, "Well, here is a job for you, 18s. a week and steady employment." An actual job, and not a job in the air, made all the difference in the world, and they began to hesitate as to whether it would suit them. Finally six of them said: Oh, yes, they would be very glad, it would suit them, and they would go. It was all arranged, they were to go next morning, and six of them left the workhouse at seven o'clock to start on the job, which was only about 600 yards off. Only one got as far, the other five slunk off. Here were men professing to be looking for work all over the place, but only one would take it. I inquired about him the next time I went to Wellington, six months afterwards, and he was working there still. I mention that as showing that labour was in demand there; the employer found great difficulty in getting it, and that is a fair rate of wages.

Instance of tramps' reluctance to work.

4389. (*The O'Conor Don.*) What kind of work was it?—Removing wood and a little wood sawing.

4390. (*Professor Smart.*) 18s. a week, you say?—18s. a week, it being a particularly cheap place.

4391. (*Mr. Booth.*) We now come to Williton, where there seems to be a small port?—There are one or two little watering places, nothing else.

Conditions in Williton Union.

4392. Is Williton itself a town?—No, it is really a village.

4393. There is no shipping industry that you know of?—Watchet has a fair harbour and some coasting trade; elsewhere I know of no industry of any kind; there are two or three little watering places; it is a favourite place for tourists.

4394. It is really residential?—Residential mainly, and pastoral.

4395. Have you anything to say about the Poor Law administration there?—No, the Poor Law is relieved to some extent, I think, because there is a large proprietor there, Sir Thomas Acland, who has a system of pensions for all his old labourers, and he has, no doubt, taken some off the Poor Law.

Private scheme of pensions for labourers.

4396. There seems to be rather a large amount of out-relief?—Yes, there is.

4397. And there is a very large number of old people, I see—eighty-four per 1,000?—It is very large.

4398. I believe that Dulverton completes Somerset. That is entirely agricultural, is not it?—Dulverton is not small in extent, because it contains nearly all Exmoor, but it is thinly populated and there is a small number of guardians.

Conditions in Dulverton Union.

4399. The population is quite small?—A very small population indeed. I do not think there is anything to be said about that in particular.

4400. The pauperism, although still rather high, has been steadily reduced?—Yes, it has gone down lately.

4401. Are there difficulties in administration consequent upon the large area in proportion to the number of people?—I do not think so.

4402. It does not get out of the reach of the guardians ?—No, there are so few people really to deal with, that I do not think there is any trouble of that sort.

ditions Barnstaple ion.

4403. Now we come to Devonshire, and I propose to begin with Barnstaple on the north coast; that is chiefly agricultural ?—Yes. Barnstaple is a union that is much more pauperised than it ought to be. It includes those thriving watering places, Ilfracombe and Lynton. It is tolerably high in old age; it is seventy-eight per 1,000. In one of my Reports, I draw a comparison between Barnstaple and Taunton, which may explain something. It is not very long, so perhaps I may read it. This is what I said—"It may be interesting to compare the circumstances of two unions not far from each other, of which one has the lowest rate of pauperism in the West of England, while the other, though it does not stand last on the list, has an inordinate proportion, which until its relief organisation is reformed is not the least likely to be reduced. Taunton contains a population of 38,643, of which 21,078 is urban, being contained in the borough. The proportion of inhabitants above the age of sixty-five is seventy-four per 1,000. It has four relieving officers, and on the 1st January, 1902, there were 392 outdoor paupers. Its rate of pauperism is eighteen per 1,000." This was written in 1902. "The Barnstaple union has a population of 43,078, of which 14,137 is in the borough of Barnstaple; and 10,198 in the watering places of Ilfracombe and Lynton. So here, also, rather more than half the population is of an urban character. The proportion of inhabitants above the age of sixty-five is seventy-eight per 1,000, being thus only fractionally larger than in Taunton. But for 1,479 outdoor paupers it has only three relieving officers, much of whose time is taken up with other duties two of them being also inspectors of nuisances, while the third is so much occupied with his functions as registrar that he has frankly stated his inability properly to investigate the circumstances of the paupers to whom he administers relief; and of whom he has over 700 on his books. It is not wonderful that in these circumstances, this flourishing union has a rate of pauperism of no less than forty-two per 1,000 or considerably more than twice that of Taunton. Twice the guardians have at my instigation resolved to increase their staff of relieving officers, and twice they have subsequently repealed their resolution to that effect." They carry resolutions when I am there, and, about a couple of months afterwards, when I am not there, they rescind them. At last I represented to the Local Government Board that really this was a case in which they ought to say that the guardians must appoint another officer. When this was intimated to them they were furious. They made all sorts of representations, they went to their Member of Parliament and expostulated as to the tyranny of the Board, and so on, and so on. However, the Board stuck to its guns, and said the case was so flagrant that a compulsory order would be issued unless they proceeded to make the appointment. So they did. Then I went down again, I think some eight or nine months after the officer had been appointed, and I was able to show them, as I had told them before would be the case, that they had saved the salary of the officer several times over, and they were now in a position to judge whether their people wanted relief or did not want relief, which was the great thing. Though they had been furious with me for worrying them over this, and for getting them forced to appoint him, they proceeded to pass a vote of thanks to me, which was carried unanimously, for having done it. The result was that for some time the outdoor relief was continually being cut down, and cut down apparently without any hardship, as I had indicated to them; after a time they got lax again, and now I have no doubt they will fitfully make efforts to reduce their relief, but it has been a little creeping up lately. That is an instance. The relieving officers themselves told me that if they were properly backed up they had no doubt there were lots of people receiving relief there who might be struck off the lists. Of course the difficulty with a board like that is that the relieving officer is not properly backed up; but still the first function of the Local Government Board is to see that boards of guardians have machinery enough to supply them with the information; it is their responsibility to deal with the information when they get it; and without a proper staff of relieving officers they cannot get the information.

nparison ween nstaple Taunton.

city of ving ers at nstaple its effect.

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906

Cause of paucity of relieving officers in Barnstaple.

4404. It is in the supposed interests of economy that relieving officers are not appointed ?—Yes. The farmers come up and they see that a salary of £100 or of £120 a year, or something of that sort, would be necessary, and they say, "More salaries of officers," and they do not reflect, and you cannot get it into their heads that proper inquiries will save them two or three times that £100 a year, as it was beginning to do in that case. I need not say that I rubbed that into them.

4405. Yet you say it is creeping up again ?—Now it is increasing again, and pauperism in many unions has been rising just lately. I have not got the figures finally, but from the weekly returns sent to me, I see a large number of places where they are giving more relief—not always because they have any unemployed; but merely because the newspapers are talking about the unemployed; they think there must be unemployed, and therefore they ought to give more relief.

Special difficulties in connection with seaside resorts.

4406. There are certain disadvantages in connection with all popular resorts—there is a certain amount of casual seasonal employment; a good deal of money is spent by visitors in various ways which do not tend to stability or regularity of employment. Do they suffer from that in comparison with a town like Taunton ?—They may to a certain extent, but, on the other hand, money is poured into the union year after year by visitors. I have no doubt there is, as you say, some instability of employment, now and then, as happened when we had a very wet year about three years ago; it was quite curious how one or two of the watering places were very nearly ruined—all the lodging-house keepers and everyone else. I remember there was a question of a system of sewerage which was urgently wanted for one rather important watering place in Cornwall, but it had to be put aside—they said, "We have no money; we cannot pay our debts; it is all a question of this season, when no one has come near the place." That particular year watering places were unfortunate; they are dependent on various fluctuations.

4407. And such fluctuations tend rather to demoralise the people who are so irregularly employed ?—No doubt that may be so.

Conditions in South Molton.

4408. Now we come to South Molton; is that a town ?—It is a little town; quite a small town on the top of a hill.

4409. Have you anything to say about that ?—No, it is purely agricultural; nothing else.

Instances of unwieldy boards of guardians.

4410. To revert to Barnstaple, is that an unwieldy board of guardians ?—It is rather large, but is not one of those I have noted as specially unwieldy, like one or two we shall come to directly, such as Newton Abbot, St. Thomas, Penzance, Liskeard and Truro. I have nothing to say about it in that respect.

Conditions in Tiverton Union.

4411. Then we will go on to Tiverton, which is a very highly pauperised place, in which the reduction has been very small. It has improved, but very slightly improved. Can you tell us about that ?—They have a large number of old people; they have seventy-six per 1,000. With regard to their pauperism, although the reduction has not been large, I think it started somewhat higher than some.

Effect of administration on pauperism

4412. That is true, but it remains very high. I have it forty per 1,000 for 1905 ?—Yes, it is very high. Its administration is not carried out according to fixed rules; it is rather haphazard, and it is susceptible of improvement. The excessive pauperism is not due to the character of the population.

4413. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Tiverton is the centre of a decaying women's industry, is it not—lace-making ?—You are not thinking of Honiton, are you ?

4414. No, I was thinking of Tiverton also ?—I am afraid I do not know that.

4415. (*Mr. Booth.*) You do not know what the industries are ?—There are very few industries.

4416. It is a very old town ?—Yes; Lord Palmerston was Member for it.

4417. Do you know whether there are any endowed charities there ?—There are some charities there; I cannot give particulars, but I know as a fact that there are certain endowed charities.

4418. We have the curious fact that its pauperism is

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

high and persistently high—nothing whatever seems to alter it. It would be very desirable to know if that is caused by the decay of the industry?—Not to my knowledge.

4419. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) The population has decreased too?—Yes.

Conditions in Honiton Union.

4420. (*Mr. Booth.*) Then we come to Honiton. Honiton contrasts very well with Tiverton, because the pauperism was much higher at Honiton twenty years ago, and it has now reached a point a little lower than Tiverton—Tiverton having remained practically the same over the whole twenty years, but Honiton has fallen from sixty-four to fifty-eight and then to thirty-nine. Something is going on there apparently?—Honiton has been improving its administration considerably. It has, a very large number of old people: eighty-eight per 1,000.

4421. Nevertheless the pauperism is much lower?—Yes, it has been improving lately.

4422. Is that a satisfactorily administered union?—Very fairly so. I have nothing to say against it.

4423. (*Professor Smart.*) Do not they employ women labour too?—They have tried to revive the lace industry with not very great effect.

4424. At home or in factories?—At home.

4425 (*Mr. Booth.*) Are there charities there?—I am afraid I cannot say offhand.

4426. You say they are seeking to revive the lace industry; did it cease altogether or merely get to a low ebb?—It never quite ceased, indeed there are now old women in the workhouse, who have always been making lace. But for a good many years it has not been popular with the younger generation; partly, perhaps because machine-made lace has reduced the demand. Of late there has been some attempt to get it taken up by the young women, and that is doing something.

4427. Is that an economic development or a patronised development?—Mainly a patronised development.

Conditions in Axminster Union.

4428. Axminster, I suppose, is an old town?—It is old and small.

The maximum proportion of aged people in the district.

4429. The pauperism was very much higher when you came than it is now? Perhaps you can say something about that administration?—The union has the largest proportion of old folk in the district: the enormous proportion of ninety-four per 1,000 of persons above 65. I have nothing to say in favour of its administration.

4430. Nevertheless there has been a considerable reduction in the rate of paupersim?—There has been a reduction, but I have over and over again represented to the guardians that they are much too indiscriminate in their relief, and last year they passed a vote of censure on themselves in the following resolution: "That more out-relief is given in the Axminster Union than is necessary; and more careful and strict inquiries should be made into new cases that are brought before the board." That is what I have been telling them for the last seven or eight years, and at last they have become convinced of it. I hope something may result.

4431. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I notice there are seventeen parishes, a population of 15,000 and thirty-three guardians?—It has two watering places in it.

4432. It has very small electoral units to elect the guardians?—Yes.

4433. Has that anything to do with it?—I could not say.

4434. Each guardian must represent a very few heads of families?—No doubt that is so.

4435. (*Mr. Booth.*) Are there a sufficient number of relieving officers?—Yes, the number of relieving officers there is not too small.

4436. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Are Axminster carpets made there?—No, none at all I believe now.

Conditions in Exeter and St. Thomas.

4437. (*Mr. Booth*) We now come to Exeter. St. Thomas is a portion of Exeter; would you wish to treat it separately or would you take St. Thomas and Exeter together?—St. Thomas should be treated separately. It is not part of the Poor Law district, although it is part of the city under the recent Act. St. Thomas is a very wide agricultural union—Exeter is exclusively an urban union. In the ancient city of Exeter itself, which is co-extensive with the Poor Law administrative area, the population does not increase at all, and no changes take place. It is exceedingly flourishing in many ways, because it is the centre for the whole of Devon, except the parts immediately by Plymouth—it is the best shopping centre for all sorts of things; it is the best market and it is altogether prosperous and yet, when I came there I found it had forty-two per 1,000 of the population who were paupers.

4438. Are you speaking now of Exeter proper or St. Thomas?—Exeter proper exclusively. It is a case quite apart; the other is an agricultural Union. I found the administration was very unsatisfactory in many respects; in the first place its workhouse was bad, its accommodation for the sick was adversely criticised by Sir William Chance in an address which he published—I think the epithet he used was "abominable," and altogether it was as bad as it could be. Forty-two per 1,000 for a town of that sort abounding in charities, everybody only wanting to find somebody to bestow charity upon, and poor-law relief given broadcast! They had not grasped until it was represented to them, how much pauperised they were in comparison with other places, and when they came to know that, and came to know that fixed rules were desirable, and that giving relief indiscriminately was not good for anybody, they reformed their ways—one or two very influential guardians took up the matter thoroughly, and instead of having 1,127 outdoor paupers they have at the present time under 500. I think the last return sent to me was 450 something.

Effect of strict administration in reducing pauperism.

4439. It was 510 on January 1st?—Yes, and it has gone down in this last year. That saved them £2,700 a year, so I was then able to go to them and say: Well, now you have been saved this, do not you think you can provide properly for your sick inside the workhouse and build a decent infirmary? They said: That is a fair way of putting it, we will; what do you want us to spend? They have now built a very excellent infirmary, and their poor law relief is going down still. I took the trouble to go round only a week or two ago for the purpose—knowing I should have the honour of being examined before this Commission—of finding out whether there was any hardship from this at all. I went to the clergymen of the different parishes, to the chief constable, to the secretary of the Charity Organisation Society and to the secretary of the Church Army. I had talks with all those people, and the universal opinion was that the result had been wholly beneficial. One of the clergymen, who has a parish of, I think, about 4,000 or 5,000 people—a man who knows the condition of every man, woman, and child in his parish—was able to turn to a book as to all the smaller houses, in which he kept the names of people living in the houses; he could tell you about Mary Smith and William Jones, and every individual, and what they were doing. He was a man who knew all about it, and I went over the old lists of paupers with him. The Exeter guardians do a very useful thing; they print the names of their paupers in their half yearly book, half-year after half-year. Then they circulate these books a great deal, and sometimes people come and say: This man or this woman does not want this relief; he or she has a flourishing son who lives at so and so, and could perfectly well afford to keep her or him; and, on the other hand, someone may come and say: This woman is only getting 3s. a week; it is very hard on her; she ought to have more. It is a very useful thing to do that. I went through some of the names with the present clerk of the guardians; he was once a relieving officer and therefore has a very large knowledge of the whole thing; he was able to indicate this person and that person and say of her, that person is doing very well; she sells apples in the market, or she peddles—she is making herself very comfortable indeed, and her son lives with her. Then someone else now lives with a married daughter—someone else lives with a married son, and so on. Lots of these people who had had relief seven years before, were living on, and had got merged in the general population, and were earning their living, or being supported by people whose proper duty it was to support them, without any harm to anyone, but with great benefit to the ratepayers.

Absence of hardship under strict administration.

Effect of publication of lists of paupers and amounts of relief given.

4440. Was this beneficial change connected with a change in the *personnel* of the guardians?—Not of the

guardians, but in their methods more particularly; to some extent it was a change in the *personnel*.

4441. Was it connected with a change in the chairmanship?—No. There they have the plan I very much object to; the Chairman changes every year. It was not connected with that change, but there were one or two exceedingly influential guardians who came round to take my view of it after a short time, and they influenced the others. A good deal is done there by politics, which I hate in poor law, but they went so far as to combine against one guardian who was very obstructive, who was always in favour of relief to everybody, making speeches full of irrelevancies; he was an absolute nuisance in the board of guardians. The two parties combined and said: "We will not have this man any more, we will run an independent man and turn him out. They turned him out, and it has been the greatest blessing possible. It is quite curious the amount of mischief one man can do who is ignorant and who is energetic.

4442. Was it an instigation on your part which brought about the change?—I did not instigate their doing that.

4443. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Has not there been a great change in the composition of the Exeter board of guardians, in respect of the number of guardians and the elective area?—Yes, that has been a very great advantage. The number has been reduced; it is now only twenty-four, it was, I think, thirty-six.

4444. It was under a local Act, was not it?—Yes.

4445. There were a great many little parishes?—Yes.

4446. Then it was made into one parish?—Yes. Now there are only twenty-four guardians. That one parish is divided into wards. That has had a very beneficial effect. I was talking the other day to the guardian whom I was referring to as being most instrumental in bringing about improvement, and he said: "You must not forget that factor; it has been an uncommonly good thing that we have not had the unwieldy board that we had before.

4447. Are the guardians elected for a ward or for the whole parish?—They are elected for wards, though there may be two for a ward or something of that sort.

4448. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Had not the town council some representation on the board of guardians under that Act?—I know they were very much mixed up with the guardians; the guardians still are called the incorporation of guardians.

4449. (*Mrs. Webb.*) It is still under the local Act?—Yes.

4450. (*Mr. Booth.*) I notice that the improvement in St. Thomas is quite as great proportionately as in the Exeter portion. Has there been a similar change in the methods there?—There have been various personal influences which have been at work which have produced improvement. I do not think it is quite so much in proportion, is it?

4451. I think the change is about equal. I have it from forty-four to twenty-seven in the one case and from thirty-seven to twenty-one in the other. At any rate it is very satisfactory?—There has been a very satisfactory change there too.

4452. Due to more or less the same cause; you could not instigate the one without the other knowing of it, naturally?—I think generally it is a very enlightened board of guardians now at St. Thomas, and its composition is excellent; of late years they have addressed themselves to looking into things thoroughly.

4453. Are there endowed charities in either portion?—There are very considerable endowed charities in Exeter, and some certainly in St. Thomas.

4454. Now we will pass to Crediton. There is still a high pauperism there, but a decrease in it?—Yes. There again they have a very large number of old people, eighty-two per 1,000.

4455. Is there any manufacture there that you can mention in particular?—No, none; it is a district rather of large owners. Sir Redvers Buller has considerable property there, and various other people as well.

4456. Have you anything to say about the administration there?—No, I do not think I need comment on it.

4457. Now we come to Torrington. There seems to be some manufacture there?—It is of no importance. Torrington may be spoken of as a purely agricultural place.

4458. It has a decreasing population and a very high rate?—Very high pauperism indeed. *Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.*

4459. And there is a high old age?—Very high old age; an old age figure of eighty-two per thousand. 27 Feb. 1906.

4460. Is the administration there satisfactory?—No, I do not think so. At any rate they do not go on any strict rules at all, and I think that there is not sufficient inquiry as to the cases. I have nothing that I can say particularly as to that. It is not possible to apply any appropriate adjective to it. Aged people in Torrington.

4461. The rate of pauperism has remained practically unchanged during the whole period?—Yes.

4462. Bideford of course is a little port, and there is some fishing I suppose?—A little fishing, and people come to Westward Ho, golfers especially. A large number of visitors stay all about that neighbourhood in the summer. Conditions in Bideford Union.

4463. Have you anything to say about that union?—No; the proportion is not extraordinarily high, though it is higher than it ought to be, considering all things. For some reason that I do not understand the old age is very much less than that of other agricultural unions. The figure is only sixty-seven, whereas other agricultural unions get to seventy-five, eighty, and even ninety.

4464. The bulk of the population you would call agricultural?—It is agricultural mainly, with a few fishermen, but not many.

4465. Not enough to affect the death rate?—No.

4466. Then Holsworthy?—Holsworthy is a very little union on the borders of Devon and Cornwall. Conditions in Holsworthy Union.

4467. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I notice that Holsworthy has twenty-two parishes and thirty-eight guardians. Each guardian has only seventy-eight families and it is increasing its pauperism?—Yes. Effect of large number of guardians for small union.

4468. (*Mr. Booth.*) It is one of the few unions that has increased its pauperism since 1895?—Yes; but on the other hand, though it has got more pauperism than it had, its pauperism is not high in comparison with other agricultural unions.

4469. It was lower in 1885 than it is now?—Yes. When the unions are as small as that you really cannot say very much about statistics and averages. It is so small that a very little affects them. Deceptiveness of statistics where small numbers are concerned.

4470. You have this peculiarity which Mrs. Webb has referred to, that it contains very small units of election?—Very small indeed.

4471. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Does the guardian ever give relief himself in a case like this?—No, I think not. I think it is always given by the relieving officer; but too often the guardian advocates the granting of relief to the people of his parish, and so he rather confuses the functions of witness and judge.

4472. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) The smaller the parish the more likely he is to do that, is he not?—Yes.

4473. (*Mr. Booth.*) Okehampton is agricultural entirely, like Holsworthy?—That is agricultural entirely, except that it contains a large part of Dartmoor, and there is at times a considerable aggregation of soldiers. That affects the population in certain ways. The camp there is permanent. Conditions in Okehampton Union.

4474. The rate of pauperism was reduced, but is still very high?—It is still very high—much higher than it ought to be.

4475. Have you anything definite to say about the administration?—No. It has a rather high rate of old people; viz., seventy-nine per 1,000 but I have no special criticism to make. They look into their cases better than a good many of the agricultural unions, and I do not quite understand what are the circumstances which make its pauperism so high.

4476. We come then to Newton Abbot. There you have a large residential population?—Yes. There are several towns here. There is the town of Newton Abbot itself which is increasing very rapidly. It is said to be the cheapest place in the West of England. Then there are two or three watering places, notably Torquay, Dawlish and Teignmouth. It has an enormous board of guardians; I think there are about eighty of them; and when all those eighty people come, it is very difficult to get business transacted with any amount of efficiency—and they do Conditions in Newton Abbot Union. Low cost of living.

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

attend very well. It seems to me, from an extensive experience of boards of guardians, that meetings of large numbers are a drawback.

4477. Nevertheless, the administration has been fairly successful there; at least, the rate of pauperism is not great?—The rate of pauperism is not very high.

Effect of unwieldy board of guardians.

4478. But it might be lower?—It might be much lower.

Conditions in Totnes Union.

4479. Now we will take Totnes. I do not know whether there is any port there for shipping which amounts to anything?—There is Dartmouth, which, of course, has the Naval Training College (the "Britannia" that was), and it has a certain amount of shipping, but it has lost some of its regular lines, and now I think there is only one line, from South America, that runs there. It has not any shipping of importance, except such as is connected with the Royal Navy.

4480. The administration there is persistent?—It is pretty fair there. Their rate of pauperism is not very high for a country union; it is rather below the average, I think.

Conditions in Kingsbridge Union.

4481. Now we go to Kingsbridge, which is something similar, is not it?—Kingsbridge has no port. Salcombe cannot be called a port; it is a watering place and a popular yachting resort.

4482. There has been a considerable reduction in the pauperism there in the last ten years?—Yes. It is still high, although the figure has been reduced.

4483. Has there been a change in administration during those ten years?—Yes, they have gone according to rules a good deal more. That was one of the unions which, being extraordinarily high, was particularly attacked, and I think the result has been useful.

4484. It had increased enormously in the previous ten years, I see?—Yes.

Conditions in Plympton St. Mary Union

4485. Then Plympton St. Mary?—In the case of Plympton St. Mary, it is rather difficult to compare the present condition with the past condition, because a good deal of it has been absorbed within the last ten years into Plymouth and Devonport, and it is largely a sort of residential neighbourhood for people who go into one of these towns every day.

Effect of alteration of area on statistics.

4486. Is that the explanation of the increase of pauperism in the last ten years?—I think so.

Conditions in Plymouth Union.

4487. Now we come to Plymouth itself. There the rate of pauperism has been considerably reduced, I see?—Yes, but it is enormously high for a place like Plymouth. With all its advantages, with the amount of money that goes into it from all sources, with the work that is provided in the Dockyards (because although the Dockyards themselves are mainly in Devonport Union, the people very largely live in Plymouth), Plymouth ought to be and is flourishing. I suppose it is the biggest fishing port in the district; there is an enormous number of fishing boats (both trawlers and drifters) which go out constantly, and a great deal of money is poured into Plymouth from various sources. Although for the West of England the pauperism does not seem extraordinary, yet, compared with other places outside, it is very high indeed. While the rate of pauperism has gone down, the absolute number of paupers is rising. The earlier rate was not based on an estimated population, but on a previous census which was not recent. Therefore I rather doubt the value of those earlier figures. Of course, when a place increases very rapidly it ought not to add to its pauperism much, because the people that come into it, for the most part, are attracted by the large amount of employment, and they are of the able-bodied class. It is your old decaying unions that must have more pauperism. Pauperism ought to be very low indeed in Plymouth, but anyone present at one of the meetings of the guardians for half-an-hour would understand quite easily why it does not decrease there.

Effect of a rapidly increasing population on pauperism.

4488. What are the relations between Plymouth and Devonport?—Hostile generally.

4489. Devonport is the naval part, is it not?—I thought for the moment you had in your mind the question of amalgamation, which would be the natural thing, but is quite prevented by local feeling.

4490. I see the rate for Devonport is not only very low, but has been enormously decreased in the last ten years?—I will say something about that when we come to Devonport.

Effect of electoral unit on administration.

4491. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I was at Plymouth about six years ago, and I understood that a great deterioration in the guardians had taken place when the Plymouth Union was divided up into small wards: that they had become political, and there had been a great deal more out-door relief in consequence?—They are suffused with politics, and there seems to be a race very often as to who shall appeal to what they suppose to be popular opinion, by giving relief to everybody.

4492. Do you think an alteration in the electoral unit for electing guardians from two districts to ten, which was made about 1880, had any effect in making the constitution worse, from the point of view of administering relief?—I cannot compare it with the earlier time. That was before I knew anything of this district. I should say, judged from its results, the present arrangement is not a satisfactory one. Out-door relief has sometimes been given to persons whom I have heard described as a nuisance to the whole neighbourhood—always getting drunk—and they have been having it constantly and for long periods. The relieving officer has stated the facts quite frankly about these people, but the guardians have given the relief.

Effect of administration.

4493. When I attended the board of guardians, the relief was always recommended by the individual guardian of the ward?—Yes.

4494. The relieving officer was hardly considered at all?—The relieving officers now make their recommendations, but they are constantly over-ridden in the sense of "Let us give relief to everybody."

4495. Each guardian really directs the relief in his own ward?—I should not put it quite so high as that at present.

Merits of different relief committee systems.

4496. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is the relief given in wards or by the whole board?—They have three committees now, I think. They used to take all the cases, until three or four years ago, before the whole board. I found nothing could be more unsatisfactory than that, and I suggested Committees, but they did not arrange the Committees properly. The best way for a relief committee is that each man on the committee should not deal with the paupers from his own ward, but, if necessary, the guardian should be called in to supplement the information given by the relieving officer. That is common sense, otherwise he acts both as judge and as witness. They had nothing of that sort. I have mentioned that to them once or twice. They have kept on their committee system, but they are not satisfied with it. Perhaps at present they are placed in rather a difficulty, because their workhouse is absolutely full—overcrowded. Years ago I pressed them very much to build an infirmary; this was coming on, their workhouse was getting more and more full, and they had more and more difficulty in offering the house as an alternative. Then they passed a resolution in favour of building an infirmary. They wrangled over that for some time, but they eventually sent plans to the Local Government Board for a new infirmary. The Local Government Board accepted those plans. As soon as they got them approved, they passed another resolution saying they would do nothing at all. Then matters went from worse to worse; there has been more and more pauperism, and last year again I persuaded them—and this time I really think I have succeeded in converting the chief opponents of the infirmary scheme. They have submitted plans to the Local Government Board for a new infirmary to hold 300 people. We had a conference; the plans were approved; and they are now, I hope, going to build, but I shall not be quite satisfied until I see that the tenders are accepted.

Overcrowding workhouse Plymouth.

Conditions Devonport Union.

4497. (*Mr. Booth.*) Will you now tell us about Devonport?—Devonport is a residential place. It is a place full of people, mostly employed at Keyham. I have mentioned it specially in my statement, and I need not add much. Devonport has a pauperism of only nineteen per thousand—it may be credited with good administration, but it owes its position in part to very favourable circumstances, as its proportion of old persons is the smallest in the district, and the bulk of the population consists of skilled artizans in Government employ, of pensioners, and generally of the well-to-do classes, while

over 8,000 men of the Navy and Army swell the number. When you take that 8,000 off, that would raise their rate a little, but still they do their work well and look into things.

4498. The rate of pauperism has been very greatly decreased in the last ten years—has there been any material alteration in the social conditions of the place? Were there not the soldiers and sailors and these advantages as much ten years ago as now?—Yes, except that lately there have been very extensive additions to the dockyard. Sir John Jackson has had huge contracts, amounting to millions of money, and that has been spent mainly in Devonport.

4499. (*Mrs. Webb.*) May I call attention to the fact that the guardians have been reduced from 116 to 45? (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Has the union been altered?—Not that I remember in my time.

4500. There was an alteration in the borough, but I do not know about the union?—Yes, I now find there was a bit taken from Plympton Union in 1898.

4501. (*Chairman.*) I do not think it would be fair to compare that with the other districts?—It is rather exceptional.

Local Act at Devonport.

4502. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There was an old local Act there, was not there?—Which, as you are aware, was repealed some few years ago.

4503. (*Mrs. Webb.*) There were 116 Commissioners under that local Act, but now there are only 45 guardians?—It is quite a fairly workable number now.

4504. (*Mr. Booth.*) That may have had a great influence?—It may have had, but it is a very flourishing and prosperous place.

4505. (*Mr. Bentham.*) At the same time the area has been increased?—Yes, somewhat.

Conditions in East Stonehouse Union.

4506. (*Mr. Booth.*) East Stonehouse is also part of Plymouth, is not it?—Yes; it is a very small place between Devonport and Plymouth, but they are extraordinarily careful. They have only one relieving officer, but he is a particularly active man, and he is backed up by quite a small Board. I think there are only a dozen guardians or so.

4507. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Ten. Are those ten guardians elected by the one parish *en bloc*, or are they elected by wards?—I am afraid I cannot answer that. I did not think of looking into that point.

4508. (*Mr. Booth.*) The result of the administration in the East Stonehouse portion seems satisfactory?—It is excellent; those guardians have a much higher sense of public duty than a good many. To give an example, I have known them do this. There has been an applicant for relief for a certain object—going to some hospital or something or other—and the guardians have said, "Well, we can do this legally, but it will be rather an inconvenient precedent; it is only a matter of 12s.; do you not think we might as well subscribe this?" and they have put their hands into their pockets and subscribed the 12s. There are not many boards of guardians that would do that, in order to avoid creating an inconvenient precedent. Although the amount in that instance was small, it would be something to them.

Conditions in Tavistock Union.

4509. The last union in Devonshire is Tavistock, which is a mining district?—It has almost ceased to be mining now.

4510. Is that tin mining?—It used to have tin and arsenic, and the arsenic works kept on a long time after the tin had disappeared; but even the arsenic manufacture has almost stopped, if not entirely. The extraordinary increase in the price of tin, is resulting in the opening of mines which have been disused for half a century or more, and Tavistock is one of the unions where possibly that may go on. One mine has been opened, which, I think, is within the limits of the Tavistock union, and several are being re-started in Cornwall and on Dartmoor.

4511. The rate of pauperism has been reduced considerably there lately?—Yes.

4512. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is it not partly manufacturing now?—I do not think there is any manufacture there.

4513. There is a worsted manufactory there, is there not?—Not that I know of. There may be, but I do not remember any.

4514. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is there anything you want to say particularly about the administration there?—I do not think so.

4515. Now we will go on to Cornwall. I will begin at the corner, at Stratton; what do you say as to that union?—Stratton is so small that it is quite a negligible quantity. It is all agricultural, barring Bude, which is a watering place. It is a very small union indeed, and I do not think it is necessary to say anything about it.

Conditions in Stratton Union.

4516. On the other hand, it has a high rate of pauperism, I see?—Yes; but the figures are so small that you cannot infer much from that.

Deceptiveness of statistics where small numbers are concerned.

4517. Are the guardians elected for very small electoral districts?—Generally, I should say so; but that is a matter of fact that I will not answer from memory, because it is not a point that was suggested to me to inquire into.

4518. That is a suggestion which has been made by Mrs. Webb, who finds that a high rate of pauperism coincides in very many cases with small electoral districts for a board of guardians?—That may be so. The fact can be discovered from actual figures, and I would not attempt to give a general opinion on it.

4519. You do not explain in any particular way the high rate of pauperism at Stratton?—No, I do not.

Conditions in Camelford Union.

4520. Then I will take Camelford, which goes along the side of the coast; is that similar to Stratton? It is pretty similar. It has the watering place of Boscastle. It is almost on all fours with Stratton in most respects.

4521. Except that there is some mining there, I think?—Not now, I believe.

4522. Has the mining gone, then? I do not think there is any mining in either of those two unions now.

4523. It would be tin mining if anything, would it not?—Tin mining or china clay, but I do not think there is either.

4524. Are there old mines there?—There may have been in the very remote past, but not for the last half century, I think. There is a big quarry there.

Conditions Launceston Union.

4525. Then take Launceston, what do you say as to that?—Launceston is a very well and very carefully administered union indeed. They have reformed their method of late years, and now, considering all things, Launceston ranks in my estimation almost next to Taunton in goodness of results. You must have a certain number of paupers, you must get a certain irreducible minimum, what with very old people, what with lunatics and so on; but Launceston is quite excellently administered, they are very careful, and they have got good relieving officers, although they have got a great proportion of old people—80 per 1,000.

The irreducible minimum of pauperism.

Aged people in Launceston.

Conditions St. German Union.

4526. Then St. Germans?—St. Germans now is a sort of overflow suburb of Devonport really, as regards a considerable portion of its population. You will see that the old age figure is remarkably low, which means that they have got a very large number of able-bodied people living there. It is a flourishing community, with very few extremely poor people, and they look after their pauperism carefully.

4527. There has been a considerable improvement there in the last ten years, I think?—There has.

Conditions in Liskeard Union:

4528. Now Liskeard?—Liskeard has a high rate of pauperism, but then it has a very high rate of old age—it has 88 per 1,000 of people over 65, and stands next to Axminster in that respect. It has one difficulty which adds to its pauperism, that is to say, a certain number of years ago—perhaps about fifteen or twenty years ago—tin mining there stopped and the tin miners went away, leaving their wives and families behind to a certain extent; at any rate, people clung to the soil after there was nothing for them to make money out of. The result is that a good many of those have gone on the rates. Some of the guardians have been making efforts to reduce the high rate of pauperism there, and I have some hope that in the next few years there will be considerable improvement. At present the relieving officers are not sufficiently backed up, and there is much laxity in the grant of out-relief.

Effect of failure of an industry on pauperism.

4529. Is the tin mining beginning again now at all?—It has not actually begun, but when I was down there

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

about a month ago, they told me there was a mine which they were almost certain to start there, and which might be the beginning of a number of mines starting.

4530. I think it is about twenty years ago since the mining was abandoned; that is about the date you mentioned?—I think it was about that, but I could not speak to that with accuracy.

4531. At that time I see the pauperism was extremely high?—Yes, it was.

4532. Have you anything specific to say about the boards of guardians in Stratton, Camelford, Launceston, St. Germans and Liskeard?—I do not think so.

Conditions in Bodmin Union.

4533. Now take Bodmin; there the pauperism has increased in the last ten years, has it not?—There has been a recent increase up to January 1st, 1905, but surely Bodmin has gone down in the last seven or eight years. That is my impression, but, unfortunately, I have not a print of the return before me.

4534. My figures—and I think they are probably correct—are 29 per 1,000 in 1895, 31 per 1,000 in 1905, and a great reduction upon 1885?—The total figure is low, but, as you say, there was a considerable reduction between 1885 and 1895, and there is a fractional increase between 1895 and 1905.

4535. You have nothing particular to say about that union, I gather?—Nothing.

Conditions in St. Columb Major Union.

4536. St. Columb Major?—That union contains the very flourishing watering place of Newquay, which is accountable for a large part of its rateable value. Its pauperism has somewhat decreased.

4537. Very slightly?—Yes. It has 75 per 1,000 of old people. Dividing the unions into the highest third, the middle third, and the lowest third, St. Columb stands amongst the lowest third; and that, for a mainly agricultural union, is very creditable.

4538. Of course it is residential as far as that watering place is concerned?—Yes, as far as Newquay is concerned, but not otherwise.

4539. Is the administration of the poor law satisfactory?—I have nothing to say against it.

Conditions in St. Austell Union.

4540. Now, what have you to say about St. Austell?—St. Austell is the centre of the china clay industry, which is exceedingly flourishing, as there are great demands for china clay. Formerly, it was only used for making china, but now it is used for paper making, also in Lancashire for adding weight to calico—at least, so I am assured—and for various other purposes.

4541. Is the labour connected with it mere digging?—It is quarried out, and thousands and thousands of tons are sent out to all parts of the world from Fowey. People make a great amount of money out of it, and it always affords plenty of employment.

4542. Is it used at all now for the potteries?—It is used for making china to some extent, but I am told that less than a tenth of the whole amount is used in that way. Some is, I believe, still sent to the celebrated Sèvres manufactory in France, and to some of the other great china manufacturers. It is mainly used for the other purposes I have mentioned.

4543. For adding weight to calico, you say?—Yes, but its chief use is in paper-making. Paper is now mainly made of china clay and wood fibre.

Conditions in Truro Union.

4544. Now we come to Truro?—Truro is an agricultural union with a little cathedral town in the middle of it. I do not think that it has any special features. It has a high old-age figure—83 per 1,000—and it stands about in the middle of the unions as regards pauperism.

4545. But its pauperism shows a considerable reduction in the last ten years, I think?—It has been going down.

4546. Has that been due to better administration?—To some extent.

Conditions in Falmouth Union.

Effect of failure of an industry on pauperism.

4547. Now take Falmouth?—Falmouth is in a very unfortunate position, inasmuch as it has lost all its trade. It used to be the great port of call, but now it does nothing in that way. Then it used to be a great port for repairing ships when they got into storms in the Channel, but now that the ships are all under steam they are taken into Plymouth. The result is there is a rather high rate of pauperism in Falmouth, and from there, more than from anywhere else in my district, the Local Government Board get applications for making exceptions from the Prohibitory Order as to relieving able-bodied people. Those applications in the aggregate do not relate to large numbers, but they do come more from Falmouth than from elsewhere.

4548. I suppose there is a reducing population?—Yes, there is. At the present time it is becoming a winter watering-place, and probably, having ceased to be a trading place, it will be a watering-place in the future. It has a perfectly delightful climate in the winter, and people are finding that out.

Conditions in Redruth Union.

4549. What have you to say about the Redruth union?—It has a mining population. The two great tin mines of Cornwall are in the union. It has, as you see, a very small old-age figure, which means a very large able-bodied figure.

4550. The number of old has not been high in Redruth, has it?—No, the number is much smaller than in other places. One thing which makes the pauperism greater is that a large number of miners have gone from Redruth to South Africa. They go away, and they send remittances to their wives and children for some time; but many of them, after a while, cease sending remittances, and then the families are thrown on the rates.

4551. Do not the families ever follow them?—Very rarely. A man makes his money there, and then comes back; sometimes, of course, he settles down there. Most of these people have gone to the Transvaal, to the Rand, and so on, where living is so enormously expensive that they cannot afford to take their families with them.

4552. I think Redruth is one of the few unions where the rate of pauperism has steadily increased during the last few years?—It is, and what I have just stated is perhaps mainly the reason. Then, the tin mines have been steadily diminishing in yield.

4553. Would you say that what is left is the residue of the mining?—Yes. They have now to raise a great deal more stuff in order to get the same amount of tin, and it costs much more to raise, because they have to go so much deeper for it. That is the great difficulty. Then they have a good many cases of miners' phthisis, and that has thrown people on the rates. They have to labour under special difficulties there.

4554. Are the mines deep?—Some, such as Carnbrea and Dolcoath are very deep. Apparently there is a revival just coming on, and if it is not stopped by a fall in the price of tin, more mines will be opened about there, and Redruth may flourish again.

4555. Have you anything to say about the administration there?—Nothing occurs to me.

Conditions in Helston Union.

4556. Then we come to Helston; is there any mining at Helston?—I do not think there is a single mine in Helston now.

Effect of a strong administrator on a board of guardians.

4557. I think that there is a pretty considerable reduction in the rate of pauperism in that union?—Yes. It so often comes to the personal equation in the case of these unions. One strong man will do an enormous amount of good, as has been shown, especially in Launceston and Taunton and some other places; but if you have not a strong man there, it is so very much easier to give out-door relief freely than to refuse it. You want your strong man to refuse it; but if you have not got your strong man, then they yield.

4558. I see the proportion of out-relief given in Redruth is more than double what it is in Helston?—It is very large indeed at Redruth, I know.

Conditions in Penzance Union.

4559. The last of these unions in Cornwall is Penzance, and that appears to be extremely satisfactory as regards its pauperism?—Yes. Penzance has always been a puzzle to me, because it has no habit of adhering to rules very strictly. The circumstances of its population are exceptional.

Instance of low rate of pauperism concurrent with lax administration and with large board of guardians.

4560. I notice that its rate of pauperism has been very low, even at a time when on the whole the rate was so much higher; even twenty years ago it was very much the lowest?—Yes, it was.

4561. I have it that it was twenty per 1,000 in 1885, twenty-two per 1,000 in 1895, and eighteen per 1,000 in 1905; so that on the average its rate of pauperism is very much the lowest?—Yes. As to Penzance, I think I can only refer you to what I have said in my printed

memorandum: "Penzance comes third with twenty-one per 1,000, its position being partly due to the fact that there seems to be more disclination than elsewhere to apply for Poor Law relief; arrangements exist among some of the fishing population under which the widows and orphans of deceased fishermen are specially provided for; while in parts of the union the market gardens furnish a good deal of light labour for the old and infirm." Then people can live for almost nothing in Penzance. Their staple food is fish, and they can get three or four pilchards for a penny. It is an extraordinarily cheap place, and various circumstances combine to make the pauperism low without any special effort on the part of the guardians.

Low cost of living in Penzance.

4562. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I see there are sixty-nine guardians on the Penzance Board?—Yes, there are a great number of them.

Large number of guardians.

4563. (*Mr. Booth.*) So you would say that, in spite of everything the general good conditions keep the rate of pauperism down?—Yes. I have remonstrated with them over and over again, for giving too small allowances to the people they do relieve, and they have raised the allowances from time to time. They tell me when I go next time that they have raised them somewhat, and you can see from the comparative return I have given that some increase has taken place. I went round with the relieving officers of the Penzance union to the different pay stations, spending day after day, and talking with the paupers; but I could not find, after seeing them and hearing what they said, that there was any exceptional distress that ought to be relieved, although I am bound to say that the allowances are extraordinarily low there.

4564. In fact, there, would you say, the usual canons of perfect administration are all lacking, and yet the results are good?—Everything is wrong, except the result. But the relieving officers are particularly efficient.

Possible effect of racial conditions on pauperism.

4565. Let us look for a cause outside the Boards. Have you considered the question of race? In England you do often find, even in counties, almost a different race of people; in contrasting these three counties, Somerset, Devon and Cornwall, do you recognise any difference of that kind? I suppose there are no counties more definitely, separately proud of their individuality than Cornwall and Devon—and I think Somerset shows the same feeling. A Devon man or a Cornishman is proud of his county. That may or not may be a question of race; but it shows at any rate a different spirit in the two counties. Do you trace in this simple Poor Law question a difference between the counties which may be attributable to a difference of race?—There is a very considerable difference as between Devon and Cornwall. The Cornish people are Celts, and one characteristic of them is that they do not drink. The difference between Devon and Cornwall is very curious. The Tamar, in its upper parts, is a wretched little stream that you can walk across without the water getting much above your ankles; and yet I have heard it asserted—perhaps with some little exaggeration—that the people on the two sides of that stream will not have anything to say to each other in the way of marriage. The two counties keep more apart than one would have considered possible. The whole appearance of the people is quite different, and their way of treating things.

4566. Does that difference show itself in the language; does the dialect differ?—Yes, strongly. Then you have the perfect trustworthiness combined with the stolidity of the Devonian, and the greater briskness—I will not say whether it is combined with anything—of the Cornishman.

Effect of good administration in reducing pauperism.

4567. (*Chairman.*) You have given us some very interesting evidence, and I think the purport of it is that the governing consideration which reduces pauperism in these counties has been good administration?—Certainly.

System adopted by central authority for securing good administration.

4568. Let us clearly understand what are the obstacles to good administration. The Local Government Board wish to inculcate sound principles of administration upon the local boards, but the Local Government Board has, I think, very little authority through its inspectors?—It has very little compulsory authority, but it has great influence through the inspectors. The Local Government Board does not tie its inspectors down by any special instructions. I have never had any instructions as to what is the policy as to this or that matter, with the exception of one or two special circulars. I have been left to apply the general principles, so far as I have been able to collect them from reports, and economic books. As I have said, boards of guardians have shown themselves generally willing, when they have known that they are not doing well, to do better; and I think that has been largely the result of constantly bringing before them comparative statistics, addressing circulars to them as to the differences between this and that union, and preaching proper principles to them.

4569. Then there is no definite code of instructions?—No, none.

4570. And there is no model scheme of what Poor Law administration should be?—Not officially.

4571. I assume that with these rural boards of guardians the disposition is to go on very much as their forefathers did?—Very much.

Tendency of guardians to regard relief as a charity.

4572. Is there not a tendency rather to regard the poor rate as a sort of charitable fund which they have to administer?—One consideration which I have had to press upon them in many places has been that they are not administering a charity, but are discharging a trust with the money of often needy ratepayers.

4573. The result of bringing to their attention comparative statistics and showing them what other boards of guardians do, has, I understand, had a very salutary effect?—It has had a considerable effect in reducing pauperism.

4574. Would you think that your position would be strengthened if you had a more definite code of instructions or some model scheme of administration sanctioned by the Local Government Board, which could be produced as a standard or as a model for any board of guardians to follow?—I do not feel personally that I want anything of the sort. I rather prefer to take my own way of stating what seems to me to be the principle upon which they ought to act. I should be sorry for the details or methods to be stereotyped by the Local Government Board. I should find probably that what would be applicable to one union might not very well be applicable to another, and I might have something thrown in my teeth. If you ask me whether I have felt the want of any definite instructions, I say—No, personally I have not.

Objections to stereotyped instructions from Local Government Board to inspectors.

4575. The legal powers of the Local Government Board are very small, and a wide discretion is left to guardians within broad legal limits; is that not so?—Their discretion is very wide indeed—so wide that till recently in many places the number of relieving officers has been quite insufficient, yet the Board have alway hesitated to exercise their powers of compelling guardians to appoint relieving officers. In my district, a few years ago, I brought forward a very flagrant case at Redruth, where it seemed to me to be absolutely necessary that the Board should for the first time take the course of saying, You shall appoint a relieving officer, and if you do not we shall issue a compulsory order which will be enforceable by mandamus. That has been done in a few instances since, and one or two orders have been actually issued. That precedent has been exceedingly useful, because till the Redruth case the fact was not recognised that the Board could compel them to appoint; and though the power need not be exercised, it is convenient to have it in the background.

Wide discretion of guardians.

4576. Assuming the law in other respects remains much the same, I gather that you would not advocate increased powers being given to the Local Government Board, or to their inspectors?—I have not felt the want of such powers.

Sufficiency of existing powers of Local Government Board and inspectors.

4577. I suppose the real difficulty is that frequently the guardian is a person who is hardly adequate to discharge the very delicate duties that he is called upon to perform Can you suggest anything that would encourage people of force of character and of station in the neighbourhood to take a greater interest in the Poor Law; for instance, assuming that the areas were increased, would that have any effect as regards the character of the guardians who would go upon the boards?—It does not occur to me that that would have any effect. I must say that I dread any considerable alteration of areas; first, on the ground of

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

expense. If there were any change of the sort, what with the officers to be compensated, and what with the new buildings that are generally inevitable, the expense would be very great indeed. You always think, of course, that if you bring the paupers of two unions into one, that will be a saving; but in the long run you do not find it so. I have had some experience in this direction. There were two unions in my late district, and the workhouse of one of them was abolished years ago. But it acted very badly, and those two unions collectively were among the highest in pauperism of that district, if they were not quite the highest. I consider that the present areas of unions—speaking quite generally, and confining myself to my own district—are excellently arranged, generally about the market towns, and they are quite big enough.

Objections to increasing size of Poor Law areas.

Difficulties of classification by workhouses.

Sometimes we have had meetings on the question whether unions could not be amalgamated. We had one in my late district, and we have had one in Devon, the object being to avoid expense by having one workhouse for two unions. But we found immediately that nobody would give up his own workhouse, although willing to have paupers from elsewhere. The universal feeling at the two or three meetings we had was —"No, it would not be fair to take the sick so far from their friends;" and "If you classify by workhouses instead of by people you will split up families and you will have great difficulties." Altogether I am very well satisfied, generally speaking, with the areas; and I do not myself think that any change of areas would give you much better administrators. Of course, the county councils are excellent in many ways, but then the county councils have plenty to do, and some of them are complaining that they have too much to do. If county councils had to deal with pauperism through their committees, I do not think you would gain in the long run.

Objections to county council as Poor Law authority.

Scheme for transferring imbeciles to care of county councils.

4578. (*Mr. Booth.*) You have told the Commission that you wish to take the imbeciles out of the workhouses and to put them into institutions; those institutions would not be institutions belonging to each union, would they?—No.

4579. So you do contemplate larger areas for certain specific purposes?—I would make the imbeciles a county charge, and let the county councils deal with them as a special class, just as they deal with the lunatics as a special class now; but I would not in any other respect alter it.

4580. You mean that you would not deal with any other classes on that basis?—Yes.

Convenience of existing Poor Law areas.

4581. (*Chairman.*) As regards the administration of the Poor Law, I take it that you think the present areas are satisfactory?—That is my opinion. There are some cases like the unions which I mentioned earlier to-day, which are popularly called the Three Towns, namely, Devonport, Plymouth, and East Stonehouse, which are all in a ring fence, and which obviously ought to be one town, but the local jealousies are so great that if you tried to amalgamate them by a local Act you would be fighting for years, and thousands and thousands of pounds would be spent in opposing the Bill, and I am not sure whether it would not break down in the end, simply because of those local jealousies.

4582. You became inspector in this district in 1897, did you not?—Yes.

4583. The Local Government Act of 1894 must have been in operation then; did it materially affect the character of the guardians?—I have heard it said that it did; but I cannot compare the present boards with anything before, because I knew nothing of the district in those days.

4584. You have said that in 1897 you were not satisfied with the system of Poor Law administration that prevailed in many unions, and then you were speaking of a state of things prior to any change that has been effected since 1894, were you not?—I was rather speaking of the state of things which I found when I took charge of the district.

Miscellaneous types of guardians.

4585. Do you think that the general intelligence and intentions of the present boards of guardians are satisfactory?—I am afraid that is rather a difficult question to generalise upon. I know boards of guardians which contain many very intelligent men. On the other hand, there are some which contain members who apparently have other motives than the actual administration of the Poor Law in the best possible way.

4586. Would you suggest any other method of election than that which now prevails?—I have none to suggest. Perhaps I might give an example of the motives which influence boards of guardians. On one occasion I was pressing very much that a particular board should inquire into the out-relief system, and a very prominent member got up and said, "We are sent here to give outdoor relief to our relations—our fathers and our mothers and our sisters and our brothers and our cousins and our uncles and our aunts; and if we did not do it, we should very soon be sent about our business." That statement was received without dissent from any of them.

Lax views of guardians as to out-relief.

4587. But you did not find that feeling generally, did you?—Not generally; but there are one or two unions in which there is too much of that.

4588. You have told that us at Exeter they publish a list of those receiving poor relief; what effect has that publication had on the community, and on the pople receiving the relief?—That has been done for a great number of years, and it has had a very useful effect. It is done by a great many unions. They publish a list of the paupers, the amount given to each, and the cause of destitution; sometimes the age of the pauper is given. In some unions the list is published half-yearly, and in some it is published yearly. Exeter publishes the list half-yearly. I think it has had an excellent effect. It is sent round to clergymen and others likely to be acquainted with the condition of the poor, in order that they may state any case in which they think that the person to whom the allowance is made ought not to be on the list or that the amount given is wrong.

Effect of publication of names of paupers.

4589. Would you see any objection to making that practice uniform?—No; I think, however, that some of the small unions would grumble a little at having the list printed. They can publish the list now if they like, and I often find that if you compel people to do things which they might do, and do not care to do, not much good arises from it.

4590. I think you would like to say something as to the method of choosing officers?—Yes. Perhaps I might read a short extract from one of my reports on this subject. "I have more than once had occasion to wish that particular boards of guardians would take a more enlightened view as to their responsibility in the matter of choice of officers. Local considerations and personal acquaintance have often an undue weight, and sometimes the question seems not to be whether the candidate is fitted for the office, but whether the salary is needed by the candidate. I am certainly not inclined to attach excessive importance to testimonials alone; indeed, I have now and then had reason to believe that the amount of eulogy in a particular testimonial has reflected the strong desire on the body giving it that the services of the person recommended should no longer be devoted to themselves. But I have seen local candidates, with little or no experience in the Poor Law, preferred, in the case of such appointments as those of workhouse masters and matrons, to apparently much more eligible applicants, the evidence of whose superior qualifications ought not, as it seemed to me, to have been put aside without much more consideration than it has received." I have come across flagrant instances of the kind. There was one case in a rather important workhouse, where a man was appointed master who had been at sea all his life. He was appointed straight away because he was a local man. He had got tired of the sea, but when he was appointed to the workhouse he was more at sea than ever. He did not make a good workhouse master, and he is no longer in office. Then, broken-down farmers not infrequently are appointed. The Local Government Board have no power in the matter. No qualifications are prescribed for masterships of workhouses, and it would be difficult to prescribe any. The actual choice must rest with the guardians, but it now and then happens that people are jobbed in for their own sake instead of for the sake of the office. I wish some means could be found of bettering this. On the whole, I think we have wonderfully good masters and matrons, notwithstanding the defect which I have pointed out as to their appointment. I have had all sorts of evidence of the kindness of masters and matrons —especially to the old paupers—and of the fondness of the inmates for them. People talk about workhouses being

Objections to existing method of choosing officers of guardians.

Question of prescribing qualifications for guardians' officers.

Bastilles and about the barbarous treatment in workhouses; all I can say is that, talking to paupers constantly alone and away from any officers, and talking freely with them, in 99 cases out of 100 I have heard nothing but gratitude for the treatment they have received. In numberless instances people who have refused to go to the workhouse, and who have had to be almost forced to go there—you cannot quite force them, unfortunately—after they have been there a couple of months have said, "If I had known this was so comfortable I should have been here long ago."

4591. Would you suggest that the Local Government Board should have a veto on the appointment of any officer?—To a certain extent they have a veto now; that is to say, their approval is required, but as long as no qualifications are prescribed for any particular office, practically the choice is left to the guardians. Now and then the guardians can be asked to reconsider it in the case of particular appointments, but if they stick to their guns and appoint the original person whom they want to job in, the Local Government Board have to give way.

4592. Would you suggest that the qualifications should be defined?—There would be very considerable difficulty in defining them, but I have had some doubt as to whether in the larger workhouses you should not require some evidence of experience or knowledge of the poor law before appointing. I think that is a matter which deserves some consideration, let us say, in regard to workhouses where there are over 100 or over 150 inmates.

4593. What have you to say to us on the subject of superannuation?—I should like to call special attention to a point in regard to nurses. The Superannuation Act has improved very much the class of men who have become Poor Law officers. People feel that it is a provision for life. For instance, the office of relieving officer is an office that is very much coveted. There are always numerous candidates, even when the salary is very small. The Superannuation Act has given us an excellent class of officers. On the other hand, it may have added a little to the difficulty of getting rid of them. I have known an instance of a relieving officer who was not quite bad enough to be dismissed, but he was an incompetent man and would probably have been sent about his business, but the Guardians said, "Well, he has paid towards his superannuation for so many years, and he will get his pension in six years more, so we must keep him." There are isolated instances of that kind. The one direction in which the Superannuation Act seems to me to want some amendment is some special provision for nurses. In my Memorandum I say, "The one point in which the Poor Law service might have been expected to afford an attraction to the number of fairly educated women in need of a life's employment, viz., the provision of a pension for old age, has proved a signal failure. Nearly all nurses contract themselves out of the Superannuation Act, probably because it does not allow them to retire until they have devoted almost a life-time to the service. If it were possible to introduce a system under which any trained nurse could, after twenty or twenty-five years' service, claim a pension of £25 or £30 per annum, payable by the State, the difficulty experienced by so many women of providing for themselves after middle age would be to some extent surmounted, and it is conceivable that the service might attract candidates—especially if means for training them locally were organised." It seems to me that when the question of Exchequer grants to local authorities comes to be considered—and I believe the Local Taxation Commission were pretty well agreed that they ought to be made to a larger extent than at present—the question of establishing a special pension fund for nurses will deserve consideration. Nurses now are extraordinarily hard to get. Women do not like to take to workhouse nursing, which is very disagreeable in many ways and consists to a great extent in feeding and keeping clean a large number of people who are only slowly dying. There are very few interesting cases in a workhouse—very few cases that a nurse really cares to have—and you want rather a special class of nurse for them. I should therefore like to offer such attractions as some scheme of superannuation would give them. After all, I think the total number of workhouse nurses in the country, is only about 6,000; even supposing—which it is absurd to suppose—that you had at once to pension all those with twenty years' service, and taking the highest figure I have mentioned, £30, the amount required would be inconsiderable; and I believe that you would get a great return for your money by attracting a larger number of people to become workhouse nurses—and workhouse nurses are a very great want at the present time.

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

4594. Then I think you would like to say something about boarding-out; has that answered very well, do you think?—I think we want to know more about it. Speaking of boarding-out within the unions, I have been made aware of various cases in which it has not answered well. I think it was Miss Clifford who said that, thoroughly well supervised and arranged, it was the best system for blending the pauper with the general population; but while in theory you may multiply your inspections and you may multiply all sorts of checks; in practice you do not get adequate supervision. Then your superior class of artisan does not want to be bothered with strange children. Our inspector of boarding-out, Miss Mason—she has only got to do with boarding-out outside the unions—is constantly saying, "We cannot get the homes." Then, again, people do not take these children for charitable purposes; they are not philanthropists; they take them in to make money, and the worse they treat them, and the worse they feed them, and the worse they clothe them, the more money they will make. You have always got that bed-rock, as it seems to me, and it is very hard to get over it by any amount of supervision. Perhaps everything practicable has been done as regards visits from relieving officers, medical officers, and so on; but I should like to know a good deal more, and to have some investigation into 200 or 300 cases of boarding-out within different unions by some entirely unprejudiced person who would look into the system and report whether it is acting well. My impression is that a good many bad cases would be found.

Difficulties of boarding-out system for children.

Suggested inquiry into boarding-out system.

4595. Have any bad cases come before you?—Several, within my district.

4596. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Within the union cases?—Yes.

4597. (*Chairman.*) Would that objection apply to boarding-out outside the union?—To a certain extent. I believe there are more committees in that case—I only know from Miss Mason's reports—but there seem to be committees who recognise their responsibility. Very often within the unions there are committees whose duty it is to look after the children, but it is only a paper duty, and some of them do not do much.

4598. I observe that in nearly all the unions the children who are not boarded-out are lodged in the workhouse and attend a public elementary school?—That is so.

Pauper children lodged in workhouse and sent to public elementary schools.

4599. I think that you have reported that that system has worked very well?—For myself I would sooner have all the children removed from the workhouse, but I think that system does work fairly well and produces good results. You have this great difficulty though, that the children are in the workhouse for the greater part of two days every week, namely, every Saturday, when they do not go to school, and every Sunday, when only a few of them may go to Sunday school. Therefore, two days out of the seven, they are more or less in the workhouse, besides being there every morning and every evening. What happens? Either they are strictly under discipline, strictly kept apart under an officer—which it is very hard to do in a small country workhouse—and therefore, they cannot call their souls their own; or else you go to the other extremity, and they walk about the workhouse and mix with the others as they like, and so come into constant contact with adult paupers whose influence is depraving.

4600. Of the paupers now receiving relief in your district is there a considerable proportion who had, as children, been brought up in the workhouse?—That I cannot say. It would want enquiry and a detailed return to show. Probably there would not be many. There is one union I know of in which quite recently three young girls, all sisters, came back one after the other. They had all been brought up in the workhouse and had been said to be very nice girls when they were

Suggested inquiry into after-careers of pauper children.

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

there, but they all three came back with illegitimate children. That was, however, an exceptional case. I should say, generally, that workhouse children, even under the present arrangement (which seems to me to be to a certain extent faulty) do, for the reasons I have said, exceedingly well. In the first place they are brought up with great cleanliness, then they are well looked after, and they are uncommonly well-fed.

Advantages of scattered homes.

4601. Are you in favour of building children's homes?—I think the scattered homes are excellent. I have had no experience of grouped homes in my district. I have seen some in other districts, as the Board allowed me to go round to various parts of England for my own information and see grouped homes and scattered homes, when I was thinking of getting some introduced into my district. I did not like the grouped homes so well, because it seemed that there was an unmixed atmosphere of pauperism about them. I have scattered homes in five of my unions, and the more I see of them the more I like them, when guardians take the trouble, as they have done in my unions, to get the right sort of women to look after them. I think the number of fifteen, which was originally suggested by the Board as the maximum number, is a little too big; fifteen children is a greater number than one woman can very comfortably look after, especially if most of them are small and therefore cannot help much in the work of the house.

Comparative cost of children in scattered homes and in workhouse.

4602. Is the system costly?—No; but it is rather more costly than keeping them in the workhouse. I have given particulars in my memorandum. In Plymouth the cost is 6s. 11d. per child. I dissuaded them very much from any idea of building houses. I said, "If you rush into bricks and mortar, there may come something or other to change the whole system, and then you will have had this expenditure and you will lose the benefit of it after a few years; but if you take a house, at any rate you will not lose any more than the rent, and then if the system is changed, and you have to put the children elsewhere, you will not do any harm. There is the old proverb, "Fools build houses and wise men live in them;" you will have to pay a great deal more for building a house than you will have to pay for buying a house, or renting a house." They followed my advice, and did not build at all. Including everything, cost of administration, salaries necessaries, coals and rates, it works out at Plymouth to 3s. 8d. for maintenance, clothing and necessaries, and 3s. 3d. for salaries, rent, interest on loans and repairs, giving a total for each child of 6s. 11d. At Newton Abbot it is rather more, 8s. 1d.; at Barnstaple it is 7s. 1d.; at Wells it is 6s. 11d., and at St. Austell it is only 5s. 4d. They get their houses very cheap and they run the thing very economically at St. Austell.

4603. (*Mr. Phelps*). Why is the maintenance so high at Barnstaple; the average is 3s. 8d. or 3s. 10d., but it suddenly goes up to 4s. 10d. at Barnstaple?—I am afraid I cannot explain that. It happens that I only had these particulars three or four days ago, so I have not had time to go into the figures.

4604. (*Chairman*). What would a child cost if he was in the workhouse; have you any idea?—The cost in the workhouse varies very much indeed, but I should think it would be about 2s. 10d. for food and 1s. 4d. or 1s. 6d. more for establishment charges. Perhaps it would be about 5s. taking it altogether, but there are great variations in different workhouses, and it is scarcely practicable to strike an average.

4605. (*Mr. Nunn*). What sort of things would "necessaries" include?—"Necessaries" would be coals, gas, and various small things of that sort; I think it would be mainly those things.

4606. (*Mr. Bentham*). I suppose "necessaries" would include everything except rent, interest on loans, food, and salaries?—I have separated salaries, rent, interest and repairs in those figures which I have given in my memorandum.

4607. (*Mr. Nunn*). "Necessaries" do not include food?—They come in the one item of "maintenance, clothing and necessaries."

Table showing connection between pauperism, old age and wages.

4608. (*Chairman*). I think you wish to hand in a table showing the connection between pauperism and (1) old age and (2) wages?—Yes. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VIII. (C).)

4609. (*Mr. Booth*). Are the wages in this table taken from the Board of Trade returns?—I have taken them from Mr. Wilson Fox's return of 1902. I have taken the pauperism from the figures of 1902, and the number of people over sixty-five years of age from the Census of 1901. As the Commission will notice, this table deals with counties. I have hitherto been dealing entirely with my own district, and I have ventured to put in this table for the whole of England simply by way of emphasising the fact how extraordinarily pauperism does depend on old age. The counties are arranged in order of pauperism, and in the six most pauperised unions the proportion of persons over sixty-five years of age ranges from sixty-five to seventy-seven per 1,000, and the agricultural wages range from 14s. 6d. to 16s. 4d. Then going to the other end, and taking the six least pauperised unions, the old age figure in four of them is below forty and in no case reaches fifty, while in five the wages range from 19s. 10d. to 21s. 7d., and in one only are the wages below 17s. That is in Warwickshire where, for reasons explained by Mr. Wilson Fox, there is much difficulty in striking an average. My table gives the agricultural wages, and of course agricultural wages do not indicate the wages of working men in a county like Warwickshire, which is mainly a manufacturing county. As to the old age figure, it is very striking to notice that all the most pauperised counties have the greatest old age, and all the least pauperised counties have the least old age. Devonshire, for instance, has an old age figure of sixty-nine per 1,000, but the corresponding figure in Lancashire is thirty-three per 1,000. That is an extrardinary difference as between a manufacturing and an agricultural county, which is perhaps worth your attention.

Large proportion of aged at Axminster.

4610. (*Dr. Downes.*) Is there anything special in the circumstances of Axminster to attract such a proportion of old people as you show in your Table, namely 94 per 1,000?—No; I have not been able to understand why there should be so many, unless there has been an enormous amount of migration from it of the young and vigorous, who have left the old and feeble behind them. That is the only explanation I can give. Between the two censuses there was a reduction of nearly 10 per cent. in the population of the Axminster Union.

4611. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Would that be due mainly to the rural question?—The union is mostly in a rural district.

Question of transfer of vaccination administration from guardians to statutory authorities.

4612. (*Chairman.*) Would you like to say anything on the subject of vaccination, and the functions of Poor Law Boards in connection with it?—Yes. Vaccination was originally given to boards of guardians in the time when arm-to-arm vaccination was in vogue, and when therefore you had to collect a lot of children together in order to give adequate choice of lymph. It was necessary then that you should have tolerably big areas, and the work was placed in the hands of the guardians as the only authorities available. Then sanitary authorities were constituted, but the vaccination was not transferred to them. At the present time, when calf lymph has been substituted for arm-to arm vaccination, it really does not matter whether your district is big or little, and therefore the reason which used to operate against giving it to the sanitary authorities all over the country, some of which were very small, has ceased to exist. It is the one *quasi* public health function that the guardians possess; it complicates their business, it is a burning question in many places, and it has no relation whatever to any of their other work. I really do not see why it should not be transferred from them at the first opportunity.

Status of Superintendent-Registrar.

4613. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is the Registrar the servant of the board of guardians at present?—Generally, but not always, he is, as a matter of fact, the clerk to the guardians. As Registrar he is the servant, not of the guardians but of the Registrar-General in London.

4614. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You are speaking now of the Superintendent Registrar are you not—not of the Registrar of Births and Deaths?—I am speaking of the Superintendent Registrar.

Poor Law system in Switzerland.

4615. (*Chairman.*) I think now you would like to say something about the workhouse system in Switzerland, to which I understand you have paid special attention?—I have only a few words to say in answer to your Lordship's question as to Switzerland. I happened to be in

Mr. Herbert Preston-Thomas.

27 Feb. 1906.

Italy some time ago, and the Local Government Board allowed me on my way home to make inquiry as to vagrancy in Switzerland, and as to the various methods of dealing with it. In the course of that inquiry I visited a great many institutions, among them forced labour farms, workhouses, poor-houses, orphanages, and so on. I need not say much about the Swiss workhouses, because they are rather the English workhouses of forty or fifty years ago, with a considerable absence of classification The sanitary arrangements are such as do not exist in any English workhouses; the management is of a very economical character. The people are fed very largely on a vegetable diet—vegetable soups, and so on; I tasted some, and it seemed to me excellent and appetising, but still not nearly so costly as the diet in our workhouses. We have not much to learn from Swiss workhouses, but it is noticeable that some inmates are compulsorily detained there. There was one feature which I thought very good. Many have a considerable amount of land, and a good deal of farm labour is done on it. Owing to the Swiss capacity for extracting everything that is good from the land, they work their farms very well and very economically. Another part of the Swiss method struck me as admirable; that is their system of forced labour farms. In England, if a man drinks heavily, and if he will not maintain his wife and children, and they apply to the rates for help, we take some futile proceedings against him, and sometimes he is sent to prison for a fortnight or some short period of that sort. In a very large proportion of the cases, he goes on with his drink and he goes on with his neglect, sometimes with a little imprisonment, now and then a period of prison. The Swiss way of dealing with that sort of man is not, like ours, to commit him for a fortnight or a month to a prison where he is better fed and has less work than he would have in a workhouse, but to send him for a year or a couple of years to a forced labour farm. I went to one between the Lake of Bienne and the Lake of Neuchatel. It covered about 2,000 acres. It was land which had been originally marsh land. By admirable management they had reclaimed it. They had added something like £17,000 to its value, and they had erected the buildings—all by the labour of the people sent there. It was worked with extraordinary economy, so that practically it was almost paying its own expenses. Between 150 and 200 people were kept there, and the only grant from anyone was an allowance of about £1,200 a year from the Cantonal authorities. They were constantly reclaiming more land, and consequently making this farm more valuable. The system struck me as an admirable way of dealing with wastrels. They have no hesitation in sending a man there for a year or two years, and then he is occupied from early morn to dewy eve, and has to work hard the whole time. Sometimes, if he has been a drinker, as he is cut off from drink, he gets out of the habit of drinking; and if he has been a loafer, as he is cut off from all chance of loafing, he gets to be a worker. It has certainly done wonders in Switzerland. I should like to see some of our people who leave their families on the rates, instead of being treated in our mild way and being left to go on drinking and neglecting their families, committed for a period of years to a place where you could utilise their labour and where you would have a chance of effecting some reformation. There is one other thing that I should like to mention; in various Swiss Cantons there is a strict prohibition against innkeepers supplying alcoholic drink to anybody in receipt of Poor Law relief. I am quite sure that would be a good thing, if it could possibly be enforceable in this country. One of the most pitiable things I know is that when inmates of workhouses here get leave for a day, a number of them come back either absolutely drunk or else under the influence of liquor. If we could do anything to prevent that, and to make it a penal offence to serve paupers with liquor, just as we make it a penal offence to serve anyone who is on the Black List, I think it would have an uncommonly good effect. It would also prevent the money of the ratepayers which is given for out-door relief being spent in drink. I think it is worth seeing what Switzerland has done in this way.

Prohibition of sale of drink to paupers.

4616. How do they know who are the persons who are in receipt of Poor Law Relief?—I suppose, following the same analogy, just as we know the people who are on the Black List under our system. I speak with some ignorance, but I believe that a certain list is sent round to the publicans, and a publican is fined if he supplies liquor to anybody on the Black List under the Licensing Act. I suppose something of the same sort might conceivably be done in regard to people in receipt of Poor Law relief.

4617. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do they print the roll of paupers in Switzerland?—I am afraid I cannot say.

4618. (*Chairman.*) Going back to the forced labour farms, are these persons compulsorily detained there?—Yes.

Compulsory detention in Swiss Labour Colonies and punishment for attempts to escape.

4619. What punishment is inflicted on them if they escape or try to escape?—They are only brought back, but sometimes there is a slight punishment in connection with the diet. They have to wear a distinctive, although not a very conspicuous dress. The police in Switzerland are very active. Then there is the additional security for recapture that each man must have a *dossier*, and if he sleeps two nights at a place, he is sure to have a policeman coming to see his papers.

Identification papers.

FIFTEENTH DAY.

Monday, 5th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. EDMUND PEARSE BURD, called; and Examined.

Mr. Edmund Pearse Burd.

5 Mar. 1906.

4620. (*Chairman.*) You are now Inspector of Audits under the Local Government Board, I believe?—I am.

4621. You have previously had considerable experience as auditor, have you not?—Yes, in Lancashire.

Duties of Inspector of Audits, &c.

4622. Do you yourself audit now?—No.

4623. Your inspection of the work of your auditors is a local inspection, is it not?—Yes.

Ratepayers' right to inspect books and object to expenditure.

4624. You have given us a clear statement, I think, of your duties (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. IX. (A)). Among other things, you state the fact that the books have to be for seven clear days open to inspection by any person liable to be rated to the poor rate; do ratepayers avail themselves of that?—Occasionally they do, but very rarely.

4625. Did you ever get a complaint before the audit has begun from a ratepayer in connection with any expenditure?—I never did.

4626. Or have the auditors, so far as you know?—Not as far as I know, directly, but I believe occasionally the Board have received objections which have been sent to the Auditors.

4627. So that the interest taken by the ratepayers in the audit is small?—It is very small. Occasionally, interest is aroused, and you get a Ratepayers' Association attending before the auditor and objecting to certain items in the accounts. As a rule, though, I do not suppose it would be one audit in a hundred that any person attends for the purpose of making any actual objection; of course, when I am speaking of a hundred audits, I am taking the big and the little authorities together.

Extent of Auditors' discretion.

4628. Are your duties very strictly defined, or have you any discretionary power of interpreting what is extravagance?—In determining what is extravagance, the auditors have discretionary power; in determining what is legal and what is illegal, they have no discretionary power; if expenditure is illegal they are bound to disallow it.

4629. Of course under their instructions, however venial may be the error, if technically it is an error, it has to be reported?—If it is an illegal error it has to be reported, and it has to be disallowed; if it is merely a thing that the auditor thinks he can deal with himself he would not disallow it.

Auditor's position when consulted by Guardians as to legality of proposed expenditure.

4630. Do the board of guardians ever, in advance of an expenditure, consult the Local Government Board or the Audit Department of the Board as to whether the expenditure they propose is legal or not?—I think they very often ask the district auditor to say whether he considers certain expenditure legal; but a district auditor would go out of his way if he told them whether it was legal or whether it was not. He is not their consulting legal adviser.

4631. Do you consider that his duty is not to give that advice, but simply to concentrate his attention on the accounts when presented?—I should look at it in this way: I should think if he could trust the man who asked him he would give the advice, but would say, "It is my personal opinion." It makes a great deal of difference when you know whom you are dealing with. To one man you can say one thing, but to another man you dare not say it.

4632. For fear that the opinion which is given as a personal opinion, might afterwards be held to be binding on the Department of which the auditor was the representative?—On the auditor certainly, but not on the Department.

Procedure of auditor as regards unnecessary relief.

4633. Now, in regard to the discretionary power which the auditor has; what is the form of the expenditure in connection with which that has most to be exercised—would it be out-door relief?—It would be almost entirely in connection with the out-door relief.

4634. Would the question whether the amount was excessive be a point that he could take into consideration?—He would take into consideration the conditions of each particular case that he had to deal with. Cases are constantly cropping up where relief is given where the incomings of the family show there is no destitution. Those are cases that a district auditor has power to deal with.

4635. Are there any rules, or is there any standard laid down, by which he would be able to decide without exercising his own discretion whether the relief was uncalled-for?—No. He has to take every case on its merits. It depends entirely on the conditions of the particular case.

Difficulty of a uniform standard for "necessary" relief.

4636. Is there any difficulty in enforcing uniformity in the decisions of the auditors in the different districts?—I do not think it would be possible to have uniform decisions—the cases differ so very much. You could not lay down a rule that in one district if 10s. a week came in the family should be considered to be destitute, and in another district if there were 10s. a week coming in it should not be considered to be destitute. The districts vary so much that there is quite that much distinction between them, and in one district you might say 10s. a week for the family should not be considered to be destitution. Not only that, but it depends on the number of the family too; so I do not see that it would be possible to lay down any hard and fast line.

4637. I assume that inspecting as you do all the auditors, at their work, you are endeavouring to establish something like uniformity?—Certainly.

4638. Do you find that some district auditors are very much stricter than others in their interpretation of their instructions?—It is rather difficult to say; I have not noticed it

Mode of exercise by auditors of their discretionary powers.

4639. Do you think that the discretion which they have got is, on the whole, used wisely and works well?—I think so, quite. An auditor, as a rule, has to remember that the local authority have presumably considered the matter before him, and that they have a discretion to a very great extent, and unless he sees they abuse that discretion he would not interfere with it.

4640. I notice that you say you have never in practice made an audit of out-door relief given under an order of the justices?—I never have.

4641. That refers, I suppose, not only to your own experience, but to the experience practically of the auditors who have been under you?—I was making inquiries the other day, and I believe there has not been a case reported for fifteen years.

Auditors' powers as regards contracts.

4642. What are the powers of the auditor as regards contracts? Has he merely to see that the terms and prices of the contracts are adhered to, or can he go behind the contracts?—He could certainly go behind a contract. Those contracts are all based on tenders, and if the tenders show that the amounts tendered are improper, the auditor certainly would have power to go behind them. It would not be often that he would know that they were improper, but occasionally it would occur.

4643. Have any cases occurred within your knowledge where there has been an investigation into the contracts?—I always used to see the contracts and I believe auditors now do so and check them with the expenditure so as to see that the amounts are correct. But I have heard of cases where tenders were made in respect of large quantities at unreasonably low prices, and small quantities at unreasonably high prices, and it is almost an impossibility for the district auditor who does not know the actual circumstances, to go behind that. That is a way in which it is possible to get round the question of the tender.

4644. Have any contracts been upset by the Board within your knowledge?—No.

4645. Is it, therefore, your general experience that the contracts are, on the whole, fairly made?—I think so.

Procedure for stock-taking.

4646. Do the auditors do any stock-taking work?—No, that is the duty of the guardians. In certain cases, there are stock-takers appointed, that is, the Local Government Board issue Orders, and in certain unions stock-takers are appointed to check the stock.

Procedure on discovery of fraud by an officer.

4647. If your investigations show that any fraud has been committed by any official, I assume the Local Government Board brings pressure to bear upon the guardians in connection with that official?—If it is required; occasionally the guardians act immediately and refer the matter to the Local Government Board.

4648. I think you also audit the accounts of other branches of local expenditure?—The audit staff do.

4649. The municipalities are under a special clause of their own, are they not?—Except as to education, and the accounts of eight boroughs subject to Government audit under the provisions of Local Acts.

4650. But the system of control, and I suppose of audit, in connection with other branches of administration is much the same as that applied to the Poor Law?—It is based on the Poor Law system.

Observations on existing form of union accounts.

4651. On the whole, do you think the system works well?—I think I have seen almost every form of account that it is possible for a local authority to produce. When I was in Lancashire I had to change urban district councils accounts from their old form into the form that was required by the Local Government Board under an Order of 1880. In my own mind I am quite satisfied that the system of account for unions is as simple as it is possible for an authority to use. I have never seen a better. This does not apply to the workhouse masters' accounts.

Enforcement of certificate of surcharge by auditor.

4652. There are a considerable number of surcharges made every year; I believe the auditors' functions cease when he disallows or surcharges?—Unless he has to enforce his certificate.

4653. The option of whether the surcharge should be enforced or not does not rest with you; it rests with another branch of the Local Government Board, does it not?—Yes; it rests with the Audit Appeals and Sanctions Department of the Local Government Board, if there is an appeal to the Board.

Mr. Edmund Pearse Burd.

5 Mar. 1906.

4654. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) But in the absence of an appeal it is the duty of the auditor to enforce his certificate, is it not?—Yes, or after an appeal, if the Board decides not to remit, and does not reverse the auditor's decision.

Insufficient check on balances in hands of officers continuing in office.

4655. (*Chairman.*) Could you suggest any improvement in the system of audit, or make any recommendation which would strengthen or simplify the check that is now in force?—I do not think there is any improvement required as regards the union accounts *qua* union; but in the overseers' accounts there are several things that might be beneficially altered. One of those touches the union accounts, that is, as to certifying the balance due from officers who continue in office. The auditors find a very great difficulty on that point now. One of the statutes provides that they shall not certify a balance due from an officer continuing in office. There are a great many officers who continue in office from year to year, and they have balances in hand at the end of the year, but the district auditor is powerless to deal with those.

4656. These balances are, I suppose, public funds?—They are generally balances of rate moneys. If district auditors could require that any balances in collecting officers' hands at the date the accounts are closed should be paid over to the authority, it would considerably strengthen the audit.

4657. That is a recommendation which you would make?—I certainly should make it.

Insufficiency of ratepayers' right to inspect poor law books.

4658. Have you any other suggestions to make?—There is a question, which I believe, interests the Commission a great deal, and that is as to the position of the ratepayers and so on, as to the inspection of accounts by ratepayers prior to the audit. The law in connection with the inspection of documents prior to the union audit is not as good as it is under the Public Health Act in connection with the urban district audit; Sub-section 4 of Section 247 of the Public Health Act gives a better power than the Poor Law does.

4659. And that power under the Public Health Act you think might with advantage be applied to the Poor Law?—Yes.

Question of insufficient definition of poor law terms.

4660. If the General Consolidated Order were revised, and there was a simpler definition given to "able-bodied" and other terms which now are undefined, I assume that would help your audit?—Anything that would tend to complete definition would help the audit.

4661. Do you find any inconvenience from lack of accurate definition?—Personally I do not.

4662. It is not a subject of complaint at all, is it?—No, I never heard a complaint.

4663. I assume that the guardians give every assistance to your department?—In nearly every case.

4664. Have there been exceptions?—I have known exceptions.

4665. But not sufficient, I suppose, to necessitate any special notice from the Commission?—No. As a rule, certainly, the clerks to the guardians and everybody connected with the guardians are quite ready to assist the auditor in every way.

Persons present at Audits.

4666. Who is present when the accounts are audited; may anybody be present, and are the officers of the guardians, for instance, present?—Occasionally some of the guardians attend, and very often the chairman of the Finance Committee or the chairman of the board. The clerk is practically certain to be there during part of the audit.

4667. Do the officers connected with the disbursements attend too?—I do not think any auditor would pass the account of an accounting officer unless he were present, except for some very good reason.

4668. He would have to produce all the vouchers?—Certainly.

Duties of Inspector of Audits.

4669. (*The O'Conor Don.*) I see the statement you have handed in is chiefly taken up with the duties of the auditors, but I do not find in it any statement of what your own duties are; would you kindly say what are your special duties as inspector of audit?—I am afraid I am not prepared to put a limit to them. My duties as inspector are not confined simply to the inspection of audits, and that is not the largest part of my duty, I think. I go down and attend the audits

Mr. Edmund Pearse Burd.

5 Mar. 1906.

where the auditors are at work, and I see how they work, and my endeavour is to get them all to work on the same lines. I have not been able, however, to succeed in doing that in the twelve months since I have been appointed.

4670. You go to the auditors in the different districts in England and see how they are working?—Yes.

4671. Do you make any reports to the Local Government Board?—Yes, I report after each visit.

Duties of Auditors' clerks.

4672. I see that most of the auditors have clerks to assist them: what is the duty of those clerks?—The clerks will do the ordinary routine work—the casting of columns of figures, and things of that sort.

4673. Do not the auditors do that themselves?—They have to do a certain amount of it; they cannot help it. There is so much work for them to do that if they did not do some of the casting they would never get through their work.

4674. Is much of the casting of accounts, the totting-up and the verifying of accounts, done by the clerks and not by the auditors?—It is mostly done by the clerks.

4675. Then the clerks are really responsible for that?—Certainly.

Appointment and salary of auditors' clerks.

4676. And the auditors cannot be responsible when the duty is not thrown upon them?—The auditor is responsible for all his clerks do, I always should say. He should look after them, and if they are not satisfactory he has the power of dismissing them, as they are his clerks and are not civil servants.

4677. Are they appointed by the auditors themselves, then?—Yes.

4678. Are they paid in the same way as the auditor?—They are paid by the Government.

4679. What is the pay given to the clerk for this clerical work?—It starts at £70 for a junior clerk, but I am afraid I cannot tell you what the maximum is. There is an annual increment.

4680. Does it vary at different places, or is there a uniform salary?—The minimum is uniform and the maximum is uniform; but between those two it would vary in different districts.

4681. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It goes up to £250, does it not?—It may be so, but I am not quite certain.

Non-poor law work of auditors.

4682. (*The O'Conor Don.*) I see there is only one auditor exclusively employed upon Poor Law work; what are the others chiefly employed on besides Poor Law work?—They have the urban district councils; there are eight boroughs now come under audit entirely; there is the education work of the whole of the boroughs; there are all the counties and the education work of all the counties; and there are the rural district councils.

4683. Those are all under the Local Government Board auditors, are they?—Yes. Then there are various joint boards, such as joint sewerage boards, joint hospital boards, and joint water boards, and certain water boards under private Acts, which come under them.

Qualifications for Auditors.

4684. In regard to appointment to the office of auditor, I see you stated that one qualification is that they must have undergone a course of training with a district auditor; in what does that course of training consist?—Very often they go as clerks; in certain other cases they go as volunteers. As volunteers they go with the district auditors, staying with them for a period, getting no salary and paying their own expenses.

4685. Are these clerks to the auditor sometimes promoted to be auditors themselves?—Yes, certainly.

Procedure for stock-taking.

4686. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you tell us to what extent expert stock-takers are used, and in the absence of an expert stock-taker whether the auditor has any other means of checking the commodities and stores in hand except his own knowledge?—I cannot give you the number of stock-takers, but you can find from those books in front of you the number of stocktaking orders.

4687. Are they Local Government Board officials?—No. Where a stock taker is appointed an order is issued by the Local Government Board, and the names of the unions where such orders are in force would be given in the orders.

4688. What determines whether a union shall have a stock-taker ordered by the Local Government Board or not?—That I cannot answer. There was no stock-taker in my old district. I think if the guardians consider that a stock-taker should be appointed, and they apply to the Local Government Board, the Local Government Board would be perfectly willing to issue an Order. But that is outside my province, and I could not answer you definitely. I might say that the stock-taking by the guardians is not at all satisfactory.

4689. I have come across cases in which I understood that expert stock-takers had been appointed through employers who were anxious to preserve the "purity" of their commodities?—I have never heard of such a thing, and I do not know of any such case.

4690. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Is not stock-taking obligatory on the guardians?—The guardians have to take stock as to provisions at the end of every quarter, and as to clothing at the end of every half year. Where no stock-taker is appointed, the guardians themselves have to certify to the quantities.

4691. But they practically have to take it from somebody they appoint; they could not do it themselves, could they?—They are supposed to do it themselves; the books are signed by them, anyhow.

4692. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Has the auditor any power to insist that the stock be taken after the last meal of the old quarter and before the first meal of the new quarter?—No, I do not think he could. He would see the amounts of food and of necessaries and other things that had been issued between the time of the last meal and the time when the stock was taken; it could always be arranged for in that way. If the guardians did their duty there should be no difficulty up to within a week or so in seeing that the stock taken agrees with what ought to be in store.

4693. My point is that very often the guardians are careless about the stock-taking, and that that results in the workhouse-master or the clerk working backwards all through the quarter?—That, I am afraid, is very often the case.

Proposed reform of stock-taking.

4694. Would it not be rather important that a stricter rule should be enforced?—I quite agree that it would be a great advantage if in every union in the Kingdom a stock-taker was appointed, and if he was bound to take the stock directly at the end of every quarter.

4695. But the Local Government Board have no power to insist on that, have they?—No.

4696. Do you think that ought to be done?—I certainly should be very pleased to see it. I have had trouble myself with guardians because they did not take the stock; and in one case I refused to hold the audit until the stock was taken and certified by them, because I said it was the basis of the whole audit, and so it is. Eventually they did it.

4697. This carelessness in stock-taking very often leads, does it not, to the practical demoralisation of some of the officers, who get into lax ways owing to the guardians' slackness?—I do not think it is necessary for the guardians to be slack.

Audit staff for London.

4698. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) How many clerks has the auditor for London?—The audit staff consists of an auditor, one assistant-auditor, and two clerks; and sanction is usually given for the aid, during the year, of two clerks for two weeks, in order to help in the examination of the claims relating to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

4699. You audit the accounts of each union twice a a year, do you not?—Yes.

4700. How many men would there be engaged in the audit of one of the unions of London?—Four, I should take it.

Statement as to duration of audits in London.

4701. How long would it take them, as a rule?—That varies very much with the different unions, and, of course, depends very much on the expenditure, though not entirely on the expenditure. I have a statement made out here of the different times that have been taken in the different unions.

4702. Will that be put in?—I can put it in. It is rather misleading, I am sorry to say, because during part of the time the district auditor was very ill (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. IX. B)).

4703. From your experience, do you think that the audit itself is worth very much?—I certainly do.

Ins'ances of effectiveness of audit.

4704. From the point of view of proving embezzlement or illegal payments ?—Certainly.

4705. Have you any cases where the auditors have proved embezzlement ?—I do not think there is a single union in the Kingdom where embezzlement has taken place where the district auditors have not found it out; I do not mean to say they have found out each particular case, but they have certainly found out cases in almost every union in the Kingdom.

4706. Could you give us the number of cases in the Metropolis in which the auditors, without any previous information from other people, have of themselves discovered discrepancies ?—I have no knowledge of that at all; but I daresay I might be able to get that information if you give me time.

4707. Has the Audit Department ever brought out through their examination of accounts any dishonest discrepancy in an officer's accounts ?—Certainly, it is being constantly done.

4708. Could we have some instances ?—I certainly have no objection; I could give you instances of my own, if you would like to have them.

4709. I would like to have them for the Metropolis ?—There, I cannot help you, but I can get them for you, as the Local Government Board would not have the faintest objection to let you have them.

Duration and sufficiency of audit for Paddington Union.

4710. Can you tell me how long it takes, for instance, to do a union like Paddington ?—The assistant auditor in the half-year ending September, 1904, was fifteen hours, and in the half-year ending March, 1905, the district auditor and the assistant auditor were each fifteen hours.

4711. How much money would there be involved in those two audits ?—The expenditure in Paddington amounted to £71,011 in the half-year ending September, 1904, and £69,707 in the half-year ending March, 1905.

4712. A good deal of that would be for out-door relief, would it not ?—I should say so.

4713. Do you think that was sufficient time to go through the relieving officer's books in an effective manner ?—It is difficult to say, as I have not been to Paddington. I have given a description in my Statement of how I used to manage it, and the way that I adopted was that if I found any case that was wrong, then I used to go more and more deeply into it.

4714. Supposing there are fifteen relieving officers in a union, can you tell us what the method of the present auditors would be ?—They do the same as I used to do; I have seen them do that. But I have not seen Mr. Gordon at work, so I cannot answer the question as regards him.

4715. He is the auditor for London, is he ?—Yes.

Sufficiency of audit staff for London.

4716. What I want to get at is whether you think that one auditor and these other gentlemen, four altogether, is enough staff to audit the London accounts ?—I asked Mr. Gordon that question the other day, and he said that he had an exceptionally good staff, and the work was quite well done.

4717. Have you ever seen a London audit ?—Never. I have no doubt that the audit is a good one. I think that the auditor, when I spoke to him the other day, if he had not considered it a good one would have told me so at once. He is a man who is a very good judge; he has been in several districts.

4718. But that is only your opinion on the evidence of the gentleman who is concerned in doing the audit ?—Certainly, and a man that I know.

Type of persons appointed as auditors.

4719. Has a clerk ever been raised to the position of auditor ?—Yes.

4720. I mean a paid clerk; I do not mean one of the voluntary gentlemen ?—I am thinking of paid clerks.

4721. Can you tell us how many within the last twenty-five years ?—If I had a list of the auditors I could pick them out. One of the senior auditors at the present moment was a paid clerk.

4722. What I wanted to find out was whether the appointment was due to patronage, or whether it was due to a man's ability ? I should say it was due to patronage tempered by ability, or ability tempered by patronage.

4723. How many auditors are chartered accountants ?—I do not know that there is one. I should not like to say there is none, but I do not fancy there is.

4724. In regard to out-door relief, it is in the discretion, is it not, of the auditor whether he allows the expenditure on cases of sudden and urgent necessity ?—He would have a discretion there; but he would inquire distinctly from the relieving officer what caused him to give the relief.

Auditor's procedure in cases of relief on "sudden and urgent necessity."

4725. Would that not rather imply that if it is to be a proper audit, the auditor ought to go behind all those cases and form his judgment on them ?—I think so.

4726. Where there are hundreds of cases of sudden and urgent necessity, do you really think the auditor is able to exercise any discretion at all ?—I should certainly go into every case myself if I held the audit. I would not allow a single case of sudden and urgent necessity to pass without the reasons being given to me.

4727. Do you think that they do that in the Metropolis ?—That I cannot tell you. As I told you just now, it is an impossibility for me to say, because I have not been present at one of their audits; I am sorry I have not.

Instances of relief surcharged where applicant not destitute.

4728. Has there been a surcharge made in a case such as you describe where the income of a family was in the judgment of the auditor such that they could not be considered destitute ?—Yes, certainly.

4729. Were any of those cases in London, do you know ?—I do not know of a case in London.

4730. You have not got any particular case in your mind just now ?—No. There is a case of Mr. Chamberlin's I have in my mind, but that is a midland counties case.

4731. How long ago would that be ?—That is about six months ago now.

The hearing by auditors of reasons against surcharge.

4732. Now with regard to the appeals against the decisions of the auditors; the auditor is supposed to give the person surcharged notice and also he is expected to tell him that if he or she has anything to say why they should not be surcharged, they can go and say it to him ?—Certainly.

4733. Do the auditors allow people to do that ?—Yes.

4734. Do you know that of your own knowledge ?—Certainly I do.

4735. Do you say that the real rule that ought to be observed is that the auditor has got to hear those whom he proposes to surcharge ?—Yes, certainly, and I have never heard of such a thing occurring as a refusal to hear them.

Extent of auditor's inquiry into guardians procedure as to contracts.

4736. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to contracts, is it the auditor's business to see that the provision about advertising them has been fulfilled ?—It might become his duty to see to that. I do not know that I can say that so much in connection with the Poor Law as in connection with the public health.

4737. Under the Poor Law, is it not so ?—Under the Poor Law I do not know that he would be bound to look into that in the same way.

4738. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is it not the fact that the guardians cannot spend more than £50 without advertising or without the sanction of the Local Government Board ?—That is provided for by the general consolidated order, 1847.

4739. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would you not think it was the business of the auditor to see that the advertisement had been issued ?—He would do this if his suspicions were aroused, but I cannot say that I did it. I never had reason to believe that guardians in my old district neglected to advertise, but I had reason to know that certain other bodies did.

4740. Is it the business of the auditor to see or to inquire whether the guardians have taken the lowest tender ?—He should see that.

4741. Does he ?—I should think in many cases he does, but in certain cases he would not. That depends very much upon the auditor.

4742. Supposing they had not taken the lowest tender in such a case, would he ask for their reasons ?—Certainly; he would ask for their reasons and get them out thoroughly.

4743. But you do not think that that is necessarily done by the auditor ?—I do not think it is done in every case.

4744. Might I ask you whether it comes at all under the purview of the auditor to inquire incidentally into what is the practice with regard to the acceptance of one

Mr. Edmund Pearse Bird.

5 Mar. 1906

contract rather than another; for instance, would you know whether the clerk usually did it by samples and disguised the thing or withheld the name or withheld other particulars in order to prevent collusion?—Do you mean so that the guardians themselves should not know the name of the person that makes the tender?

4745. Yes: is that usual?—I think so, quite.

4746. Would the auditor see that that was done?—He could not see that that was done, because he would not be there.

4747. Would he inquire?—I do not think so.

4748. Then he would have no knowledge of whether the guardians had the sort of information that would enable them to have collusion with an outside trader?—No. Unless something turned up to make him very suspicious, I do not think the auditor would go into that at all. That is a question that he would leave to the guardians, and they would deal with it entirely.

4749. I suppose occasionally he would have suspicions would he not?—Very likely.

4750. Would he report them to the Local Government Board?—If he got anything of that sort he would certainly report it to the Local Government Board, and then the Local Government Board would write to the guardians and ask for their observations.

Auditor's reports referred to general inspector.

4751. Would his report go to the inspector?—The inspector would be sure to see it at some stage, but I cannot say it would go to him first.

Extent of auditor's check over contracts.

4752. Then practically an audit does not prevent corrupt contracts, which it is supposed to do?—It is supposed to do that certainly, but the difficulty is for the auditor to get hold of those.

4753. That is rather what I wanted to get out?—If an auditor had any knowledge of it there would be an end of it at once, as he would put a stop to it; but the difficulty is for him to get that knowledge.

4754. Would he be considered to be going beyond his functions if he were to inquire whether that sort of caution had been exerted to prevent corrupt contracts?—I do not think he would do it unless he had his suspicions aroused, as I have mentioned just now.

4755. Is it not his business to test the quality as compared with the price of the contracts?—No, not at all. Auditors have a great many qualifications, but I do not think they are equal to do that.

4756. Would it not come before them at all?—No, not in any way, unless the auditor happened to be in the board room, as I happened to be very often, when all the samples are there in front of him. He could have a look at them then, but I do not think he could say which was the best even then.

4757. Does it in any way occur that a discontented ratepayer comes up and makes objections to the way in which the contracts are given?—I do not recollect ever having had a ratepayer before me or seeing one at any of these audits on that particular point. I have often seen ratepayers there, but not in connection with contracts.

4758. Of course under the Poor Law you have got nothing like you have in the municipal world, where you have a ratepayers' auditor, a people's auditor?—That is so.

Documents placed before auditor.

4759. Does the auditor to a board of guardians call for all the particular Orders or permits under which that that board is working?—Yes. That is part of the knowledge that he is required to attain; he must know all the Orders affecting the particular area with which he has to deal.

4760. How does he get to know them; does he call for them?—When he is appointed, he is supplied with a full list of all the Orders, and then he has to find out for himself which of the Orders apply to which of the unions.

4761. Then with regard to the permits, the letters permitting the Boards to do certain things, how does he know of those?—Those would all be sent to him and he would know them; and if there were any sanctions for various things that had not been sent to him, he would never pass anything without seeing the sanction, and initialling the sanction so that it would not come before him again as a sanction for some other payment.

4762. Would the clerk of an individual union bring up a book containing all the special Orders or Permits?—Yes. I will not say always, but very often they keep the sanctions of the Local Government Board in connection with each half year and the letters of the Board separately and in a case, and those are produced to the auditor and there is never any trouble in finding them.

Number and efficiency of audit staff.

4763. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 15 of your memorandum you state that there are fifty audit districts in England and Wales; has the number of audit districts been increased since the Act of 1879, when they were formed?—Yes. Seven county audit districts were formed after the Local Government 1888; and the audit arrangements of all the districts were altered about four years ago.

4764. How many auditors do you think were appointed at that time?—I was not in the office, and not very much interested; but there were I believe thirteen auditors appointed then.

4765. Do you consider there is a sufficient number of auditors and assistant auditors to make a thoroughly efficient audit of all the accounts they have to deal with?—I do not. The question of re-arranging the districts and getting an increase of staff is under the consideration of the Board at the present moment.

Auditor's procedure for testing legality of out-relief.

4766. In auditing the accounts of the union under the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order, is it the practice to check the cases that are granted out-door relief in order to ascertain whether any has been granted illegally?—Yes, certainly. I do not mean to say that a district auditor goes through each case, taking the outdoor relief cases and going through them from beginning to end. He would never do that, unless he found there were a lot of cases where the relief was improperly given; but he would take a certain number of cases and test them.

4767. The object being to ascertain if any are being granted relief outdoor who do not come under the exceptions which are mentioned in the Order?—Yes.

Prevalence of out-relief in unions under "the Prohibitory Order."

4768. How do you account for it that some of the unions that give most out-door relief are under the Prohibitory Order?—That is rather difficult to account for off-hand.

4769. Have you any theory?—I should fancy that there is a certain amount of laxity on the part of the guardians; but of course it depends entirely what the population is and what are the different classes of individuals to whom relief is given.

4770. As a matter of fact, in Wales most of these unions are under the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order?—Yes.

4771. I find that in one district the two highest unions in regard to out-door relief are twice as high as the average of the United Kingdom; still they are under the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order?—That is quite possible.

4772. You do not assume that all those people come under the exceptions of the Order, do you?—I cannot say, but in South Wales and in the west of England, and in the south-west of England too, I have noticed (this has not been in connection with my audit work), that the out-relief is very high. In Wales, when I have been holding inquiries on altogether different subjects, I have constantly called attention to the huge amount of the poor rate, because it was one of the things I have had to report upon.

4773. Would it be easy to find out the cases that have been relieved contrary to the Order?—Certainly. I have no reason to believe the district auditors do not do their duty. They would check them at once. The amount of relief in that way runs up very easily; if they give 5s. a week in one union and 3s. in another, even to people who are absolutely entitled to it, it makes a lot of difference.

4774. I am not speaking of the amount, but of the proportion of in-door to out-door in numbers?—In certain unions the guardians insist on the workhouse test, or did. I do not know of any case now, speaking off-hand, where that is insisted on entirely; but in certain unions where they do not insist on the workhouse test being applied as they should, of course the out-relief would go up.

Proposed simplification of procedure as to surcharges made on purely technical grounds.

4775. Could there be a simple division made between the purely technical surcharges and those of other kinds,

so that the technical surcharges might be remitted almost as a matter of course without going through all the formalities that would be necessary in the case of other surcharges?—I take it you mean whether we could distinguish between an absolutely illegal payment and one where a district auditor has simply dealt with a matter which was within his discretion. I do not know how we are to distinguish them. If it is the auditor's duty to disallow any item contrary to law, it is likewise his duty to disallow any extravagant or exorbitant payment. I am not quite clear as to your object in asking the question, but if I could help you in any way I would be very glad.

Operation of Local Authorities Expenses Act 1887.

4776. The object is to prevent those irritating surcharges that are of no moment, and are of a purely technical character in some cases, and might be dealt with by the Local Government Board without any difficulty?—The Local Authorities (Expenses) Act, 1887, enables that to be done now. There are scores of cases in the course of a year that come before the Board, and the Board obviate the necessity of the surcharge by giving their sanction.

4777. Do you think that meets the case really?—I think it meets it to a very great extent. There are certain small things that irritate people quite as much as large ones, where they could not get the sanction of the Board.

Objections to yearly instead of half-yearly audit of union accounts.

4778. With regard to the keeping of the union accounts, do you see any reason why they should not be made up yearly instead of half-yearly?—Yes.

4779. What is the reason?—I do not think it is a question for me to go into really, but, broadly speaking, I should say at once that the yearly audit is not so good for checking fraud as the half-yearly one. I think Mr. Pitts is going to give evidence upon this, and perhaps I had better not say anything about it.

4780. Mr. Pitts has been here, and given us evidence upon this point?—From an audit point of view the more frequent the audit is the less probability there is of fraud remaining undetected. That is the strongest reason against it in my view. Another reason is that with a yearly audit some of the audits must be late—you cannot help that—and the local authorities object very much to having their audits as late as they are already.

4781. Is it not a matter of fact now that they are nearly always late, and in many cases nine months late, year after year?—It is possible that they are so, but it would be very unusual for an audit to be always nine months late, because if an auditor took it at one time one year he would usually take it an earlier time another year.

4782. I was thinking that if all the audits were yearly it would make no more difference in finding out mistakes in union accounts than it does in the accounts of other local authorities?—If I had my way, everything should be audited half-yearly. Unless you have had experience in it, you do not know how difficult it is to get at the facts of the case a long time afterwards, and what a difference there is after twelve months' interval as compared with six months.

4783. If the union accounts were made up like those of other local bodies, to the end of March in each year, would it be practicable for the audit to be made twice during the year, part of the books to be audited up to a certain point and then completed at the end of the year?—That is not a good system. Of course it is possible, but it means a great waste of time. Preliminary audits are never satisfactory unless the books are absolutely balanced.

4784. Do you think it would interfere with the efficiency of the audit?—I do.

Divergence of auditors' practice as to surcharges.

4785. Do the auditors in your experience differ rather widely with respect to some matters of surcharge?—I do not think they do as regards the surcharges. I have never noticed any great difference.

4786. You do not know that matters are allowed to pass in some unions that are surcharged in others?—No. Of course one district auditor may take more upon himself than another would, but the rule is laid down very hard and fast that he shall do certain things.

4787. When a surcharge is made by an auditor, I suppose it is reported to the Local Government Board?—Yes.

4788. Is it a matter of general practice on the part of the Board to give instructions to all the auditors to surcharge similar items in the accounts of other unions?—No; there is no necessity for it.

4789. Does the Board rely upon the instructions that are already given?—There is the law of the land that says what they shall do.

4790. But new things are constantly arising and new points are constantly arising that are not always seen beforehand?—The auditors meet together and they talk these matters over, and they try as far as possible to work on the same lines. I am trying, as I said just now, to get them to work on the same lines as far as possible.

4791. As far as you are concerned, you try to get uniformity in all the unions in the country?—Yes.

4792. You aim at that?—That is what I am trying for.

Auditors' qualifications: by whom prescribed.

4793. (*Professor Smart.*) In Paragraph 22 of your statement you give the qualifications of the auditors; where are those qualifications laid down?—They were laid down originally by the Treasury, and the Local Government Board now mention them in every case in connection with the auditor. No auditor is appointed who has not some one or other of these qualifications.

4794. Is that the only statement of it?—This is taken from one of the Board's forms—I forget which one now, but it is copied absolutely word for word from it. That does not set out what the qualifications of an auditor really are.

Type of persons appointed as auditors.

4795. (*Chairman.*) We know that the auditors are not chartered accountants, but what are they? Are they barristers and solicitors, or are they persons who have undergone a course of training with a district auditor or have served in the Department of the Local Government Board?—There are some of each. There are auditors who are barristers, there are auditors who are solicitors, there are auditors who have undergone a course of training with a district auditor, and there are auditors who have served in the department of the Local Government Board.

4796. I suppose the majority really come under the last mentioned category, do they not?—I think there are only three who have served with the Local Government Board; I do not remember any more.

4797. (*Professor Smart.*) I suppose a good deal of the auditor's work is to audit the workhouse accounts?—That is not a large portion of it

4798. But it is a part of their work?—It is a part of it certainly.

Extent and difficulty of auditors' work.

4799. How many workhouses would there be on an average under each auditor, roughly speaking?—That depends entirely on the districts, and I could not answer the question off-hand. The districts are arranged so that there should be a certain number, or rather an uncertain number of unions and an uncertain number of urban districts and other authorities whose accounts the auditor has to audit; and those districts have been arranged in accordance with the actual facts as to the time those audits would take, as ascertained at the date when the arrangement was made. I think it is four years ago they were re-arranged and now they are out of date.

4800. Each auditor would have a considerable number of workhouses in his district, would he not?—They may vary from eight up to twenty perhaps.

4801. Are the workhouse accounts at all complicated?—No.

4802. Nothing comparable, for example, to the accounts of a large hotel?—I have never gone into an hotel account, so I could not say; but I have seen almost all the local authorities' accounts, and the union form of accounts is the simplest of all.

4803. The auditor must check all the buying of stuff as well as all the selling of stuff, must he not?—Yes, he has to see the contracts and everything in that way.

4804. Besides being an auditor of the workhouse accounts, he must be an expert in the Poor Law, I suppose?—Certainly.

4805. The books of all commercial and industrial undertakings are audited by accountants almost without exception, are they not?—An ordinary commercial undertaking would be, I suppose.

Mr. Edmund Pearse Burd.

5 Mar. 1906.

4806. Is it not the case that accountancy considers itself a profession?—Certainly.

4807. I think it exacts a four or five years' apprenticeship and the passing of certain examinations for C.A. and so on?—Yes.

Capability of persons appointed as Auditors.

4808. What qualifications has a barrister, *qua* barrister, for acting as auditor?—The reason for taking a barrister and a solicitor—and it is a great one too—I understand is that these people have constantly questions of law raised before them which never come before an auditor for a commercial undertaking—he would have nothing whatever to do with them.

4809. It seems to me that there are two parts then in a Poor Law audit—there is the legal part and there is the commercial part?—Certainly.

4810. I cannot conceive that any industrial firm would ever think of asking a barrister to audit their accounts?—That depends on the barrister.

4811. Certainly not unless the barrister had an accountant's training?—There are barristers who are district auditors who are quite as capable of auditing the accounts of an industrial undertaking as any accountant in Christendom, according to my view.

4812. If they had had an accountant's training?—Yes.

4813. But that of course applies to everyone?—Yes.

4814. You could take any man and say he was qualified for it if you added that he had had an accountant's training?—Yes.

Auditor's action as regards balances and overdrafts.

4815. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In auditing the accounts of a union, the auditors would have to deal with the balances at the end of the year, I suppose?—Certainly.

4816. Do they call attention to the amount of balances?—Yes; that is a thing that is very constantly being done. In certain unions the guardians are very fond of keeping a balance. I have a case in my mind now where the guardians had over £10,000 of one township's money in their hands, and the rural townships were all of them, except one, indebted to the guardians. Attention was called to that, and it was altered within two years. It takes a certain time to do it, because otherwise the rates would have to be put up suddenly.

4817. Speaking roughly, in dealing with the balances they would reckon the income and expenditure and what they considered to be an average balance they would pass, and anything above that they would call attention to, I suppose?—Yes. A district auditor did that in my presence the other day.

4818. What is the action of the auditors if they find that a Board of guardians have a large overdraft?—They would surcharge the interest.

Auditor's discretion as to persons to be surcharged.

4819. That is to say, you might have a case in which the guardians had been refused the power to raise a loan, and had made a large overdraft with their banker; the auditor would discover that, and on whom would he make a surcharge?—That depends on the circumstances. He could take the minutes and he could surcharge anybody who was present at the meeting when the overdraft was ordered, or he could take the people who actually signed the cheque creating the overdraft, or the cheques, as the case might happen to be.

4820. He would use his discretion with regard to that, would he?—Yes.

4821. Would there be a different principle with different auditors?—As a rule the auditors take the persons who sign the cheques, but I personally am not in favour of that.

The strictness of the audit.

4822. On the subject of disallowing payments which are illegal, do the auditors take what I may call a stern view with regard to that; are they very prompt to mark down an illegal expenditure and disallow it?—No, I do not think they are.

4823. As an instance, take this case which came under my notice the other day: A board of guardians discussed the question whether they should allow an able-bodied man and his wife to leave the workhouse and leave two children in the workhouse; would the auditor have surcharged or disallowed the relief to the children?—I consider he should do so under those circumstances. It would be very easy for the guardians to have obtained the authority of the Local Government Board to keep the children there.

4824. Supposing they have not got the authority, you think he ought to surcharge?—I do, certainly. I think it is their own fault, that they have not applied for the authority, and if they do not choose to do it, they must be made to do it; otherwise the orders become useless.

Right of a company *qua* ratepayer to be represented at audit, &c.

4825. (*Dr. Downes*). Would a railway company in its corporate capacity have a right to have a representative at the audit?—Yes—I have had a railway company represented before me objecting to charges arising out of a riot rate.

4826. Has any person interested a right to examine a contract at an audit, if the auditor allows it?—Yes, certainly.

Variations in prices for goods paid by guardians.

4827. Is it within your knowledge that very great variations in prices are paid by guardians for commodities?—Yes, the variations are very great.

4828. For commodities of ostensibly the same description?—Yes.

4829. Would you say the variations are very extreme?—They are very extraordinary.

4830. Can you offer any suggestions as to the possible reasons for that?—Locality has a great deal to do with it, and also what I mentioned just now where a certain quantity is known to be required—some very small quantity of one thing, and a large quantity of another thing; the variation in price there might enable a certain amount of dishonesty to occur. That might be done by the collusion of a workhouse master, who would know that only a small quantity of one thing was required, but that a large quantity of another thing would be required, and would let the man who makes the tender know which was which.

4831. If the person who was tendering had a private knowledge of the stocks in hand of the different commodities, that would guide him in fixing his price, would it not?—Very much.

4832. Can you suggest any means of meeting that or defeating it?—No. As long as human nature is human nature, I am afraid you cannot stop it.

The deferrence of the audit.

4833. Speaking of cases having been brought to the knowledge of the Local Government Board by the action of the auditors, I think within the last week there was a case from West Ham in the public Press; I do not know whether you saw it?—I did not see it, but I know the case. It is not the amount that the district auditors disallow that is the great advantage of the audit; it is the amount that they prevent being spent. The amount they disallow is nothing compared with the amount of expenditure that they prevent.

4834. Have you any experience of the different modes of contracting for drugs?—No; I have never gone into that question at all. The amount of drugs that was used in my old unions was not very great: in most cases the medical officers provided them themselves.

The safe keeping of "contract samples."

4835. Have you had within your experience any case where samples have been tampered with during the running of the contract?—No, not that I know of.

4836. How are sealed samples generally secured from interference?—I do not know that they are secured from interference. It is rather going outside my province as an auditor to say how those things are managed: but I know that the samples go to the clerk, and I have over and over again seen them open in the board-room standing round in bottles and things of that sort.

4837. You have no knowledge in whose custody they are kept in the interval?—No.

4838. Do you think that the statements of the union accounts are in their present form intelligible to the ordinary ratepayer?—To what statements are you referring? There was the old statutory financial statement, which was a very good one indeed.

4839. Take the ordinary ratepayer who wishes to know whether the expenditure of his union is going up or is not going up, or who wishes to compare the expenditure on coal in one-half-year with that in the same half-year of the year preceding; does he get the accounts in such a form ordinarily as would enable him to do that?—If he goes to the audit he can always see it, and there would be no difficulty at all in it. What the guardians publish is another matter altogether.

Necessity for publication of Union accounts.

4840. There is no obligation, I believe, on the guardians to publish such accounts?—No, except that the non-statutory financial statement might be printed and circulated among the ratepayers, or advertised in some newspaper circulating in the Union. That is the only publication I remember, and I should not like to be absolutely certain about that, but I think I am right.

4841. Does that appear in the public Press?—No.

4842. Do you think it desirable that they should be required to publish their accounts?—It certainly would be desirable if anybody looked at them, but I am not at all sure that anybody would now. It is advisable that these accounts should be published not only in the case of unions, but every local authority that has anything to do with spending public money ought to publish such an account as everybody can understand.

4843. In the accounts of the Metropolitan Asylums Board is the definition of "in-maintenance" quite the same as in other poor law establishments?—I am afraid you must give me notice of such a question, or ask some other witness.

Departmental Committee on Accounts.

4844. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) I suppose you could not tell us how soon there is likely to be any action taken by the Departmental Committee on Accounts?—The Committee has already met.

4845. It has been appointed, I understand, with a view to making some changes?—With a view to devising some system of accounts which shall be perfect.

4846. And perhaps simpler?—Let us hope so.

Length of previous training of auditors.

4847. How long does the course of training with a district auditor usually take?—It varies very much. I have known men to be with district auditors for close on twenty years before they have got an appointment as district auditor.

4848. Have they been all that time acting as volunteers?—No, not as volunteers necessarily, but as volunteers, paid clerks, and so on. I could not follow the whole of the man's career that I am speaking about now, but I should think for nearly the whole of that time he was a clerk. Parts of the time he was assistant auditor and now he is an assistant auditor, and if he lives long enough he will be appointed district auditor I dare say. Others are in the same position; they have been clerks and have been assistant auditors, and eventually they have become auditors.

4849. Comparatively few people from outside other than clerks go in for this course of training, I think?—Very few go in for the course. There are just a few volunteers, I think I know of two at the present moment.

Incidence of cost of audit.

4850. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I should like to ask whether it is the case, as I think we have been told, that the cost of the audit in England is paid in the first place out of sums voted by Parliament and is then repaid by the local authorities?—It is partially repaid by the local authorities.

4851. Through the sale of stamps under the District Auditors Act and other Acts?—Under the District Auditors Act, 1879, almost entirely.

4852. The cost is repaid in that way?—Only a portion of it, not the whole.

4853. Can you say how much is defrayed out of public money?—I think it is about five-sixths of it. I am sorry I have not these figures with me; if I had known I was going to be asked questions on this point I would have brought them.

4854. I have the figures in the Estimates here, from which it appears that the cost of the audit for 1905–6 was £74,918, and the amount realised in 1905–4 was £56,830?—That leaves a bigger balance than I thought there was.

4855. That leaves a balance of something like £18,000?—Yes, it does.

4856. Does that include all the expenses, or are there other costs paid by the local authorities themselves?—There are no other costs in connection with the audit that I know of paid by the local authority.

4857. There is the publication of the audit?—The publication, that is advertisements, and so on, would be defrayed by the local authorities, except in the case of unions where the cost of advertising the notice of audit is an imperial charge.

4858. As regards the audit itself, I understand that it is a half-yearly audit?—For unions.

Frequency of audit.

4859. There is no more frequent audit than that—there is no continuous monthly audit, is there?—No.

Procedure for stock taking and auditor's check thereon.

4860. I think you have told us that there is no audit in England of the stock in the workhouses except what is undertaken by the guardians themselves; there is no supervision by the public auditor, is there?—Not by the public auditor, unless in very exceptional cases. I have known a district auditor send his clerk to try and find a two gallon jar of rum which was in the list of balances and which had been there a long while. It could not be found immediately, but it turned up the next morning, at least a jar turned up the next morning.

4861. Do you think it is right that the audit of the stock of a workhouse should be conducted by the board of guardians?—I quite agree that it is not, and I said so just now, if I remember rightly. In every case the stock ought to be taken by some professional stock-taker, or somebody appointed outside the guardians altogether. That is the basis of the audit of union accounts, and now that basis is bad.

Recommendations of Municipal Trading Committee as to qualifications for auditors.

4862. With regard to the qualification of an auditor, I do not know whether I am correct in thinking that there was a suggestion made by the Municipal Trading Committee (which was a Committee, I think, of both Houses), that in future none but chartered accountants should be appointed to the post of auditor; was that not so?—Yes, that was so, but that was limited to municipal corporations and urban district councils. I do not think it applied to unions.

4863. Would that recommendation, assuming it to be a sound one, apply equally to the accounts of unions as to municipal accounts?—Certainly. If they thought that the accountant auditor was the best and the unions wished to have the best, and they were satisfied that the accountant auditor was the man, of course it would be better to have him. Personally, I am not satisfied that he is the best man. The ideal district auditor is not born yet. He must be a good accountant, he must have a very fair knowledge of the law relating to the poor, public health, highways, tramways, electric lighting, water, and contracts; in addition to that he must know the Board's orders; he must be able to state clearly his reasons for any disallowance or allowance; he ought to be able to write a very good report, he must be extremely courteous, have an angelic temper, be tactful, be a thoroughly business-like man (it is no good if he is not; it is no good his being a quibbler in any way), he must be firm, he ought to be dignified, he must be accurate and quick if he is to get through his work, able to hold his own with anybody who comes and makes any objection—and very often that is a very difficult thing for a man to do—he must be thoroughly interested in the work, a hard worker, have a very extreme sense of duty, be thoroughly healthy and energetic, and a sort of man that the officers can look up to and respect. I have not since my appointment found that man; I am looking for him.

Qualities required of an auditor.

4864. (*Chairman.*) And in addition would you say that he ought discourteously to disbelieve everything that is not supported by documents?—I do not think so. I think one of the district auditor's duties is to believe an old officer as far as he possibly can. It is a very difficult thing sometimes, and very often district auditors are blamed because they have believed an old officer, but I think it is a matter that they may very easily be excused for doing.

Desirability of separate auditors for Poor Law accounts.

4865. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) It certainly looks to one as if an auditor who might have acquired a knowledge of auditing the accounts of a board of guardians might not have been able to acquire the knowledge necessary to audit municipal or public health accounts, and accordingly there may be some reason for separating the duties?—I do not think so at all, because the district auditor (except the auditor for the Metropolitan Poor Law area) sees all those accounts. Of course some auditors are better than others and learn more quickly.

Auditors' practice as to persons to be surcharged.

4866. In reference to Paragraph 53 of your statement, where you are dealing with disallowances and surcharges, when a payment has been made by cheque, that cheque being signed by certain members of the board of guardians,

Mr. Edmund Pearse Burd

5 Mar. 1906.

whom do you surcharge?—As I said just now, the common system is for the district auditor to surcharge the members signing the cheque or one of them; but there is no necessity for that, and he is not limited to that.

4867. Is there a right of recourse against those who passed the payment, or against the board of guardians as a whole, or against all those who were parties to the resolution?—The auditors can surcharge any member of the board of guardians present at the meeting when the cheque was authorised, except those who distinctly got up and objected to the payment.

4868. Has that been done; is it a matter of ordinary practice?—It is constantly done. It is not necessarily the members who sign the cheque who are surcharged. Take the case of the Chairman who is attending the audit; the district auditor mentions the fact that he is obliged to surcharge certain sums, and he finds out that the Chairman was present at the board meeting when they were authorised, and he says: "I will surcharge you in order to save trouble."

Position of Clerk to Guardians who countersigns a cheque for an illegal payment.

4869. I think according to your practice the clerk who has to sign the cheque is specially exempted from surcharge?—I do not think he is exempted specially, but it would be no good surcharging him because he is not the man who is actually responsible.

Auditors usually selected from assistant auditors.

4870. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the appointment of auditors, is it the practice now that the auditors should be appointed from the assistant auditors?—Yes, that is the intention; as I understand, the whole scheme is based on the idea that they should pass through the mill.

4871. Consequently, before a man becomes an auditor he has had experience as an assistant auditor?—Yes, and very often as a clerk.

Qualifications of assistant auditors.

4872. Further than that, the assistant auditors themselves are only appointed from the class which you have described, namely barristers, solicitors, and so forth?—Certainly—including the chartered accountants, who have got the same opportunity of coming in as the others.

Difference between district and commercial auditor.

4873. Is there not this difference between the position of the district auditor and the auditor of a commercial undertaking, namely, that in the case of the district auditor he has to judge of the legality of the payments, which would be a matter that the auditor of a commercial undertaking would have nothing whatever to do with?—Certainly; I mentioned that just now.

Purport of Municipal Trading Committees' recommendations as to auditors' qualifications.

4874. Is it not also the fact that in the Report of the Municipal Trading Committee they appear to have been rather thinking of cases where local authorities had got large commercial undertakings, such as electric lighting undertakings, gas undertakings, and so forth?—That is really what they were originally intended to deal with.

4875. They seem to have had those things in their mind?—I expect so.

4876. At least, we may presume that they had?—Yes.

4877. They were not thinking of the legality of the charges?—Not in any way, I should say.

Deterrent effect of the audit.

4878. Is it not the fact that the indirect effect of the disallowance made by an auditor is more important than the disallowance actually itself?—I consider that it is immeasurably more important.

4879. According to your experience, would the fact that payments were disallowed have a deterrent effect upon a board of guardians in the future, assuming, as I am doing, that the payment in itself was improper as well as technically illegal?—Yes, there is no question about that. It prevents that class of payment recurring, and it even prevents their ever being made to begin with. Over and over again you hear the clerk say, The board would have done this, that and the other, if you had not been coming.

Auditors' practice for testing accounts.

4880. I suppose that where a number of items come before an auditor, for instance, the charges for the provisions actually consumed by the inmates of workhouses, the audit must be in the nature of a test audit?—Yes; you do not go into every item.

4881. That would be impossible?—That is practically impossible.

4882. And with the relieving officer the auditor would, I suppose, test his accounts in the same way, would he not?—Certainly.

4883. If he found there were errors, then he would go more minutely into the accounts?—He would go more and more closely into them.

4884. (*Chairman.*) I understand that in the case of outdoor relief you would not go through the accounts case by case, but you would take test cases?—You would begin close at the beginning of the book and give the name of a pauper; the relieving officer would state what the relief ordered by the guardians was in that particular case; then the district auditor would ask why it was given, and would get particulars in connection with the case, and he would know whether it was to be repaid or whether there were any children or other persons liable to repay the guardians the amount of the relief given. Then he would take another case, perhaps on that page. It would go on in that way. If any thing were found out he would gradually get closer and closer.

4885. I assume that if he had reason to believe that anything was wrong he would probably go more carefully through the book, and take case by case?—Certainly.

SIXTEENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 6th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. FRANCIS THOMAS BIRCHAM, called; and Examined.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

4886. (*Chairman.*) You are poor law inspector for the district of Wales?—Yes; and Monmouthshire.

4887. How long have you held that post?—In Wales, since January, 1874. I was appointed in 1872, but I was not in Wales the first eighteen months.

4888. So that you have had a continuous experience of Wales for over thirty years?—Yes.

Industrial division of Wales.

4889. We have in our hands your written statement. I will take you very briefly through it. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. X. (A).) Your district divides itself naturally, so far as occupations are concerned, into north and south, the north being mainly agricultural, and in the south there are considerable mining and shipping industries?—That is so. There is a great deal of slate industry quite in the north.

4890. There are considerable slate mines in the north?—Yes.

4891. Are they in one or more districts?—In four. They are in the same district geologically, but in four different unions. Snowdonia would be generally its area.

4892. What would the districts be?—Bangor, Carnarvon, Festiniog and Dolgelly. Llanrwst and Corwen have also secondary slate industries, but the chief ones are in Bangor, Festiniog and Carnarvon.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, in Wales.

4893. The Act of 1894 made a very considerable change in the *personnel* of the guardians of North Wales?—Certainly.

English and Welsh-speaking Guardians.

4894. It got rid of the old element of guardians who were non-elective; and, to a very large extent, I believe, those who were elective did not understand English?—That is so. They could not express themselves to their satisfaction in English, but they could understand what you said.

4895. Previous to 1894 was the business of these districts carried on in English?—I should say that in the early days I had not North Wales in my district. I had North Wales in 1892, but I had a year in North Wales in 1874, and then I do not remember nearly so much Welsh, but in South Wales, in the district which I have always had, there are a good many unions where guardians speak Welsh now, whereas they all spoke English when I joined the district. I think I have explained that.

4896. In the old days, with Welsh-speaking members who did not understand English, how was the business transacted?—Very well; by those who understood English, and they did all the work. The others said nothing. They understood enough about it, because there were plenty of guardians to translate what an old man or woman wanted with regard to relief.

4897. What about the relieving officers?—The relieving officers speak English perfectly well, and many of the guardians speak English as well as Welsh, and they could always translate for the benefit of the few. Then there were *ex-officio* guardians who could speak Welsh too.

Relieving officers' knowledge of English.

4898. The result of that Act was, not only that there was a large influx of Welsh-speaking guardians, but they came in with little knowledge of the law, or of the regulations which they had to administer?—None whatever.

4899. None whatever?—Absolutely, I should say.

Qualifications of Welsh-speaking Guardians.

4900. The result was that, in your judgment, there was too much outdoor relief in certain of these unions?—Yes.

Large amount of out-relief.

4901. I understand, according to your statement, that the guardians were rather apt to do the work of the relieving officer?—I say that, and I think I explained that the relieving officer lives in a district perhaps twelve or thirteen miles across, very often across valleys in which very few people live, and it is impossible for him to go and do the visiting which is expected of a relieving officer in other districts; consequently, no doubt, a good deal of it is left primarily to the guardians.

Welsh guardians as semi-official relieving officers.

4902. I assume that in these Welsh-speaking agricultural unions the workhouse is hardly up to modern ideas?—No, it is not intended to be.

4903. And, therefore, anything like a classification of its inmates is very difficult?—Of course it is. In some workhouses the number of inmates is so few that you cannot sub-divide them.

Reduction in rate of pauperism in Wales.

4904. Although in your judgment there is too much outdoor relief. I see, looking at the return which you have put in of the number of paupers in receipt of relief on the 25th March, 1905, as compared with 1895 there has been a considerable reduction in the percentage of relief?—Are you taking the typical Welsh unions, or the whole of the district?

4905. I am taking the last two columns, which show a reduction from 3·2 per cent. to 2·8 per cent.?—If you were taking the typical Welsh unions, about which you have been asking me hitherto, the reduction would be a great deal more, and the outdoor pauperism considerably less.

4906. I notice, in running down the unions one by one, there is, with very few exceptions, a general reduction during that period?—Yes, in the ten years' retrospect, certainly; almost universal, I should say.

4907. I think there are only six out of the whole of the unions in which there has been a rise during that period? In those unions probably the population has very much

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

increased. Are you taking the percentage of paupers to the population, or the actual number of paupers?

4908. The percentage of paupers to the population?—I have taken the figures for 1901, in all my papers, because I have no official means of getting at any other census, so it is now still less than what I show.

4909. The population is 1891?—Yes, and 1901.

4910. And the pauperism is for different years?—Yes, and it has decreased again since then, particularly in North Wales.

Process of administrative education of the guardians of 1894.

4911. Therefore, even though these guardians were not acquainted with the theory of the law, the upshot has not been unsatisfactory from the point of view of administration?—No, though I think they have required a good deal of waking up. When I took over that district I was perfectly conversant with South Wales; that was in 1892. I had had many years' experience in South Wales, and then the Local Government Board gave me North Wales also. During the first three or four years of my tenure of North Wales, I spent a great deal more time in that part of my district than would have been justifiable, other things being equal; so I was enabled to bring matters before the guardians and go round and visit, with the relieving officers, the paupers actually in their homes—district after district, and I saw the boarded-out children as well, in order to get myself conversant with the habits of the people; consequently I was able to put it before the guardians of the unions which were remarkable for a high rate of pauperism, like Carnarvon, Bangor, Holywell, Anglesea, Holyhead; and a lot of them were reduced from their 5 per cent. to less than 3 per cent. in a few years. That was entirely in outdoor relief. When you say "I say there is too much outdoor relief," I wish to qualify that, because there must always be more outdoor relief compared with indoor relief in a country like Wales. They have made a reduction, and if they go on, in another ten years (I do not suppose they could make another such reduction) I think they will restore their position to the normal position of unions in the rest of the country, even if it has not arrived at that now.

4912. You found that these guardians responded to the pressure and advice which you gave them?—Yes, and they gradually learned by themselves to a great extent. It has not nearly come to an end yet, but there is no doubt they did do so.

Need for Welsh-speaking inspector.

4913. You would recommend, if practicable, that your successor should be Welsh-speaking?—It is absolutely necessary for the Welsh-speaking unions. It is not so necessary for South Wales, with the exception of one or two unions.

Effect on pauperism of depression in slate industry.

4914. Looking at these lists of unions, I observe that in 1895, Holyhead, Carnarvon, and Holywell had the highest rate of pauperism. Is the reduction in their pauperism entirely due to more strict administration, or did the strike and troubles in connection with the slate quarries affect them?—No, the slate quarry depression has not affected pauperism one single bit, except so far as perhaps an old woman who used to be kept by her sons, and that kind of thing; but you may say it has not affected it. This winter was about the first winter that the depression in the slate industry has had any effect whatever, because, although the price of slate has been very low lately, the employment has been the same. There have been no quarries of any consequence closed on account of the depression.

4915. We may take it there has been no great disturbing element?—No, you may take it as a constant force all through.

4916. This shows the commencement of an improvement which you think, with a continuance of kindly pressure and advice, will develop itself still further?—I hope so, and I think a knowledge of Welsh will drive it home still further on the part of an inspector who takes a proper line otherwise.

Over-large boards of guardians in Wales.

4917. Certain of the boards of guardians are too large, in your judgment?—That is my humble opinion, but I cannot go against it. I think they are. Take Cardiff, Swansea, Newport, and Bridgend, with their sixty or eighty guardians, each with his own notion; it is a very difficult number to manage, and as the tendency of public opinion goes in favour of increasing outdoor relief, it renders the work of the relieving officers extremely difficult, if the paupers go to the guardians behind the backs of these officers, which they may do in some instances.

4918. What would be your ideal number for boards of guardians? I suppose sufficient to transact the business and to form the necessary committees?—Yes, not one more than that. Except you must remember that Wales is a country where what was agricultural in the old times has now become industrial in parts, and the consequence is that there are large agricultural portions in those unions which have a very large industrial portion as well. Those areas must be represented so long as they are represented by a parish, and the consequence is the board of guardians cannot be reduced unless you roll all those agricultural parishes like a snowball into one mass.

Increase of number of guardians by county council.

4919. Are the parishes very small?—Some of them. Take Bridgend. A certain number of them were amalgamated in times gone by when we had power to do it and hold inquiries. Unfortunately that has been taken out of our hands and put in the hands of the county council; and, instead of decreasing the number of guardians, they have increased them in most instances.

Suitability existing union areas

4920. As regards the unions, would you wish them at all to be consolidated, or do you think that they are, as at present constituted, a good and efficient unit of administration?—I do not think you can improve on them very much. I have tried it in many instances. There is one instance I have been all my time trying to divide, that is the great big union of Haverfordwest, but they will not have it. You cannot consolidate a union twenty-five miles long with another union twenty-five miles long; you would get a diameter of fifty miles, with only perhaps 15,000 people in each union, or less than that.

Advisability of publishing half-yearly totals of pauperism.

4921. In Paragraph 28 of your statement you say that if unions would only publish a half-year's history of outrelief, as is still done in Wales, the unions would, in many instances, tumble down from the prominence gained by their pauperism being calculated upon one day only?—I say probably they would. I know nothing personally about them. I do not know whether you have a copy of that Return, and Sir Samuel Provis will be able to tell you why they discontinued publishing it in the Blue-book; I have kept it on ever since it was discontinued. That gives an analysis for six months of the different classes of outdoor paupers. That shows how many have been through the pauper mill during the six months; not only how many you catch merely on one day; and I say this, that if some of these industrial centres would publish that kind of thing, you would find hundreds or thousands more cases in bad times, which would raise their percentage of pauperism very high, but they only publish it on one day, the same as I do in this other Return, but you must lose a lot of fish out of the net.

Unreliability of returns giving one-day's count of paupers.

4922. Is there much discrepancy between the result of the Return that you have handed to me, and the half-yearly Return taken on one day?—Yes, there is a difference between 50,000 and 63,000 there—13,000 difference. That is to say, 13,000 more men, women, and children had outdoor relief during the six months than appeared on the one day, the 25th March, in that six months; but that is a very small difference compared to what other districts would be.

4923. It is a small difference to what sometimes occurs?—No, as compared with what it would be in other districts. In my district it is sometimes more, and it is getting more. There is more outdoor relief given than used to be given in the populous unions.

4924. Assuming there was an accurate record of every one who received relief during the six months, it would, in your judgment, put up the percentage of pauperism?—Yes, in those districts for which those Returns are not published. I sent Mr. Bagenal one of those Returns when he was appointed, and I believe he does publish those for his district.

4925. You take all the people who have received relief during the six months?—Yes, out-relief.

Half-yearly returns: Amount of error from duplicate entries.

4926. But the same person may have received relief more than once during that time?—Yes. I have had that under consideration, but the figures would not be worth the trouble that would be entailed in a clerk working them out.

4927. You think that number is quite small?—Yes, the same person occurring in the same six months would not make any appreciable difference at all in my district.

4928. The number who had received relief in two different unions would be very small?—Yes, practically none. Of course, there would be the person who was removed, who was relieved for a few weeks in one union and then his settlement was found out to be in another and he was transferred; but most of those get non-resident relief in Wales, not a very satisfactory mode of relief, but they do it. They find that the paupers live in a union and they let them live there, and the other union pays, so that would not come in.

4929. Are the figures we have on Paper "A" taken from Return "B"?—No, "B" is a six months' total of pauperism "A" is taken from the Returns of indoor and out-door pauperism, given me by the clerks to the guardians for the week ending the 25th March of each year, on what is called Form "A."

4930. Form B would give a higher percentage than you find on Form A?—Much, in my district, because there are very few indoor poor.

4931. Form B, in your judgment, is the more accurate Return?—Yes, it gives a return of all the people who have received relief during the six months instead of only those whom you may catch on one single day. So far it is more accurate.

4932. In Clause 33 of your Memorandum you state that the Board's Circular impressing the need for adequate relief to deserving poor has been very freely translated. Previous to that circular was the out-door relief inadequate in many cases?—I think out-door relief is always inadequate. It is very hard to define. Two of the hardest things in the whole of the English language to define are destitution and what is adequate relief. Adequate relief in the view of a pauper is as much as he can get, adequate relief in the view of many boards of guardians and economists is as little as you can possibly give; and as for destitution it is quite as difficult to define, at least that is my experience. I will say this, that I think the Circular had some use, in that it has raised the scale of individual relief in most unions by 6d. or 1s. where I think it was very much wanted. Widows with children generally get 6d. more now than they did say, ten years ago, and that accounts a great deal for the increase in the expenditure; you observe now with a decreased pauperism an additional expenditure, and that is so all over the country.

4933. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is that 6d. a child?—Yes, Where it was 1s. or 1s. 6d. it is now 1s. 6d. and 2s.; very rarely 2s. It is not always fixed exactly, but still there is a scale.

4934. (*Chairman.*) The amount expended has considerably risen during that period, although the percentage of pauperism to population has diminished?—May I give the figures on that point, because I think they will help you? Taking a ten years' comparison, between 1905 and 1895, the population of England and Wales has increased 12 per cent., but the rate of pauperism is about the same. The expenditure has increased 33 per cent. Wales and Monmouthshire has increased in population 13 per cent., it has decreased in rate of pauperism 13 per cent., it has increased in expenditure 22 per cent. North Wales has a 4 per cent. population increase, it has a decreased rate of pauperism of 20 per cent., and its expenditure has increased 1 per cent., that is with the out-door relief system, so there is something to be learned from this. In South Wales the population has increased 16 per cent., the rate of pauperism has decreased 7 per cent. (that is the industrial part of my district, we will say), and the increase in expenditure is 32 per cent. I attribute that largely to these large towns where you have had to build up-to-date in-door accommodation, and to the fact that with regard to out-relief, the relief given to individuals has increased at least 20 per cent., I will say, broadly speaking, since Mr. Chaplin's Circular, but it might have occurred a year or two before that.

4935. You think that that Circular gave an impetus to out-door relief?—I am sure it did.

4936. Not only as regards amount; did it also increase the number?—I do not know so much about that; it is the expenditure chiefly. I have no proof of that.

4937. Now we come to the paragraph in your report which deals with the Workmen's Compensation Act. Your impression is that the tendency of that Act has been to make the age at which men fall out of employment much lower than it was before?—Most decidedly. When a man now gets a few grey hairs, or loses the tip of his little finger, or does not see or hear quite so well as he did, out he goes, particularly in those industries which are not under their own friendly societies. Take the colliery industry, which employs 150,000 colliers, or something like that. They had a Miners' Permanent Provident Society. That Miners' Provident Society before the split in 1898 had 79,000 members. When, first of all the Employers' Liability Act, and then the Workmen's Compensation Act and its amendment, came into force, the numbers working together in this Miners' Provident Society fell to 17,000, which is the present number. They could get better relief from their societies than the Compensation Act gives, yet the men join the Federation which they did not belong to at the time of the great strike, and will not contract out of the Act. With regard to the 17,000 men that belong to those pits where the old men do not get turned out, they find work for their old men who are a little deficient in this, that, and the other, and do not turn them out the same as the other men, who go under the Compensation Act, are turned out, and also they have an old age pension society, by which they are enabled to relieve a number of them, and keep them off the rates within their own friendly society, yet the great majority of men belong to their own society, the Federation, and do not subscribe to the friendly society, because they say: "Oh, the employers will keep us"; but they will not keep them, because liability only arises in case of accident; and the young men now, who are careless in youth with high wages, and rollicking and thinking of nothing, will become the men presently with the few grey hairs and the little finger gone and the bad eyes. Where will they be? They are not subscribing to clubs; the clubs are all going down. I intended to make this more interesting, so I went the other day to the Registrar of Friendly Societies, who was without any reports for the last five years, and had nothing to show me as to the state of things at the time that the Workmen's Compensation Act began to take effect. He had no figures to give me. He is, however, going to make a census in April, and if you can get the figure for Glamorganshire to compare the number of members of good friendly societies now (I would not trouble about what may be termed the rotten clubs; they do more harm than good), with what they were before this Act passed, you might get some very interesting evidence to show how they have been affected, and there is no doubt that the pauperism is affected most directly. If, for example, you go round Bedwellty or Merthyr, you will find crowds of men who can get little or nothing to do. You are manufacturing paupers for whose old age you will have to provide.

4938. Do not the men realise that the Workmen's Compensation Act only gives compensation in case of accident?—I do not think the young man with high wages realises anything. He ought to be made to realise.

4939. Do not they realise that it only gives them compensation for accidents, and makes no provision for their old age?—Nothing whatever; the Compensation Act provides nothing for old age or sickness, it only provides for accidents. Of course, sickness resulting from an accident might be treated as an accident.

4940. Your experience is that the Miners' Provident Society not only gives better compensation for accidents, but also increases continuity of work?—Yes, and continuity of work combined with the old age pensions; an old man getting his 5s. a week from them will still be kept on at work, i.e. a reduced amount of work which he can do. I will hand you a very interesting account given by the Secretary of the Society before the Committee* which was appointed, if you will remember, on the working of the Compensation Act. That will tell you much better than I can tell you the effect that it has had. It is Mr Evan Owen's evidence, and he would be a very useful witness for the Commission.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

Effect of Workmen's Compensation Act on Friendly societies and pauperism.

* Cd. 2331-1904. Evidence, questions 9063-9175.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

4941. You made use of the expression just now that when an oldish man gets a certain allowance for old age he still works on at a lower wage?—At such work as he is able to do; and as it is generally piecework, he can do much less and gets less pay. The men who get the 5s. extra pension are men of a good age and men of good character to whom the employers owe a good deal. There is a loyal feeling between employers and employees in those pits where they are, but not where a hard and fast Act of Parliament comes in to do everything, or is supposed to do.

Reduction in number of members of Miners' Provident Association.

4942. The reduction of the members of the Miners' Provident Society during the last three years you say is from 70,000 to 17,000?—I believe that 79,000 was the highest number. I was a member of it and subscribed for years. In 1879 it came to 79,600, and, according to Mr. Owen, it has gone down to 19,000. That was in 1904, but since then Mr. Owen's clerk tells me it has gone down to 17,000.

Objections to cost of drugs being defrayed out of medical officer's salary.

4943. You make various suggestions in your Memorandum which, I think, are more or less self-evident?—There is a small point I should like to refer to, and it is a most important point to bear in mind when you take medical evidence; it is this. I am strongly of opinion, with regard to provincial workhouses, that the system of the workhouse medical officer finding his own medicines and drugs out of the salary which is given to him should not be allowed. It should be made absolutely illegal, because we cannot get anything like up-to-date and useful drugs when the men get the miserable salary they do get in our provincial workhouses. I am not talking now of the big hospitals, where it is well done, but it is the rule in small and middle-sized provincial workhouses that the workhouse medical officer finds the drugs out of his salary, and human nature will not allow him to use anything which is very expensive. He cannot try the up-to-date drugs which may save a person's life. I am sure Dr. Downes will think over that matter. It is a very important point, and I believe the present system may cost the life of an inmate of a workhouse.

4944. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) You suggest they should be paid for the drugs separately?—Certainly. Perhaps in small workhouses the doctor could find those drugs, and he should put in a bill for them; but I think the preferable way would be for a committee of the guardians to provide a stock of what is necessary for the little surgery, and get the doctor to use them and account for them, as the master accounts for the things under his care. I feel it my duty to bring that point before you, because I feel very strongly upon it.

Effect of Merthyr Tydvil decision as to strike relief.

4945. (*Chairman.*) We now come to the concluding paragraphs of your evidence, which relate to strike relief. You have stated, I think, very clearly, what is the up-shot of the last legal decision?—I should like to know what it was.

4946. It results, does it not, in this: that where there is a strike and those who struck could get work if they had not struck, they are not qualified for relief, but their children and their wives must be fed?—Yes.

4947. Whereas in the other cases of men who cannot get employment in consequence of belonging to some industry which is dependent upon coal, before they can get any relief for their children or wives they have to submit to the labour test?—That is so.

4948. Have you any ideas on this subject? What would you suggest?—When I read the late Master of the Rolls' decision, I said to myself as I went on reading (it is a column and a half), "Why, he is going to let the people starve; now our way is easy enough," and I read on till within the very last two lines, and I said, "He is bound to ride off somehow," and so he did. He said, "You must not give relief to a single soul of the kind; assumably no in-door or out-door relief," but when he came to the last line, he said, "But the wives and children must be fed." Who would have fed these great big hulking fellows if it had not been for their wives and children? I advised the guardians to exact the test from these people, which they did to a certain extent; it was a great failure, for reasons which I think I have explained pretty clearly here. It was partly owing to the non-existence of any harmonious action between the guardians representing the employers and the guardians representing the employed, and the whole thing got into the hands of the men's guardians. There was, no doubt, a great waste of money, and officers were appointed to look after relieving and paying the men who were not officers at all, who were really strikers themselves; so there was a good deal of loss; still there was a test. According to this decision of the Master of the Rolls, as it is read down there, you must absolutely relieve all these women and children under the urgent necessity clause. That means that a relieving officers have to watch the wives and children of 100,000 people, and let them get into that state on a Wednesday or a Thursday that they would die if they were not relieved on the Friday, and then give them enough relief to last them until after the next board day. After the next board day that position comes up again. I said it loses its status of urgent necessity and becomes one of chronic necessity, and, therefore, it comes under the Prohibitory Order, plus the Out-door Labour Test Order. The Master of the Rolls said that was all wrong. He gave his decision, and he emphasised the duty of feeding the wives and children. So we are confronted with the difficulty that the guardians may not give any test of work to men who refuse employment, which would, if they took it, be sufficient to maintain themselves and their families, but men who are out of employment for no fault of their own must go through a test before they can get relief. I want it made legal for boards of guardians to exact the test when they think proper, with the sanction of the Local Government Board, and make their relief dependent on that kind of man going through a test in the same way as other able-bodied paupers who are not on strike but who are destitute.

4949. The man on strike is disqualified from getting relief. The relief that is given is for his wife and children alone?—Certainly, and not sufficient for him, but he eats it, and probably the major part of it, and he stands by with his hands in his pockets whilst you are feeding his wife and children.

4950. The other man who is relieved comes under the labour test?—He has to work eight hours a day and gets considerably less than half-pay for doing that work.

4951. He gets food for himself as well as for his wife and children?—Certainly, and so would this man if he was in the labour yard. So he did under my illegal system. I will not bring in the Board, but the Board were of the same opinion as I was, that you must exact a test. I have Minutes from Sir Hugh Owen, who was Secretary at that time, and he also saw the clerk to the guardians of Merthyr and impressed upon him the necessity of having a test. Sir Hugh wrote to me with regard to other unions, where I did not want this test at all in labour yards. I was successful in preventing labour yards being opened in other unions during the strike by taking a little latitude. There was sickness of a very slight kind and they got relief in the case of sickness, in order to prevent labour yards; it was not very much, but he urged on me to have a test. It is illegal now, according to the only decision which has been given on it, by the Master of the Rolls, on appeal. I should like to see the decision altered.

4952. It is illegal to feed the man, and it is illegal to subject him to a test by which he can feed his wife and children?—Yes, but you must feed the wife and children, and you are not supposed to do that unless something will happen if you do not. That is a very invidious task to put upon a relieving officer.

4953. That refers to the cases you mentioned as requiring relief in the case of sudden and urgent necessity?—My view is that that provision does not apply to them, but it is not, of course, in conformity with the decision.

4954. It is not practical to apply it?—It is not. You cannot run a man in under the George IV. Act for not maintaining his wife and children, when you have 100,00 of them. You would have to fill the prisons, at great expense, and the irony of it would be that you would have to feed the wives and children while the men were in prison.

Effect o pauperis strike o 1898.

4955. Has the effect of that great strike been to increase the permanent amount of pauperism in the district where it occurred?—No, I do not think it has. I think the Workmen's Compensation Act has done much more to increase pauperism than that. Although the relief has increased, however, I do not think it has increased more than the population. There are some cases of old people who, on account of the strike, were permanently left on the rates because their sons could not support them.

When once people get on the books in that kind of way it is difficult to get them off again. The sons marry, and they are not pressed, and people remain on who would not have been on at all if the strike had not taken place. On the whole, however, I do not think the number of such cases is very appreciable. The strike was eight years ago; it was in 1898.

4956. You have had a period of prosperity since?—Yes. That is what has been done. There has been peace in the land, and coal has been paying fairly well.

oposed ification of itdoor lief and ohibitory ders.

4957. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would you mind looking at Paragraph 41 of your Memorandum. You suggest whether it might be practicable to have one Order in lieu of the Regulation Order and the Prohibitory Order. Would it be practicable, do you think, to have one code of Regulations which should apply both to urban unions and to rural unions?—I think so. What I should suggest would be to have a Prohibitory Order and an out-door labour test Order to replace the Regulation Order. The Regulation Order is practically the same as the Out-door Prohibitory Order plus the labour test.

4958. The object of having the Regulation Order was, was it not, that you could deal with cases where you could not make the whole of the able-bodied come into the workhouse because the workhouse was not big enough?—Yes.

4959. How would you get over that difficulty?—I would draft something of that kind out of the Regulation Order into the Prohibitory Order and make one Order that would satisfy all those points. I am not a very good judge of how to do it; I think you would be a better judge as to whether there is anything in the Regulation Order that would be better put in the Prohibitory Order, so as to have one Order. There are two or three unions still in my district that have the Regulation Order, and some have a combination of the two.

4960. The unions you have with the Regulation Order, I suppose, are the more populous unions?—No, they are not.

4961. Do you remember what they are?—I think there is some doubt about that in the office, because they sent me two old forms for Tregaron and the very small union of Machynlleth, in which there was an order which they described as a combination of the two. When I looked at it, it seemed to me to be the Prohibitory Order pure and simple; but that could be ascertained at the office.

4962. Your plan would be to get rid of the Regulation Order, practically, and have a Prohibitory Order with certain exceptions to meet particular cases?—Yes, plus an out-door labour test.

oposed olition overseers.

4963. Turning to another matter, your view rather is that overseers might, with advantage, be got rid of?—I should like to see the assistant overseers and the people who collect the rates appointed by a larger body than the parish. I should like to see overseers abolished.

tent of by over- rs of wer to e relief.

4964. Overseers may give relief in cases of sudden and urgent necessity. Do they, as a matter of fact, in your district, give relief in cases of sudden and urgent necessity?—I do not think I have had three cases in the last twenty years. I have now and then attended the board and heard a rare instance where an overseer has got a rap over the knuckles for giving relief when he ought not to have given it, but as I have said, such a case is very rare. I know of only one instance where an assistant overseer has given relief.

4965. You do not think there would be any practical difficulty with regard to that matter?—No, I do not.

4966. Even in rural places? The rural places would be the difficulty if there was one; but even in rural places you do not think there would be a difficulty if the overseers were got rid of?—No, because, I say, if it occurred anywhere, it would occur in a district like mine. There is no doubt about it, in town districts, the fewer people who have power to give relief the better—at least I think so.

equency of pector's endance at etings of ardians.

4967. (*Mr. Patten-Macdougall.*) How often do you attend meetings of boards of guardians? I think we have been told before that it is generally a more or less surprise visit and not a visit by invitation. Is that the custom that prevails?—No, not always with regard to visiting boards of guardians. Very often, to ensure what I want, I say that I am coming, so that they may give me more time than I otherwise would get. I am obliged to do that. Some of these boards only meet monthly, or once in five weeks; some of them meet fortnightly. It is a most difficult thing to travel about Wales, therefore I have to go when I can, but I never leave a board of guardians without one visit in the year. I may have to pay three or four visits to another board of guardians if I have to get something done.

4968. If you want some special information?—Yes.

Effect on administration of infrequent meetings of guardians.

4969. In the case of those boards which do not meet except once a month, or occasionally, I think you said once in five weeks, what happens with regard to relief in the meantime?—The relieving officer comes with a bundle of cases for confirmation at the end of the four weeks, and the actual granting of relief passes out of the hands of the guardians altogether.

Power of relieving officer to give relief between meetings of guardians.

4970. Into the hands of the relieving officer?—It puts it into the hands of the relieving officer. The only way of telling whether the officer gives proper relief is by paying a personal visit. He acts simply on the doctor's orders, because he is afraid something would happen if he did not give relief, and sometimes the person gets three or four weeks relief when, if the case was strictly enquired into, he would not get that amount. In some cases they have relief committees which meet once a fortnight, whereas the meetings of the guardians are only held once a month.

4971. Is it in your view a satisfactory thing that the relieving officers should have power to give relief in these cases themselves?—I think it is necessary someone should have a statutory power to give relief, because otherwise someone might die, and there being no available officer with the statutory power to give relief a scandal might arise.

Type and number of relieving officers in Wales.

4972. Are relieving officers generally of a class such as you can trust to deal properly and efficiently with cases of applications for relief?—Certainly, I think my officers, although they are not immaculate, are very good all round.

4973. Taking a typical or ordinary union in Wales, how many relieving officers are there as compared with the number of parishes in the union?—The population and not the number of parishes is the criterion, because there are very numerous small parishes. If you refer to the towns, I think Cardiff, with a population of 220,000, has eight relieving officers. I wanted them to appoint a superintending relieving officer to save the guardians from themselves, but they would not do it; they were afraid of it. They perhaps prefer their little popularity and they will not employ a superintending relieving officer.

4974. Are these eight relieving officers independent of one another; is there no head?—No, there is no head. The relieving officer attend the relief committees and the chairman of the committee is the only one who has the power of finding fault with them.

Relief given by relieving officer on medical certificate.

4975. Is the practice this, the relieving officer gives relief in the first instance and then what he has done comes before the relief committee of the board of guardians?—If it is an urgent case. He is not supposed to give relief prior to the board day unless in an urgent case. He has got to back it up by a medical certificate unless it is some old and very urgent case. If there is a medical certificate, I find that practically no relieving officer refuses, because he is afraid. In even a doubtful case he gives it if there is a medical order, and medical orders are very easily given in many cases. He is not supposed to give relief prior to the meeting of the board, but he often does in country districts.

Causes tending to increase size of boards of guardians.

4976. I think you said that in your opinion the boards of guardians are much too large for efficient administration?—I think some of them are.

4977. What do you suggest as a remedy?—I have nothing to suggest unless you alter the whole plan of the unions—of having agricultural unions tacked on to urban unions, and I will tell you why. We will take a union of 50,000 inhabitants; three-quarters of its area is represented by agricultural parishes with 10,000 people; a quarter of the area is represented by a couple of parishes, very small ones perhaps, with 40,000 people. That

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.
6 Mar. 1906.

population is modern. A few years ago these two parishes had only two or three guardians, and the others had, we will say, twenty or thirty according to the number of parishes. Now they apply for more guardians. They say that on the basis of valuation and population they are entitled to more guardians than the other parishes. That is how all these large number of guardians spring up; they do not reduce the agricultural parish guardians, they increase the urban parish guardians; the consequence being an unwieldy number, but you see how difficult it is. I do not advocate taking the agricultural parishes and making them maintain themselves; they could not do it. They depend upon the prosperity of the big towns for selling their produce, and they ought to pay a contribution towards the urban part as well. I have practically no suggestion to offer, but in the old times I used to hold the inquiries and a good many small parishes were amalgamated. When, however, the new Act came in, instead of wiping out the old guardians they increased the guardians for the populous parishes.

4978. Your idea would be to have the small parishes combined?—Yes, and we did it in many instances.

The Welsh guardians as semi-official relieving officers.

4979. I also gathered that in these cases the guardian generally is the person who really gives relief, because the applicant for relief gets at the guardian, and induces him to do what he desires?—There is a danger of that. In the typical Welsh union the guardian acts with the relieving officer very often, he is a sort of deputy relieving officer. I do not say the guardian does the duty of the relieving officer, certainly not in the populous unions. I think the paupers do go to the guardians in many instances behind the relieving officer's back, but they do not get relief until the board day; then the guardian, as an advocate for the relief, brings the case before the rest of his committee, and generally the relief is granted.

Poor Law administration in Cardiff.

4980. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Cardiff, I think, is a town where there is an increase of pauperism and large out-relief?—Yes, both.

4981. In a communication we have from the chairman of the board there he asks that the Local Government Board should do more to lay down principles for the guidance of the guardians. Do you think, if that were done, it would be any help to them?—Mr. Jones would be very strict if he could, much stricter than he is. There are hanging up in the Cardiff Board of Guardians' room rules that I drew up with the guardians thirty years ago, and you might as well print a page out of the Proverbs and put them there; they look very nice. They are bye-laws which, if adopted in connection with the Poor Law, would give a very wholesome rule to go by, but the guardians always find plenty of exceptions to them. I do not see what the Board could do unless it had compulsory power to compel them. But the Board is prohibited from interfering in individual cases of relief.

4982. I notice that he also asked that out-door relief should be either restricted or abolished altogether. Does not he represent the feeling of his board at all in that?—No; he cannot represent the feeling of the board that out-door relief be abolished altogether, when there are something like 4,373 persons in receipt of out-relief in the Cardiff union in one day.

4983. Do you think the guardians themselves, the board as a whole, would be glad to be, as you say, saved from themselves, if they could excuse themselves from being hard-hearted by referring to strict regulations?—I think what shows they do not want to be saved from themselves is that they refused to appoint an officer who they rather suspected would be their master instead of their being his.

4984. Then nothing but the conversion of the board would do any good?—The Cardiff guardians do a lot of good, it is not all harm. They are too easy, I think, with the out-door relief, but their relieving officers are very good men; but many good relieving officers have told me, "It is no good saying anything, they will not take advice in these cases." When I have pointed out to a relieving officer cases which I do not think ought to have relief, he has said, "I have said so many times"; no doubt guardians do give outdoor relief in many cases where the relieving officer would not recommend it.

Nursing of outdoor sick.

4985. I should like to pass to the question of nursing the outdoor sick. I see you mention that. From Swansea we are asked for greater nursing facilities for the outdoor sick. Are the guardians not at liberty to appoint nurses?—Yes, but they never have done so. I do not think the appointment of a nurse is half so desirable as subscribing to a good nursing association, where they are more particular about trained nursing. I do not know who they would not appoint if it got into the hands of the guardians. They might appoint any young girl. I do not think it is good to put the appointment of outdoor nurses under the guardians.

4986. Are there sufficient of these associations to cover the ground?—You would be surprised at the increase made in the last few years. You must have a Welsh-speaking nurse in most places, and trained Welsh-speaking nurses are now becoming much more numerous than they used to be. I refer to places like Merionethshire, where a nurse sometimes has to go miles on a bicycle. I mention Merionethshire to show what can be done, because that is the most difficult county to get about in that I have in my district, on account of the bad means of communication. There is in those unions a network of district nurses who have been a great benefit in visiting paupers, and who also take the serious cases in the little workhouses. One of these nurses is always at the call of the medical officer to attend when you cannot afford to have a trained nurse in a little place where there are only twenty, thirty, or forty inmates. The Cardiff guardians give considerably more than £100 a year towards the outdoor nurses—I should think it was nearer £200. Swansea has got a good many association nurses, and they are being added to. If you help them it is surely much better than appointing some second-rate nurse yourself and not subscribing any longer to a thoroughly good institution. I would rather back up that than I would advocate the appointment by guardians of outdoor nurses.

4987. Could you tell me what type of pauper cases these nurses are attending? Are they serious cases, or are they the infirm paupers you would like to see brought into workhouses?—They are people who cannot be looked after—cases of infirmity, and paralysed cases sometimes, which from the absence of neighbours are out of the way of nursing, and sometimes cannot properly be looked after, and are left to the tender mercies of a casual "neighbour" and people living in houses not fit for habitation. There are many of those cases, I am sorry to say. The number of houses unfit for habitation occupied by paupers is very large in my district. I think a main cause of pauperism is the disgraceful state of the houses in which many of the paupers live.

4988. Are these nurses engaged largely in looking after the class of people you have just mentioned?—I do not think they are. The kind of people who want to be relieved in the workhouse would be the people not looked after by these nurses, and who cannot be, and whom no nurses that you may appoint would look after either, they are too out of the way. I dare say there are many cases in some parts of the country which urgently require removal to the workhouse, but the guardians will not do it because they have no power. Those people would rather live in filth and misery than come into the workhouse.

4989. These association nurses are engaged in temporary cases, not chronic cases?—Temporary cases, as a rule; but they would take up a chronic case that wanted bandaging—bad legs, and that type of disease.

Nursing in workhouses

4990. How far are they a substitute for an infirmary? How far would the cases, if you had a good infirmary, be brought into the infirmary if it were not for these nurses?—That is a very hard question to answer, because it varies so much in the different unions. Where I find the workhouse being more used I always devote my attention to getting the accommodation for the sick improved, and I have done it. But there are small workhouses, such as Llanrwst and Corwen—little places with thirty or forty people,—where there are only two or three sick. I do not know that they would be any more used if there were no outdoor nurses. What happened a few years ago when there were no nurses was that such cases were left to their neighbours. I do not think it would have much effect. You do not have a trained nurse in a provincial workhouse where you have less than ten,

twelve, or fifteen sick. A trained nurse would not stay there; she would not come there to begin with.

4991. In these small districts the nurses are really a necessity?—I think so; and we find them, as I say, very useful in helping a surgical case, or dressing a case, and helping the doctor in the workhouse.

4992. It is not compulsory for the guardians to have them?—It is not compulsory, but they are only too glad to subscribe; they were not a few years ago.

edical ficer's wer to crease mber of rses.

4993. (*Dr. Downes.*) The medical officer has power to requisition more nurses, has he not?—Yes, in the workhouse, and the master is obliged to get one, but put yourselves in a place like Corwen or Llanrwst. You cannot very well get a nurse unless you send to Liverpool, or some other distant place.

cessity for lief stations Wales.

4994. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Are pay stations very largely used?—Yes, very largely, but there are no shops or public-houses. It is almost impossible to prevent them because of the distance.

4995. Do you find that it works well, or are there abuses attaching to it?—I do not see the objection that many people have. Of course, the ideal thing would be for the relieving officer to take the relief to the paupers' own homes, but it is utterly impossible; it could not be done. Put yourselves in the position. You could not do it. You must have some stations. There is no doubt they give rise to little abuses. You find some old woman gets a penny from five other old women for taking their relief back. It is considered a crime almost worthy of hanging, I believe, but I think the world will still go on although the old woman gets the penny. I do not approve of it, but I think it is a lesser evil than trying to do the impossible, which making the officers go round to the homes would be.

4996. The hardship I have heard is that it is very difficult for these old people to get their relief; it is sometimes almost impossible?—I have never heard of it. I have heard of guardians complain that they have got a bad relieving officer, that he has not paid the pauper, and those cases have been looked into, but it is very rarely that the pauper is not paid every week.

4997. If the paupers are unable to come, it is taken to them?—He ought to go and take it himself in that case, if the pauper does not come. There is Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Roberts, they live together; one week Mrs. Jones comes and hobbles up and another week Mrs. Roberts; it is awfully wicked I know that Mrs. Jones should take back Mrs. Roberts' relief, and Mrs. Roberts should do it the next week, but it is done, and I do not think there is very much in it. Now-a-days the guardians look after the relieving officer very sharply about that. If there is any case of neglect, I find it very quickly looked after.

vision of ief lists by lsh ardians.

4998. How often, as a rule, are orders revised?—My advice to guardians is to give no relief for longer than three months, and to make an automatic revision of cases. I advise them to divide what they call their permanent cases into as many times as the Board meet in the quarter, so that an equal number of them come due in three months' time, so that no board day is particularly overweighted with the number of cases, because I find that these general periodical three monthly or six monthly revisions are absolutely and entirely useless. They are done in a hurry if they are done at all. The relieving officer wants to go and the guardians want to go, and one case after another being of the same nature the chairman initials them; and so on, even if it is done every three months, but generally permanent cases are put every six months. I cannot get it done universally; some unions have done it and some do do it; those who have done it have found it a great benefit. Then each guardian of each parish gets the list of those cases which are coming for revision at the next board day sent him by post by the relieving officer, so that if he has anything to say he can come in, but that is not carried out so strictly as it ought to be.

sad- ntages of e-paper tem.

4999. Are there any unions in Wales where the Case Paper system is in use?—No, my opinion is this, if the Application and Report Book is properly kept, and if you read the columns and see the information there, it is quite enough. I do deprecate having more books than are necessary. I dare say the Case Paper system may be a very good system, but I do not see the necessity for it if your book is properly kept. That Application and Report Book is an admirable book, and for the needs of my district, if the information required by the printed headings to the columns is properly entered therein, I do not see, except as regards having a record of the cases and having an alphabetical index, what is the use of the Case Paper system.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

5000. Do you consider the inquiries are generally adequate?—No, certainly not, not in all cases. That depends greatly on the guardians and their relieving officers, but I do not see that the Case Paper system would make it any more so. Besides, in the typical Welsh unions they have known these people, and know more about them than any Case Paper would supply they have made up their minds what to give them, they know exactly what they have in their pot in the kitchen, and every sixpence they have got. They do not require any more information; the thing is, have they strength of mind to say "no" when they ought to?

Relief to wage-earning women.

5001. Are there any districts in Wales where out-relief is given to women who are at work?—Yes, a great many.

5002. What sort of districts would they be?—I have always brought the guardians to task about it in seaside places like Aberystwyth, Llandudno, Colwyn Bay, and Rhyl; a widow gets the same amount for herself and her children all the year round, summer and winter. Those widows often are getting very good earnings in the summer when the visitors are there, at all events very much more than they get in the winter, when they practically get nothing, but they still get the same relief. In a Welsh district an old woman of fifty or sixty will still be working in the fields getting an odd job; the relieving officer puts it down as "charing," but in the agricultural districts it is generally agricultural work; she gets 2s. 6d. from the guardians and she can live; you could not live in many parts of the country on that, but you can in Wales. The guardians prefer that kind of relief to building pauper palaces at great expense for them, where they would be doing nothing.

5003. Are there any factories or mills in the towns where the women work?—Yes, particularly in the woollen mills and the tin works where the wages the girls get are considerable, and they are taken into account, but they do not get more than 7s. or 8s. a week as a rule—that is the girls in the tin works. The girls on the pits are lessening, I am glad to say. I remember the time when you used to see the tips at Dowlais covered with girls; now they are not employed so much. The girls in factories are fewer in number also. At Llanidloes and Newtown there are a good many girls employed in factories. I do not think we have any case of any employment where girls are supposed to support their mothers out of the wages they get.

5004. In some cases would the mothers themselves be working?—No, not married women.

5005. They would not be getting relief if they were earning wages?—No, not if they were earning sufficient wages, but partial relief in aid of wages is no doubt given. I do not think it affects the prices as it used to do.

5006. Still, if they were getting insufficient wages, they would get outdoor relief?—Yes, they would, but only in a very few cases.

5007. But still it happens?—Yes, it does, and evils happen all over the world, but the question is, are not they of so small an extent that to combat them would bring worse evils.

Boarding out of children.

5008. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In paragraph 25 you deal with boarding out. I notice that the children are boarded out within the union for the most part?—Within the union.

5009. With the inspection of the relieving officer?—And the doctor. The doctors are paid 2s. 6d. a case for quarterly reports, and the relieving officers are paid nothing, but they have also to report. I must say, with regard to that, I visited several unions myself, and went round to every boarded-out child with the relieving officer. I cannot go, particularly in the case of girl children, and inspect them with the minutiæ that a lady inspector could do, but I could form a very good general idea of how they were being treated, compared with children of their own condition who were not paupers, and I

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar 1906.

must say that now and then I found cases where I insisted upon the guardians removing them at once, and they were removed; but the large majority of cases are very fairly done by. That is all I can say. I do not know any other inspector that has been round, but I thought it part of my duty, because the lady inspectors' duties are limited to boarding out under the Boarding-out Order, and these really were out-relief cases, orphans and deserted children getting out-relief within the union. The union where I live was so badly managed that I got the Board, with some difficulty, to abolish the boarding-out committee, because the management was so bad; but I think every union has some twenty or thirty children; roughly speaking there are over 1,000 now getting relief in that way, and I certainly should not alter it. You cannot build cottage homes in a little union for a small handful of children like that. I think they are very fairly done by, but there are exceptions, no doubt.

Disadvantages of Cottage Homes system.

5010. Would it not be better to group the small unions, say, into counties for this purpose, and make cottage homes?—No, I think not, because the distances are so great in Wales. Directly you begin to group unions there will be dislike on the part of the guardians to take the children from their relations. There is a good deal of relationship between the people you put these children with; many a married sister takes a child and gets 2s. 6d. from the guardians, and no more, because they think she ought to do the clothing and the rest—or it may be an aunt or a grandmother. You would do away with that at once if you took them away from those surroundings.

After-careers of boarded-out children.

5011. On the whole, you think these children turn out satisfactorily in life?—I think so.

5012. I suppose there are no figures to be had with regard to that?—No.

5013. They are lost in the population?—They are, except so far as the children, who are very few, sent out from workhouses.

Workhouse Schools in Wales.

5014. You have a few in the workhouses?—Very few, and only those temporarily, now; they go out to school. Conway is an exception. I am trying to get them to build cottage homes or to board out in hired homes, but they do not see it at present. I have a lady guardian on that union who is going to move in the matter, but she cannot see her way yet. Wrexham has a workhouse school, but that, I think, may be only a question of time. I should like to see cottage homes built for that union. I may say that the first cottage homes ever built under the Poor Law were in South Wales.

5015. The Wrexham indoor workhouse school keeps no return of the career of the children?—It is a separate building, and would have returns of what had become of the children, and they are very satisfactory ones; but it is a school where a large number of boys, girls, and infants are collected together under one roof and not placed in separate cottages, etc. It is wanted for other purposes. I should very much like to see it done away with and the children put in cottage homes.

Need for greater powers to detain paupers.

5016. Sometimes we are told that the guardians ought to have more power to detain persons?—Certainly.

5017. Do you think that is necessary?—Absolutely. I should like to see them have power to retain any single woman with an illegitimate child who has no visible means of providing for herself and family. That is one class. Then there are those half imbeciles—the feeble-minded. The difficulty with them is to know where to draw the line between who is feeble-minded and who is not. If you get that difficulty over, then I should like to see that class—certainly the half imbecile class, who cannot look after themselves, who fall into trouble very often—kept in workhouses until such time, at all events, as they showed some prospect of being able to maintain themselves. I should like to see a power to detain all unsatisfactory cases of that kind, and a power to enforce the people to come in who cannot be looked after outside at a reasonable cost to the rates.

Inoffensiveness of imbeciles in small country workhouses.

5018. We have heard a good deal about the hardship upon the poor people in small country workhouses where there are a good many feeble-minded and imbecile people in the workhouses. Have you any suggestion to make on that?—I have none. I hear these dreadful accusations, but when I go round my workhouses I only find two or three imbeciles who are generally capable kind of people. If they make a noise or are offensive, they are generally removed to the asylum. The inmates of the provincial workhouses are generally made up of two or three incapable people, and two or three old and infirm, and perhaps a girl with a child. With regard to the few imbeciles in such places you can remove them to an asylum, but they really do the useful work of the place, and they are happy. That is my experience. If we have cases which are offensive, they are taken to the asylum, because we have no special wards. If they had room in the workhouses for them, and had some pretended classification, with their small staff they would not be able to look after them, and it is better that they should be sent off to other institutions. I should like to see those institutions put on a better footing; places where we could send imbecile children to: places where we could send epileptics to; and places where we could send ordinary cases to. Three or four years ago I brought that point up. I wanted two things: an idiots' school, as it was called in those days, and also an epileptic colony. I took Glamorganshire first of all, because of its large population; but, unfortunately, there were two county boroughs, Swansea and Cardiff, created and they did not help us, but the county of Glamorganshire did. I wanted, not a pauper place, but a non-pauper place, so that the guardians could contribute and send their pauper cases, because you could compel non-pauper cases to go in, which you could not if it was a pauper place. We got all the information for Glamorganshire county; and very useful information it was. It is in a pigeon-hole in Cardiff, and the clerk to the guardians could send it to you any day. If we got similar information for Swansea and Cardiff, we should have got, I believe, material to start in Central Wales, somewhere where you could get 100 acres, say, of land, a very good place for them all to go to. I should like to have seen it done. Perhaps my successor will, but we are a long way off. Cardiff and Swansea, in being made counties, must have their own lunatic asylums to begin with, and Cardiff has spent an enormous sum on a new lunatic asylum; therefore, they would not listen to this business. I hope to see it, and I want to see it. I deprecate making provision for such cases in provincial workhouses.

Scheme for separate treatment of idiot children and epileptics.

5019. (*Dr. Downes.*) In the suggestions we have had from chairmen of guardians I see five chairmen make a point of the segregation of the feeble-minded and imbeciles, the particular unions are Aberayron, Conway, Pontardawe, Wrexham, and Monmouth. Are you aware of any difficulties at those places which you have found yourself?—No, at Pontardawe and Conway certainly not. At Monmouth, yes. At Monmouth they are considering the matter, and then we may have a better room for imbeciles. I do not think Monmouth is a very important case. At Wrexham we are building a new infirmary, and we shall have special rooms for harmless imbeciles there, but we are only beginning to build it now. Mr. Simon Jones, who is now chairman, and succeeded the gentleman who signed that suggestion to which you have alluded was at this meeting which I have referred to for dealing with the imbeciles of his workhouse. I think we shall be able to deal with them when we get the new infirmary.

5020. Such difficulties as may exist are being dealt with?—Yes, but what I am saying does not refer to idiot children. Did your question refer to them?

5021. I have only a *précis* of the answer. I cannot tell what the wording of the actual answer was?—I think it only refers to adult idiots and imbeciles. I want a school of instruction to take away the idiot children altogether. I do not think that refers to them. Anyhow that is a want.

Nature of complaints by workhouse inmates.

5022. In going round the workhouses, do you receive complaints from time to time?—Very seldom.

5023. Do you get complaints as to classification?—No, none.

5024. What is the nature of the complaints that you do get generally?—I get but very few. Now and then there is a complaint, but certainly not of any importance. Complaints are generally matters of this nature: some discontented fellow has had his tobacco stopped, or cannot get leave, and when I go into the matter, I generally find there is some reason for it. Now and then there

is a little failing, and, of course, that I have to pull up, but it is nothing of any importance. I think the inmates are very fairly well treated. I certainly get nothing about classification or married couples living together. The other day, for the first time in all these years, a man came to me and asked to be allowed to live with his old wife. I enquired into the matter; they were a very decent couple. There was no room in the workhouse that could be fixed up for them. I asked the guardians to see to it, and I believe they are going to do so, but it is very seldom married couples wish to live together. The truth is, in Wales they never send decent couples into the workhouse unless they are hopelessly ill or done for. Then they go into the infirmaries, where, of course, they cannot live together.

Infrequency of demand by married couples for separate quarters.

5025. It often happens that the one old person has to act as nurse to the other when they get into the married quarters?—When they get so bad they have to go to the infirmary.

5026. In paragraph 24 of your statement you say the workhouses are only used for a few imbeciles or infirm old men?—I ought to have left out that word "men," it ought to have been "people."

5027. You say "with no one to look after them"?—That means outside; it should be "or infirm old people with no one to look after them outside."

Compulsory removal to workhouse of helpless aged.

5028. On that question of the compulsory removal to the workhouse of all people who are living under bad conditions outside, I think every one will admit it is desirable, but may not there be hardship in some cases?—No, I would say that that should be done under the certificate of the medical officer and done by magistrates and not by the guardians at all. The guardians should take the case before the magistrates, and let them mention the time for which the person should be detained in the workhouse, upon the evidence of the doctor, and the relieving officer, or the guardians, if you like—I would not give the guardians the responsibility.

5029. You recognise there should be some stringent safeguard?—Yes, I presuppose all that. I only put this in to call the attention of the Commissioners to it.

5030. It might happen that the old person was occupying a cottage which somebody wanted, might it not?—It is possible, of course, but as a rule the cottages they have are not very desirable. In towns that might be so, certainly.

5031. That is the sort of thing that might have to be guarded against?—I should suggest that you have to bring it before the magistrate by the relieving officer and the doctor; as against that you have only some ill-conditioned person who wants the house, or who is, perhaps, the owner. I do not think there is the slightest danger in my district in Wales from that side of the question.

Lack of necessity for case paper system in rural unions.

5032. In dealing with the Case Paper system, you spoke of the special knowledge which Welsh guardians have of their cases?—In typical Welsh unions, not in the big towns.

5033. Would it follow that the one guardian would communicate all that special knowledge to his fellow guardians?—No, not at all; they keep a little behind very often.

5034. But very possibly that special knowledge might come out on the Case Paper?—What if it did? It does not make any difference to the manner in which the case would be dealt with in a typical union. I do not question that in the town unions you would require this Case Paper much more, if it is required. Where you have the guardians having special knowledge and withholding it is only in the farming country districts.

Nursing of outdoor sick at Swansea.

5035. You were asked by Mrs. Bosanquet as to the suggestion which came from Swansea as to the necessity for greater nursing facilities for outdoor sick. Do you know of any special difficulties in Swansea having regard to their present facilities?—I think as time goes on we shall get better still. I think the number of nurses will increase. We have built large hospitals at Swansea.

5036. It is for the outdoor sick they ask it?—If they are not properly nursed, they ought to be brought into the workhouse hospital, therefore it raises the question of whether you are going to build or whether you are going to rely on outdoor nursing. I am not in a position to say that the outdoor nursing is as satisfactory as it should be; it never is in any place. I have been round with relieving officers and found people living in rooms where they cannot be properly nursed, and in which they certainly ought not to lie in sickness even, but you cannot go building big new infirmaries to take them all in. Where you are going to stop I do not know. We have room for about 1,000 in Swansea now, but it is generally full.

5037. Do you find that agencies for the relief of sickness outside the poor law are extending or otherwise in your district?—Not in Wales. You do not mean nursing associations?

Effect of medical relief on medical clubs, &c.

5038. I refer not only to nursing associations, but to provident medical clubs and cottage hospitals?—How can you have medical clubs when you tell a fellow that he can come and get it from the board of guardians for nothing and not be made a pauper. They go down at once, and no wonder. I should like some evidence on that, and I wrote to Cardiff about it, and to several other places, but they would not tell me a word about these medical clubs. I have some answers, but they are worth nothing. Medical relief alone was going up by leaps and bounds in Cardiff and Swansea till I had to call the attention of the guardians to it, because it is perfectly wicked the amount that is now spent on people who have dropped their subscriptions to anything like a sick club.

5039. I gather that your experience is that lavish medical poor relief kills provident medical relief?—How do you mean, lavish? I never knew too much attention given to this by poor law medical doctors, if that is what you mean.

5040. I rather gathered from what you said that where there is this provision for medical attendance made by the guardians with medical extras and all the appurtenances of medical relief, when given freely, the men do not join the medical clubs?—I have no evidence to prove that they do not, but I am perfectly sure that you cannot expect medical clubs to thrive where the relief is got and does not pauperise. There is no disqualification attaching to it; but whether they can give medical extras is a legal question which is not settled yet, I think. Is it settled whether you can give medical extras?

5041. I do not know. If you could suggest evidence to us on this point, I think it would be desirable?—The best evidence I could give you would be the increase in medical relief only in the unions I mentioned, during the last three years, which must show that those people who now get relief from the guardians used to get it from other quarters. The medical relief clubs will not give you any list of members, and the benefit clubs do not all give doctors, the Hearts of Oak do not give a doctor at all. Other clubs do. I have no information at all on that, and I do not see how I can give it. I have tried to get it.

Voluntary Cottage Hospitals in Wales.

5042. Are cottage hospitals general in Wales?—No. There is one at Llanelly and one at Merthyr. They call them cottage hospitals, but they are getting beyond mere cottage hospitals. What do you exactly mean by a cottage hospital?

5043. A small voluntary hospital serving the needs of the district?—There is one at Llanelly. I cannot call Merthyr a cottage hospital now. There is one at Aberystwith, a small one; and one at Bangor, but that is gradually getting much bigger. They have been growing out of the category of cottage hospitals.

Utilisation by Welsh unions of distant voluntary hospitals.

5044. Are there county infirmaries in most of the Welsh counties?—Yes; I was trying to think where there was not one. I do not think there is one in Merionethshire. I do not think there is one in Montgomeryshire; they go to Shrewsbury; they get better attention, and it is almost as convenient.

5045. The railway system serves those places well?—Yes, for serious cases. Boards of guardians in North Wales frequently send their cases to Liverpool, even over to Dublin, to Manchester, to Birmingham, and to Shrewsbury, whenever they have a difficult case.

5046. Do the guardians subscribe to all those hospitals?—They do a great deal in North Wales, because they feel their workhouses are not sufficient to treat an acute case of any difficulty.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

5047. Do you find that the medical officers of workhouses avail themselves of this power to requisition more nurses in their workhouses?—Several times they have, but that is chiefly in the case of infectious diseases.

Use by medical officer of power to requisition nurses.

5048. As to the question of drugs to which you referred, do any of the guardians make arrangements with chemists in small places?—No, some of the unions find the drugs not out of the salary of the medical officer; then, of course, they deal with some good chemist and get their drugs from him, but that is generally done on the order of the medical officer.

Methods of providing drugs for paupers.

5049. Do you think an arrangement of that sort would be serviceable in small places?—With the medical officer?

5050. Where the chemist makes up the prescription, and the guardians pay?—Are you talking about outdoor relief?—

5051. Either?—Only drugs for the indoor poor would be included in the salary of the medical officer.

5052. Let us take the indoor poor?—I think the best way is to let the medical officer order what drugs he wants, and account for them, and let them be kept in a small surgery in the workhouse, and be made up from time to time when it is convenient.

5053. Even in the small places would you do that?—I would. I think it is easy. In the very small places the doctors might be allowed to send in their bills for medicine. I think it is much better that they should have a little drug store of their own in the workhouse, and that they should order drugs when required.

Method of feeding wives and children of strikers.

5054. Turning to the feeding of women and children in times of strike, as a matter of fact in the great strike to which you refer in Paragraph 62, how were those women and children in thousands fed? Was it by relief in kind given to them at home?—On paper entirely. They were given tickets for food and a little money. I tried to prevent money being given at all, and wanted all the relief to be given in kind to these strikers, but the guardians would not have it.

5055. You said, I think, that there was some suspicion that the men benefited by that food or that relief?—Not in those cases. I said that would be the result of the Master of the Rolls' view. We fed our men through the labour yard, and we gave to the men up to a certain point until we were stopped. Just at the end of the strike (it did not very much matter then) it was the case that we had to relieve the wives and children, and the men looked on while we were doing it, and did nothing for it, but, of course, they consumed the food.

5056. Assuming that the men did benefit from the food given to the wives and children under the Master of the Rolls' decision, do you think that that evil could be minimised if the women and children were fed by meals provided by the guardians either at the workhouses or at certain places?—In a strike like that you could not have done it. Look at the distances the women and children would have to come, and where you would have to take these meals to. I had to get round the district, and I did not get half round the union in a whole day, working from sunrise to sunset. For miles and miles a place could not be provided for the children. They are not all in one town.

5057. I am not suggesting the meals should be taken to the children, but that the meals should be provided in convenient places to which the people could come?—I do not think that is reasonable in such a strike as we had in Wales; and in the district under consideration I do not think that would be practically possible.

5058. On account of the distances?—Yes.

5059. What would be the greatest distance they would have to go?—It is not only the distance, it is the inconvenience. There are mountains to go over; and look at the weather, sickly children could not be dragged over in that; you would have to build houses for them to feed in. I think that is impossible.

5060. You assume they would have to build houses to feed them in?—I assume that the whole idea is impracticable, knowing what I do of the district.

Type of rural guardian.

5061. (*Mr. Phelps.*) The unions in your district fall into two classes, rural and urban, I think you said necessarily; from what sort of class do the guardians in the rural unions come?—Principally from the farmer class.

5062. Farmers on a small scale or on a large scale?—In the typical Welsh unions there are practically no farmers on a large scale. In Glamorganshire and some other places there are large farms, but a farm of 200 or 300 acres is a very great rarity, except in certain parts of South Wales. Generally, the small farmer who would be a guardian would not have more than 60 to 70 acres to farm, except in Anglesey.

5063. Does the country gentleman play much part in the administration of the poor law?—No, he is not elected.

5064. Is that a recent change?—He was not elected before, but where he was a magistrate he was an *ex officio* guardian.

5065. I gather from the statement you have sent in, that his influence is much less on the administration of the poor law than it was?—Practically he has none. The magistrate *qua* magistrate is not on the board, only sometimes he gets elected for his parish, together with a clergyman or two.

Effect on Poor Law administration of Local Government Act, 1894.

5066. Do you date a great change from 1894?—Yes, but not so much a change in the personnel as in the powers of speaking, the loquacity as I say in my statement. When the proceedings were conducted in English, the *ex officio* guardians did it pretty nearly all; the other people could not express themselves well in English and consequently, said nothing, but they were there.

5067. Do you think, once that change took place, the education of the guardians has proceeded in a sense more rapidly?—I have not a high opinion of the knowledge of the poor law possessed by the present guardians in these typical Welsh districts. I think that they have to take more interest in their work, and that they are thrown more in contact with the poor than they were perhaps formerly. It is, however, very much the same there, only they have found their voice which they had not before.

5068. Then you do not think the area of interest in poor law questions is very much enlarged by the absence of the one or two people who really worked the whole board?—No. From my point of view, it was better perhaps in the old time, because Welsh is a language which allows a great deal of talking on very small subjects.

Clergymen and ministers as guardians.

5069. Do you find many ministers of religion on the boards?—Not many what I call licensed ministers, but there are some. Even in the most typically Welsh part of my district, there are nearly always a clergyman or two on the board that have been elected by the parish, and they are generally rather exceptional men—men who respite their being clergymen have been elected because they are really good men.

5070. Do you find ministers of other denominations on the boards?—Yes. It is hard to know sometimes when a man is a minister, and when he is not. They do not appear always as ministers, but I find out afterwards what they are when I ask. I should think there is a good sprinkling of them, but in the country districts the members are mostly farmers

5071. Do politics play much part in the elections in the country?—I do not know that I can give you evidence about that. If you ask me my private opinion, I should say that politics in Wales is simply church and chapel.

Type of town guardians.

5072. What class do the guardians come from in the large towns?—They vary. There is still a good sprinkling of men connected with the industries of the localities, shopkeepers, now and then innkeepers, and ministers of religion and clergymen. They are very varied in the towns; now and then there is a gentleman on the board who takes an interest in the work. On the whole, I should think they are very varied, and very intelligent—quite fit to learn more about poor law than they know; and they are teaching themselves—there is no doubt about that.

5073. On the whole, you think the state of things there is encouraging, I take it?—I think so. I think the town guardians in Wales (except as I have said there are too many of them) are on the way to learn; I think they are improving and anxious to do their duty.

Pauperism in Glamorgan, Monmouth, and Carmarthen.

5074. In the 32nd paragraph of your statement you say, with regard to the unions in Glamorganshire, part of Monmouthshire and Llanelly in Carmarthenshire,

"they are most of them increasing in pauperism of late years;" but I do not think the figures quite bear that out, do they? I find on looking at the figures that pauperism is falling at Bridgend and Pontardawe, according to Mr. Booth's analysis, and that Bridgend is one of the lowest of the whole?—Yes; but in these last two years Bridgend has largely increased in pauperism.

5075. According to the figures, it has gone down from 2·5 in 1885 to 1·5 in 1905?—But the population has increased enormously.

5076. The proportion of paupers has gone down very much, apparently?—Certainly as between those years, but it has increased in this last year considerably.

5077. Since these figures were made up?—Yes.

5078. The same is true of Pontardawe; there has been a considerable falling since 1895?—It is only from 3 per cent. to 2·7 per cent.?

5079. But that is an improvement. If you take Merthyr Tydfil, if you take Neath, and if you take Pontypridd, they are all stationary; there is no sign of increase there, I think?—Since the last 25th March Bedwellty and Merthyr Tydfil have increased very considerably; there is no doubt about that.

Increase of pauperism in Cardiff and Swansea.

5080. The two towns which have increased largely are both Cardiff and Swansea?—Cardiff and Swansea have increased not only in actual numbers but in percentage of pauperism.

5081. Are there any particular circumstances which account for that increase in pauperism?—No, except that the guardians will have it so; they love to have it so. What will be the end thereof, I do not know.

Conditions in Monmouth Union and Forest of Dean.

5082. Take, for instance, Monmouth; Monmouth has an English speaking board entirely I take it, and I know something of Monmouth?—Yes, it has.

5083. And it is an entirely country district; that is one of the most pauperised unions of the district?—If you know the Monmouth district, you know the Forest of Dean portion, where there are a lot of very poor squatters in their own freehold cottages, living from hand to mouth on a very fluctuating trade. The quarry industries, charcoal industries, and what tin plate industries there were in the Forest, have been for years in a very depressed state. The collieries are a little better now. Still the fact is that these people live in their own houses, a great many of them without any sanitary convenience at all; and, as I said this morning, I attribute the increase in pauperism as much to bringing up people in filthy insanitary houses as to any other one condition that I know of. If you could go round the Forest of Dean with me as I have been round with a relieving officer, you would wonder they were not all paupers sometimes, if you looked at the houses they dwell in. But business is improving in the Forest, and they are not so bad as they were.

5084. Do I understand—I only ask this by the way—that many of these people live in freehold cottages?—Yes, under certain conditions. I am not in a position to tell you how, but they are practically freehold.

5085. Do they hold under the Crown, or something of that sort?—Yes; it is a very peculiar tenure.

Interest of Guardians in workhouse administration.

5086. With regard to the outdoor relief, you say there is a considerable increase; do you find in the management of institutions such as workhouses and the like, that the boards of guardians in these large towns are efficient?—Take Cardiff; I consider that Cardiff Guardians are quite, I was going to say, first-rate in the interest they have taken in three points of their workhouse administration—one being the treatment of the sick; another being the provision of an almost unique place for the old and infirm, where they are separated entirely from the other part of the workhouse—three miles off in an ideal place; and the third being the scattered homes which take nearly 300 children. I go round there with the greatest possible care; I find that the individual guardians who are entrusted with the different homes in their localities take great pains. They have imitated and improved upon Sheffield, which the guardians went to see. I consider that that board of guardians takes the greatest possible interest in all their in-door work. They will be proud to show any of their institutions to any board. Swansea is not perhaps entitled to that amount of praise. They have cottage homes of a rougher and more primitive kind. They have just now built an up-to-date infirmary, and they have got very fair accommodation. There is a new infirmary at Bridgend just being built; at Merthyr the new infirmary is quite good; at Pontypridd they have cottage homes, but they have an insufficient workhouse. I understand, however, that they are intending to build there. Altogether, I must say that in the industrial and the large centres—not in the small unions—the workhouse administration has vastly improved during these last three years, and is, to my mind, very fairly satisfactory without their building unnecessary barracks and palaces.

5087. It has not gone back since 1894?—No. It has gone ahead by leaps and bounds, I should say.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, on workhouse administration. Willingness of guardians to erect buildings.

5088. Have you had much difficulty in persuading guardians to put up new buildings and to improve their accommodation?—I am not a very exacting inspector. I hate every brick that is put into a poor law building. It is only when it is absolutely necessary that I bring it before them. I think that by the time I bring it before them they have pretty well made up their own minds that it is necessary, and, therefore, I have little or no difficulty. I do not mean to say that I get exactly all I want—none of us do; but I wait till I can see that they are ripe for it, and then I take them along and make them finish it. I have no real difficulty about it. Even in my own workhouse at Chepstow, which is a purely agricultural union, we are now putting up a new infirmary. A lot of farmers form the majority of that board.

Increase of medical relief at Cardiff.

5089. I think earlier in the day you were going to quote some figures to show the increase in medical relief?—Yes. I have here the Cardiff figures of out-door paupers in receipt of medical relief only from 1872 to 1878. There appears to be a gap in all the eighties; but, before the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, the numbers in receipt of medical relief only were very few. On 1st July there were 71 out-door paupers in receipt of medical relief only; next year they increased to 170; the number was 156 the year after that; then 106, 134, 278, and 197. I then began to wake the guardians up about it, and it is now going down a little again. On the 1st January, which is taking a winter month, the number in 1900 were 212, 238 the next year, and then in succeeding years 207, 131, 224, 336 and 248. If you were to take the numbers relieved during six months, they would be ten times as many. Those figures are only for one day.

Infrequency of loan relief.

5090. Is medical relief ever given on loan?—I have brought that before them, but hardly anything is given on loan in my district. At Swansea they have tried to do it of late; I do not know with what success, but practically it has not been done hitherto.

5091. Do you find that in most of your unions they have a scale of relief?—Yes, I think so.

Scale of relief in Wales.

5092. Could you put in one or two typical scales of relief for country and town unions—I do not mean at this moment, but could you send them to the Secretary?—They do not confess that they have a scale. "We treat them on their own merits," is a very favourite expression with a board of guardians; whether it is always acted up to is another thing, but that is their expression and they will not confess to a scale. Widows have a scale, but that varies; in one or two country unions it is still a rate of 1s. for each child, but it is generally 1s. 6d.; and in one or two of the urban town districts it is 2s. a child, with nothing for the widow if she is able-bodied, unless her circumstances warrant it. The treatment of the old people varies very much in urban districts. Take a union like Cardiff; there you cannot get a house under double what you pay in a typical Welsh district, where a cottage is to be had for £5 a year or £4—such cottages as they do have; whereas a person in Cardiff for one room has to pay 4s. 6d. per week. You cannot make a scale to fit that; you are obliged to give higher relief on these occasions.

5093. Would the Cardiff guardians have a printed scale before them when they meet?—No, nothing of that kind. They do not pretend to have any scale. But the relieving officers no doubt have a kind of scale, because

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

directly one old woman hears of another old woman getting 6d. more than she does, the second old woman's relief goes up also; so it is very infectious.

Extent and effect of compounding for rates in Wales.

5094. Going now to paragraph 46 of your printed statement, am I to understand by that that you want to see compounding for rates abolished ?—I am not lawyer enough to do that, but the Assessed Rates Act has been the cause of great extravagance, I think. In these industrial centres, by far the majority of the electors of guardians are the very men from whose classes applications for relief come, and they, in thousands to instances, pay no rates, but they pay rent. Of course a political economist will come to me at once and say, but then they have to pay, if their rates are so high, more rent. It is not so. You cannot alter the rent. There is a fixed rent of 4s. 6d. for a collier, and it does not go up and down with the rates at all. It is no barometer of that kind. It is always the same, and it does not matter to them, as I say in the statement, whether the rate is 5s. or 4s.—they pay just the same. Therefore there is no incentive to economy, and they do not feel where the shoe pinches if there is what you call extravagance.

5095. Compounding for your rates is almost universal in this district, is it not ?—Wherever you get large collieries the proprietors build the cottages and rent them out and pay all the rates. That is the rule.

5096. Do you know whether compounding is common in the country districts ?—I do not think so, but every house under £8 can compound. It is where you get rows of houses, with men changing their residence, that it is manifestly convenient to be able to collect the rates from the proprietor, and it saves the assistant overseer a lot of trouble to get it out of one pocket, besides being much better paid in that way. I foresee all the difficulty, but you will get no check on extravagance until you make the people who spend the money feel that it comes out of their pocket, and not, by pulling a string, out of heaven or somewhere else.

Settlement litigation in Wales.

5097. Have you found that in Wales settlement questions are much contested ?—Yes, a good deal. I think in the districts of cosmopolitan unions like Cardiff and Swansea, they agree to take a pauper and do not worry about his Irish settlement or his Scottish settlement very much, but if he belongs to a neighbouring union they enforce it. The clerk at Cardiff—and that is the most important union in my district, from its varying circumstances—is strongly in favour of doing away with the law of settlement altogether, or, at all events, of reducing it to the one year as I have said in my statement; but he says his guardians would probably not agree with it, because when they get an expensive pauper they like to send him off to another union.

Effect of abolition of settlement.

5098. Do you think it would make much difference in Wales if settlement was abolished ?—I think there is a good deal of very unnecessary expenditure about it, even in Wales.

5099. Do you think any particular type of union would gain very much, and any particular type of union would lose very much, if settlement was abolished ?—In port towns like Cardiff and Newport, where sailors come in who are very often permanently disabled, and are thus thrown on the hands of the unions, there might be some hardship; but even then I would make it a rule to a great extent that where the tree falls there it should lie.

5100. Do you think the town unions would suffer at the expense of the country unions, if settlement were abolished —No, I do not think so.

5101. (*Miss Hill.*) You were mentioning nursing associations; are those voluntary bodies ?—Yes, all.

Extent of charities in Wales.

5102. Have you many charities in Wales ?—I am sorry to say very few. May I be allowed to amplify that remark ? You should understand that old Wales is a very small part of the population of present Wales. There are no charities in any of the towns where the populations are of recent growth, nor in the industrial centres round the coal pits of Glamorganshire and the iron-works. There are no better class residents there, and there are no endowed charities of any kind, and the consequence is there is no Charity Organisation Society—I wish there were, but I do not see how they can thrive upon nothing. There is a Charity Organisation Society in Cardiff, and there is one in Swansea, but they do little or no work, because they have no money to go upon. The chief charities are what one might call church charities and chapel charities, but they are not endowed in any way, and there is no old form of charities that you could organise, in order to help boards of guardians by transferring from one to the other; I wish there were.

Type and characteristics of Welsh guardians.

5103. (*Professor Smart.*) You say that the guardians in the industrial districts consist very much of managers of works and pits, clergymen, grocers and small shopkeepers, and that the membership of the boards is very varied and very intelligent ?—Yes; but I was talking of the towns. The coal districts vary considerably from that. If you take the Merthyr board of guardians, you will find they are like the present House of Commons; they largely consist of what I call labour members—in fact I found that out in the strike of eight years ago, but now they are larger still in numbers. The other day Merthyr became a borough with a Mayor and a Charter and everything else, and by far the larger part of the councillors are purely working men, the Mayor himself being a working man. That will show you how they differ from a place like Cardiff or Swansea. They differ everywhere in that way. I was talking rather of Swansea, Newport, Cardiff and that kind of place, when I used the words you have just quoted, and not so much of the coal district.

5104. I take it that among Welsh guardians there is a much more intimate knowledge of the people than is usually the case ?—Much more, in the typical Welsh union. As I say, they would be fit for Elberfeld if they would only tell the whole of what they do know—sometimes they keep a little back.

5105. Is this due to the more clannish feelings of the Welsh, or is the social life of all classes in Wales more on an equality ?—I think the latter is the case in the towns, but in the mountainous and thinly populated districts there is a clannishness amongst the people, and each valley almost is different from the next valley, and they have their own individuality—there is a long Welsh word for that, but I will not trouble you with it. But the people know each other, and help each other to a certain extent. When they get so poor that they cannot help each other, then the guardian comes and says, "I will get you a half-a-crown at the Board." Mind you, that half-a-crown is worth 5s. or 6s. here; you must always bear that in mind. There is a tendency to subsidise what little these old people have, which springs from an intimate knowledge of their family concerns; that is in the typical Welsh unions.

5106. In the rural districts you say farmers form a large proportion of the guardians ?—Yes, they do, in the rural districts certainly.

5107. And they are likely to be intimately acquainted with the people of the district ?—Certainly.

5108. Am I right in saying that it is this intimate knowledge that makes outdoor relief better guarded in Wales than it could be anywhere else ?—Yes; that is always barring the cosmopolitan parts of Wales. You mean the Welsh parts of Wales, I take it ?

5109. May I ask if you are a Welshman ?—No, I am not; I am an East Anglian.

5110. How many inspectors have you under you ?—None.

5111. Are any of your assistants Welsh ?—No.

Disadvantages of Inspector's ignorance of Welsh.

5112. Do you feel your inability to speak Welsh yourself to be a hindrance ?—I do certainly—not so much speaking as understanding all that is going on when they do not want me to understand. I know a little about Welsh and I can speak to an old woman in a workhouse but I cannot make a speech; and if they do not want me to understand it is like a person using a foreign language before you—you may be able to speak French pretty well, but a couple of Frenchmen can talk so that you cannot understand a word that they say. There is where I should like to come in, but I cannot.

Sentiment against entering the workhouse.

5113. I suppose the prejudice against going to the workhouse is very great ?—It is, still they get in there, and then they wonder that it is so comfortable.

5114. Is that as great in the industrial districts as in the rural districts ?—They say so, but then that is to get the outdoor relief. I do not think there is the same disinclination on the part of guardians to make use of the workhouse in the unions which have large workhouses. They say they could not possibly maintain these people outside under 7s. a week at the very least; and there are hundreds of these men with little or nothing to do.

5115. Is that the reason why a strict workhouse test could not be applied in Wales ?—Yes, and I hope it never will be.

Features of agricultural Wales.

5116. Is there a large number of small farmers in Wales ? —Yes.

5117. Very small farmers ?—Yes; and some of them get relief when they become so old that they cannot look after their little holdings. They pass the holding on to a son who may have a young wife, and make it over to him; then it becomes the son's, and he and his wife begin again, and these old people get relief sometimes. I do not mean to say there are many such cases, but you must remember they have been living worse than a labouring man all their lives, and bringing up families too. They would be a lesson to some of the unemployed.

5118. I suppose these are mostly grazing and sheep farmers ?—Yes. They all have a field which has a bit of potatoes and a bit of turnips and a bit of green-stuff on it, and then the rest is grass for cows and there is a little sheep run; they generally have a mountain for that, which is the most paying thing of the lot.

5119. Are they so small that you would describe them as crofters ?—Very often thirty acres is about the size of these small hill farms with a bit of a run for the sheep, with little houses built up against the side of the mountain, with the wet all coming in—damp walls, no ventilation, no place to put a sick person, pig-styes and everything against the back of the house, no drainage away, and yet in the most picturesque lovely spots you can conceive. I am speaking now of parts in North Wales especially.

5120. I hear that in Wales agricultural wages are high ?—That depends on the nearness to the industrial centres. They are high in counties like Glamorganshire, Breconshire, and Carmarthenshire, where they are near what they call the "works." That is a large question. In typical Wales there are very few labourers. There is the "hwsmon" who is engaged by the six months of the year for so much and his food. If he is a bachelor, that is all very well, but if he is a married man the food goes into him and not into his wife and children, and he has only 10s. a week to send his wife and children who may be living somewhere else.

5121. Is "hwsmon" a Welsh word ?—The "hwsmon" is the house-man, or head man. He looks after all the other men on the place. A most interesting description of Wales was given by Mr. L. Thomas before the Agricultural Commission. His description will tell you all about it. It is as good as a novel to read.

Outdoor relief Friendly Societies Acts and their effect on unstable Benefit Clubs, etc.

5122. May I refer you to paragraph 33 in your Statement, and ask you what you mean by saying that the Friendly Societies Act is but a premium on rotten clubs ? —That is open to comment, I admit. Rotten clubs are not clubs like the Manchester Unity, but break-up clubs and small village clubs. Directly they get a few old men on them, they break up and send the old men adrift and start again. Those are rotten clubs which only give their people 2s. 6d. a week, or something like that, and those clubs get more benefit out of this Act than a good sound club which gives more than 5s. a week that is put in the Act. The section is read by the guardians in this way—that if the poor person gets 5s. you have got to consider that in the relief. What the Act really says—only I do not press it at all, because I never approved of it—is that after 5s. you shall begin to take account, but that the 5s. of club relief shall not be taken into consideration. I say that if the Manchester Unity, of the Hearts of Oak, or the Foresters, or that kind of club, want to do well in a place they will do better where the boards of guardians are strict than where they are slack, and that it would be well if boards of guardians would recognise good clubs by ordering the workhouse in bad cases instead of giving them out-relief. That is the difference that should be made—the workhouse for the fellows who have not got a club or who have a bad club, and the out-relief for the person who belongs to a good club if his relief from the club is not sufficient. That is where I say the boards of guardians could back up the good clubs. I speak of "rotten" clubs, and they are rotten—there is no other word for these small break-up clubs.

Unstable Benefit Clubs.

5123. I understand that it is rather usual for well-off people to subscribe to these clubs as a kind of charity and without any intention of coming on them ?—Certainly; I do myself, and so do lots of people.

5124. That is why the rotten clubs subsist, is it not ? —I do it as an example to the place I live in, so that other people may belong to them; but I am specially exempted from the benefits. I have subscribed to the Miners' Provident Society though I am not a miner. I subscribe to the club in my district, and there are a good many of my neighbours who do subscribe also, and I think it is very legitimate to help the good clubs in that way. The club I subscribe to is the Manchester Unity.

5125. I thought you were denouncing rotten clubs ?— The Manchester Unity is not a rotten club. I do not think these people subscribe to the rotten clubs.

5126. I thought you were speaking of rotten clubs entirely, and that you meant clubs that could not pay what they undertake to pay unless they are assisted by subscriptions from people who never intend to come on the club, so that you, for example, in subscribing to them would be fostering a very bad system ?—No. I think the clubs I have in my mind are rotten in any way you look at them, whether or not you include what they get from chance local help and from people who do not intend to participate in the benefits (but I do not think they do get such help). I think the people who want to help clubs by voluntary subscriptions help the good clubs as a rule and not the rotten clubs. By a rotten club I mean a club that will only give 2s. 6d. a week, and will break up directly it is getting a little low in its funds and begin again.

Assurance in Wales and effect thereon of Workmen's Compensation Act.

5127. Do you find that insurance is increasing in Wales with good offices like the Prudential for example ?—No, I do not believe it is, but it is impossible to get figures to give evidence upon. As I have told you, I went to the Registrar of Friendly Societies but could get no figures.

5128. Cannot you get any figures about the Prudential for example; I thought they were well known ?—I could get them with regard to Cardiff, because one of the leading guardians there is the head manager of the Prudential in that district.

5129. I rather understand, but I am not sure, that the subscriptions to the Prudential are increasing, and I cannot quite make out how that is reconcilable with your suggestion that the Workmen's Compensation Act has had a deleterious effect on Friendly Societies ?—Do you call the Prudential a strict Friendly Society ?

5130. No, but it is part of the same movement; a Friendly Society insurance and a Prudential insurance is very much the same thing—in both cases it is an insurance ?—I cannot give evidence upon that, but I am told wherever I enquire, by relieving officers and by responsible guardians, that the clubs are not kept up by the young men in the same way that their fathers used to keep them up. I wish I could give you some information on that; I tried my best to get it and failed. As to what effect the Workmen's Compensation Act has had upon Friendly Societies in Glamorganshire, that could be got before the end of the year from the registrar.

Position and influence of Rhymney Iron and Steel Company.

5131. I suppose that in many districts the bulk of the rates is paid by property owners and companies ?— Yes.

5132. Do you know anything of Rhymney ?—Not financially.

5133. But you have a general knowledge of Rhymney. I take it ?—Yes.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham

6 Mar. 1906.

5134. I suppose the Iron and Steel Company there employs most of the labour?—Yes; they are colliers.

5135. It practically has the monopoly of employment there?—Yes.

5136. Does it own, do you know, any property besides its own works and pits?—I think the only business that it does is coal raising now; they have shut up the tin works and the steel works.

5137. You do not know if it owns the brewery?—Are you thinking of the truck business?

5138. No; you do not know if it owns the brewery?—I do not know; it may still do so.

5139. You do not know if it owns the public-houses?—No.

5140. You do not know if it owns all the public-houses?—I would rather not give evidence on that, because I could not swear to it.

5141. Do you not know that it owns some hundreds of the colliers' houses?—Yes, I do know that. They all do that.

5142. Then that property obviously would pay a very large portion of the rates?—Yes.

5143. Do you know if any of the officials at these works are on the board of guardians?—Not so many as there used to be. I remember for years when the chairman of the Rhymney Company was also chairman of the board of guardians at Tredegar. The cashier used to be a member, and the very man in charge of the brewery and of the truck business was a member for years. But I do not think there are very many Rhymney officials on the board now, in fact there are very few officials compared with what there used to be.

Influence of employers and property-owners on Poor Law administration.

5144. Of course these companies either directly or indirectly would have a great influence on the whole matter of poor relief?—But these men do not form the majority.

5145. I am thinking of the owners of property and employers generally?—They have not so much influence as they used to have. There is a labour majority on all these boards now, and the employers are not represented to the same extent.

5146. Do you ever hear of any complaint being made of influence being brought to bear on the assessments?—No, not that I could give evidence upon. The persons who could give evidence upon that would be the clerks of the assessment committees and the clerks of the guardians.

5147. Might one say that where there is a great monopolist power, it is probable that it is not without influence if it likes to exert it?—I do not think there are any monopolies now; there used to be, no doubt. I remember the Bedwellty board of guardians, when the board almost entirely consisted of the chairmen and officials of different companies; and I do not think they administered their poor relief arbitrarily or narrowly; I think they administered it as straightforwardly as it is done now, if anything, more so. I never detected any sort of unpopularity, and they were elected year after year. But we have grown different since. I do not think they used their monopolies unfairly with regard to Poor Law relief; I must say that.

5148. One would not suggest that, but one merely thinks that if there is a great monopolist power, it can be exerted if people like to exert it?—Yes; but these monopolies do not exist now.

Alternatives to stone-breaking as labour test.

5149. You do not think very highly of stone-breaking as a financial success?—Certainly not in the case of large numbers, because there results such a large accumulation of stone that it is very hard to get rid of it. Then it is difficult to bring it there in the first place; it is only brought at a great cost, and the quarrymen drive up the prices when they know who is to have it. So, financially, it is very expensive. The returns of the Merthyr board of guardians would show a very great loss.

5150. I think we should all agree in that. Then you say that in 1874 a great deal of useful work was done by strikers in road making and repairing?—Yes.

5151. Is road making and repairing a possible alternative now to the stoneyard?—It has to be done out of the rates, but it is done now by rural district councils and urban district councils, and they would not employ the rates to keep men who are on strike. Their duty is not to relieve the destitute, or to find work out of the rates of their particular parish in order to relieve men who could go to work if they chose. That is why there was nothing of the kind done. Besides, you know, in those old times of 1874 the roads wanted making. There were no roads over the mountains—that is thirty years ago—but since then they have been made, and there is not the same work wanting to be done elsewhere. The reservoirs have all been made, and so we could not employ the strikers to make them. I do not know what to suggest instead of a stone-yard.

Welsh Guardians unofficial relieving officers.

5152. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 21 of your statement you refer to the Welsh guardian as being practically the relieving officer of his parish?—Yes; to a certain extent that is quite true in the Welsh parishes.

5153. In all of these parishes I suppose there will be a guardian, and then probably the relieving officer will cover the area of three or four parishes; would that be so?—A good many more than that.

5154. Therefore the guardian is more easily reached by the applicants than the relieving officer?—Yes; but, you should understand, there is very little urgent relief wanted in these districts.

5155. I take it that in the first place the applicant will apply to the guardian, he being more accessible than the relieving officer?—Yes, very often, unless the relieving officer happens to live near.

5156. I take it from what you say that you consider that to be rather an evil, and that it leads to an increased amount of relief being given?—That is very small. That is not quite regular, and it is not a principle to be approved of, but after all is said and done, the relieving officers and the guardians work very much hand-in-hand. We will take the case of an old woman who is getting relief, and who suddenly becomes sick and wants a little more help. The guardian would send to the doctor direct, without going to the relieving officer, and she or the guardian—the guardian himself most likely—would go off to the doctor and get him, rather than waste a whole day in getting hold of the relieving officer.

5157. When you speak of the doctor, do you mean the district medical officer under the guardians?—Yes.

5158. Would the doctor go to the old woman without hearing from the relieving officer?—I think he could hardly refuse.

5159. That is the common practice, is it, for the doctor to go without an order from the relieving officer?—Yes, very often, where there are difficulties in getting at the relieving officer.

5160. The question I want to ask you particularly is whether you see any way of getting over this difficulty of the guardian acting as a relieving officer in these areas?—No, I do not, and all things considered I think it is not without its advantages to have the guardian in such districts as a sort of fifth wheel or second wheel to fall back upon, when the relieving officer is not available.

5161. Taken upon the whole, it is a system that works fairly well; is that what you mean?—Yes, considering the circumstances of the country. I must draw your attention to some of these unions; I have sixteen of them with over 100,000 acres, and six of them with over 150,000 acres, and that area not consisting of level ground where you can have railways or where you can drive, but of mountains and valleys. In those cases, you must depend upon a little help, unless you are going to an absurd expense in having a large staff which shall have practically nothing to do.

Compulsory removal of infirm to the workhouse.

5162. I see there are several chairmen of boards of guardians in your district who recommend compulsory powers being obtained for removing infirm people to workhouses; and you also recommend the same?—Yes, in certain cases.

5163. Has there been some difficulty with regard to this class of case that makes these chairmen recommend this course being adopted—I mean a difficulty in the way of removal by means of an ambulance ?—No, I wonder they have not all recommended it. I have been in communication with them about it and have talked with them, and I think all the chairmen of my boards of guardians, if they were here to-day, would be in favour of compulsory removal under certain safeguards.

5164. You mean that if all the chairmen of all the boards of guardians in your district had all met together they would have all recommended the same thing ?—I think so, on that point.

5165. And on that point only ?—That is the only point at present under discussion.

5166. If that were so, it shows that it is a want in your district ?—Yes. It is to get over the difficulties that exist in Wales arising out of the disinclination to go into the workhouse and its unpopularity. Although the guardians themselves—Welsh guardians as they are—say: here is a case that ought to be in the workhouse, they will not incur the unpopularity of withdrawing outdoor relief and they cannot compel the people to come into the workhouse.

5167. What is the method adopted of removing infirm people to the workhouse ?—You send over a carriage, a cab, or a fly, the same as you would in removing people to the asylum. We have to drive them twenty miles in a fly very often to the asylum.

5168. They do hire a decent conveyance ?—Yes, They have a carriage and pair sometimes.

5169. Then there is no objection on that score ?—There is no difficulty on that score.

5170. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I suppose the difficulty is more felt in a very sparsely-populated country of leaving persons who are unable to look after themselves practically without any assistance, than it is in a populous centre like London or Cardiff ?—I would rather trust to to the kindness of a Welsh neighbour, although he was a quarter of a mile off, than I would to that of the next-door neighbour in Soho, or some place like that.

Publication of relief lists.

5171. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Would you recommend that boards of guardians should publish the names of recipients of relief ?—They do not do it; they left off that years ago. They used to put up a list at the church door and many other places, but I never see it done now.

Procedure of Welsh Guardians in granting relief.

5172. Do you often sit with the boards when they are granting relief ?—Yes.

5173. Do they examine the application and report book with the object of ascertaining if all the circumstances are taken into consideration ?—Yes.

5174. And if the relieving officer visits the case frequently ?—Yes, but they do not always.

5175. Do they make a practice of that ?—They do not always do it, but I always call their attention to it. I have seen a great improvement of late years in the way relieving officers keep their books. I can only go to a board of guardians once or twice a year, and when my back is turned the guardians may cease to take notice of what I have said. It is a very difficult matter to know what to do, particularly when you get an old relieving officer who may be otherwise very good, but who is a bit slack in his book-keeping. I wish these books were kept better, because as I said this morning I think all the information you want will be found in them.

Need for index to Application and Report Book.

5176. Do you find that the relieving officers in the urban areas keep a proper index of all the cases ?—I do not think they do; that is where the case paper system would come in, no doubt. If they kept a proper alphabetical index to the application and report book, I think it would be a great help.

Question of attendance before Guardians of applicants for relief.

5177. Do the guardians insist upon the applicants who are able to appear coming before the board on every occasion of renewal of relief ?—Not in every case in every union by any means, but they do in the town unions. In many unions the old cases on the list come up for renewal, but the pauper is never required to attend.

5178. Then the guardians in many instances will never have seen the applicants at all ?—No; they rely upon the guardians who put them on the list first. But that is not the case with unions like Cardiff or Merthyr, etc; that is the case in the Welsh unions.

5179. My question applies to the urban areas; I know the difficulty in the country areas ?—If you apply your question to the urban areas, they do require it. In Merthyr every applicant for renewal of relief who can go appears before the board on the renewal of relief every three months, and in a good many other unions too; but at Pontypridd they do not, and that is one of the highly pauperised unions in my district—and it is the richest too.

Revision of relief lists.

5180. Is there any system for the revision of cases in these larger unions ?—They are all revised every half year, but, as I said, I do not believe in that revision; I believe it is much better to make it come automatically in the way that I mentioned this morning.

5181. What kind of revision is it ?—All the cases are put off till the end of the half-year. Then they come up for renewal and have to be signed in the application and report book by the chairman. Questions are asked, and the guardians can be present if they like, but unless there is any alteration, the cases are initialled as a matter of course. There is very little interest taken in going into the cases, because the guardians say they know them so well already; but that is not right.

5182. That is not what I mean by revision; that is simply renewing the cases again ?—That is all.

Cross-visitation of paupers.

5183. Is there no system of revising cases in between the period for which relief is granted, on possibly a cross-visitor's report, or something of that sort ?—No. Cross visiting is what I would like to see in a populous union, and that is what I have recommended. We shall have a cross-visitor in Newport, but I have failed to get one in Cardiff. I should like to have this interim visiting very much.

5184. Does it not exist in any of these unions ?—No, it does not exist in a single union in my district. I wish it did in the populous unions.

Rules adopted by guardians as to relief.

5185. You say there are no scales of relief in existence that you know of; but do any of the unions have regulations to guide their own relief committees in dealing with the cases of relief ?—Yes, I think it is understood that if so-and-so wants more than 3s. there would have to be some special reason for it. In some unions when they get to seventy years of age they go up 6d., and when they get to eighty they go up a shilling, and if they get to near a hundred, why they get anything they like; but they do go up by decades. Of course if they are delicate or ill, they get more relief according to their necessities. There is, however, no fixed scale, further than what they recognise amongst themselves in each union as enough for that class of person.

5186. I do not mean particularly a scale, but I meant regulations to guide the guardians as regards the class of case they could give relief to ?—Every board of guardians has printed by-laws which say that no person is to be relieved who lives in a house unfit for health, or who has relatives able to maintain him, whether morally or legally liable. All these good intentions have gone to pave the board-rooms of boards of guardians, and there they are still, but, as I say, they are not strictly adhered to.

5187. Do you say that you have drafted a set of regulations ?—I did not myself draft them, but with the consent of the guardians they were drawn up. No doubt I was present originally, and I find that they are practically the same as are being adopted in many unions in other districts.

5188. Do you draw the attention of the guardians to the fact that they are not adhering to these regulations ?—Yes, often. I point to the rule, but it is no good. I

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1096.

draw their attention to the rule about the houses, but they say, "Where are they to go to?"

Relief in Wales and its effect on charity.

5189. Do you find that the charitable agencies are increasing in their usefulness in any of these large areas?—I am sorry to say there are very few in Wales, even in the big towns. I never heard of much co-operation between the boards of guardians and the charitable agents in my district. There is no charitable organisation whatever worth speaking of, and there is no sort of intercommunication that I know of between the guardians and their relieving officers on the one hand and the charitable societies on the other, further than that it may come to a relieving officer's notice that a person gets something out of some local charity and he goes and makes inquiries.

5190. Then really Poor Law relief is expected to meet the whole of the needs of the poverty of the area?—It does, except at Christmas time and in the winter, when each of the churches and chapels subscribes a little, and they generally would have enough to meet the winter difficulty if it were not for this scare about unemployment.

5191. Do you think administration on the part of the guardians has had any effect upon the charitable instincts of the people?—I am not sure that a very strict board of guardians, absolutely refusing relief to people who require it, might not have driven these people into the arms of the public and then the public might have started charity to maintain them. But I do not see much proof of it in Wales at all. People want everything out of the rates now; they want the poor relief, and everything else. That is the tendency—to draw upon the rates. However strict the guardians may wish to be, it is the opinion of the public that the rates should maintain such and such a person, and that it is the proper fund to look to. I am afraid that damps charity.

5192. Then you think the tendency is towards more dependence on the rates for everything?—Yes. I think be who runs may read.

Cause of decline of Miners' Provident Society.

5193. There is one point in paragraph 37 that I do not quite understand. With regard to the Miners' Provident Society, I think you said that the society gave better advantages than even the men get under the Workmen's Compensation Act?—Yes, certainly. That is obvious from the authorised scheme of the Society, which I now hand in. (*See* App. Vol. I. (A), No. X (C).)

5194. Still the society is decreasing; how do you account for its decreasing?—It is a party thing altogether. Before 1898 the colliers did not belong to the Federation; now, nine-tenths of them, I was going to say, belong to the Federation. They joined together and with the employer formed a sliding scale committee, and, in connection with that, there was the Miners' Provident Society; then in 1898 that broke up. An agitation was got up, and the men joined the Federation, and ever since then by far the greater majority belong to the Federation, and the Federation only recognise the Acts of Parliament that are in force and will not allow their men to contract out of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Therefore, the men, in case of an accident, are dealt with entirely under the Workmen's Compensation Act, and they must abide by it. If they choose to belong to the Miners' Provident Society they could get better terms than they get under the Act itself.

5195. (*Professor Smart.*) But they would have to leave the Federation?—No. There are 17,000 still who have clung to the Society. These workmen are very strong, and although they belong to the Federation for all other purposes, they will not give up that. They are quite right, and their leaders ought to stick to that kind of thing too.

Efficacy of outdoor labour test.

5196. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I rather gather from what you state that you do not approve of an out-door labour test; is that so?—No, but I think it ought to be worked in combination with the Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order. Financially, the labour test was a failure, because so many had to break the stone, and it was so badly managed.

5197. Of course you cannot expect a labour yard to be a financial success, can you?—No, but still I thought there was a good deal more waste than might have been if it had been better managed. A financial success it will never be, but if you get rid of the pauperism, that is your success—not in making money, of course.

5198. Then the effectiveness of a labour yard is shown by the decrease in the number who avail themselves of it?—So far as the test goes; but I think you ought to put the men themselves who are responsible for all this misery to some sort of work, instead of their looking on with their hands in their pockets while you feed their women and children.

5199. Do you prefer the labour test rather than the urgent necessity plea?—Yes, certainly; the latter is no test. As I say, the poor people who are thrown out of employment owing to the strike, but through no fault of their own, you are obliged to put through a test.

5200. When there are no labour yards in existence in the unions in your area, are there any able-bodied people who are being relieved under the urgent necessity plea who you think ought not to be relieved?—In a case of sickness only, do you mean?

Relief to able-bodied men under the guise of "sudden an urgent necessity."

5201. Are any able-bodied people getting out-door relief on the plea of urgent necessity on behalf of some member of their family?—Now and then they may get relief just for one week, and then it is tided over.

5202. Are not cases renewed week by week?—No, they are not renewed week by week. In the six months of which I have the figures before me the total number of people in all Wales relieved for want of work was 237—that is in fifty-three unions.

5203. That might be so on paper, but as these unions are all under the Prohibitory Order, I want to know whether you find that out-door relief is really granted to people who are able-bodied, on the plea of urgent necessity in the case of some members of the family?—Not to any appreciable extent, except in cases of sickness. Of course if there is sickness, then relief can be given to an able-bodied person.

5204. Even if the sickness might be the sickness of a member of the family and not of the head of the family?—Yes, that is perfectly legal. I can give you the numbers and you may take these numbers as being quite accurate. The adult males relieved on account of their own sickness were over 2,000, the adult males relieved on account of the sickness of a member of the family or in the case of a funeral were 200, and the adult males relieved on account of want of work were 237.

5205. In those cases where it is given because of the sickness of a member of the family, do you ever check the amount of relief that is given to that household for that purpose?—No.

5206. Then you really do not know whether relief is given to a whole family on the pretext that is being given for a sick member of the family?—Of course I check it if I see sons who are living at home and who are working and earning wages. I often draw the attention of the guardians to that, and say: Have you taken that into full consideration? Very often they go into it then, and find that they have not; or when I draw their attention to it they might say: Yes, but there is this reason or that reason, and so on. All the members of the family who are living at home and earning wages are down in the application and report book. They would not go to the relatives living away, for temporary cases of sickness.

5207. What I want to get at by these questions is whether they get behind the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order on the plea of urgent necessity, and grant relief to exactly the same class of cases that it would be granted to in a union which is under the Out-door Relief Regulation Order, and do it in those cases *minus* an employment test?—They cannot do it for more than one week, that is till the next board day.

5208. According to law, cannot they do it?—That is so, and they do not do it. I have often had to check a relieving officer for doing it for that one week. That led to a lot of relief at Llanelly during the bad times, because the relieving officer was under the impression

that he could, without visiting a case, give relief for one week pending the board day to pretty well any man who asked him. I found he was doing a lot of harm, and I was gibbeted in "Truth" for the advice that I gave him. It is perfectly true that that led to a great deal of harm, and I checked it at the time and eventually it was stopped. I do not think it is done now at all, except that there may be cases of sickness in which it is done under the rose, that is, where there is not very much sickness and there is a want of work; but I do not know about that.

espective erits of utdoo: elief ohibitory d egulation ders.

5209. In your district the rate of pauperism seems to be decreasing, and yet the average is higher than in other parts of the country which are under the Out-door Relief Regulation Order. I have wondered whether you would say that there ought to be a less rate of pauperism in the unions which are under the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order than in the unions which are under the Out-door Relief Regulation Order?—I think there ought. Do I gather from you that you think the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order is, by being a little stricter, likely to be abused and not carried out in its entirety?

5210. Yes, in order to get exactly the same advantages that are gained under the Out-Door Relief Regulation Order?—It is for that reason that I made the suggestion in my statement. I want one order for all unions, combining the good points of the Regulation Order, of the Prohibitory Order, and of the Out-door Labour Test Order, in one.

5211. For the simple reason that you think that the Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order is not prohibitory; is that it?—No. There are differences in the two, but they might be made the same. If you have the Out-Door Relief Prohibitory Order, that prohibits you from doing anything until you have got the Out-door Labour Test Order given you. When you have got that, then it reduces you pretty well to the same position as if you had the Out-Door Regulation Order. I prefer the Out-Door Regulation Order myself, but still I think you might have a combination of the merits of both, adding the Out-Door Labour Test Order to them.

fect of 'orkmen's mpensa- n Act on ployment d uperism.

5212. (*Mrs. Webb.*) In reference to paragraph 34 you say the Workmen's Compensation Act has resulted in throwing elderly men out of work, as I gather?—Yes, certainly.

5213. Have you ascertained whether the average age of persons in employment under the Act has actually been lowered?—No, I have not ascertained that.

5214. You have no knowledge of it?—Not actual knowledge.

5215. Have you any reason to suppose that the average age of persons actually in employment in mines under that Act has been lowered?—Yes, decidedly. You have nothing to do but to go round the workhouses and see the increase in the number of inmates, and what class they belong to. If you question the men, they will tell you, "I cannot get employment because I am this, that, and the other." It is a common by-word in the whole district. In a report published by the Miners' Provident Society the evidence given before the Departmental Committee on the Workmen's Compensation Act* by Mr. Owen and the different labour leaders of the society will tell you how they got turned out of these pits that are under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

5216. But you have not got actual statistical information on the subject?—No, I should not believe it if I had.

5217. You would not believe it?—I should not believe statistics. It is almost impossible to get accurate statistics.

5218. If you found that in those mines the average age had not been actually lowered, would you not consider that fact of any account in expressing an opinion as to whether the Act had resulted in lowering the age?—I do not want to be told about that. I know it has resulted in people being turned out of the pits. Whether the average age has been affected I really cannot tell.

5219. Statistics would not count, and they would have no effect on your opinion?—Not so much as on some people perhaps. I may state that my remarks do not refer only to men working underground, but outside labour as well.

5220. I notice that in two unions you say that "the Workmen's Compensation Act has resulted in a considerable increase to the permanent list of paupers." I turn to the figures, and I find that taking the two unions you specially stigmatise, one has actually decreased in pauperism since the Act came into operation, and the other is stationary. That would not affect your opinion?—That is in total numbers, not in men, is it not?

5221. No; in men between forty-five and sixty?—I do not go so low as that; over fifty I should say. There are a large number at Merthyr and Bedwellty, and the workhouses are so full that they are obliged to relieve the people out-door just now, but they are building a new workhouse. They are now going to send a lot of men to Pontypool. That has all occurred since Ladyday, 1905.

5222. Would you be prepared to say that since the coming in of the Act in 1897 the number of men, say, over 40——?—I did not say over forty.

5223. What do you say then, over fifty?—I would say over fifty.

5224. Had actually increased?—Certainly.

5225. But you have no statistics to prove that?—No, I have no statistics here.

5226. Is it not rather odd that the total amount of pauperism has actually gone down in spite of the fact that this particular class of pauper has increased?—Gone down where?

5227. It has gone down in the whole district?—You must not take the whole district. That is where statistics mislead you.

5228. It has gone down in one of the unions which you specially mention, Bedwellty?—Are you referring to in-door paupers?

5229. In Bedwellty it has gone down from 3·1 to 2·8 in exactly the decade in which the Workmen's Compensation Act has been operative?—Ten years ago they were very bad.

5230. Still there are the statistics?—Go and look at the pauperism in Bedwellty at the present moment. It is considerably above what it was even on the 25th March last.

5231. Then we have not got the latest statistics?—No. The statistics on this table are for 1905 compared with 1895.

5232. And in 1897 the Workmen's Compensation Act came in force?—Yes, but then it was amended in 1900, I think you will find.

5233. Still for five years it has been operative, and in spite of that fact in one of the unions which you specially signalise the pauperism has gone down?—It is in bad times when you find the bad effect of it, and we have not had bad times till now.

5234. Then, as a matter of fact, it has not increased pauperism?—What has not?

5235. The Workmen's Compensation Act, because the pauperism has not increased?—You think so.

5236. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Has not the population increased rather largely?—Here are the figures; the population was 64,000, and it is 85,000 now, I daresay.

5237. (*Mrs. Webb.*) But still the rate per thousand has actually gone down; I want to get the facts?—You cannot expect me to give the facts; they can only be supplied by colliery proprietors and owners.

5238. We have this fact, which is writ very large, that the pauperism has fallen from 3·1 to 2·8, yet you say that pauperism has been increased by the Workmen's Compensation Act?—Yes, and if you will go to the

* Cd. 2334—1904.—Evidence, Questions 9069-9175.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

Bedwellty workhouse and the Merthyr workhouse you will agree with me.

5239. Then we ought to have a loose impression rather than a statistic ?—Very well ; you can call it a loose impression if you like.

5240. May I call your attention also to the statistics of your mining unions. I notice that out of fifty of your unions, twenty-four are classified as principally mining : during this decade between 1897 and 1906, which is the exact decade in which the Workmen's Compensation Act has been in operation, fourteen of those unions have actually decreased in pauperism, seven are stationary, and only three have increased. Does that bear out your contention that the Workmen's Compensation Act has, as a matter of fact, increased pauperism ?—I can only say what I see, and what I hear when I ask questions. I go round the Merthyr workhouse, and I go round the Bedwellty workhouse, and I see the large increase in the number of men who can do something, but not much, and they all tell me the same thing. I am perfectly convinced of what I say, and everyone in the district will tell you the same thing—working men, all the relieving officers, and everyone else. I am not prepared with figures to show how many men have been dismissed because they have got a few grey hairs and all that kind of thing ; but it is the case. They are not all miners.

5241. Do you think it likely that the official of the Miners Federation would say the same thing ?—I do not know what it is likely that the Miners' Federation would say. How can I know ? I very much approve of the men belonging to the Federation. I do not say that the Workmen's Compensation Act was not an absolute necessity ; I only say one of the effects of it—and they cannot all be good—is the increase in pauperism amongst that class of men who could do some work, and who are even now kept on in the pits which are under the Miners' Provident Society.

5242. But you still assert that there has been an actual and positive increase in the amount of male pauperism over fifty since the Workmen's Compensation Act came into force ?—I should say there was no doubt about that.

5243. (*Dr. Downes.*) I should like to ask whether it is not possible that an increase in a particular class of paupers may be co-incident with a decrease in the total number of paupers ?—Quite so ; *cela va sans dire.*

5244. (*Mrs. Webb.*) That would be a statistic for us to find out ?—A statistic is a dreadful thing to go by.

"Destitution" as the qualification for relief

5245. (*Mr. Nunn.*) With regard to guardians dealing with the poverty of their district, you said there were no charitable agencies in your area, but did I understand you to say that the guardians dealt with cases of poverty as distinguished from cases of pure destitution ?—I do not think destitution is in it now ; it never was much. As I said before, it is a very hard word to define. Destitution is no longer the first necessity for relief ; poverty is really the thing. I do not see how you are to describe destitution literally. There is no doubt about it that in Wales relief is given in aid of small wages, as, for instance, where a poor woman living alone can earn only a few shillings a week ; it is all taken into account, and a little relief is given her in addition. There is no doubt about that. You might call that poverty, but it would be destitution if it were not for that half-a-crown a week.

5246. But the guardians are unwilling on the whole to exercise the test of destitution by offering the house ?—I should not offer the house to those cases at all. I think the system works very well in the typical parts of Wales. It is capable of being riddled to holes from any political economist's point of view, but it works very well, and I think it is better than any substitute you could put for it. It utilises the intimate knowledge of the local guardian, and there is very little jobbery with it, I really think.

Proportion of women and children paupers in Wales.

5247. In the country parts I understand it is very largely a matter of relieving a widow or an old person ?—And so it is throughout all my district. If you will take the return of my poor, you will see that the proportion of women and children to the total who are relieved is more than three-fourths. It is a very interesting return from that point of view, I can assure you. Out of 63,700 people relieved, there were not 11,000 who were males.

5248. May I ask what was the point of deploring the collapse of the medical provident movement in its relation to the poor law ?—I really do not think there were ever any medical funds—certainly there were no registered ones for I enquired about that in Cardiff and Swansea. There are no registered medical relief societies in Wales that I know of.

Scope and constitution of Miners' Provident Society.

5249. Does not the Miners' Provident Society give sick benefit ?—That is not a medical relief society. It is only intended to deal with accidents.

5250. But surely it gives sick benefits ?—No. There is an old age pension fund attached to it, but they have not got money enough to deal with more than 100. That book of the Miners' Provident Society is very interesting. It puts you *au courant* with all the questions that Mrs. Webb asked so much about, and it gives the figures.

5251. I notice that that is considerably subsidised not only by employers' associations, but by private individuals on rather a large scale ?—Yes, but it is a drop in the ocean when you have an explosion or anything like that. The members are connected with coal works and people feel their conscience smiting them when they live up in London. They may remember that they have got little works down in Wales which they get a little income from, and it is perhaps as a sort of conscience money that they subscribe to that society ; but they do not do it nearly so much as they ought.

5252. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Might I ask whether the Miners' Provident Fund is not practically a branch of the Liberty and Property Defence League ?—I cannot say.

5253. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I see that the proprietors subscribed £8,900, life members between £4,000 and £5,000, and honorary members about £6,600 a year ?—Yes. The honorary members include a lot of people who, as I say, feel they ought to give something, but are not called upon legally to do it.

5254. That is a very different proportion to the honorary members of such a society as the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows or the Foresters ?—Yes, but you could not expect anyone but those connected with the coal trade in South Wales to subscribe to that society.

Insanitary surroundings and drink as causes of pauperism.

5255. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) You put down as one of the great causes of pauperism in your own district in Wales insanitary surroundings of various kinds, do you not ?—Yes, but I think that is not confined to Wales at all.

5256. Would you add drink as one of the other contributing causes ?—There is no doubt about that, to a certain excent, but drink does not account for everything.

5257. A good many workhouses in your district are very small ones, are they not ?—A great many.

5258. Are they old buildings, principally ?—Yes, but they have all been modernised to a great extent, except those hopeless little ones which it is no good doing anything to, they are so very small.

Type of workhouse master in Wales.

5259. The quality of master that you would get in a workhouse of that kind would be, I suppose, not of a very high class ?—No, but still they are of a class that the guardians come from themselves in those typical districts. For instance, Llanrwst has lost its old master and matron, who have been there for longer than I have been. They were an old couple, who knew nothing very much and were not able to learn very much, but they were very kind to the poor. The guardians have a very long list of candidates for the post, and I notice that all sorts of people are applying ; I do not know who they are, as I have not read it through.

Cause of prejudice against entering workhouse.

5260. Now as to the prejudice against going into the workhouse, which, of course, is existing everywhere ; has it any special force in the Welsh district of Wales, owing to the fact that removal from home surroundings there means going into another valley and to an absolutely different sort of place altogether ?—I think there

is a great deal more of that feeling than there is in most parts of England. I should think that probably Cumberland and Westmorland would be a very similar kind of district; I do not know them, but I should think they very likely would be.

Question of substituting almshouses for smaller workhouses.

5261. Would it be possible, in your judgment, to substitute anything in the shape of an average accommodation almshouse or anything of that sort for these smaller workhouses?—No. I think they are practically the same thing. If you had almshouses under the guardians they would still be workhouses from the legal point of view. I do not know how you would substitute almshouses. In the big towns where we have no charities, I have often thought that almshouses might be a very good way of dealing with the old people, instead of driving them into the workhouse. There are no charities or endowments of almshouses in Wales whatever. I should not be at all sorry to see some of the boards of guardians build places for their old people, so as to take them out of the workhouse where they cannot be properly classified and where they feel more confined; but in the country I do not think you can substitute almshouses. The people would not use almshouses; they would rather stick to their old cottages, and as to the people who must come into the workhouse—well, it is an almshouse now and nothing more.

Welsh sheep runs.

5262. In regard to the sheep runs in these mountain districts, have you any idea on what tenure those sheep runs are held?—I know that they are taken with the farm. I wish I had brought with me a book I was reading last night about the tenure of those Welsh farms. The sheep runs have gone with the farms for hundreds of years.

5263. Are they not counted in the acreage of the farm?—Not in the thirty acres.

5264. Then a man would hold thirty acres and a sheep run?—Yes.

5265. The sheep run might mean a great deal?—It depends. If he has a big sheep run he would be charged more rent for the holding.

5266. (*Dr. Downes.*) Most of these farms have the right of turning so many sheep on to the hill, is that not so?—Yes, but still some runs are much better than others.

5267. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I put the question simply in order to account for the enormous acreage, and the number of small farms; you cannot account for that?—These sheep runs go to a great height, and there is no agriculture there at all. The tops of these mountains are 2,000 and 3,000 feet high.

Probable effect on pauperism of higher standard of relief.

5268. (*Mr. Booth.*) In paragraph 31 of your statement you say, "There are unions like those of Glamorganshire, part of Monmouthshire and Llanelly in Carmarthenshire which present a far different aspect"; and in paragraph 32 you say, "I need not trouble the Commission with these unions further than to say that many of them have a difficult time before them." As a matter of fact that is very interesting to us, because, as Mr. Phelps has mentioned, the figures we have do not I think show an increasing pauperism in any but one of those unions in recent years?—That is quite recent.

5269. Therefore I may regard what you say here, "that many of them have a difficult time before them," as the main point?—Yes. It is more difficult now than it has been hitherto.

5270. You foresee difficulties?—I foresee them, I think, unless they are very careful.

5271. And the reason you foresee difficulties is that they are apt to bring in a new system which at first, at any rate, will possibly increase pauperism?—At first, I think. Public opinion demands better treatment of the in-door poor, better sick accommodation and better nursing than they have had up to now, because their population has grown so quickly upon them, and there is a higher scale of individual out-door relief compared with what they had a few years ago.

Pauperism in Cardiff Union.

5272. On several occasions in your evidence there has been a sort of penalising of Cardiff I think. Although its pauperism has increased in the last decade, Cardiff still remains a not highly pauperised place if you test it by percentage. The population has nearly doubled; it was 133,000 in 1885 and it was 258,000 in 1905, which is an enormous increase of population that may easily bring in circumstances which account for the slight upward movement in the percentage of pauperism. It is a little hard on Cardiff I think, considering that on the whole the pauperism is a very light percentage, that that little turn upward should be rubbed in against it?—Would you not consider that a town whose prosperity was marked by an increase of population of from 117,000 to 228,000 in ten years, ought to show if anything a considerable decrease in pauperism?

5273. That raises a most interesting question which we can hardly go into now, as to whether these rapid increases of urban population do or do not tend to lessen pauperism; they may bring prosperity to some and poverty to others, and I think they do. But I do not mean to ask a question on that; I merely wish to point out that, tested simply by the figures we have here, Cardiff does not come out very badly?—I want the percentage to be less, because I am perfectly certain that there might be some improvement there.

5274. That it might be better?—Yes.

Characteristics of Monmouthshire Unions.

5275. Taking you, as I hope to do rather rapidly, through the counties, in Monmouthshire you point out that the eastern portion is agricultural; that consists, I take it, of the unions of Abergavenny, Chepstow, and Monmouth?—Yes, Abergavenny has now Blaenavon in it, which has great iron works and collieries, otherwise it is rural.

5276. Then the three north-western and western unions, which are mainly or largely industrial, are Bedwellty, Newport, and Pontypool?—Bedwellty is entirely mining, Newport has a good deal of agriculture but it is mostly industrial, and of course it is a sea-port; and Pontypool too.

5277. Then it is rather singular that the three more or less agricultural unions have a much higher rate of pauperism than the three which are industrial?—They suffer from the old traditions. They ought not to be so high as they are, but still they are getting better I think; are they not?

5278. Not all of them?—No; Chepstow is not.

5279. Abergavenny is steadily getting worse?—The Abergavenny increase is entirely due to the Blaenavon works.

5280. The same thing is true to even a greater extent of Chepstow, is it not?—Yes.

5281. Chepstow has very markedly increased?—The guardians there are not quite so strict with regard to their administration as they were; there is no doubt about that.

5282. Is there any reason you can give for it?—No. I go and tell them about it every year, and they are very pleased to see me, but they go on the same.

5283. In speaking to the guardians of the various unions, do you make comparisons and point out what others have done, and urge them to do the same?—I rather find out their own faults, than compare them with others. The Welsh people do not like being compared with other people. If I find some real blots, I bring them straightway before them, no matter what goes on in other boards.

5284. In regard to Monmouth, where there has been a slight decrease in population, there has been a very marked decrease in the pauperism percentage, so that there you seem to have had success in your methods?—Monmouth has not decreased very much.

5285. It was 4·7 per cent. in 1885, 3·9 per cent. in 1895, and 3·7 per cent. in 1905; the reduction all took place in the first decade?—Yes, it did.

5286. At that time you were inspector there, were you not?—Yes, and I lived in the county.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

5287. Was there an improvement ?—There was, but not in the last few years.

5288. During the ten years from 1885 to 1895 ?—Yes. They had a very good chairman ; there is a good deal in that.

Characteristics of Breconshire Unions.

5289. Then to pass to Breconshire ; this is all purely agricultural and "Welsh," you say ; by "Welsh," do you mean that the Welsh language is mainly used there ?—No, not in Breconshire.

5290. But you say that, do you not ?—In Brecon and Builth the habits are Welsh with regard both to pauperism and to living, but they are not Welsh-speaking people there.

5291. Then when you use the word "Welsh" in that instance, it does not refer to the language ?—No, not in Breconshire.

5292. So when you say "there are four unions all purely agricultural and Welsh," you mean Welsh in their characteristics ?—Yes ; the same kind of farms and the same kind of living and hiring of labour.

5293. Crickhowell shows a very marked decrease in pauperism ?—Yes ; but that is because of the works. They have got large works up there. They are not purely rural. They had very bad times about 1895, and thus relief was very high then. That was not owing to strikes ; it was owing to bad times and depression in trade.

5294. The decrease looks persistent, because in 1885 it was 3·8 per cent., in 1895 3·2 per cent., and in 1905 2·1 per cent. ?—There is what I call having over-much faith in statistics. These statistics are perfectiy accurate, but there was an exceptional reason why in 1895 their relief was very high, as I happen to know. Therefore that reduction from 3·2 to 2·1 per cent. was not a fair reduction. It was less than that the year before.

5295. But ten years before it was higher ?—Yes, but that is an interval again.

5296. Naturally one looks at that reduction ?—Certainly ; but that is why I say you must find the explanation from what you know happened. I could give you the reason for every one of these figures if you went through them.

5297. Comparing that with Hay, the conditions are similar, are they not ?—Yes ; that is purely rural.

5298. There the rate of pauperism has not decreased materially ?—No ; but it is a wonder it has not. It has gone down from 4 to 3·2 and that for a very thinly populated district of 9,000 people is not a bad reduction. It is a wretched little union as far as poverty goes.

5299. Then you, on the whole, expect a higher percentage of pauperism with a small population ?—I do, because everything costs more if you have a few people to employ ; in every phase of society I think that is the case. You cannot run 9,000 in the same way that you can run 90,000 ; you do not get the help.

5300. It is not a question of the cost of administering relief, but of the number of people who demand it, and I do not see why the number of people who demand it should be greater in proportion in a little than in a big district ?—What does that mean ? Why does the population decrease slowly ? It is because all the able-bodied people go away to the works instead of doing the agricultural work at home, and only these poor old people are left to be looked after.

5301. Then we should find a proportionate increase in the old people ?—Yes ; it is the able-bodied population that have disappeared.

Conditions in Cardiganshire Unions.

5302. Passing to Cardiganshire, Cardigan itself is a marked instance of reduction ; there has been a very great fall in its population and a fall in the percentage of pauperism from nearly 6 per cent. to a little over 3 per cent. Can you account for that ; is it due to improved administration ?—The circumstances of the unions are entirely the same, and if you knew how much I have urged them to improve their administration you might find some reason for it. I have been a great number of years at them.

5303. Where an improvement has occurred we want to know what are the causes, in order to see how those causes have been brought about ?—I think the guardians have been brought to understand that the stricter they are with the undeserving, the more freely they should give to the deserving. I think they look at it pretty well in that way. They are getting stricter in these Cardiganshire unions, though Aberystwith is not nearly so strict as it used to be.

5304. In Aberystwith also the population is falling ?—Yes. The lead works have been shut down, but they used to employ between 4,000 and 5,000 people. Then the agricultural people are going off. Otherwise, Aberystwith itself has largely increased.

Conditions in Carmarthenshire Unions.

5305. Then with regard to Carmarthen, there has been an extraordinarily great improvement in the degree of pauperism there, has there not ?—Yes.

5306. Have you anything at all to say about that ?—Nothing can be done, but ding-dong preaching at them and getting them to see things from a better point of view. All these unions have done great credit to the Board, I consider. Of course they are very poor.

5307. Carmarthen and Llandilo Fawr in the same way, would you say ?—Llandilo Fawr has a great deal of tin plate industries now, and I should say its population has increased considerably.

5308. Then Llanelly has an increased population, and all of these Carmarthenshire unions appear to be extremely satisfactory, so far as the figures before us go ?—Yes ; I am not otherwise than very pleased with them.

Conditions in Glamorganshire Unions.

5309. What I said about Cardiff applies to Glamorganshire, namely, that the rate of pauperism seems to be rather moderate, except at Neath ?—But it is going up every week.

5310. What is the matter with Neath ?—I do not know. I wish you would come and cure it.

5311. The population has increased enormously ; is that due to coal ?—Coal, tin plates, iron, copper—in fact they are in a very thriving condition now.

5312. Neath is a port too, is it not ?—It is a kind of port. It is about the worst port along that coast. Port Talbot is a better port.

5313. Is that one of the large Boards of Guardians ?—No. Bridgend, Cardiff, Newport, Pontypridd and Swansea are the largest boards.

5314 And not so much Neath ?—No, not so much Neath.

5315. So that a very large Board of Guardians in that instance does not cause the mischief, because Pontypridd on the contrary has a remarkably low rate of pauperism ?—It is galloping in prosperity. Pontypridd is almost the largest union I have in Wales and it ought to have the least pauperism—it ought to be much less than Cardiff.

5316. There the population has doubled in twenty years ?—Yes, and the latest figures you have are not nearly what it is now. The 204,000 is more like 220,000 now I think.

5317. I have it as 235,998 up to 1905, but that of course is an estimate ?—You have estimated it very correctly, I should think.

Conditions in Pembrokeshire Unions.

5318. With regard to Pembrokeshire, there seems to be a very depressed condition there, but it is improving ?—I want another union there.

5319. Haverfordwest seems to have improved, but it was very bad ?—It has greatly improved. Look what a place it was ten years ago—nearly five per cent. I consider that Wales during the last ten or twenty years has shown a very marked improvement.

onditions in hayader nion.

5320. The most remarkable instance comes at the end of South Wales, in Radnorshire, at the place called Rhayader?—There are statistics that you must avoid, and that is an instance. Rhayader includes the Birmingham water works, and in 1891 there were over 3,000 Birmingham people working there. Now, they are all gone, except 800, and they will go soon. Where will Rhayader be then? I have had to put Rhayader upon the top of my list as being the least pauperised. When the waterworks were started Birmingham said to them, "Now please make us vagrant wards, make us a hospital, make us an infectious place and provide all you must do, together with a workhouse to put our people in." I told the Rhayader Guardians that they had displayed a masterly inactivity under my *regime* for many years, and if they would continue that same system, the Birmingham people would soon get sick of it and would do it all for themselves—which they did. They subsequently built receiving wards, vagrant wards, and a small-pox hospital, &c., and the Rhayader people have had nothing to do with it. Presently the Birmingham people will go, and will take away their rateable value with them except the waterworks, which will not be much, and you will see Rhayader topple down the list to nearly the bottom.

ffect on atistics of mporary flux of pulation to a union.

5321. I suppose the people are still there?—The 3,000 Birmingham workers have left with the exception of about 700 or 800.

nditions in olyhead nion.

5322. On January 1, 1905, I estimated the population as though it were continuing to increase at 11,000, and of course not allowing for that reduction of 3,500. Now, I will pass to North Wales. One of the most remarkable instances in this list is Holyhead, which had 7 per cent. of pauperism in 1885, 4·9 per cent. in 1895, and 3·3 per cent. in 1905. What is that great improvement due to?—As I have often told the Holyhead people, "it is less due to you than to the iniquities of your forbears." There was so much leeway to be made up that they could have done as much again. The relief was most excessive, and even now it is too high.

5323. Do you expect this improvement to go on?—I say this decrease ought to go on at the same rate for another ten years; but it will not, I am afraid.

nditions in rnarvon ire Unions.

5324. There is something the same to be said about Carnarvonshire, is there not? The rate of pauperism there was very high?—Yes; compared with what they were ten years ago it shows a very satisfactory decrease. They are still at the bottom of my ladder, although they have made such a reduction.

5325. Altogether, you treat these changes as due to rather general causes, the pressure you have put on them being one of those general causes?—I will not say the pressure that I have put upon them. The guardians have advanced in their intelligence and in the improvement of their administration.

5326. And South Wales has, on the whole, in spite of strikes and so on, enjoyed very considerable prosperity?—Yes.

5327. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Do you think that the constitution of boards of guardians has improved under the new system as compared with the old?—I must say of the big towns in South Wales that I have no reason to suppose that they are not just as good, if not better. I think they take more trouble to put themselves into communication with the poor that they have to deal with than they used to do.

ct of al rnment , 1894, on inis- ion.

5328. Does that apply to the whole country?—The typical Welsh part of the country, as I said, is pretty nearly the same as it was, *minus* the *ex officio* element. I am very sorry to lose the *ex officio* element but it was bound to go, and it has gone, and we have done better without it than I expected. These gentlemen who never spoke a word before have found their tongues and they are ready to speak in their Welsh, and they do. But then they pay their own rates, and they feel that out of every half-crown that old Mrs. Evans gets they are paying 1s. 5d., and they are very careful.

5329. On the whole, you think there is an improvement?—Yes, I do. I am not able to say it is an improvement everywhere; certainly there are still a good many of the guardians who take no interest except in their own parish, and who leave, as they did before, all the work to be done by a few working members.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

5330. You have no reason to suppose, have you, that any of these boards are open to the taint of corruption?—No, not beyond very small things. As I told you this morning, the practice of old Mrs. Jones bringing Mrs. Robinson's relief and getting a penny for it is a great Poor Law crime, but after all I think Wales will still go on.

Absence of corruption in Poor Law administration.

5331. There is no corruption in the disposal of their patronage in any way?—No, I think that is fairly satisfactory. I think the Poor Law is very good. It is not the Poor Law that wants altering. It is the other laws that manufacture the article that they give us expecting us to turn them into angels and this, that, and the other. I think we do very fairly well with the stuff we get given us to deal with.

5332. With regard to out-door relief, is that given uniformly in money or partly in kind and partly in money?—Not at all in kind now, except to undeserving cases or cases where the money would be misapplied.

Comparison of relief in money and in kind.

5333. With these exceptions it is all given in money then?—Yes. I think the last union that gave bread and money was Chepstow, but now they give all money.

5334. Which method do you think is the best?—Money in Wales—it must be; money goes farther. Besides, it would cost a fortune to take bread to half-a-dozen people in some of the unions in Wales. It would take all day to get there. Then they often bake their own bread. What is the use of giving a fellow a great 4-lb. loaf when he bakes his own bread? The habits are so different.

5335. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) What do the guardians generally do with the children in Wales?—With the exception of two workhouses, there are hardly any children in the workhouses at all. They give them out-relief within the union—generally with relatives at a small price, because they consider it is the relatives' duty to do the rest. The populous unions have cottage homes and different ways of treating the children away from the workhouse.

Methods of relief to Welsh Poor Law children.

5336. Have the Welsh guardians adopted the ideas contained in the circulars of the Local Government Board which were issued in 1899 and 1900, and do they take care of the old people outside the workhouse rather than inside?—They always did that. They did not want Mr. Chaplin for that; they did that before his circular. But since that circular, they have increased the relief to individuals to a higher scale than they used to adopt.

Effect of Mr. Chaplin's circular of 1900.

5337. Do you think that has worked any mischief morally? I mean, has it hurt the moral fibre of the Welsh people at all?—I am not going to be responsible for the moral fibre of the Welsh people; that is like the Nonconformist conscience. I think the Welsh are like many other people; they take all they can get.

5338. I will put it in another way, if you do not mind: Do you think giving relief to aged people in that sort of way has done any mischief in Wales?—They always did it; they never drove them into the workhouses.

5339. They have done it for a long time; I suppose that is what you really mean?—Always; I do not suppose there ever was a time when any person who was at all what you would call decent was given other than out-relief.

5340. What I want to get from you, if you do not mind, is whether you think that that has done any mischief in Wales; that is to say, whether it has prevented people doing the best they could for themselves?—I think you know that Wales has always been a country where they have very little shame in asking for outdoor relief. Some people will consider there is as much shame in getting outdoor relief as there is in getting indoor relief. There is great discredit in being an indoor pauper in Wales, but there is none in getting outdoor relief; so I do not think any circular or any change in treatment has had any effect in Wales of recent years. Wales has gone on the tradition of past years, and that has been to give outdoor relief to poor people, rather than to build great

Out-relief not deterrent in Wales.

Mr. Francis Thomas Bircham.

6 Mar. 1906.

palaces and barracks to stuff them in against their will. That they never will do. Of course, a large amount of out-relief always must have a tendency to destroy people's sense of independence, but I do not think that any recent circulars or change of administration in my time has had any deleterious effect with regard to the poor outside or to the people who administer the Poor Law.

"Labour" men as Guardians.

5341. It is a fact that you have got labour people on the boards of guardians?—Yes, and I like to see them. They know more about the people.

5342. It has worked for good and not for evil, having them there?—I think so, but I do not want them all to be labour people.

Scope and constitution of Miners' Provident Society.

5343. No, you want a mixture. Then about the Miners' Provident Society; would not the people who belong to that have to leave the Trade Union?—No. I understand that any person belonging to the Federation may subscribe to that.

5344. Is not the object of that society to get compensation for accidents in another way than under the Act?—Yes. But the Miners' Provident Society does not turn the men out of the pits under it when they get a certain age and a little infirm; and then the men have got something to go back upon. The men are kept in the pits very often, and even, as I said this morning, they get a pension of 5s. a week as old members of the society. They get better terms under that fund than they will do under the bare Act of Parliament, when both employers and employed simply go by what the Act of Parliament tells them.

5345. But that would not apply to an accident, would it?—Yes, it applies only to accidents; neither of them relieve in cases of sickness.

5346. But the members do in old age get a pension?—In the Miners' Provident Society they do. Since the men joined the Federation its membership has gone down from 79,000 to 17,000, and so I am afraid it cannot last.

5347. Is that because the Miners' Provident Society is really run by the people who are known in Wales as the opponents of Trade Unionism?—I do not think so. They know who they are, of course. The Miners' Provident Society was got up by the same people, men and masters, who got up the Sliding Scale, and therefore it so far may be connected; but I could not give evidence about that.

Interaction of rents and rates.

5348. In paragraph 46 of your statement, you say "every endeavour should be made, if possible, to secure that the ratepayers who elect guardians and the guardians whom they elect should pay their portion of the rates they are spending?"—Yes. I want them to feel the difference between a rate being 2s. or 4s. or 6s. or 7s. Now they do not, because they compound for their rates.

5349. I suppose you are aware that in some of the lightest-rated districts rents are highest?—I know what rent they pay—4s. 6d.—and they have done it for years for half a house, that is to say, for half a double house which is built for two families. There are hundreds and thousands of them all through the Rhondda Valley, and good houses too. They do not pay any more or less, whether the rates are twice as much or not.

5350. That is exactly what I wanted to suggest to you. —that it is not that which settles the question of rent at all; it is the number of people who live in the houses, is it not?—Yes; because they get lodgers and so on.

5351. The rent that is paid for the house by the person taking it depends upon the number of people who want that particular house, does it not?—No; the rents are all the same.

5352. How is it that in the districts that are lightly rated, the rents are high?—Where do you say that is the the case? Not in Glamorganshire.?

5353. I should say it of any urban district?—That may be so in regard to towns; but they are not towns here. I wish you could come down to Wales and see the kind of district you are talking about. They are aggregations of dwellings round a pit, and they are not towns in the sense in which you speak of towns here. Those houses are built by the colliery proprietors, and they are let at the same rent that they always have been let at—just enough to pay 4 per cent. or something to include repairs, and the owners do not make any profits at all out of them.

Compounding for rates at Cardiff.

5354. Is that true of Cardiff?—Not of Cardiff. A man paying £50 a year for rent compounds for his rates there; you would not believe it, but he does. Therefore the alteration I propose would not affect a man like that.

5355. (*Professor Smart.*) Do you mean that they do not compound in the country districts?—They do not in the purely country districts.

5356. (*Miss Hill.*) I suppose the mine owners pay the rates in the case of the houses that you have just been speaking of?—Yes. That saves a lot of trouble, of course, but it does not make the people who vote feel whether they are paying a big rate or a small one.

SEVENTEENTH DAY.

Monday, 12th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. EDWARD BESTBRIDGE WETHERED, called; and Examined.

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.
12 Mar. 1906.

5357. (*Chairman.*) I understand you are now general inspector under the Local Government Board of the poor law district comprising the county of Gloucester and parts of Hereford, Somerset, Stafford, Wiltshire, and Worcester?—Yes.

5358. Have long have you been in charge of your present district?—It will be ten years next November.

tandard of orkhouses Glouces- ershire and lereford- hire.

5359. You have sent in to the Commission a comprehensive memorandum concerning your district, and I only propose to review those particular parts of it which seem to require a further investigation (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XI. (A-B)). I will run very rapidly over the earlier part of your memorandum. As regards Gloucestershire, I think there is nothing very noticeable there, except that the workhouses are, in your judgment, hardly up to modern conditions?—That is so.

5360. And in Herefordshire the same criticism applies, I understand?—Yes. I might say with regard to their not being up-to-date, that that chiefly has reference to the infirmary accommodation. Most of the workhouses were built for the accommodation of able-bodied paupers, and when they were built there was little regard had for the sick; but now the condition of things has entirely changed, and the able-bodied pauper does not appear in the workhouses to any great extent, whereas the sick and infirm have very considerably increased. When the workhouses were built, there were no proper infirmaries built at the same time; that is the difficulty.

5361. Are the existing workhouses not capable of adaptation to modern requirements?—Some might be, but others would not; in any case, it would involve considerable expense.

istory of fficulty as workhouse commoda- on at ristol.

5362. I will take, as an illustration of what you say, the town of Bristol: You have had there considerable communications with the guardians as regards the indoor accommodation for the poor, I understand?—Yes, that is so.

5363. Your functions as inspector, as the law now stands, are mainly limited to giving advice, are they not?—Yes.

5364. In a case like Bristol, where, in your judgment, as as I understand, the workhouse is not up-to-date or to standard, you have no power of overcoming the objections or the obstruction of those who are opposed to providing better accommodation, have you?—That is so. Perhaps it would be just as well if I were to explain the circumstances at Bristol to the Commission. Briefly, the position stands thus: In 1898 the Bristol Corporation Bill for extending the city boundaries was carried; that altered the boundaries of Bristol very largely. Up to that date, the union consisted of what was then known as the Incorporation of the Poor, which was the oldest form of workhouse and board of guardians in the whole kingdom at that time. There were two surrounding unions, one, Barton Regis, which was a very large one, and the other, Bedminster, which was also a large one. Prior to the passing of the Bristol Corporation Bill of 1898, nothing had been done practically to the workhouses of these unions for something like fourteen or fifteen years in anticipation of some extension of the boundaries and of a readjustment of the unions. The consequence was that when this Bill passed Parliament, nothing had been done practically to the Bristol workhouse, known as the Stapleton workhouse, and the Barton Regis workhouse, except in a temporary way, for a great many years. The Bill passed, and the Bristol Board of Guardians was then formed, and took over the greater part of the Barton Regis union, their large workhouse included. As I have said, the Barton Regis Guardians had done nothing to the workhouse for a great number of years, and the Local Government Board had sanctioned temporary accommodation by means of corrugated iron pavilions for the sick and also wooden pavilions, which were likewise being used for the sick and infirm. These had been put up pending this alteration of the union areas. When the present union was formed in 1898, the Bristol Guardians very wisely sent round a committee to visit other large unions in England and to see what they had done. As the result of the investigation they recommended the building of a large infirmary to take the sick, and, if they could arrange it, the selling of what was then the old Barton Regis workhouse, now known at Eastville. They spent a large sum of money in plans, and the plans were approved by the Board. Then some elections of guardians took place, and it was found that the Bristol rates were going up from one cause and another. Then it was said that this new infirmary was too expensive. The consequence is that ever since then up to the present time, the guardians have been trying to find out some other scheme. Other schemes have been sent up to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board has been unable to sanction them. Where the difficulty comes in is this—though the Local Government Board has power to say, We cannot sanction this scheme or that scheme, they have no power to say, You must carry out some scheme. This is very often extremely irritating to guardians. The position at Bristol at the present moment is that there is absolutely a deadlock. There are two schemes before them—one is the original infirmary scheme, the other is a scheme to adapt the Eastville Workhouse for an infirmary. They are about equally divided, and the position is entirely controlled by those guardians who say, We will do nothing at all; and the Board has no power to come in to say, You must do something definitely. They have only power to say, We refuse this or that. The spread of Bristol has been unprecedented, and in

Mr. Edward Isthbridge Wethered.

12 Mar. 1906.

1903 another Bristol Extension Bill was passed by Parliament, and the union has been further extended in consequence, and Bristol has taken over the new Barton Regis workhouse, which is modern.

Workhouse accommodation in Somersetshire and Staffordshire.

5365. Passing on with your memorandum, similar conditions seem to prevail a good deal in the other counties, for instance, in both Somersetshire and Staffordshire, namely, that the workhouses which were built under different conditions are not quite up-to-date for their present work?—In Somersetshire the unions are Bath, Long Ashton (which was the original Bedminster) and Keynsham. In Bath they have done their best to improve the workhouse, and they have improved it. So far as Long Ashton is concerned, they have a large workhouse that was suitable for the larger union before the half of it was taken into Bristol, but it is a very old building and far too large for the guardians now. The guardians at the time were advised to get rid of that workhouse, and to build a smaller one, but they did not take the advice, and, therefore, are in their present difficulty. I wish to make it clear that so far as the infirmary accommodation at Long Ashton is concerned, that is the best part of the workhouse, and I do not complain of that in any way.

Wolverhampton:—Excessive out-relief a result of inadequate Workhouse accommodation.

5366. Now I come to paragraph 31; a new workhouse has been opened at Wolverhampton, you say?—Yes.

5367. But until that was opened, I gather that the accommodation at the old workhouse was such that it was impossible for the guardians to apply the workhouse test as rigorously as they should have done?—Yes.

5368. The result was that out-relief assumed high proportions?—It did.

5369. But you think that the establishment of this workhouse will result in a reduction of the out-relief?—Yes; it is going down. There is a reduction now as compared with last year. I can give you the exact figures, if you think proper to have them.

5370. I think they would be interesting?—Taking the expenditure in out-door relief according to the last return which I have received, which is for the ninth week of the Lady Day quarter, I find that it then amounted to £282 2s. 3d., and in the corresponding week of last year it was £319 0s. 9d.; therefore, there is a saving there of £37 per week, roundly.

5371. Now I pass on to paragraph 42, which relates to Kidderminster. There are a considerable number of children in the workhouse there, I see; and looking further on, to paragraph 57, I see there are also a considerable number of children in the workhouse at Swindon?—That is so.

Advantages of removing children from workhouse.

5372. Do I rightly gather that you condemn that system?—I do not know whether "condemn" is the right term to use. The children are much better out of the workhouse. The alteration in the children that have been removed from the workhouse is generally most striking. I should like to lay emphasis upon that. Bristol is a case in point. When I first took over the district, the whole of the children, some 500 in number, were treated in the workhouse, and I was very much struck on first going there with the listlessness of the children and their want of power; they did not seem to care to play or to do anything of that sort like other children. I was struck with the dulness of the children generally. It was not that the children were not properly looked after; they were very well fed and very kindly treated, but there was this dulness and listlessness about them which was most marked. Now that has entirely disappeared; they are now in scattered homes and cottage homes, and it is quite a pleasure to see the children. When the Bristol Guardians first proposed to take scattered homes for the children, there was considerable reluctance in Bristol to let houses for that purpose. The people said they were not going to let houses for what they called poor law children. Then the schools were not particularly anxious—I will put it in that way—to take the children. Now opinion has entirely changed. There is no difficulty in getting houses there, and the local schools are only too glad to get the children, who are well behaved and who attend regularly. Many of the children attend Bands of Hope as far as can be, here and there, and some of the children sing in the choirs both of the churches and of the chapels in Bristol, which is very satisfactory. This is proceeding in the other unions in the same degree, where the children are away from the workhouse. Where they remain in the workhouse but go to the local schools, there is also a change in the children for the better, which will assist them better to face the struggle for life afterwards.

Bristol.

Tendency to remove children from workhouse.

5373. Therefore, I take it, the practice of keeping children in the workhouse is steadily diminishing in your district?—It is not rapidly diminishing, but it is diminishing. Generally speaking, where more workhouse accommodation has to be found, the children's quarters are adapted for that purpose, if it possibly can be so, and the children are taken out.

5374. Do you think the guardians generally recognise the advantage of removing the children away from the workhouse?—I think the guardians generally recognise that fact, but some guardians do not like the cost of it. I think that is the way they look at it.

Able-bodied paupers in district.

5375. Now I come to a very interesting statement which you make at paragraph 63, as regards the number of able-bodied paupers in the various workhouses in your district?—I obtained a special report with regard to the number of able-bodied men in the workhouses, because there seemed to be an impression abroad that there were a considerable number, and that workhouses were the resort of able-bodied paupers. I think that the misunderstanding perhaps partly arose owing to the form of the Local Government Return which is called Form A, which I have here before me. In the form you will see that the adults are reported upon as Men in Health and Temporarily Disabled. Those men under 60 years of age who are in health are generally supposed to be the able-bodied but it does not always naturally follow that they are able-bodied, because they may have lost a leg or they may have lost an arm, or something of that sort. A good deal depends upon the interpretation which the Master puts upon the term "health" in regard to a particular man or woman. Generally speaking, I think it may be taken that the rule is that if the pauper is not actually under the care of the doctor, he is returned as able-bodied; but of course there are a good many who are not strictly able-bodied who are not under the care of the doctor. I think that is where a good deal of misunderstanding with regard to the number of able-bodied men and women in the workhouse has arisen.

Meaning of term "able bodied."

Paucity of really able-bodied paupers.

5376. I see that your examination brought down to very small proportions the number which you thought could be accurately described as able-bodied?—Yes. The proportions are given in my memorandum. The return shows that there were in fact 6,079 male inmates, and only 216 of them were able-bodied as defined in the previous paragraph, namely, male inmates "who were mentally and physically able to earn their living out of the workhouse."

5377. Then there is a further deduction that you make, is there not?—Yes. Of those 216, fifty-four were in the Wolverhampton workhouse, twenty-five at Bristol, twenty-two at Bath, and twenty-one at Worcester. It thus appears that 112 out of the 216 were confined to four workhouses. In thirteen workhouses in my district there were no able-bodied men at all.

5378. Then, when you examined, as you apparently did, according to paragraphs 65 and 66, the proportion of able-bodied that were in the Wolverhampton and Bath workhouses, a very considerable further deduction had to be made?—Yes. In paragraph 65 I say, "When I inspected the Wolverhampton workhouse in November last, there were thirty-one able-bodied men included among the inmates. Of these fourteen were described as regular ins-and-outs. The average age of the thirty-one was forty-four years, and ranged between twenty-six and fifty-nine. As to occupation, nineteen were labourers, and the others various. There were twenty-five single men among the number, two were widowers with children, the others were married." Going on to the Bath workhouse, I say, "Of the twenty-two able-bodied men reported at Bath, five were married, sixteen single, and one widower. As to character, nineteen out of the twenty-two were stated to be either undesirables or confirmed drunkards, three were deserving cases but intellectually weak." My

object is to show that, even taking the few able-bodied men that you find in workhouses they are not usually what you would call the most desirables. I do not mean to say but what exceptions do occur sometimes, and you do find a deserving case come into the workhouse from no fault of his own in any way or form. But I would say this for the masters of workhouses, that if a man does come into the workhouse who really is deserving of sympathy and is there through no fault of his own, they generally do their best to find that man some occupation. It is quite a mistake to suppose that respectable men are forced into the workhouse by guardians. In my district the guardians do not force a case into the workhouse if that case can be properly looked after outside and is deserving; but of course there are many cases of people who cannot be looked after outside, such as the old and infirm without friends. The men who go to the workhouse are the less deserving. Though there are so many men in the Wolverhampton workhouse, I do not think there are so many as there were in the old place. I remember going to this workhouse shortly after it was opened, and having numerous complaints from the able-bodied inmates as to the amount of work that they had to do there; and when I inquired, I think I may say that many of the more capable inmates preferred the old place. I can describe what the old place was like by quoting the words of the Member for Wolverhampton—I cannot, perhaps, quote his exact words, but they were to the effect that the old Wolverhampton workhouse was as bad as a Siberian prison. You can form an opinion of what it is like by that. I say definitely that many of the able-bodied men and women rather than go into the new place (where the regulations were better carried out, and where there were more provisions for working), would have preferred the old place to the new one.

5379. Out of the twenty-two reported to be able-bodied men at Bath according to your return, there was not a single one who could be recommended to an employer as either a capable or a reliable workman?—Three were deserving cases, but they were weak intellectually and they were not men whom a man would employ if he could employ anyone else. I do not say it was their own fault; of course if they were intellectually weak it was an infirmity, and they were deserving as far as that goes. They were respectable men in a way.

Number of bastard children born in workhouse.

5380. Now we will pass on to the question of illegitimate children. There seem to have been 411 illegitimate children born during last year in the forty-three workhouses in your district; and in paragraph 71 you say that the mothers of these children seemed to be below the average in intelligence, and many of them bordered on imbecility. Would that remark about the mothers of last year apply to other years?—Yes, certainly; it applies at the present time.

5381. Should you say that these girls got into this trouble from a lack of intelligence?—Yes, to a very great extent, and chiefly, I would add, to that lack of mental intelligence "and their surroundings": the two things go together. A person with greater intellectual capacity would have resisted probably.

Power to detain in workhouse unmarried mothers.

5382. Have you any suggestions to make as to how you would deal with this particular class of girl; would you suggest, for instance, that there should be greater powers of detaining them?—There is a strong opinion among guardians that they should have power to retain some of these girls for a longer period; and I am disposed to agree. You have not only to consider the girl herself, but you have to consider the infant as well. The tendency of these girls very often is to go out of the house as quickly as they possibly can, and what becomes of the child afterwards is very problematical indeed. I had a case in one of the workhouses where the matron said, "Here is a young woman with an illegitimate child; she has been here before, and the previous child died under rather suspicious circumstances—and she wants to take this child out." I said to the woman, "You ought not to take that child out; there is the child to be considered, and the child is not fit to go out." She made reply to me, "If it pleases the Lord to take the child, I cannot help it." No doubt she was going to take the child out, and it was impossible to say what would become of it.

5383. Are you able to ascertain if these women have more than one illegitimate child?—Certainly, some of them do. I think I should be within bounds when say that if they once come in with an illegitimate child, they very often return with another one later on.

5384. The tendency would be, if they got into trouble again, to return to the workhouse?—Yes.

5385. I suppose it is over those cases that the guardians would like to have some powers in addition to what they now possess?—Yes.

Question of attractiveness of Medical Relief.

5386. You give us some interesting statistics as regards the number of sick and the nurses, and in paragraph 80 you consider the question whether improved nursing attracts people and adds to the burden of pauperism. Do you look at it from the point of view of whether it increases the actual expenditure, or from the point of view of whether it tends to encourage people to become paupers?—It does both. It undoubtedly adds to the expenditure, and it must do so. The question I wanted to bring out in paragraph 80 is the question whether a better infirmary administration does have the effect of inducing people to go into the workhouse. That is a point I have tried to get definite evidence upon, and I am bound to say that generally I do not think it does actually attract. People are much better cared for, and sometimes when they get to the workhouse they may not be so keen to go out; but generally speaking, they like to get out as soon as they possibly can. I did find the mother of one of the guardians in one workhouse—a person who was paid for, and who ought not to have been there at all—but that was quite an exception.

5387. I gather that the result of your experience is that the improved quality of the nursing has not been detrimental by specially encouraging people to have recourse to infirmaries and thus adding to the general expenditure?—I have no evidence of it. I have tried to get evidence on the matter, and I cannot find anything to confirm any such idea. No doubt there is a tendency on the part of public hospitals to send cases into the workhouse infirmaries which they did not send years ago; and I believe that is mainly due to the fact that the public hospitals generally are rather crowded, and perhaps many of these cases are not sufficiently interesting cases.

Effect on Pauperism of Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation Acts.

5388. Now we come to a very important matter dealt with in paragraph 81, that is, the number of fairly capable men over sixty years of age who are classed as "old and infirm." I understand from your memorandum that certain of these paupers allege that the Employers' Liability Act has acted detrimentally to them; is that impression general, do you think?—It is, more especially in Staffordshire.

5389. I suppose you have no figures or statistics by which you can test that assertion either one way or the other?—No. I have tried in every way I possibly can to get those statistics, but I do not see how I can possibly get them. I have no power as an inspector to ask for those statistics to be returned, and it would be extremely difficult to get them otherwise. A return could be obtained of the number of men in any particular workhouse who allege that they are there because of the Employers' Liability Acts; but every case would have to be tested and gone into. When these men have made these assertions to me, I have generally questioned them about it, and I am bound to say that in the majority of cases the men I have come across cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory workmen. If a man over fifty years of age in South Staffordshire happens to have lost a situation by reason of incompetency or drink, or anything of that sort, it is exceedingly difficult for that man to get employed again; but I believe myself that employers of labour, if they have in their employ a man over fifty years of age who is an industrious, respectable and capable man, do keep that man on as long as they possibly can. The largest carpet manufacturer at Kidderminster, who is the Chairman of the board of guardians, speaking to me about this very matter, said, "In our trade of carpet-making, so much is done by machinery that we prefer an elderly man, if he is a respectable and sober man, rather than a young man, simply because he has had more experience of machinery than a younger man would have." Therefore I am disposed to think that these men make the most of it, when they say they are thrown out of employment because of the Employers' Liability Acts. If you

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

12 Mar. 1906.

come to investigate their general character, you will find, that, taken as a rule—there are exceptions no doubt—they are not the most desirable class of workmen.

5390. What is your experience as regards the impression of the people themselves ? I understand that in Staffordshire this idea is prevalent in the workhouses ?—Yes, very much so ; and you will find it also at the Relief Committees. I have had interviews with relieving officers with especial reference to this matter, and the relieving officers confirm it.

5391. It is their impression too ?—Yes, very strongly. You will find the same thing at West Bromwich, but perhaps less than at Wolverhampton. You will find it generally in South Staffordshire.

5392. Have you heard of anybody who has made an investigation from which they can produce any statistics on the subject ?—Not at the present time ; but that might be done by taking a particular workhouse and requesting the relieving officers to investigate the cases. It is quite impossible for me going round to the workhouses there and then to select John Smith as an instance ; I must go and make inquiries from his employer as to his statements and as to his circumstances generally.

Proportion of paupers in West Bromwich workhouse who would benefit by old-age pension.

5393. Now we come to paragraphs 87 and 88, in which you deal with the character and condition of the persons over sixty-five years of age who are in the workhouse. In paragraph 88 you say that a Committee of Investigation appointed to make inquiries with respect to the inmates of the West Bromwich workhouse arrived at the conclusion that out of 325 persons over sixty-five years of age, who were inmates of the workhouse, 203 were unable to take care of themselves and were also either mentally or physically infirm ; so that there would be only a margin of 122 left to deal with ?—There were no cases, I believe, found in that workhouse who could be relieved outside the workhouse on a pension of 5s. or 7s. per week.

5394. Then I see there was a further analysis of the 122, and the conclusion was that there was not one case which could be made the subject of out-relief ?—That is so. I selected this workhouse myself because—and it is only due to the guardians to say it—it is an exceedingly well-administered workhouse, and these statistics may be absolutely relied upon, I believe.

5395. Would there be anything very special in this workhouse as compared with other workhouses, or would your experience make you think that much the same sort of conclusion would be arrived at in other workhouses ?—You would come to much the same sort of conclusion elsewhere, I think.

5396. That particular form of investigation has not been adopted as far as you know by any other committee, I understand?—There was at Cirencester, but I have not got the figures. I think I can answer the question definitely in this way: this may be taken as fairly typical of workhouses generally, that is to say, the guardians do not force a deserving case into the workhouse if they can possibly avoid it. That applies to the whole of my district. I always advise guardians, where they do give out-relief in deserving cases, that they should only give it after very careful investigation, and when it is given, that relief should be adequate.

General increase of pauperism in district.

5397. Going on to paragraph 89, which refers to the general trend of Poor Law administration and methods, there has, I believe, been a considerable increase in pauperism during the last five years in your district ?—Yes. It is a very large district, but considering the depression of trade, I do not think the increase is anything very considerable.

Pauperism in Walsall.

5398. I understand that that increase, or at any rate a very large proportion of it, was in the union of Walsall ? —That is so ; and chiefly in the out-door relief.

5399. Walsall got exceptional employment during the South African War, which on the close of the war fell off, did it not ?—Yes.

5400. It is a town which always contains a considerable amount of pauperism, I understand ?—Yes, the rate of pauperism is high there as compared with other districts ; there is no doubt about that. The guardians in the past have given too much out-relief there altogether, and they have not had a sufficient number of relieving officers to investigate the cases.

5401. And that, with the conditions which exist in Walsall, combined to cause this large increase of 2491 ?—Yes. That figure is arrived at by comparing the figures for the last week ending December, 1905, with those for the corresponding week of 1900.

5402. That is an increase of over 2,400 out of a total increase for the other Staffordshire unions of only 2,790?—Yes.

Effect of Mr. Chaplin's Circular on out-relief.

5403. In your judgment did the circular issued by the Local Government Board in 1900 increase the cost of out-relief ?—It undoubtedly did.

5404. It increased it by augmenting the amount that was given to individual cases, but did it actually increase, in your judgment, the number of recipients ?—It is very difficult to say whether it did so or not. Of course the more out-relief that is given the more temptation there is to people to apply for it.

Out-relief to aged and "deserving" at Bath.

5405. The more temptation to individuals you mean ?—Yes. There is a very good instance in the case of Bath, which shows the effect of that circular. The guardians decided after that circular was issued that more out-door relief should be afforded to people over sixty-five years of age ; and the clerk to the guardians prepared a special report, in which he said that the effect has been that this out-relief has not only been given to the aged and deserving but to others as well, They have lost sight of the word "deserving," and he says, "The danger appears to be lest the term 'deserving' should be overlooked and this 'more adequate' relief be given to other cases."

Number of Friendly Society members in workhouses.

5406. Now coming to the question of thrift, in paragraph 115 you examine the statement that there were inmates of workhouses who had belonged to friendly societies. The result of your examination is to show that the so-called benefit societies were in nearly every case merely public-house clubs, I think ?—Yes ; that was so.

5407. Did you come across anybody in receipt of relief who belonged to a benefit society ?—Yes ; if you mean who belonged to the Oddfellows, or the Sons of Temperance or the Foresters. There are a few you find occasionally, but the majority of those are men who ceased to subscribe some time back.

Reluctance of relatives to maintain paupers.

5408. You seem to think that there is rather an increased tendency on the part of relatives to shirk their responsibilities ?—There is no doubt about that at all.

5409. Have you noticed that during the ten years that you have been in the district ?—Yes, and I think I am right in saying it is a growing tendency amongst a certain class. The thriftless class, if they can possibly put the cost of looking after their parents or other relatives on to the poor law, do not hesitate to do it. In days gone by, there used to be a certain amount of reluctance on the part of people to become paupers at all, even to receive outdoor relief ; but with a certain class of people at the present time, if the occupiers of No. 1 in a street get out-relief, neighbours think they ought to have it as well, and they deem themselves fortunate if they do.

5410. In the next paragraph (116) you call attention to the increase in the number of aged poor, and, as I gather, you attribute that to some extent to this diminishing sense of responsibility ?—To some extent certainly, But I would also say this—that we have just passed through a period of bad and dull trade, and naturally when that is so a man who has a family to support is not able perhaps to contribute towards the support of his other relatives to the extent that he might wish. That, no doubt would account for it in some degree.

Number of teetotalers in workhouses.

5411. As regards pauperism itself, you produce some strong evidence to show how largely intemperance contributes to it ?—That appears when you investigate the cases of the people in the workhouse. Of course it does not do to put too inquisitorial questions to them, and one does not like to do that ; but if you go into the matter it is astonishing and sad to find the number of cases in which drink has been a very material factor in reducing them to the position in which they are. That not only applies to those in the body of the workhouse, but it also applies to those in the infirmaries and sick wards as well. Up to quite recently I had found only one total abstainer in the workhouse in my district, and that man had been a total abstainer for only seven years before he came into the workhouse. I say "up to quite

recently," because when I was at the Stourbridge workhouse, about three months ago, certain cases were reported to me as being total abstainers. I have had a further report since on those, but before I can say anything definite about that, I would like to have a little further investigation. One of them, a man, said he was a teetotaler. I enquired, "How long have you been a teetotaler?" He did not quite know. I asked, "When did you have your last glass?" He replied, "I went out with the pigs a fortnight ago, and I had a glass then." So he had been a teetotaler for a rather limited period. I only mention that to show that one has to be very careful in investigating the statements of these people. Though I have had these people reported to me as being total abstainers, I would like to investigate their cases more definitely before making any statements about them. But I am quite safe in saying that you very seldom find in the workhouse a total abstainer who has been so for a length of time. The same thing applies to the persons who are relieved outside. Of course some teetotalers are like other people, and are brought to want from various causes, still you very seldom find a person who has been a teetotaler for a length of time even applying for outside relief.

5412. Have you any reason to think that these two workhouses, which give some very unpleasant figures as regards the proportion of persons who owe their downfall to drink, are exceptional workhouses?—No. I selected those workhouses because they are both of them well-administered workhouses and have very good masters and matrons. I thought they would be fairly typical workhouses, and the information, I am sure, is reliable.

5413. The master of the West Bromwich workhouse stated apparently that out of 416 inmates 205 could not be allowed out for a day's leave "without fear of their returning the worse for drink"?—Yes, that is so.

Control of intemperate paupers.

5414. Here again you think there should be an increased power given either to the guardians or to the Local Government Board to deal with these habitual hard-drinkers?—Yes, I do, because they simply make a convenience of the workhouse. They go into the workhouse and then they take their discharge; of course they can be detained longer now than they could be a few years ago, but some of them give notice to go out again directly they come back—that is perhaps not generally the case, but still it is done in some cases. I shall be within bounds when I say that this class of pauper simply makes the workhouse a convenience, and the effect upon other paupers is not a desirable one. I wish to add this: I am not an advocate for multiplying establishments, and I think that any relief that is given should be through the guardians; if you have several other different sorts of establishments dealing independently with certain classes, you will find that they will overlap and that that will bring about confusion.

Success of "Homes" for Children.

5415. Now we come to the question of the children: you consider that the Home system has been a success?—Very much so, as far as the children are concerned; it has benefited them greatly. It is costly, no doubt.

Defects of boarding-out system.

5416. But as regards boarding-out poor law children, you are of opinion, I think, that this system requires very careful supervision?—Undoubtedly.

5417. Under this system have any cases of maltreatment of children in your district come under your notice?—There was one case, which was not a case of maltreatment, that was not satisfactory. I do not as a rule visit the boarded-out children, as that duty does not come under the inspectors, and we could not possibly do it; but I have done so sometimes as a matter of interest and when I have thought that things are possibly not going quite right. It is always my practice when I go to a board of guardians or workhouses to inquire about the boarded-out children. I cannot say that I can produce any definite case of maltreatment. There was one union where I found that some of the foster parents were paid 1s. 6d. per week. My suspicions were awakened in one union by the number of people I saw going to the workhouse on a particular day. I said to the master: "What are these people coming about?" He said, "They are all coming to try and adopt children." I said, "I must make some investigation into this"; and I made a point to go round that union to see how these children were treated. I must say that the foster-parents were being paid a very low rate for them in some cases—sometimes they were relatives, no doubt; but I cannot say that I came across any absolute case of maltreatment. There was one case which I recommended some consideration should be given to, but not because the children were not properly looked after. I think the system requires more supervision than it gets.

Prospects of pauperism.

5418. From paragraph 143 I see that you do not take a very hopeful view as regards pauperism in the future?—I am afraid I do not. I think the diminution, or, if I may use the term, the reform of pauperism must come from the outside rather than from the Poor Law. I think it is an outside matter; that is to say, a social matter. If you get social reform, more thrift amongst the people, and less money spent in drink, and so forth—for one thing re-acts on the other—that would necessarily reform the people, and there would be less resort to the Poor Law. So far as the actual administration of the workhouse is concerned, I think consideration is generally shown to the people there. The point which I think requires most attention and most consideration with regard to the Poor Law, is the outdoor relief system, on which a large number of people, as I said just now, depend.

5419. A good deal of your district is agricultural, is it not?—Yes.

5420. Would you apply your remarks as regards the future of pauperism to the agricultural districts, as well as to the industrial districts?—They apply to a certain extent to those, but not to the same extent. I think they apply more especially to the towns.

5421. Pauperism in the industrial districts is, in your judgment, apparently, increasing?—It is increasing undoubtedly.

5422. More than in the rural districts?—Yes. Some of the rural districts show a decrease in pauperism: that is no doubt partly owing to the exodus of people from the country districts, but not entirely.

Rural areas favourable to system of out-relief.

5423. In these rural districts is there an expensive system of outdoor relief?—No. They follow the ordinary course. That is to say, the guardians meet, and relief is always given on the same day that the guardians meet, the relief committees meet generally before the guardians. In the agricultural districts it is much more easy to investigate the cases, because they are fewer, and as a rule the guardian coming from a particular district knows most of the people in his district; therefore the investigation is much easier in the country districts than it is in the town districts.

5424. I think it has been asserted, or at any rate implied, by some of the preceding witnesses, that it is possible to work a not unsatisfactory system of out-door relief in the country districts?—I quite agree that that is so. I think it is better done there, because, as I say, there are fewer people, and everybody is known, if I may use the expression, by their respective guardians.

5425. The conditions which make a system of out-door relief controllable and effective in a rural district do no exist to the same extent in the industrial or crowded districts?—Not to the same extent.

Inspection of boarded-out children.

5426. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Going back to one of the last points you spoke upon—the boarded-out children—I should like to ask you whether there is any inspection whatever of boarded-out children now?—Not within the unions, except by the guardians themselves and their relieving officer. There is no inspection by the Local Government Board Inspectors, except of such cases as we think proper to go to.

5427. Have you no lady inspectors under the Local Government Board?—Not in the same way as we have for the children outside the unions. For the children boarded-out without the union there are lady inspectors, but not for the children boarded-out within the union.

Out relief to undeserving.

5428. As a general rule, do you think the out-door relief is confined to the deserving cases?—I am afraid it is not. I think a great many people who are undeserving get it.

5429. I understood from an answer you gave before that you thought that it was as a rule only given to deserving cases?—I think I said that the guardians do not force into the workhouses deserving cases. That is quite another matter from giving out-relief; in fact, it is very often

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

12 Mar. 1906.

the other way about. You will find some boards of guardians, where the workhouse wants extension, rather than go to the expense of making the workhouse adequate, will give out-door relief to prevent people going in.

5430. I suppose the out-door relief depends a good deal upon the reports of the relieving officers ?—It does to a certain extent ; sometimes not to the extent it ought to.

Type of relieving officers.

5431. Do you consider the relieving officers as a rule are a reliable and good class of men ?—I do.

Relieving officers as collectors.

5432. Do the relieving officers give their whole time to this work ?—Not always. They Act as collectors for the guardians sometimes.

Regulation of number and salaries of relieving officers.

5433. I suppose the board of guardians decide absolutely the number of relieving officers that they will have ?—Yes.

5434. The Local Government Board having no power to dictate the number that there should be ?—The Local Government Board has not exercised any such powers in my district so far.

5435. Have they the power to dictate that ?—They have the power to do so.

5436. Upon what principle is the number of relieving officers regulated ; is it according to the area, or population, or the number of persons in receipt of relief ?—I am afraid that the number of relieving officers is not regulated by any principle at all except the will of the guardians. Generally speaking, in the populous districts the relieving officers have too many cases to look after.

5437. What are the average salaries of the relieving officers ?—I should require to look into that before answering ; I could not say off-hand.

5438. Does the salary vary ?—Yes, it does somewhat.

Out relief in money and kind.

5439. Do they give relief in kind as well as in money ?—The relieving officers have the power to give relief in kind to a destitute case. Supposing I am a relieving officer and a case is brought to me or my attention is brought to a case as being a case of destitution, I have the power, if I think proper, to give the relief in kind up to the time of the next board meeting, when I must report the case.

5440. As a rule, it is not given in money—or is it ?—The relieving officer has no power to give money without an order of the guardians, but he may give relief in kind.

5441. The guardians can give relief in money or in kind, can they not ?—Yes.

5442. Which do they do ?—Generally speaking, part in money and so many loaves as well. But if they have a drunken case brought before them, or a case that cannot be trusted, sometimes they say to the relieving officer, give relief at your discretion in kind.

5443. Have you any union in which the relief is altogether given in kind ?—Not to everybody—certainly not.

5444. When it is given in kind, does the relieving officer carry the relief to the recipient, or has the recipient to come to fetch it somehow ?—The relieving officer gives him a note generally by which he can get it at a certain shop.

5445. Is the relief in money given at any particular centres, or is it only given at the homes of the people ?—It is given at the various centres if the people have the power to come for it. On the other hand, if the recipients have not the power to come for it, it is the relieving officer's duty to take it.

5446. Have you ever considered whether relief in kind would be better than relief in money ?—I certainly should not advise giving relief in kind only, as an absolute rule. It is a matter for discretion entirely.

5447. Do you think it might be done sometimes with advantage as a test of the reality of the distress ?—It is done now sometimes in that way with advantage.

Disadvantages of out-relief unions.

5448. To any great extent ?—Not to any great extent, but it is done. If I were to go to a board of guardians, say to-morrow, I should probably find some cases of that description.

5449. In paragraph 32 you refer to the union of Keynsham, where you say there are a number of clerks ; how does that work ?—It does not work altogether satisfactorily in my opinion.

5450. Are these clerks acting independently of each other ?—To a certain extent they are. Perhaps I might explain the position. Part of the union is in Gloucestershire and part in Somersetshire—about half and half. The workhouse is in Somersetshire, at Keynsham. The board issued an order by which they formed two out-relief unions, the Warmsley out-relief district and the Keynsham out-relief district ; and the position now is that there is one clerk to the guardians as a whole, and one to each of the out-relief unions.

5451. Are those clerks under the chief clerk of the union so far as finance goes ?—No ; the out-relief districts do their own finances, but they make returns to the clerk to the guardians as a whole.

5452. Then the finance as a whole is under him ?—Only so far as it relates to the workhouse.

5453. Is there any other union in your district where this system prevails ?—No, that is the only one.

5454. That is quite an exception, then ?—It is quite exceptional.

5455. Have you any experience of boards of guardians under the old system of *ex officio* magistrates ?—Not officially in any way.

5456. You own official experience is confined to the new system then ?—Yes.

Drunkenness of paupers on leave of absence from workhouse.

5457. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to the number of inmates who cannot be allowed out without fear of their returning the worse for drink, do they frequently go out with money in their pockets which they can spend on drink ?—I think not. When a person comes to a workhouse he is searched, and any money he has got is taken from him.

5458. Therefore, what drink they get is the result of treating ?—Or begging, and what friends may give them, possibly—I do not know how that may be.

5459. Do you think it would be more largely a case of treating, or of what friends give them ?—It is difficult to say that. I should say it is more the result of begging than of anything else. But that is only my opinion, and it is very difficult to get definite evidence of anything of that sort.

5460. It might be extremely difficult for them to refuse that sort of mistaken kindness on the part of people who were old acquaintances ?—That is so to some extent, no doubt.

5461. But otherwise they might beg for money and spend that ?—Yes. Certain cases have been reported to me, as for instance, a certain man who goes out and begs for a time and then comes back again. I do not mean to say this is so in every case, please understand.

Effect of local industries and trade fluctuations on pauperism.

5462. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I rather gathered from you that where there were local industries there was not so much pauperism ; take, for instance, the Vale of Evesham and the Pershore plum district ?—That is not an industrial centre, if I might say so ; it is an agricultural district.

5463. But there is a special form of agriculture carried on there ?—Yes, fruit growing.

5464. There is not so much pauperism there, is there ?—No ; and there is not the extent of migration from the country into the towns which has been going on in other country districts.

5465. As a kind of reverse case, in Walsall when there was a special amount of work everything went well, but directly that work is taken away there is poverty ?—Yes.

5466. Does the fact that at certain times a large amount of increased trade is in such a district as that, draw people into the district ?—It did, to some extent, I understand.

5467. Do some of these people so drawn into the district become afterwards chargeable to the Poor rate?—I cannot say definitely about that. The increased trade did certainly attract people, and I have no doubt some of those who were attracted came upon the Poor rate. I wish it to be clearly understood that these people were earning very high wages at the time, and that some of them made very good use of their savings. On the other hand, a very large portion of the population spent their money as fast as they got it, and when the depression came, they had no reserves, and so they had to come upon the Poor Law.

5468. Would it not be more likely that those who were originally residents there would be the people to save, and the people who travel about seeking trade in different districts would be the ones to spend ?—I am afraid not.

5469. Would you put it the other way on ?—I should be disposed to say six to one and half-a-dozen to the other as far as my information goes.

Definition of "deserving" and "adequate relief."

5470. With regard to the circular of 1900 in reference to the aged and deserving poor and out-relief, have you ever been able to advise guardians perfectly as to the definition of the word "deserving" ?—I think you must judge each case on its merits. I do not think you can lay down a hard and fast rule which cannot be departed from.

5471. So it is just in the same way as "adequate relief" ?—Yes.

Living wage in West Bromwich.

5472. I notice that in paragraph 88 you quote from the report of the West Bromwich Committee to the effect that 5s. or 7s. a week would be adequate as a pension on which people could keep themselves; would that be the case in that district ?—Certainly; a single person could keep herself or himself on 7s. a week, supposing he or she was fairly capable of being able to attend to himself or herself.

Proposed penalty for drunkenness of workhouse inmates.

5473. With regard to those who are allowed out for the day, an I who cannot come back without being intoxicated, or something very nearly approaching it, would it not be desirable that some kind of penalty should apply to a person who comes back in that state; for instance, that he should not be allowed out say for another three months ?—That might be done, and it would be a very good thing to do. Of course, there is not that power at the present time, although the period of detention has been extended by the Local Government Board in the last few years.

Roll-call of "able-bodied."

5474. (*Mr. Nunn*). With regard to the able-bodied in your workhouses, is it the custom of your boards of guardians to have a call-over of their able-bodied every half-year or every quarter ?—Yes.

5475. It is on such occasions as those that such figures as you give in paragraph 65 come out, is it ?—No. Those figures were made as a special return to me.

Punishment of workhouse inmates on refusal to work.

5476. But they do make such inquiries themselves periodically, do they not ?—Yes, they do. Just lately they have prosecuted certain men in Wolverhampton for not doing work.

5477. Not men in their own workhouse ?—Yes, they have.

5478. Because they were refractory ?—For neglecting to work and becoming chargeable to the union. They were men who would not try to get work and who were everlastingly in and out of the workhouse.

5479. They did it, then, when the men made re-application ?—I do not know; I only saw it in the newspaper.

5480. In the workhouse, if a man did not perform his allotted task, they could charge him for that; but if he did not decline to perform the task of work they could not charge him with being a vagabond, could they ?—They can bring these men up, but I forget the exact statute under which they can do it.

Work of Salvation and Church Armies.

5481. Are there any institutions like the Church Army working in connection with the workhouse to try and obtain employment for the men ?—There is the Church Army, and, of course, the Salvation Army

5482. Do they both extend their operations into your workhouses ?—Only to a limited extent, though I have been myself in communication with them on certain occasions.

5483. They do not do it systematically ?—No. It would be a very good thing if they did.

Difficulty of identifying fathers of bastard paupers.

5484. In regard to illegitimacy, you say that only in a few instances were steps taken to find the putative father; I suppose the difficulty arises from the fact that the mother leaves the workhouse, and then she is no longer chargeable ?—No; very often you do not know who the father is; the father does not come in.

5485. And you cannot find him ?—No. You must get corroborative evidence, and to get corroborative evidence in a case of that sort is a most difficult thing

5486. And the guardians must proceed against him whilst the child is with them, must they not ?—I do not think the guardians can proceed direct; I think the woman herself must proceed.

5487. The guardians can proceed against the father surely for the maintenance of his child ?—Before answering I should want to look up the law on the matter. The guardians can support the woman in it, but I think the woman has to take the initiative. The guardians can do it indirectly by telling the woman she must do it.

5488. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) I think that is how it is done—they get the woman to do it and find the means for the woman to do it ?—I think that is how it is done.

Relief to members of Friendly Societies.

5489. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I notice that in the report of the West Bromwich Committee which is quoted in paragraph 88, they say, "It is to be regretted that only one case was found in which a man had been for any considerable time a member of a friendly society"—why is it to be regretted ?—I quoted that from the Guardians' Committee; I am not responsible for what they say.

5490. Turning now to paragraph 115, I suppose that the Outdoor Benefit Societies Act hardly comes into operation at all, and is practically a dead letter ?—Do you mean to say that the guardians should not take notice of these friendly societies ?

5491. When giving out-relief the guardians are not allowed to take into consideration any amounts that a man is receiving from a friendly society up to 5s. ?—You must bear in mind that the people I am speaking of in that paragraph are people actually in the workhouse, and not people getting outdoor relief. You must bear in mind, too, that at the time I saw these people in the workhouses they were not members of any friendly Society at all. The general explanation, to quote their own expression, was that the society "broke up." In giving outdoor relief, the guardians are careful to take into consideration whether the people belong to benefit societies or not, and those who do always get preferential treatment.

Bad trade as a cause of failure to maintain relatives.

5492. In paragraph 116, I think, to a certain extent you attribute the failure of the sons and daughters and other relatives to contribute liable to bad trade ?—To a certain extent, yes.

5493. Do you remember any other period of bad trade in which the same phenomenon showed itself ?—No. I am here simply speaking of the present.

5494. Could you rake up any other instances in which it has occurred in the past ? We should be very pleased to think it could be attributed to that, and not be obliged to feel that it was due to a general slackening of responsibility ?—As I said before, there is undoubtedly a general slackening of responsibility, but that is not the case in every instance. There are some people most desirous to do all they can for their parents and relatives, I know; but if a man is out of work he naturally cannot do it. Not many of the mechanics in my district during the late depression in trade have been out of work, for the most part the mechanics have been working short time; the class of persons who are mostly out of work are the unskilled workmen, of whom there are such a tremendous number in this country. There is not sufficient work for them to do.

System of out-relief unions as a check on out-relief.

5495. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I see, according to paragraph 22, that you have one out-relief union in your district; the principle of those unions is that the out-relief falls on the local rates, and the workhouse relief falls on the combined rates, I think ?—Yes.

5496. Has that at all diminished out-door relief ?—No, I do not think it has.

5497. It was designed for that purpose, was it not ? No; I fancy it was none simply as a matter of general convenience.

5498. I thought it was designed for the same sort of purpose that the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was ?—This out-relief union was formed before I took over the district, but my impression is that it was formed as a matter of general convenience.

5499. You say it has not resulted in checking the desire to give outdoor relief ?—I think the guardians administer the relief pretty fairly on both sides.

5500. One would have thought that if the guardians had to pay for the out-relief, whereas the workhouse relief was thrown on a common fund, they would have been desirous of giving more workhouse relief than outdoor relief ?—That is a very fair contention, I think, but I have no evidence that it has been so.

5501. That is rather what I want to get; there is no evidence at all of that ?—I have none

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

12 Mar. 1906.

Local Government Board's powers to control provision of new workhouse and proposed exercise thereof.

5502. You have not noticed in this union a disclination to give outdoor relief ?—I think not.

5503. With regard to the question of the Bristol workhouse, I gather that you think it rather serious that the Local Government Board has not power to insist on the building of a separate infirmary ?—I do think so I think that the Local Government Board ought to have increased powers in that direction, and in other directions as well ; but at the same time I wish to make it quite clear that those powers should not be used except as the very last resort. I always try to assist guardians. My idea of an inspectorship is to be loyal to the Local Government Board and to assist the guardians. I tell the guardians I do not go there to find fault with them, that I go to assist them ; and, generally speaking, I get on very well in consequence. But it is a weakness sometimes, when matters require attention like the Bristol workhouse, not to have the power behind to say, This must be done ; and the best class of guardians very much regret that it is so.

5504. How could you get that power—by what method ? —It would have to be by Act of Parliament.

5505. It would be very awkward to issue a mandamus ; by what method would you suggest the Local Government Board should proceed ?—That is a matter that would require thinking out. It is a matter of detail, I admit, but it is a matter of important detail.

5506. Would the method which is used with regard to the police grants appeal to you ? Supposing you had the grants-in-aid to Poor Law authorities organised so that the Local Government Board could withhold some of those grants unless the service was efficient, would that appeal to you ?—It would. I hardly like to make the suggestion myself, but with regard to the education authorities, if a school is not up to what is thought to be the standard, then there is the grant——

5507. And it may be withheld ?—Yes. If you gave guardians a grant and said to them, Unless you carry out these alterations this grant will be stopped, I daresay that would have the desired effect, and no doubt it would assist the local rates as well.

5508. You think it would be wise to use the grants from the Central Authority to promote efficient administration ?—I think it is a matter well worthy of consideration.

5509. Instead of giving it mechanically on the basis of so many officers, as it is given now ?—I have very little doubt myself that if you gave the grant per head of paupers in the workhouse, the same as you do with regard to paupers in asylums, it would have an effect, because it would be cheaper then to offer the workhouse instead of giving outdoor relief.

5510. It would act like the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—I do not know ; I have not gone into the details on that point.

Effect on pauperism and employment of Workmen's Compensation Acts.

5511. With regard to your paragraphs 80, 81 and 82, in which you deal with the Workmen's Compensation Act, I gather that you do not think that there are any statistics which prove that the Workmen's Compensation Act has actually increased pauperism ?—I know of none at all. What I have stated there is simply the result of my own observation. It is a matter, I would like to say, to which I have given a great deal of attention, and therefore I do not make my statements at random ; they are based upon actual and careful observation.

5512. I gather that you rather suggest that we must not take too seriously the assertion of the inmate of a workhouse that he has been thrown out of work because of the Workmen's Compensation Act ?—Not entirely. No doubt he has lost his situation by reason of the Employers' Liability Acts, but he has become what you may call an undesirable from some cause or other, and it is the undesirable who goes first.

5513. That is to say, any attempt to make the employer responsible for the conditions of employment tends to make him employ a person of good conduct rather than a person of bad conduct ?—Naturally.

5514. That would be the real effect of it, would it ?—I think so.

5515. In that way it would tend to the greater employment of people of good conduct ?—Certainly.

5516. And to the less employment of people of bad conduct ?—Certainly. I think that is just the way it does act.

5517. You would not consider that wholly undesirable, would you ?—It is quite natural and quite right.

5518. On the whole, the effect would be to stimulate good conduct ?—One would think so.

5519. As regards the actual fact of throwing people out of work, I note that, according to Mr. Booth's figures, out of the seven unions in your district in which pauperism has actually increased since the passing of the Workmen's Compensation Act, only two are manufacturing and mining and come under the Act, whereas five are agricultural and shipping, and do not come under the Act ?—If you are speaking of Gloucestershire, and will look at paragraph 104, you will see that I mention there the unions in my district in which the pauperism has increased mostly ; they are Bristol, Bath, Walsall, West Bromwich, Wolverhampton, Swindon and Highworth, and Kidderminster.

5520. It is very curious that Mr. Booth's figures do not agree with yours ?—I am very sorry. I think I must adhere to my own.

Labour yard

5521. I notice that in your memorandum you do not mention the question of the stone-yards ; have you any stone-yards in your district ?—There was a stone-yard at Walsall last year, and there was a stone-yard also at Dudley for a short period. At the former place it was not only a stone-yard but was used for other work, that is to say, they did have stone-breaking and they also did the removal of pit heaps and that sort of thing. The working of the stone-yard was exceedingly unsatisfactory.

5522. Then you do not believe in stone-yards ?—I cannot exactly say I do not believe, but I should be very glad to find some alternative for them. There was a disposition to evade the work as much as possible, and do as little as possible of it in every way. Stone-breaking is very hard work for people not accustomed to it ; I quite readily admit that.

Question of attractiveness of medical relief.

5523. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 80 you refer to the question of nursing in workhouses, and you say it has not attracted an additional number of paupers ?—So far as I have been able to ascertain it has not.

5524. You do not hold the opinion then that the better treatment inside workhouse hospitals or infirmaries has tapped a new stratum of pauperism, as it were ?—Except as regards local hospitals perhaps ; they send cases in now which in days gone by they did not send in.

5525. Would that be a small amount ?—It depends on what you call small. You will come across a good many cases of that sort, especially in the larger unions, but I cannot give you the actual figures. When I go to a workhouse infirmary I see every patient, and I want to know why they have come into the house, where they have come from, and all about them.

5526. In your district there is apparently no cause of complaint, speaking generally, as regards the infirmaries ? —Except that in some of the older workhouses the sick wards are not adapted for infirmary wards.

5527. I do not mean on that score ; I mean because of their being used for a different class of persons to what they were intended for ?—I have no evidence of that sort at all. I do not mean to say that people who have been in a much better position do not come in ; but then they are reduced to destitution generally from causes for which they are themselves responsible.

5528. Would you say then that the workhouse hospital really is not abused ?—In my district you may find an exceptional case here and there, but as a general thing certainly not.

5529. In paragraph 81 you refer to the number of fairly capable men over sixty years of age who are classed as "old and infirm" ; do you mention those because you think they are wrongly classed ?—Not at all. What I mean to say is that if they could get employment they are capable of doing a certain amount of work.

Effect of Employers' Liability Act.

5530. Are they capable of earning a living ?—They are capable of working and of earning a living if they could get it ; but, as I said just now, that is where the Employers' Liability Act comes in to a large extent—they are over sixty years of age.

5531. Do you think they should be classed as "old and infirm"?—We generally put down all those over sixty years of age as old and infirm; but do not think that they are idle, for they are put to work nevertheless. The regulation is that people should be put to such work as they are capable of, and therefore these old people are put to work as a rule.

Number of possible old-age pensioners in workhouse.

5532. In paragraph 87 you mention that the West Bromwich guardians made an inquiry into a number of cases with the object of giving them out-door relief to the extent of 5s. or 7s. a week?—It was giving them a pension really.

5533. Was that investigation made in any other union in your district?—It was made in Cirencester as well, but I have not got the figures for Cirencester here.

5534. Was it not made by Bristol?—Not to my knowledge.

5535. Only in two unions to your knowledge?—Yes.

5536. Was the result pretty much the same in the other union?—My experience going round is that it would be pretty much the same. I will explain why this occurred. There has been a Commission sitting on the question of Old Age Pensions, as probably you know, and the General Inspector was asked to recommend two unions which would give statistics, and I selected one rural and one urban union. The reason I did not get the figures for the rural union was that they were much longer about it; I simply did not get them, that was all.

5537. Had you any special object in selecting that one union—West Bromwich?—I simply selected it because I thought it was a very typical union; I had no other reason for selecting it. I knew very well that the work would be carefully carried out there.

Mr. Chaplin's Circular and its effect.

5538. In paragraph 105 you refer to the Circular of August 4, 1900; is it your experience that that circular was a mistake, or that its object was misunderstood?—I think its object was misunderstood.

5539. Do you agree with the object of that circular?—I always go on the principle that if out-door relief is given at all it should be given adequately after careful investigation, and especially to deserving people.

5540. I think you said just now in answer to a question put by Mr. Russell Wakefield, that it was very difficult to decide who were deserving, and that guardians usually placed all practically or too many under that category?—I do not think I said that; I said it was difficult to define the term "deserving."

5541. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I wanted to know whether you could guide the guardians to a rule as to who were to be included amongst the deserving and who were not?—If you put it in that way, I can answer it a little more definitely perhaps.

5542. That was the object of my question?—Supposing a man comes before an out-relief committee and that man has been subscribing to a benefit society for a considerable time, I consider that is a sign of thrift and that the man is entitled to consideration; if a man has been a sober man and has done his best to get on, that must be taken into consideration. If he has simply come to the guardians because of illness or infirmity or incapacity which is no fault of his own, I think such a man is deserving, and should not be forced into the workhouse. But where you see a man who has earned good wages, and who has never taken the trouble to put money into a benefit society, but has spent the money in drink or in some other way, I do not think that man is entitled to as much sympathy as the man who has not done that kind of thing.

5543. (*Mr. Bentham.*) The Circular says "With regard to the treatment of the Aged Deserving Poor, it has been felt that persons who have habitually led decent and deserving lives should, if they require relief in their old age, receive different treatment from those whose previous habits and character have been unsatisfactory, and who have failed to exercise thrift in the bringing up of their families or otherwise?—I quite agree with that.

5544. Do you see any real difficulty in practice in selecting the persons who come under this definition?—No, I do not.

5545. Then you believe the guardians have really misunderstood the object of the circular, and that they have not discriminated as well as they might have done?—That is so.

5546. As instanced by the number of cases they have selected as "decent and deserving?"—Speaking to the guardians on this point recently I have said, "Your out-door relief has gone up considerably," and they have said "You told us to put it up" or something to that effect. I said "Oh dear, no; nothing of the sort.'. "You came here and advocated it" they said; I said "No; I simply referred to this Circular issued by the board as to the deserving cases, but you have missed out the word 'deserving' and given it all round." There is no doubt that in certain quarters there is rather a desire to do that.

5547. Is there any union in your district that has drawn up any particular regulations with regard to this Circular, for the guidance of the guardians in deciding who should come under it?—Yes, at Bristol they have done that. I think I have referred to that in my memorandum. They have made a special class called Class A. which come under it.

5548. But the number of those who are put under it is rather large in proportion to the number of those who are receiving relief, is it not? You say in paragraph 106 "In December 1901, there were 1,452 cases of this class receiving £288 19s. 2d. per week, or an average of 4s., at the end of last year there were only 1,067 cases receiving £233 14s. 6d., or an average of 4s. 4½d per week?—I have stated it correctly in my memorandum.

5549. Would you explain the large number of persons who come under that category, on the ground that all people who were eligible for out-door relief ought to be deserving?—I think the explanation is what I said before, namely, that the guardians do not force the deserving into the workhouses.

5550. Then there really ought to be none in receipt of out-door relief except those who are deserving?—I rather incline in that direction.

5551. If that really were so, all the aged people would come under this heading, would they not?—No, I do not think so; all the aged people are not deserving.

5552. If all those aged people who are in receipt of out-door relief are deserving— ?—If they are!

5553. If they were not, they would be put inside, would they not?—That is not always the case.

5554. They naturally would be if they confined their out-door relief to those who are deserving of out-door relief?—If they did, yes.

5555. Therefore, if they confined it strictly within that definition, there would be none outside receiving relief except those who would come in this category?—If they carried out that principle absolutely.

5556. Do you think that is an advisable thing to do; would you carry it to that length?—I certainly would not force deserving people into the workhouse if they could be looked after outside—and I never have done.

5557. With regard to the children, in parargaph 123 you say there are twelve unions out of forty-three who are dealing with their children outside the workhouse; could you tell us what proportion of children there are represented by those twelve unions out of the total of forty-three in your district?—I could not; I should have to work that out.

5558. It really is the bigger unions who have adopted this principle, is it not?—The bigger unions are gradually coming round to it, undoubtedly.

Motives of foster-parents in accepting boarded-out children.

5559. In parargaph 129 you speak of the boarding-out system, and you say that people are not inclined to take children from affection towards them, but do it "with a view of making something out of them"?—I do not mean to say that some of the foster-parents do not get very fond of the children. The general principle is that the foster-parents do not, as a matter of principle, take the children because they are fond of them; but it is to make something out of them. I do not wish to be misunderstood; I have come across cases myself where the foster-parents have become exceedingly fond of the children.

5560. Do you think that if people take the children for a small payment, a certain amount of affection enters into the transaction, seeing that they do not take the children entirely for the money?—It does not necessarily follow

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

12 Mar. 1906.

that there is an amount of affection; it may be that the children are useful to them.

5561. But if they are young children under ten they cannot be so very useful?—I do not know that they are always under ten years of age.

5562. It is limited to ten except in the case of a brother or a sister who might be older?—Of course they get older after a while.

5563. The object would be an ulterior one?—Yes; it might be to make use of the children.

5564. When a larger amount is paid for boarding-out, do you not think that is an inducement held out to people to take children because it would pay them to take them?—Yes, I do.

5565. The larger the amount paid, the greater the mistake in that direction?—I do not know that that naturally follows. There is less excuse for neglecting them if they receive more money. Naturally, if you pay more money for taking the children, you will have more people after them.

5566. That would mean that the additional number that go after them would do it for that increased payment?—I go on the general principle that the motive which actuates the foster-parents in taking children is to get something out of them. I cannot go further than that.

5567. Then you would say the smaller the amount they are willing to take for them the better?—No, I do not agree with that.

5568. Do you think with regard to boarding-out there is already too much supervision or too little?—I think with regard to boarding-out without the union they are properly inspected.

Inspection of boarded-out children.

5569. But with regard to boarding out within the union, do you think they are not properly inspected?—I think it would be very much better if they were to have an inspection in the same way as outside the union.

5570. Does not that duty devolve upon the general inspector of the district?—No. We could not possibly do it—the work is too much.

5571. But it is part of your duty, is it not?—No. We have the right to go if we think proper to do so, but it is not part of our duty.

5572. What is the objection to transferring the inspection of these children boarded out within the union to the inspector of boarded-out children without the union?—None, as far as I can follow.

5573. You see no objection to it?—I do not see any objection to it.

5574. Do you think it would be better done?—As a matter of principle, I say that if you require to inspect the children without the union why not inspect those within the union as well?

5575. You would approve of it?—Yes, and I have said so in my memorandum. I think myself there is very much more attention being paid to the children now who are under the care of the guardians, and I think, generally speaking, the children are better under the care of the guardians. If you find a relative of a child, an uncle or an aunt or a grandmother, who is capable of taking charge of it, I think the proper thing to do is to put the child there, and very often there is a great advantage in doing so. You may also find people without any children at all who are anxious to take a child; and that is another matter altogether. There was one workhouse where some time ago a woman came with a child in her arms—a very well-dressed child and very well cared for; she said this was a boarded-out child, her husband was going to be removed out of that union into another place to work, and she wanted to know whether they would let her keep the child and pay her the same amount. The guardians demurred to that, and then she walked out of the room, saying, you are not going to have the child back; I am going to keep the child. So you do get satisfactory cases.

Deterrence of relief.

5576. Speaking generally, on the principle of the poor law, I take it that you agree that the position of the pauper should be less eligible than that of the independent labourer of the same class?—Yes.

5577. Do you think that that principle is departed from to any extent in your district?—No. I do not think that there are any inducements to men to come into the workhouse.

5578. Would that apply to out-door relief also?—I think the matter of out-door relief is quite different. I think if one man gets out-door relief, the other man thinks, why should I not have as much as so-and-so. There is very little repugnance among a certain class to take out-door relief. Of course to a certain class of mechanics and other men who are a superior class of men, it is very repugnant, and they would do it only in the very last resort; but one cannot deny that in the population generally there are a very large class of thriftless people who are only too glad to get out-door relief.

5579. I suppose you are familiar with what is known as the Goschen Minute with regard to pauperism in the Metropolis?—I have nothing at all to do with the Metropolis, so I cannot say that I am.

5580. Are you not familiar with that Minute which was issued by Mr. Goschen?—I am afraid not.

Co-operation with charity.

5581. It is a Minute advising co-operation between the poor law and charitable agencies?—I am not familiar with it, but, as a matter of fact, the local Charity Organisation Societies in my district, where they exist, work with the relieving officers.

5582. There is a tendency to co-operation, then?—Yes, the one gives information to the other.

5583. Has it a tendency to reduce the number of people who apply to the guardians for out-relief?—I think I may say that where a Charity Organisation Society exists, they very often give relief to cases that would come on the guardians otherwise. I had a great deal of experience of a local Charity Organisation Society at one time.

Influence of inspectors of Poor Law administration.

5584. With regard to the influence of the Local Government Board through the inspectors over the policy of the guardians in their districts, do you consider that satisfactory?—What do you mean by the "policy;" I do not quite gather.

5585. Does the inspector influence the policy of the boards in their dealing with either out-door relief or in-door relief?—I am happy to say that I am, I think, on very good terms with my boards of guardians, and that they very often consult me. They often consult me in cases of difficulty.

5586. From that point of view, do you think your influence is useful and successful?—It is not for me to say that, perhaps. I can only say I hope it is. It is always a pleasure to me to meet the guardians, and I think they are generally pleased to see me. They say so, at any rate.

5587. You meet with sufficient approval of your recommendations from the boards of guardians?—Yes. We get on extremely well for the most part.

Need for greater powers for Local Government Board.

5588. Do you think you have sufficient power for dealing with the boards?—No. I think the Local Government Board ought to have more power than it has.

5589. In what direction?—With regard to any question. If there is not sufficient nursing, if there are not sufficient relieving officers, if the accommodation is not sufficient, the board should have more power, I think, but only to be used in the very last resort. I quite believe in the principle, and I act upon it, of the inspector trying to convince the guardians; I do not believe in coercing the guardians if you can possibly help it.

5590. On the other hand, do you think any additional powers ought to be given to the boards of guardians for dealing with various classes of paupers?—As far as actual administration is concerned, it is practically vested in them, and there are certain matters such as giving gratuities and little matters of that sort which might be left to the guardians.

5591. Do you believe in their being more restricted by the central authority, or in more liberty being given to local administration?—I think it works very well as it is

5592. Do you think it is as well as it might be?—We do not profess to get perfection in this world in anything I do not think the poor law is any exception to that.

Adequacy of existing Poor Law system.

5593. Taking the poor law as a whole, do you think it is meeting the circumstances of the case?—I think it is meeting the circumstances of the case pretty fairly. I think out-relief is the question that requires the most investigation.

5594. Is there any class of recipients of relief that you think ought to be transferred to any other authority; you

mentioned imbeciles and lunatics, I think ?—I said that I regret to see sane epileptics mixed up with imbeciles in the workhouses, but I do not advocate forming a number of institutions for giving relief. I think what relief is given, should as far as possible be given by one authority: otherwise you will get conflicting influences, and general confusion will come in.

5595. Do you mean that all paupers, whether lunatic or sane, ought to come under the poor law ?—No, I did not say all paupers; I said, as a general principle. I do not like multiplying institutions. At the present moment the actual asylums are not under the poor law.

5596. But the pauper lunatics in the asylums are ? They are in a way. We do not inspect them; the guardians send them to the asylum, but the asylum is under the county council.

5597. Are there any classes which you would say might be transferred to the county council ?—I do not think so. The only classes I have referred to in my memorandum are the habitual drunkards; it is a question whether they should not be sent to inebriate homes. I think that the sane epileptics might be dealt with by combinations of board of guardians, but that they should be under the boards of guardians.

Size of Boards of Guardians.

5598. Now I want to ask you a few questions with regard to the constitution of the boards in your district. What is your opinion with regard to the size of the boards; do you consider that a large board is less efficient than a small board ?—I think I must answer that in this way—that a large union naturally taxes its members much more than a smaller one does. Take Bristol, which is one of the largest unions in England; the tax upon the members there is very great indeed.

5599. I was not thinking of the size of the union, but of the number of the members of the board ?—Do you mean to say you think they are too large in proportion to the population ?—

5600. No; what is your experience with regard to the number of members forming a board of guardians—is a board less efficient with a large number than it is with a small number ?—I think you want a reasonable number.

Small interest in Guardians' elections.

5601. Then you have really no evidence to give on that point ?—I do not know that I have particularly. It depends entirely upon the Guardians themselves. What I do complain about very much is that the amount of interest taken in Guardians' elections is very small indeed. If you take the number of votes cast for a Guardian's election, you will find it is exceedingly small compared with the total number of votes that might be cast.

Effect on Poor Law administration of size of electoral area.

5602. Is it your experience that where the electoral area is small, and there are a large number of parishes each represented, the pauperism is usually high ?—That certainly applies in the case of Bristol; on January 1st, 1905, there were 30·4 per 1,000 of the population.

5603. You have not looked through all your unions to see whether that does or does not apply all the way through ?—I do not think it applies as a general principle. Of course if you get a very large Board of Guardians it generally means populous places.

5604. Not necessarily ?—It does in my district.

5605. There are some large unions which have one township only, and their representation can be what they make it; but if a union consisted of forty parishes each parish would want its representative. Both cases may be cases of populous districts, and still those differences would obtain ?—I think you may say that as a general principle pauperism is most in populous districts.

5606. Is that so ?—I think so, taking the large towns.

5607. Is it not a fact that in some of the large towns the number of paupers per thousand of population is actually less than in an agricultural district ?—That may be so, if you take it in that sense. I did not quite see what you meant.

5608. You have no opinion with regard to the electoral area ?—I think I may say I have not.

Classification of workhouse inmates.

5609. Do you approve of the classification of the in-door poor on a character basis ?—To a certain extent yes, so far as it can be carried out.

5610. Do you think it is advisable ?—I do most certainly.

5611. You would separate these better class cases who must be inside the workhouse from the noisy ones ?—Certainly. That is done in my district so far as it possibly can be done.

Value of relieving officer as guide to Guardians.

5612. I think you said in answer to a question that if out-door relief was left more to the relieving officers it would be better administered ?—I do not think I said if it were left more to them; I think I said that the relieving officer's advice was not always taken.

5613. Do you think it should always be taken ?—What I meant to imply was simply this: that sometimes a relieving officer makes a recommendation and that recommendation is not accepted. I do not mean to say that the relieving officer's recommendation cannot be wrong, and that the relieving officer is infallible; but a relieving officer very often has complained to me that relief is given where it should not be.

5614. That is practically the same thing ?—If you like. That does come in. I do not mean to say that the relieving officer may not be wrong sometimes—he may. It is in the discretion of the Guardians. Sometimes the people have friends at court, and the relieving officer may be over-ruled.

5615. Do you think that due importance is given to the position of the relieving officer generally ?—Yes, I think so.

5616. Do you think he is sufficiently well-paid ?—I never heard him grumble.

5617. Does the appointment attract the class of men that you think ought to be employed on this work ?—I think I may say this definitely—that the relieving officers in my district are, as a rule, a very intelligent class of men, though they may be underpaid.

5618. Is it your opinion that in large districts their duty should be confined entirely to dealing with applications for relief ?—Yes, I should like to see that, but then, of course, you must increase their salary, because they probably take other duties besides now.

5619. Do you think the work would be more efficiently done if it were so ?—Yes, because then they would have more time for the work. The relieving officer for Walsall at one time had 700 cases to deal with in two districts.

EIGHTEENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 13th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. The O'CONOR DON.
The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. EDWARD BESTBRIDGE WETHERED, re-called; and further Examined.

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

13 Mar. 1906.

Attendance of inspector at relief committees.

5620. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you take a very great interest in the administration of out-relief in the various unions in your district, in so far as you sit with the guardians in their relief committees, and ascertain exactly the methods they adopt in dealing with their cases?—I take a very great deal of interest. I always make it a practice to attend the relief committees when I attend the meetings of boards of guardians, and I attend relief committees in cases where the relief committee does not sit on the same day as the guardians. I make it a practice, as far as I possibly can, to attend each relief committee separately.

Regulations adopted by guardians for giving relief.

5621. Have any of the boards of guardians in your district regulations or bye-laws for the guidance of the guardians?—Yes; in Bristol they have rather extensive ones, and I shall be pleased to hand you a copy. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XI. (C).)

5622. Is it only Bristol?—Certain boards of guardians have a regular scale that they go by, others, again, judge each case on its merits. My own view would be this, that I think it is well for guardians to have a scale for their guidance, but at the same time exceptional cases do occur. I do not believe in guardians having cast-iron rules which they cannot, in any circumstances at all, go beyond, because cases do occur sometimes which ought to be treated strictly on their merits; they are exceptional cases, but I do believe in guardians having a scale to go on as a general rule. I can give you instances or hand the papers to you, if you like, showing typical scales which are used.

5623. Do you find where they have no such regulations or by-laws that there is a great deal of difference between the districts in one union in the amount of relief given and the class of person to whom it is given?—I do not think, taking it all round, there is a great deal of difference; some are more liberal than others, no doubt.

Medical relief as the highway to pauperism.

5624. It has been said that medical relief is the stepping stone, as it were, to pauperism; that is, out-door medical relief?—Yes.

5625. Do you find that to be so in any part of you district?—I think, perhaps, there is no part of the out-door administration which is more abused than that of applying for medical relief. One so frequently finds that men who have been in good work when in health have made no provision whatever in case of sickness, and they rely on getting the parish doctor in cases of illness.

5626. Do you find that people who have begun with medical relief have followed on with a request for other forms of relief?—It very often follows, but I cannot say I have any definite instance.

5627. You do not look upon it really as a stepping stone to pauperism?—I think that if a man who is earning fairly good wages makes no provision when he is in good work, and relies on the Poor Law authorities when he gets ill, it is a stepping stone in that direction; he has a tendency to rely upon out-door relief when in distress.

5628. Supposing an extension of outdoor medical relief were contemplated, do you think it would be a danger?—I think it would.

5629. It would have a tendency to increase pauperism generally?—Yes; I think it would be an incentive against thrift, decidedly.

Effect of lax policy of out relief.

5630. Is it your experience that in consequence of the policy of out-relief, which is principally based upon the cry of "cheaper out than in," the in-door relief has been increased and not reduced? Is the policy of outdoor relief usually accompanied by an increase in in-door pauperism?—I think my answer must be thus: that when you give people the idea that guardians give out-relief in preference to offering the workhouse test, it has a demoralising effect upon the people generally, and they rely upon getting outdoor relief rather than being offered the house, and they take advantage of it. If you take the statistics I have given in my evidence in chief, you will see that in the case of Wolverhampton and the case of Stourbridge it works out in that direction, where they have not had sufficient accommodation to offer the workhouse test when necessary.

Number of visits by inspector to each union.

5631. How often do you visit the unions in your district?—I visit every workhouse at least once a year, and more often if required; I visit the boards of guardians also once a year, and all the guardians in my district know that if they want to consult me I am always willing to to come, if I can possibly do so.

5632. Do you find a visit once a year to the union is sufficient?—Yes, I think so. If anything special occurs I go again. One could not do more, or I should find considerable difficulty in getting my work done in the course of the year.

5633. Do you think the unions which you have to visit, and the institutions which you have to inspect, are too many to afford them your thorough supervision?—I can do mine. I think I have quite as much as I can do thoroughly, I do my best anyway. I may say the guardians very often write and ask me to come because they want to consult me about a certain matter.

Small holdings at Evesham.

5634. (*Professor Smart.*) In paragraph 39 of your memorandum there is a very interesting statement about fruit growing in the Vale of Evesham. Is there really much fruit growing of this kind?—Yes, there is a great deal of it.

5635. How is the land acquired; from the municipalities or private owners?—They rent it generally from landowners.

5636. Under any special Act?—No, I think not.

5637. Do you know anything about the rents ?—No, I cannot say that I do.

5638. These small holdings are in the nature of allotments, I suppose ?—They are rather larger than allotments ; I give the dimensions of them in my memorandum.

5639. Are they near the houses or the villages ?—They are right out in the country. There are the houses where the people live themselves ; some have their houses near the ground they are cultivating ; they are scattered about in various places.

5640. What kind of fruit do they grow ?—They grow a good deal of strawberries, tree fruit, and vegetables such as asparagus ; in fact, all fruits, really, that are capable of being cultivated.

5641. You find that district has not suffered from the migration of men to the towns ?—No, some of the villages have increased in population.

Mental deficiency of pauper mothers of illegitimate children.

5642. In paragraph 71 there is a terrible statement : "These girls are generally below the average in mental intelligence" ?—That is true, I am sorry to say, absolutely.

5643. Do you mean that the particular class of girls who go to the maternity wards of the workhouses are feeble-minded ?—I do not say they are feeble-minded in the strict sense of the term, because a feeble-minded person you can take control over at a certain stage, but they are below the average in point of intelligence ; they are not sufficiently wanting to be actually certified and put down as feeble-minded, but many of them are bordering upon it.

5644. Is this a special class of girl—a "workhouse girl," for example ?—No, they are girls who have been brought up amid unfortunate surroundings ; I can only express it as I express it here, that they are generally below the average in mental capacity, though they are not feeble-minded.

5645. If your experience were at all general, do you not think this Commission might make a valuable inquiry as to how many of the single women confined of illegitimate children in the workhouses of the kingdom are feeble-minded ?—If I might be allowed, I would suggest that the inquiry should be as to who are below the average intelligence, or, if you like, you could put it in both ways.

5646. Does it not strike you that it would be useful ?—I think it is a subject of much importance, and that is why I have called attention to it.

5647. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is not that subject being inquired into by the Commission on the Feeble-minded which is now sitting ?—I think they are only inquiring as to the strictly feeble-minded.

Relative cost of dealing with pauper children in and outside the workhouse.

5648. (*Professor Smart.*) In paragraph 128 you say : "I fear that this tendency is chiefly prompted by considerations of cheapness rather than the welfare of the children." Have you any grounds for that statement ?—You see I hear the matter discussed frequently and, of course, there are many exceptions, but I say simply what does occur sometimes, that I am told the boarding-out is cheaper.

5649. You are aware, I suppose, that a great many guardians have a positive enthusiasm for boarding-out —Some have, no doubt.

5650. And that would be quite independently of this ?—I am simply speaking of a certain tendency which I very often come across, with which I have often to argue.

5651. (*Miss Hill.*) Is the difference of cost very considerable between having children in scattered homes and supporting them in the workhouse ?—Yes, it certainly is. I have some particulars about it here. For instance, if you take Worcester, where there are three cottage homes, the weekly cost is 6s. 5d.

5652. That includes all the charges ?—Yes. The average number of children is seventy-two ; average weekly cost per head for food, clothing, necessaries, firing, repairs, etc., 3s. 9d. ; average weekly cost per head for salaries, rations of officers, etc., 1s. 1d. ; average weekly cost per head for interest on loan, rates, etc., 1s. 7d. ; total 6s. 5d. In Gloucester, for the year ending, Lady Day, 1905, the cost of the children in the homes, apparently, comes to 7s. 8¼d. The details are all stated. At Wolverhampton the annual cost in the cottage homes comes to £23 7s. 6d. per head. I think if you divide that it will come to about 9s. per week. Then I will take you to Bristol, and there the average cost per child for food and necessaries, including gas, water, coal, etc., in 1905, was 3s. 5½d., and for the year ending Lady Day, 1904, it was 3s. 4¾d. ; for clothing it was 11¼d., and 9¼d. for the two respective years. The officers' salaries were 2s. for each year. Rent, rates, and all other expenses come to 1s. 9¼d. each. Therefore, taking it for the year ending Lady Day, 1905, it came to 8s. 2¼d. per child ; and in the year ending Lady Day, 1904, it came to 7s. 11¾d. per child. If we come to the question of cottage homes at Downend, to which I referred in my evidence-in-chief, the clerk tells me the cost of the cottage homes at Downend has not been ascertained for an entire year yet, but for the half-year to Lady Day, 1905, it was as follows : food and necessaries, including gas, water, coal, etc., 3s. 7¼d. ; clothing 1s., officers' sa aries 2s. 6d. ; rents, rates and all other expenses, 3s. 4d. ; making 10s. 5½d. There is a considerable difference in the cottage homes as compared with the others.

Effect of the Poor Law on thrift.

5653. In paragraph 143 you say you see little prospect of any substantial decrease of pauperism till the masses of the population exercise more thrift, spend less money on drink, and rely less on the Poor Law. Of course we must all feel that, but the question is, I suppose, what administration of the Poor Law tends to promote that thrift ?—Quite so.

5654. I wonder whether you see any influences brought to bear now which are tending to promote thrift. All the recent alterations have been rather in the other direction, have not they ?—May I ask what alterations you refer to ?

5655. I was thinking, for instance, of the abolition of the inability to vote by people who receive out-door relief ?—I entirely agree with you there.

5656. I do not know whether it has been done yet, but there is an idea of not disqualifying voters whose children receive free meals in schools ?—I think that is in the same direction, I must confess.

5657. For one thing, surely the introduction of the word "deserving" makes a difference. The old definition of the Poor Law was that it meant destitution, and left the question of deserts to other people to consider. We now seem to be attempting a legal difference in the treatment of those whom we ourselves consider deserving, which is a very difficult thing to do ?—For the actual deserving poor who are brought into a state of destitution from no fault of their own, I think the greatest sympathy should be shown, and, if relief is given at all, I hold that that relief should be adequate. I do not hold with people living on the verge of starvation and otherwise. I do think this (and one cannot attend Relief Committees without being very much struck by it) that a very large proportion of the population of the country exercises no thrift or thought, and depend on charity and the Poor Law in time of need. I cannot go further than that.

5658. Do you think a board of guardians can really decide on the deserts of an applicant ?—I think so, with proper investigation ; it all depends on the question of investigation. If you do not investigate your cases properly and get all the information you can, you are very liable to be deceived, and money is wasted on undeserving cases. That very often occurs, I am bound to say.

Conditions in Dore Union.

5659. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In the tables which are given with regard to your district, I see that the Union of Dore has the highest percentage of pauperism ?—That is so.

5660. Are there any circumstances which explain that ?—The only thing I can say about the Union of Dore is that it is an entirely agricultural district in the middle of Hereford.

5661. Is it in what was called the "Golden Valley" ?—I think not, I never heard it called by that name. It is near Pontrilas.

5662. There are no other special circumstances ?—I noticed that fact the other day in going over the figures, and I was particularly struck with it. I intend to make some inquiries about it. It is entirely an agricultural district, and the wages, of course, are not high.

5663. Take again the case of Bristol : in Bristol the

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

13 Mar. 1906.

decline of pauperism has been enormous. Has that been due to a rearrangement of the areas, do you think?—If you look at Bristol from another point of view, you will find that, whereas the number of the various classes relieved on the 1st January, 1905, in the whole of England came to 27·6 per 1,000, if you take Bristol for the same period, it is 30·4 per 1,000; that is above the average.

Causes of decreased pauperism at Bristol.

5664. In the figures which Mr. Booth has drawn out, it has gone down from 5·6 per 100 (that is 56 per 1,000) in 1895, to 2·6 per 100 in 1905, that is to say, it has dropped 3 per cent.?—I do not quite understand how that works out. Bristol, taking it per 1,000 is certainly above the average in England.

5665. Do you think there has been a difference from 1895 to 1905?——

5666. (*Mr. Booth.*) It was the absorption of Barton Regis and a part of Long Ashton that altered the entire structure of the figures; so there is no comparison possible. (*Mr. Phelps.*) I am directing my question to whether the administration or the character of the population was so different as to explain the difference?—You must understand that the increase of population in Bristol is unprecedented in any city. As I explained yesterday, there have been two extensions of the city within six years.

5667. Have those extensions brought in a class of the population which does not swell the pauper average much, although it swells the population?—It has brought in a large class of people who do not swell the pauperism. My reason for making that observation is that a very large number of small houses have been built out in the direction of Horfield and other parts of Bristol, and also a large number of residental houses over the Downs and that part, which may possibly have some effect upon it.

Children's scattered homes at Bristol.

5668. Would you mind giving a short account of the history of the Bristol scattered homes?—When the Bristol union was formed in 1898, all the children were in the workhouses, and though the guardians did the best for them, the children were confined within the walls, and there was a listlessness about them, they did not enjoy their play like others; there was a dulness about them which was characteristic, though the guardians did their best—I wish to make that perfectly clear. When the union was formed, the guardians at once realised the necessity for getting the children out of the workhouse, and they decided, first of all, upon the scattered home principle. They endeavoured to get houses about Bristol for the children.

5669. They hired houses?—Yes. At first there was a considerable prejudice against them, and the guardians had the greatest difficulty to get landlords to let their houses for the purpose of taking in Poor Law children. They engaged something like fourteen houses as scattered homes for children.

5670. In what positions are those houses?—Not the middle of the city, but in the suburbs.

5671. Have you visited them?—Yes, all of them.

5672. What principles would guide the guardians in choosing a house or a scattered home?—The house has to be sanctioned; I have to report to the Local Government Board upon it.

5673. Are they semi-detached houses?—Not all of them, some of them are semi-detached. The houses originally taken (they are mostly given up now) were not of the best class for the purpose, but they were the only houses the guardians could get. They laboured most diligently, but they could not get them, because of the prejudice that existed. That prejudice has now entirely disappeared.

5674. Do they insist upon a certain area for each child?—So far as the sleeping rooms are concerned, I measured them up, and they take a certain number of children, according to the number of cubic feet.

5675. You insist upon a certain amount?—Yes, it is about 300 cubic feet per child as a minimum.

5676. Do they insist on the street in which the building is situated being of a certain width?—No, but one has to be careful in the selection of the site, that it is a healthy situation.

5677. Who selects the situation?—The guardians first, and then I go and report upon it

5678. You say on the whole there is a great deal of out-door relief given in your district?—The out-door relief in Bristol is £41,000 a year.

Amount of out-relief a Bristol.

5679. You are not in favour of forcing deserving cases into the house?—Certainly not.

5680. Have you any instance in your district of a union in which a determined effort has been made to reduce outdoor relief to very small proportions?—Yes, in the Wheatenhurst Union, but it has not been very successful.

Effect of reduction out-relief.

5681. Have you found that the effect of that is to drive deserving people into the workhouse?—No, I may say that decidedly.

5682. You do not think that what is sometimes called a strict policy has that effect?—No, I am sure it has not had that effect. Wheatenhurst is not the only place In the last few years there has been an improvement in very many of the unions. There is more attention given to the question of outdoor relief than there was, and I say, to the credit of the guardians in my district, that I know of no single case where deserving people have been forced into the workhouse who could have been looked after outside. There may be the case of a deserving person in the workhouse, but that person has not had a friend to look after him or her; then the guardians have exercised their power and said: "You must come into the workhouse infirmary."

5683. Do you think a stricter administration develops other means of support?—I think the people help themselves or their friends help them.

5684. Either they make provision for themselves or their friends help them?—Yes.

5685. Do you think there is any limit to the application of that?—It is very difficult to state a limit to a thing like that.

5686. The outdoor relief might be abolished entirely, and the deserving cases would support themselves or their friends would support them?—If you ask me if I would abolish outdoor relief, I say certainly not.

5687. I would ask if in the future there is any limit to the extent to which strict administration will grant protection to deserving cases? You say that when the administration is strict, people are not brought into the workhouse but other forms of support are developed?—That is so to a great extent.

5688. Do you think there is any limit to that?—Do you mean to say detrimentally?

5689. Supposing that outdoor relief was practically entirely abolished in time, do you think that the deserving cases would be provided for outside the workhouse?—No, I do not think they would. I think that outdoor relief should be given in certain cases to the really deserving.

5690. You think that is permanent?—I think that is permanent.

5691. Have you any experience with regard to non-settled relief?—Yes; of course, I have numbers of cases in my district.

Non-settl relief.

5692. Have you found abuses arising in connection with it?—No, I do not think I have.

5693. Do you find abuses in connection with pay stations?—No, I cannot say that I have.

Pros and *cons* of re stations.

5694. You would not be prepared to insist that relieving officers should relieve every case at the applicant's home?—I do not think it is absolutely necessary, and it would involve an enormous amount of extra work.

5695. Would it be practicable, do you think, in your district?—Not with the present number of relieving officers. I may say this: I had a very good instance at Bristol the other day, where, as I say, they have divided the better class into what they call Class A; the guardians thought the Class A people would not care to associate with other people less deserving, but the guardians now find that the old people in Class A prefer to go with the others so that they may have a chat, so I am credibly informed.

5696. You have pay stations in the towns?—Yes.

5697. But take a very scattered district?—The relieving officers pay certainly at the pay stations.

5698. Not at a place like Bristol?—Yes.

5699. They do not visit the cases in their homes every week?—Not all of them; they do periodically from time to time. If the case cannot come to the pay station it is the duty of the relieving officer to go to the house of the recipient.

5700. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Do you think that pay stations might be abolished in town areas?—I think in large towns it would be very difficult. I think there would be a hardship on some of the old people, unless you are prepared to increase the number of relieving officers, and the guardians would very much resent that on account of the cost.

5701. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Surely it is better that the relieving officer should see the conditions under which the recipient is living constantly?—That is what I am constantly pressing upon the guardians—constant visitation. If the guardians would be prepared for the relieving officers to take the relief to each case it would be better, but they would very much resent that on account of the greater cost. I think I said it would involve a very considerable increase of the staff.

Small holdings at Evesham.

5702. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Do you know anything of the process by which the land is transferred from one tenant to another in those small holdings as Evesham?—I am afraid I do not.

5703. Do you know how long the system of small holdings has been in force in that valley?—For a long time; I cannot say exactly how long, but it is some long time anyway.

5704. Can you say whether pauperism has decreased there during the whole of that period?—It was long before I came into the neighbourhood.

5705. How long have you been there?—Ten years.

5706. As a matter of fact it is twenty-five years since it started?—I was going to say I thought it was somewhere about that.

5707. You do not know the acreage, do you?—I have given the acreage.

5708. I mean of the small holdings?—From one to three acres.

5709. Can you give the total?—I could not give that.

Comparison between pauperism at Evesham and Walsall.

5710. Have you compared Mr. Booth's figures at all? Take Evesham, for instance; there you have 19 per cent. under sixteen years of age, and at Walsall, which is singled out as a union which does not look so well as the others, you have 37 per cent. of children. How do you account for the large number of children chargeable at Walsall?—You can hardly compare the two unions, if I might make the suggestion, because one is rural, although it is true it has the town of Evesham, while almost all the other part of the union is urban.

5711. If you take the figures for over sixty years, you will see that Evesham has 60 per cent. and Walsall has only 40 per cent.?—Yes.

5712. Is the large number of children chargeable at Walsall due to the fact that they are children of widows who get intermittent work at the sort of employments you specify in your paragraph on the subject?—I am afraid that is a question I should not like to answer off-hand. A good many of the children are illegitimate in Walsall.

5713. What proportion?—That is a matter I should have to get out.

5714. It is rather a serious reflection on Walsall if there is any very large number?—I do not want to make that out. I prefer to say, perhaps, that some of them are illegitimate, if I might correct it to that extent. I do not think that applies to Walsall more than to any other large place. I do not think that Walsall is worse than any other large place.

5715. It has a very large proportion of children; there are only a few others that come anywhere near it. In an industrial place like Walsall you have a large number of children chargeable, and I suggest that these are, in all probability, children of widows, and they become chargeable through the inability of the mother to get work to keep them?—I should like to get definite information before answering that question, but my impression is that the children in Walsall are not the children of widows in a greater proportion than in most other places.

5716. I do not say so either; I want to know whether they are the children of widows?—I am afraid that is a matter I could not answer correctly without getting the actual facts.

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

13 Mar. 1906.

Effect of Evesham small holdings on inhabitants.

5717. Has the small holding system in Evesham had a steadying effect upon the incomes of the people who live there?—Certainly with regard to the people who live by the fruit growing it has done so, undoubtedly.

5718. It has generally improved the whole system of living in that district?—I have only known it for ten years, but the standard of living in the Evesham Valley is above that of rural districts generally.

5719. You attribute that to the small holdings system in vogue there?—Certainly.

Adequacy of wages in the district.

5720. You said something about thrift just now. Do you think generally over your district wages are such that people really can provide for themselves?—Over the whole of the district?

5721. Yes; we have been talking quite generally about thrift, and saving, and the rest of it. Quite generally, do you think that wages are such and employment such that the people really can provide for sickness and old age?—I think my answer to that question must be that we have before our eyes the fact that the bulk of the people do.

5722. That is hardly an answer to my question?—Shall I take it more definite? No doubt you must divide the district into the country and into the towns. We know that the wages of the agricultural labourer are not great. At the same time it is very wonderful how those people do manage to keep out of the workhouse, and live with their friends, and not become chargeable. If you come to investigate the cases actually in the workhouse there is generally something wrong about them, the man has been intemperate, or something of that sort, but this is not so in every case.

5723. You are speaking of the people in the workhouse, but in your district the bulk of the relief is outside?—No doubt. As I said before, in really deserving cases when they have come to distress through no fault of their own, the guardians do give out-relief to them.

5724. I take it your criticism is really as to people inside the workhouses, and not so much those who receive relief outside?—I think that the people in the country districts are more thrifty than the people in the towns. I wish to make it very clear that one of our very great sources of pauperism at the present time is the reliance people place upon the out-door relief, rather than applying themselves to thrift.

5725. Is that the same with regard to the rural districts?—Not so much as in the towns; I think they are more thrifty in the rural districts.

Absence of genuinely able-bodied male paupers.

5726. On page 3 of your memorandum, in paragraphs 64, 65, and 66, which deal with able-bodied men, you practically agree that there are no able-bodied men chargeable in the workhouses?—I have given the actual figures here.

5727. There is generally something wrong, the term "able-bodied" means, really, people under 60, does not it?—The term "able-bodied" we get in the official return does mean people under sixty years of age. I think there has been a misunderstanding, so far as the returns are concerned, as to the number in the workhouses. The term "able-bodied" wants a little better definition in the return, I think.

Power of guardians to proceed against fathers of illegitimate children.

5728. Is the point cleared up as to whether the fathers of illegitimate children can be prosecuted?—I am a magistrate myself, and my impression is that the woman is the only person who can actually prosecute. There is not the least doubt about that, I think. The guardians take the initiative in a way, but they cannot do it unless the the woman is perfectly willing. The woman must make the application herself, but the guardians can support her.

5729. (*Mr. Nunn.*) For that to be so, the children must be under the maintenance of the guardians at the time, and that means that the woman must have made an application to the guardians?—That is so; then the guardians can proceed.

5730. That is what is meant in the Act by the children being chargeable?—Quite so.

5731. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Then I may take it that the guardians can prosecute?—Only with the consent of the

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

13 Mar. 1906.

woman herself, on the application of the woman. The guardians do frequently try, but the woman must take the initiative. The clerk of the guardians frequently works the case up, no doubt, and gets up all the evidence.

Improved nursing in workhouse infirmaries.

5732. You tell us at the bottom of that page that you do not now find cases of bedsores and neglected cases in charge of pauper inmates?—That is so.

5733. "And the nurse in charge ignorant of such cases because of the number under her care"?—I do not, of course, mean to say that we do not find any cases of bedsores, but what I mean is this—you do not find, as you found in the past, patients in the workhouse infirmary suffering from neglect, without the nurse's knowledge of it.

5734. Then it is a good thing that Mr. Chaplin issued his circular calling attention to all these things?—Which circular?

5735. The circular as to raising the tone of the workhouses and infirmaries generally, in which he said that people when they had to go in were to be properly taken care of?—I think when people go into workhouse infirmaries it does not matter what their past has been, one is entitled to as much consideration in nursing as the other. There is no distinction made in workhouse infirmaries between a person who had been thrifty and one who has not.

5736. It has been improved?—That does not apply to thrifty persons more than to others.

5737. Workhouse infirmaries did need improvement, and they have been considerably improved?—There have been great improvements in the workhouse infirmaries since the Nursing Order of 1897.

5738. That was necessary?—Yes, it was necessary. When I took over this district I found pauper nursing prevailing right through the district, to a very large extent in some cases. I remember seeing a man in a most wretched condition, suffering from terrible bedsores. The nurse knew nothing about it, and she excused herself by saying that she was sixty years of age and had eighty patients to look after.

5739. That is all done away with now?—Absolutely. You do not find cases of that sort now.

Number of paupers who could maintain themselves on old-age pensions.

5740. In regard to the inquiry of the Committee so far as the West Bromwich Workhouse was concerned, was not the result that there were very few people indeed who could go out and live on 5s. or 7s. a week?—There was not one, according to this report.

5741. At West Bromwich they have a large number of people living outside?—Yes.

5742. There is no reason why those should not receive old-age pensions?—If people in the workhouse did get old-age pensions, they are not sufficiently capable for their friends to look after them, or they have no friends.

5743. There are a large number of people in receipt of relief outside the workhouses who would be fit subjects for an old age pension?—They are practically getting it now.

5744. I know, but they are getting it at the cost of disfranchisement and loss of citizenship?—That is not so with regard to the women; they have not a vote yet. So far as the men are concerned, I suppose it does do that, but I do not think they mind it much.

5745. There are a large number of people now who are getting pensions, if you like, through the Poor Law, and they would be eligible under any scheme of old age pensions?—That may be so. I think that would be so.

5746. So the cost of the out-relief might be set against the cost of the pensions?—To some extent that would be so, no doubt.

Type of aged persons receiving out-relief.

5747. Do you think the aged people who are getting out-relief are a decent class generally?—A great many of them are, no doubt. I should not like to say that every case is, by any means.

5748. I mean the average; you could not tell me about every one, of course, but you see a number of these cases, do not you?—I see a great many that come to the relief committees.

Attitude of poor towards out-relief.

5749. Do you think it is so much want of thrift, and so much lowering of the *morale* of the men and women, that makes them take this out-relief, or is it that they look on it as a right, and as an old-age pension?—There is no doubt there has been a growing tendency to look upon it as a right, and not to exercise thrift because of that right.

5750. And to look upon it as an old-age pension?—They look upon it as a right to get outdoor relief.

5751. Do members of the boards of guardians look upon it in the light of an old-age pension they are giving people as a matter of right?—Not as a matter of right; certainly not. I do not think they do. I never heard them express anything about an old-age pension, but it is tantamount to that. I do not want to split straws. If you have a deserving case coming before you, and you do not order the workhouse, and are giving out-relief continually, it is a pension, no doubt. If you ask me that question, I think giving it through the poor law is a great protection against abuse.

Increased out-relief at Bristol with reduced pauperism.

5752. You call attention to the great increase in the number of out-relief paupers in the union of Walsall, but Mr. Phelps called your attention to the figures for Bristol. The rule has not held at Bristol, has it, that out-relief puts the other figures up? You have had a decrease of 3 per cent. there, and yet out-relief is 6,594 as against 2,777 indoor?—Yes. When you say it has not held, the Bristol guardians are in a very unsatisfactory position, as I explained yesterday; they have not sufficient workhouse accommodation to meet the requirements of the union.

5753. Still, pauperism is not increasing?—Bristol Union has been so recently enlarged it is difficult to form a comparison with the past. I am sorry not to give anything more definite, but I think you will see that answer is reasonable. The amount of out-relief is £41,000, for Lady Day, 1905, and that is tremendously heavy for any place.

Disciplinary checks on abuse of leave of absence from workhouses.

5754. With regard to the people who go out and get drunk, is it not possible under the present arrangements to deal with those?—In what direction do you mean?

5755. Has not the master power to stop leave and tobacco?—He stops tobacco, and he can stop leave; but a pauper can take his discharge. The master can refuse to give leave, but he cannot prevent the man taking his discharge after giving due notice.

5756. Do many of these old people when they go out take their discharge?—They do; if they cannot get leave they take their discharge, and go out for the day and come back at night.

5757. Would that be so in a considerable number of cases?—In a good many cases. It is a thing which masters of workhouses frequently complain to me about.

5758. From the bulk of the people he has power to withhold leave?—He has power to withhold leave, of course; if I am a pauper, and make application to you, as a master, you can give me leave to go outside, but if you refuse I can apply to the guardians.

5759. Do they give them tobacco in your district?—Very frequently.

5760. They can stop the tobacco?—They do, very often.

5761. There are other means of pulling people up?—Where you have a man addicted to drunkenness, as these people frequently are, the stopping of tobacco will not prevent it.

5762. We know that applies with regard to a number of people?—Yes; it does not apply to paupers only, but to a great many others, I am sorry to say.

Service Boys' Home at Bristol: Relief in aid of wages of boys learning trades.

5763. Could you tell us what the Service Boys' Home at Bristol really is?—The guardians felt that a good many of the boys going outside the workhouse would simply add to the number of the unskilled labourer type; therefore their idea was that, for the boys whom they adopted, the orphan boys, they should find a home for them for the first few years of their going out to work, so that they might be brought up in a trade. The wages they get in the first few years are not sufficient to keep them; therefore the guardians started a home which these boys might come to; and they contribute out of their earnings as they are able to do, according to the scale laid down in my memorandum. When they

earn sufficient wages to live on their own earnings, they go out from the home and make room for others. I think it is a most admirable thing.

5764. You think that has worked well?—It is working extremely well.

5765. You would like to see it extended?—I should like to see it extended. I was there a fortnight ago, and I was extremely pleased with the general tone of the boys.

5766. To what age would you keep the oversight of the lads?—It depends pretty much on the age the boy comes into the home. The oldest boy they had the other day was between seventeen and eighteen, I think.

5767. Is there any fixed time?—I should have to look that up to give an answer.

5768. It would be eighteen, I suppose?—A boy, if he likes, can take his discharge after the age of eighteen.

5769. Not if he is adopted?—I think eighteen is the age. That is the maximum age for detention.

Relief to children, sick, and aged not deterrent.

5770. We heard something yesterday about the condition of the paupers being less eligible than that of the independent labourer outside. With reference to the children, we are not able to carry that out, are we?—No.

5771. Neither are we with regard to the sick?—No.

5772. Nor with the old people?—In what way do you mean, less eligible?

5773. I mean in their surroundings, the food they have, the beds they sleep in, the clothes they wear, and their general conditions?—You mean able-bodied people?

5774. The able-bodied people I am leaving out altogether. I am thinking of children, sick people, and aged and infirm people. What I am asking you is, are the conditions under the Poor Law in your district less eligible than those of the independent labourer outside?—You mean, more consideration and better treatment?

5775. I mean they have a better time?—I think very many who come into the workhouse certainly do have a better time. It is much cleaner, and many of them get better clothing and less crowding.

5776. And that is so with regard to children especially?—It entirely depends on where the children have come from. The children of some widows may have had very comfortable homes before they came into the workhouse, but, on the other hand, you have children who have been absolutely neglected, and things are very much better for them. As I said in my evidence, I do not think the Dictary Order of 1900 has encouraged people into the workhouse by reason of the better dietary. May I turn to the table where I give the nursing returns, on page 4 of my Memorandum, because there is one matter which has escaped notice, which I would like to call attention to with regard to that. The Dietary Order was dated 1900, therefore the first experience of it was during 1901. If you will look at those figures you will see that for 1900 the number of pauper attendants in the infirmaries came to 315; from that time it gradually decreased until now it has come down to 175. There has been a gradual diminution ever since. It may be a matter of accident that it occurred immediately after the introduction of the Dietary Order, but I do not think it is. I think it should be ascribed very much to the fact that there is very much less beer given now than there used to be.

Effect of Dietary Order in reducing number of pauper attendants.

5777. You do not think these improvements have merely set up amongst the people a great desire to throw themselves upon the Poor Law?—No, I may say that if you get the cleanly, well-administered workhouse (people may call it a palace or whatever they like), where the bathing can be carried out properly, where the people can be put to work, where you have general cleanliness, which is a great point with this class of people, the workhouse does not attract. I have been much struck in regard to the new infirmaries that some of the people say they prefer the old to the new because of the general order and cleanliness of the thing generally in the new ones.

Unattractiveness of modern Poor Law institutions to certain classes of poor.

5778. (*Dr. Downes.*) In paragraph 140 of your Memorandum you favour the extension of the power to detain phthisical patients as a condition of their treatment by the guardians. Should you favour extended powers of detention to other classes of the indoor poor?—Yes. I think I should, decidedly—to those who go out for a day's leave or take their discharge and come back the worse for drink in the manner I have mentioned.

Need or increased power to detain various classes of paupers.

5779. Those of the inebriate class?—Yes.

5780. What do you say to the case of those who are often inebriate, the so-called in-and-out class?—I think that there might be power for longer detention than they have; at the present time that causes an immense amount of inconvenience. The in-and-out class is very much associated with the class you have just referred to.

5781. Taking the case of old people who cannot be looked after outside, or are living under bad conditions, have you any views with regard to extending the power to remove those people to the workhouse?—I quite agree it would be a very good thing if guardians had the power in cases of that sort, or if the magistrate, or some other authority, had the power to order cases of that sort into the workhouse; because the guardians do find cases of sick people, who refuse to come into the workhouse, living under the most horrible conditions. The only thing the guardians can do is to drop the out-relief altogether, which is a very hard thing to do, and they do not like to take the responsibility. There are many cases where the guardians would much prefer to have the cases removed to the infirmary rather than let the cases stay in their own surroundings.

Out-relief to phthisical patients

5782. Is much out-relief given to phthisical patients in your district?—There is a good deal given to phthisical patients. The general position is that the patient very often does not apply for out-door relief until the disease has got a considerable hold upon the person, and the disease keeps on increasing until the patient comes into the workhouse infirmary to die.

5783. And the patient may be living under conditions prejudicial to others?—It is very often the case. One is constantly struck with cases of phthisical people living in small rooms with children; and the guardians begin to realise the importance of it, they do their best to obviate it, and they sometimes say, "We can only give out-relief on condition that you sleep in a separate room, away from the rest of your family."

Co-operation of Guardians with nursing societies.

5784. What arrangements do the guardians generally make in your district with regard to nursing the outdoor sick?—In some cases they have arranged with local nursing societies, but not in many cases.

5785. That would perhaps be rather in the towns?—Yes, it is in the towns more especially.

Medical loan relief at Cirencester.

5786. Turning to Cirencester, I take it that their method of granting medical relief is quite a new one?—Quite; it has just come into operation.

5787. Do they propose to give it on loan in every case?—On loan in most cases, in the first instance.

5788. Have they any permanent list at Cirencester?—They have their regular call over; many of them are permanent.

5789. There is a class of case that the medical officer attends for a considerable period of time, without a new order being given?—Yes.

5790. That is provided for in the Consolidated Order and is known as the permanent class?—It is not the intention of the Guardians to grant medical relief on loan to these permanent cases.

Attendance of district medical officers at relief committees.

5791. Do any of your boards of guardians require the district medical officer to attend their meetings when they are revising their cases?—No, that is not the practice generally. Sometimes the medical officer attends, but I think I may say it is not the practice generally. If any case arises which raises doubts in the minds of the guardians, they very often ask the medical officer to report upon it.

Provision of drugs.

5792. Do the guardians find drugs in any of your unions?—In some two or three they do.

5793. Do they find all the drugs?—All the drugs in two or three unions.

Working of Relief to School Children Order at Bristol, &c.

5794. I suppose certain expensive drugs they find universally?—Yes.

5795. Have you had any experience under the Feeding of Children Order?—Yes, I have got facts up to the end of last year with regard to it, and the facts are these, as far

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

13 Mar. 1906.

as I can remember, speaking from memory. Up to the end of the year only fourteen cases of necessitous children were treated under the Order throughout the whole of my district, and, of the fourteen, twelve were at Bristol. I do not mean to say that at Bristol there was not a number of applications made. There was a considerable number of applications. I think there were seventy-four cases in the first instance and fifty-five cases came afterwards; up to the week before last no case has been received since January; but of the whole cases investigated in Bristol, referred to the guardians from the education authority, after investigation only twelve were found to be necessitous. I do not want to cast any reflection whatever on the education authority, because they have not the power of investigating the cases. I very well remember the first instance that occurred. I happened to be present at the meeting of the guardians when the first application under the Order came up, and, although I cannot perhaps give the actual words, the conversation was to this effect. The man advanced to the table and said, "I do not know why I am called before you, gentlemen; I have always been a very respectable man, and I call it a great insult to send the relieving officer to my house and say that my child is not properly fed; it is always properly fed." I said, "How is it, then, that your child came to be reported as a necessitous child under the Order?" He said, "My child went to school, and the schoolmistress said, 'All you children who want more food hold up your hands,' and that is how my child came to be reported." It is only fair to say that I have not heard the schoolmistress's version. Out of the seventy-four applications made, only one was found to be necessitous. Of course the school authorities have not power to investigate. I do not know whether I am going out of my province in giving my own ideas about it, but I think if the school authorities are to give the food to the children it should be by payment, and if there are any cases in which, in the opinion of the school authorities, the parents cannot afford to pay, I think that payment should be made through the guardians, because one cannot help feeling that the feeding of children, however necessary it may be, without any payment from the parents themselves, is a form of out-door relief, and I consider that all outdoor relief should come from one authority. If you have more than one authority, you will have various influences at work, and it will be very detrimental.

5796. (*Mr. Nunn.*) You said that the proportion was 1 in 74 at one board of guardians?—I speak from memory, but I believe the number was seventy-four on the first application.

5797. Have you the total number corresponding to the figure of twelve?—Yes, 129.

5798. Did the guardians prosecute the parents in those twelve cases?—I have no information on that point. It is very difficult to prosecute them in the County Court and recover the money; it is a costly business.

5799. I am anxious to hear how such prosecutions turned out?—I hope to get information on the point.

5800. (*Mr. Bentham.*) There are some prosecutions on record, are there not?—I have not heard of any, but there may be.

Cases sent by Hospitals to Poor Law nfirmaries.

5801. (*Dr. Downes.*) In paragraph 80 of your memorandum you refer to the fact that the public hospitals now send cases to the workhouse infirmaries, which, in former days, would have been retained?—That is so.

5802. Have you any separate infirmaries in your district?—No.

5803. Do those hospitals send the cases to the infirmaries of the unions in which the hospitals are situated?—Yes.

5804. Although the cases may have come from some other part of the district?—No; I think most of the cases I have come across are cases which would come within the union.

5805. They are chargeable to the union?—Yes, I think so.

5806. In what way are they admitted?—An application is made to the relieving officer.

Burial insurance of paupers.

5807. Have you any experience of the practice of insuring paupers for burial?—Yes; a great deal of that goes on in some parts of Staffordshire.

5808. Is Stoke in your district?—No.

5809. It is in Mr. Dansey's district, is it not?—I think so.

5810. Have you any facts that you could give us with regard to that?—No; I have only my own observation of the cases. You will find a good many cases at Wolverhampton, for instance. The Wolverhampton medical officer called my attention to it there.

5811. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you mean they are insured by the relatives or by the guardians?—By the relatives.

5812. (*Dr. Downes.*) Have you any information as to whether the practice of burial by friends in the case of a person dying in a Poor Law institution is increasing? I have no information on the point. I have no reason to suppose it is increasing.

5813. Nor as to the reverse?—No, I have not.

Suitability of Evesham for small holdings.

5814. With reference to the condition of things at Evesham, the Evesham valley, I think, is exceptionally favourable for small holdings of that description?—Yes; it is protected; the climate is suitable for the growth entirely.

5815. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) For fruit-growing small holdings?—Yes.

5816. It is not more suitable for other kinds of culture; the special thing at Evesham is fruit, is not it?—That is so, and vegetables.

5817. (*Dr. Downes.*) I will put it in that form if you like. I take it you mean it is specially suitable for the kind of culture which is carried on at Evesham?—Yes.

5818. It is market gardening and fruit growing?—Yes. If you take the Cotswold Hills, you could not have the same sort of thing going on up there because the soil is not suitable, nor would the climate be suitable for it.

5819. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) It means you could not grow the same kind of crop there, does it not?—It does.

5820. (*Dr. Downes.*) Have you any experience that you could give us as to the relation of wages to the manner of the administration of relief in any of the unions in your district?—In what way do you mean?

Out-relief in aid of wages.

5821. Could you tell us whether you find that a strict administration of outdoor relief, as compared with a lax administration of outdoor relief, has had any effect, in your experience, upon the wages of that district?—No, I cannot say that. I have come across and called attention to cases where out-door relief has been given and the recipient has been in employment outside, which I think has operated in lesser wages being given than otherwise would be the case. I have had to call attention to that in some cases.

Complaints of workhouse inmates to inspectors.

5822. In going round the workhouses, do you from time to time have complaints made to you by the inmates?—Very frequently.

5823. What do they chiefly relate to?—They are so very various. Sometimes it is that some of the inmates quarrel with some of the rest of the inmates; sometimes they are complaints against the officials. Sometimes they are complaints that they are overworked. In the case of the new workhouse at Wolverhampton, I found, when they removed from the old workhouse to the new, that they complained bitterly. One fellow over six feet high said he would sooner go to gaol than stop there and work. Sometimes it is with regard to their feeding; sometimes about the general arrangements of the house, and so forth; sometimes quarrels amongst themselves, and sometimes against the alleged treatment by officials. I am bound to say, in the cases I have investigated (and I investigate every case where there are any *bona fides* about it) with regard to the officials, I have very seldom found the complaints at all substantiated. I may say this: that my principle is that, when I inspect a workhouse and am going round, I require all the officials to leave the dormitories or the room I am in when I ask the question whether there are any complaints to be made, so that every inmate has an absolute opportunity of making a complaint. It is only right, when a complaint is made against an official, that the official should know that a complaint has been made. It requires great discretion, and one must exercise discretion accordingly with regard to it.

5824. Do you get many complaints with regard to classification ?—I do get complaints, but not to the extent that one would expect. I find that the inmates have a knack of classifying themselves very much. In some of the smaller workhouses I have complaints where the day rooms are very crowded. One or two may complain about the associations, but not to the extent that one would expect.

Charities at Bristol and elsewhere.

5825. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I believe there are very large endowed charities in Bristol, are there not ?—I believe there are.

5826. Do they co-operate at all with the guardians ?—I am not aware of any actual co-operation.

5827. The guardians would not send any especially good case up to them ?—I can hardly answer the question, because I do not attend the meetings very frequently. I have no personal knowledge of it.

5828. Are there other places in your district with very large charities ?—There are charities, of course, in Gloucester and Cheltenham. I am a churchwarden of the Parish Church at Cheltenham, and I have to dispense charities there once a year.

5829. The charities in Bristol would be quite enough to meet all the aged deserving cases, if they applied to them ?—I cannot say that. I could not say what the amount would be.

5830. It may be worth inquiring into ?—There is a Charity Organisation Society which works very diligently in Bristol.

Women wage earners and relief to them at Bristol and elsewhere.

5831. Is there chain making in your district ?—Yes; very much so in Wolverhampton and Dudley.

5832. That employs a great number of women ?—I am not conversant with the actual details of it.

5833. You cannot tell me whether they work there for very low wages, or whether they are in receipt of out-relief ?—A person working at the chain works would not be in the receipt of out-relief. A person would be strictly able-bodied if they did that kind of work.

5834. But very often able-bodied women are in receipt of relief. Is the straw-plaiting industry in your district?—I think not to any great extent.

5835. Can you tell me of any other women's industry ?—If you take Bristol, there are the large tobacco works there, and Fry's chocolate works, and then there is a great deal of dressmaking and millinery, bootmaking. There the paper-bag making, and so on. There are also women's industries in other parts of the district.

5836. You do not know whether the guardians are in the habit, in your district, of supplementing women's earnings ?—They do in certain cases. I have known cases of that sort; as I said just now, I have had to call attention sometimes to the fact that the guardians are sometimes really supplementing wages, but I cannot say that this is to any great extent.

5837. In the slack season, if women are out of work, would they give them relief ?—If the guardians had the case of a young woman come before them, and they were very satisfied with her case, they would do the best they could for her in the way of giving relief in kind, perhaps they would not desire to force a respectable person into the workhouse. You may take it generally that the guardians do not desire to force them into workhouses to make them paupers.

5838. They do not think that the employer ought to pay her enough to keep her all the year round ?—No, they could not do that. Do you mean when there is no work going on ?

5839. That they should pay her sufficient wages during the busy season to keep her in the slack season ?—That would be a case of supply and demand; I am afraid the guardians have no voice in the matter.

5840. I am afraid it is a question of Poor Law relief, myself ?—I have no definite information on that point

5841. Do any of your unions use Case Papers ?—No, they have not adopted that system.

Causes of unemployment of men over 50.

5842. (*Mr. Chandler*). In paragraph 82, as a result of your inquiries from guardians and employers of labour and relieving officers, you are able to state some very definite reasons which, in your opinion, account for the older men being more frequently cast upon the rates through want of employment ?—Yes. I think I said yesterday, with regard to that, that I had ascertained from the relieving officers that if a man over fifty years of age once lost his situation by reason of incapacity for work or intemperance, it was exceedingly difficult for him to find work again. When I go to the workhouses (and this is especially so in Staffordshire) I hear complaints from the inmates, and when I ask them as to the reason why they are there, they do say they are there because of the Employers' Liability Act; but it is fair to say that when one comes to question them, it is generally through some fault of their own.

5843. In paragraph 83 you state a very different cause as to why men over fifty years of age are out of employment, namely, that some will not work under a certain wage ?—Yes.

5844. Is that opinion also the result of inquiries on your part from employers of labour ?—It is from statements to me by the men themselves.

5845. Would they be agricultural labourers ?—No. For instance, the particular case I have mentioned there was a miner; another case that I came across was that of a vermin-trap maker; and so on.

5846. It is an opinion you have formed from casual remarks and statements made to you by men who come under your eye ?—Yes. I do not say it is the case, to any great extent; but it is a thing one has to meet occasionally.

5847. The amount in this case, £1 a week, would probably be less than miners receive ?—Probably. In certain mines a cutter or hewer of coal would get more than that; but a young man driving on the roads, horses, and so on, would get less than that. It would be below the average, generally.

Effect of Workmen's Compensation Act.

5848. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the Workmen's Compensation Act I notice the discrepancy between your figures and Mr. Booth's arises from the question of cost and numbers; you, under the increase of pauperism, consider the cost of pauperism ?—Yes.

5849. And Mr. Booth considers the number of paupers ?—Yes.

5850. What I meant when I asked you whether the Workmen's Compensation Act had actually increased the number of paupers was, that I see by consulting Mr. Booth's figures, which deal with numbers and not with cost, that those unions in which pauperism has most increased happen to be the unions outside the Workmen's Compensation Act; that five out of seven are agricultural and shipping, and only two are manufacturing and mining; and that even in Walsall, which is one of those which have increased, I think a good deal of the employment is outside the Workmen's Compensation Act, because it is in workshops and not in factories ?—Very likely, it may be so; I am not prepared to say it is not so. I simply mention the fact, which is a very important fact, that these statements have been made to me, and no doubt it is true, as I find from the relieving officers and employers of labour as well, that if a man loses the capacity for work or loses his character when he is over fifty years of age, it is difficult to get on again; but if the man is a diligent and reliable man, it is only right to say that the employers, whoever they are, keep him on as long as they can.

Reluctance of Guardians to provide new buildings.

5851. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You have had a good deal of experience in your district with regard to buildings ?—A certain amount.

5852. Have you found the guardians at all inclined to excessive expenditure in relation to buildings ?—No, I have found quite the contrary, I find the guardians are exceedingly reluctant to go into expense with regard to buildings.

5853. Consequently, when you yourself thought an additional building was required, you have had to exercise a good deal of persuasion with the guardians to secure its being provided ?—That is so.

Out-relief unions, their formation and effect.

5854. I do not think it is quite clear to the Commission what is the precise position of out-relief unions. They have been formed, have they not, by county councils under Section 58 of the Local Government Act, 1888, and Section 36 (*b*) of the Local Government Act, 1894 ?—They are.

Mr. Edward Bestbridge Wethered.

13 Mar. 1906.

5855. Taking your particular case, the Keynsham Union was divided into two out-relief unions, was it not, by a joint committee of the county councils of Gloucester and Somerset?—I believe that was so.

5856. The object being to get each portion of the union which was in the particular county made a separate union for out-door relief purposes?—It was before my time; I think that very likely was the case, but I cannot say definitely.

5857. If you look at Section 58 of the Act of 1888, you will see it contemplates that the part of the union in a particular county shall be formed into a separate union?—That is so.

5858. The two out-relief unions being, as it were, combined to form a joint union for the purposes of management of the workhouse and any other matters for which it is essential they should be one; such, for instance, as assessment?—That is so. That was confirmed by an order afterwards, I think.

5859. It required confirmation by the Local Government Board, but they were bound to confirm it unless there was objection raised to it?—Quite so.

5860. You are not very favourable, I gather, from what you said yesterday, to out-relief unions?—I am not.

5861. Would you a little expand your objection to them?—My criticism on that point is chiefly that in this case there are three clerks engaged to this one union, and it is difficult to get returns and information from it, not because they are unwilling, but because of the complication of having to go through the clerk of the guardians, as well as to get the information from the out-relief unions. I do not think the administration has suffered in any way: there is no evidence that it has.

5862. Does it make any difference in the administration?—I have no evidence that it does. The county interests are not always identical in the two counties.

5863. For the purpose of outdoor relief it would not make much difference?—I do not think so.

Separate provision for sane epileptics.

5864. In paragraph 30 of your memorandum you deal with sane epileptics. You say it is unfortunate that they are often mixed up with other inmates. Have you any proposal as to what you would do with those cases? Would you take them out of the workhouse altogether, or what would you do with them?—I should not remove them from the care of the guardians; but I think the proper thing to do is to have a combination of unions to treat them separately, similar to what is proposed at Aston and Birmingham. That is not in my own district, but during my colleague's illness I had to do with that matter, as you will remember.

5865. So that your plan would be to have a voluntary combination between the guardians?—Yes.

5866. And put up one colony for these cases?—Yes. I am sure association with the other imbeciles has a very bad effect upon them.

Retention of imbeciles in workhouse.

5867. Would your theory with regard to imbeciles be that it is better they should be taken out of the workhouse, or are you, on the whole, in favour of their remaining?—I think there is this to be said about it: no doubt there are a certain class of imbeciles, of the very worst type, that perhaps might be better out; but, taking the capable imbeciles in the workhouses, my impression is that they are very happy: they are the happiest class of inmates of the workhouses, and they are extremely useful in doing the work. I do not know what some of the smaller workhouses would do if it were not for the capable weak-minded inmates. They are very happy; they work; and they do not seem to me to interfere with the comfort of the other inmates.

Suitability of existing Poor Law areas.

5868. Are the unions generally, in your own district, of the proper size, or do you think they are too small and their area might with advantage be extended?—I have one case in my mind where I think the union might be done away with; but it is hardly fair to mention it, perhaps. I would say this: that there is an idea about, I know, that people would be better in bigger workhouses and fewer of them; but I would like to say decidedly that my impression is that in country districts the people are very much happier in smaller workhouses than in larger ones. They are not accustomed to being with a large number of people, and they are more happy and contented in smaller workhouses than they would be in going a long distance away, and being with a larger number of people.

5869. The chairman of one of the boards of guardians in your district has suggested to the Commission that there should be larger areas, and one has proposed that the county council should administer the Poor Law?—I think a county council has quite enough to attend to at the present time.

5870. Even apart from that, would you think it desirable, in the interests of the poor themselves, that there should be so large an area as a county as the unit of administration for Poor Law purposes?—If you were going to begin *de novo* that point would be worth consideration, but considering you have the workhouses built and the unions laid out, I question whether it would be desirable to so revolutionise matters as to begin on that principle. If you began *de novo*, as I say, that would be a different thing altogether.

Infrequency of medical loan relief.

5871. You have told us about the medical relief in the Cirencester Union; have you any other case in your district where medical relief is given by loan?—No, that is the only one.

Detention of bibulous inmates.

5872. In paragraph 122 you state some difficulty about the inmates going out and getting intoxicated. Do you think guardians require generally greater powers of detention in workhouses than they have now?—Yes, I think so, with that class of inmate.

5873. Would you give a powers of detention which would depend on behaviour; is that your view?—Yes, I think I would leave it to the discretion of the guardians.

5874. Within certain limits?—Yes. The habitually drunken class, no doubt, would be much better in inebriate homes, away from other inmates; but it is better not to multiply institutions if it can be avoided.

Visitation of children boarded out within and without the Union.

5875. In paragraph 130 you deal with cases boarded out within the union. Where the guardians have children boarded out in the union, is there any committee that visits them; a committee of the guardians, not a boarding-out committee?—Sometimes. Sometimes it is only done by the relieving officers.

5876. The relieving officer visits once a quarter?—Yes.

5877. And the medical officer visits how often?—He must go once a quarter, and oftener if necessary. He reports once a quarter.

5878. So that these children are visited at the present time?—Yes, they are.

5879. They are in a different position, are they not, from children boarded out outside the union, because when they are boarded out outside the union, the guardians themselves or their officers cannot visit them?—That is quite right.

5880. Therefore it is, is it not, that they have been placed under Government inspection, or rather that the committees have been placed under Government inspection?—Yes.

5881. So that it shall be ascertained that the work is properly done?—That is so.

5882. In paragraph 137 you refer to the Bath case, where there is special provision made for cases of tuberculosis?—Yes.

Special provision for phthisical cases.

5883. Has the fact that such provision has been made proved at all attractive in the way of cases of tuberculosis being admitted which otherwise would not have been the subject of application for relief?—I think there has been less reluctance to go there, as far as I can judge.

5884. You would not carry it further than that?—I cannot carry it further than that. I have spoken to the people who are being treated, and, no doubt, if some of those people had not been there, they would have been in their homes in Bath, or in the union, and spreading the disease; and they expressed themselves as quite content there. As soon as the disease is arrested, there is a tendency to discharge themselves; they think when it is arrested it is cured; but it is a totally different thing altogether.

Exercise of Overseers' power to give relief.

5885. Have there been any cases within your knowledge in your district where overseers have given relief?—Very few.

5886. Is it the case that it is very rarely done nowadays?—It is very rarely done.

5887. Even in rural districts, if the overseer ceased to have power to give relief, would any ill results arise?—I do not think they would.

5888. You think the relieving officer is sufficiently near at hand to prevent danger arising in cases of sudden and urgent necessity?—What I go on is the fact that it is so seldom exercised. It is exercised occasionally, and I do not think their having the power does any harm.

Number of unmarried inmates in workhouses and reasons therefor.

I think it is sometimes useful, undoubtedly, but it is so seldom exercised that I do not know that any very great amount of suffering would arise from its ceasing. There is one point which has not been mentioned in my examination I should like to refer to. I have statistics here which I think are important as bearing on the question of pauperism, and that is the number of unmarried people in workhouses. I have given the figures in my memorandum, and they are very striking. If you come to take inmates of the workhouses, you find a large proportion of the men are single. A considerable number are widowers, but a still larger proportion have never married at all. This is a fact which is I think worthy of being taken into consideration.

5889. (*Chairman*). And the women?—Yes, but not to such an extent as the men.

5890. I think you rather infer, do not you, that a union of two tends to keep each longer out of the workhouse than if they were alone?—I do not say that marriage is an antidote to pauperism; I do not suggest that for a moment, but I simply mention the fact, which is the fact I have stated here, and I think it is a fact which ought to be considered.

5891. (*Mrs. Bosanquet*). Is this information based on the statements of the men alone?—The statements are known to be correct.

5892. How were they known to be correct?—The relieving officers know most about the cases, and the masters as well.

5893. I know in common lodging-houses and shelters the men are always single, according to their own statement, but it simply means they have deserted their wives?—I do not think I am mistaken about this, because I have gone into it so very carefully.

5894. (*Mr. Nunn*). Are these figures exhaustive of the adults in the workhouses in question?—The figures I have given here are typical.

5895. For each workhouse are they exhaustive?—For the ones mentioned they give all.

5896. There are no deserted wives in any of these workhouses?—I do not say that.

5897. You have not brought out that figure?—No, I wish I had; I will bear that in mind.

5898. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield*). Do you mean to infer in paragraph 85 that the fact that a man has no surroundings and no particular interests outside makes him drift to the workhouse more readily?—There is a less tendency to exercise thrift himself, there are no home ties of any sort, and there is a tendency to drift away gradually.

5899. To a certain extent he gets more companionship inside than outside?—He does not go into the workhouse willingly; he goes in because the guardians will not give him outdoor relief.

5900. He would feel it less; he would go in, I fancy, more readily?—I do not know; he does not like going in.

5901. These single men?—They are not as a rule deserving men. They are men whose characters will not generally bear investigation; if they are, they are persons who have no friends outside, no grown up family who can look after them, and they are not able to look after themselves.

5902. (*Mr. Booth*). Do the figures for married men and women refer to couples?—They are not all couples.

5903. They are men and women taken together?—Yes.

Paupers' burial insurance by relatives.

5904. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Some of those would be the deserted wives?—Yes, some of those would be.

5905. (*Chairman.*) What is the object of a family insuring the life of a pauper in the workhouse?—The alleged object is to find means of burial. Whether there is another motive I do not know, and I am not prepared to say.

5906. Do you know if the insurance exceeds the cost of burial?—It entirely depends on the cost of burial. What one so often finds in cases of this sort is, that the widow whose husband is insured spends the greater portion of what she receives over the funeral and black clothes. I know many cases of it.

5907. The relative pays the premiums?—The man may have insured his own life.

5908. How can a pauper pay?—He may have been insured before he came in.

5909. And the family pays afterwards?—Yes, they keep it up.

5910. There are no cases of relatives taking out a policy on the life of a man after he has gone into the workhouse?—I have heard of cases of that sort; my attention has been drawn to them. A medical officer once called my attention to cases, where the relatives came to him and asked him to fill up the paper.

5911. The inference would be that if the relatives could pay the premiums on the pauper's life they could assist the pauper?—That is quite a proper deduction to draw from it.

5912. (*Mr. Nunn*). The premium would be a very small sum weekly?—Yes.

Mr. Richard Ingram Dansey, called; and Examined.

Extent and character of district.

5913. (*Chairman.*) You are a general inspector under the Local Government Board, and I believe your district, which comprises forty-one unions, embraces the counties of Salop and Chester, North Staffordshire, the unions of Leominster, Weobley, and Kington in Herefordshire, Tenbury in Worcestershire, and Ashbourne in Derbyshire?—Yes.

5914. I have your memorandum, which we will take as your evidence-in-chief; but I propose to direct your attention to one or two points in it. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XII.) Your district is, in the main, agricultural, but it contains also, does it not, semi-urban and some industrial districts?—It is nearly all rural, except in the Staffordshire pottery district and one or two towns like Birkenhead.

Pauperism in Atcham union.

5915. I see there is a very great difference in the proportions of pauperism in the different unions. You yourself in your memorandum call attention to the administration of Atcham; I believe Sir Baldwyn Leighton a great many years ago applied very strict rules of administration to that union?—He did.

5916. And that policy has been continued, I understand?—Not quite so strictly, I think, in later years.

5917. But the result, tested by the amount of relief given, is satisfactory, is it not?—I think, as regards the pauperism in the district, it is fairly satisfactory, and also as regards the cost per head of population.

Comparison of conditions in unions with highest and lowest rate of pauperism in the district.

5918. Mr. Booth has kindly supplied the Commission with an analysis of the proportions of pauperism to population in every one of the unions in your district. If you will look at his list you will see that the three highest unions, namely, Kington, Stafford and Madeley, have a ratio of pauperism of 3·7, 3·4 and 3·3 respectively. Then, if you go to the bottom of the list, you will see that the three lowest unions are Oleobury Mortimer which is 1·4, Atcham which is also 1·4, and Bucklow which is 1·2. Looking at these three unions at the top and these three unions at the bottom of Mr. Booth's list, I find there is in each class one apparently urban district, namely, Madeley and Bucklow: you would call them urban districts, would you not?—Bucklow is partly urban and partly rural; there is a good deal of rural in Bucklow.

5919. Stafford and Atcham are semi-rural, are they not?—Except for the town of Stafford and the town of Shrewsbury, they are entirely rural.

5920. So they would counterbalance one another for the purpose of comparison?—Yes.

Mr. Richard Ingram Dansey.

13 Mar. 1906.

5921. Then Kington is a rural union as against Cleobury Mortimer?—Yes.

5922. You, therefore, have six unions, two typical of rural districts, two typical of semi-rural districts, and two typical of urban districts, and yet the pauperism in one group of three is twice, if not three times, as great as it is in the other group of three. Could you suggest any industrial conditions which exist in either group which would explain this enormous difference or do you attribute it to administration?—The Kington union comprises a great many parishes in Radnorshire, and a large area of those parishes consists of moorland and very poor land; so that a relieving officer's district there has to be very wide, and the relief has not been administered in that union on very strict rules till lately. In the Kington union the guardians have now adopted a set of by-laws for their guidance, and the relief has been going down.

5923. Taking the two rural unions, and contrasting Kington and Cleobury Mortimer, I gather from your answer that the difference is due mainly to administration?—Yes. The Cleobury union was always administered on strict principles. They had an excellent chairman there for a good many years—Mr. Baldwyn Childe, who was vicar of Cleobury. Under his guidance the pauperism was very greatly reduced. The guardians have always acted very much upon the same lines since.

5924. Is there anything, so far as you know, from an industrial point of view or an agricultural point of view, to justify the remarkable difference between the amount of pauperism in these two unions?—Nothing, except in the administration. The area of Kington is a great deal larger than the area of Cleobury Mortimer. The area of Cleobury Mortimer is 52,729 acres, and there is one relieving officer for the union, while the area of one relieving officer's district in Kington is 65,533 acres, mostly hill land, and it would be more difficult for him to visit the paupers and see how they are going on, and to judge of the varying circumstances of each case.

5925. I understood you to say that part of the Kington union was in Radnorshire; in the rural districts of Wales, outdoor relief prevails to a considerable extent, does it not?—I believe it does.

5926. Coming back to my question, there is nothing that you can suggest to explain away this remarkable difference, except administration, is there?—I am not aware of anything.

5927. Then we will next take the semi-rural unions of Atcham and Stafford; Atcham includes Shrewsbury, and Stafford includes the town of Stafford, I think?—Yes.

5928. The conditions in each would rather resemble one another, would they not?—Shoemaking is the principal trade in Stafford, and that has been certainly not good; I may say it has been bad, for a considerable number of years. In the town of Shrewsbury there is no staple trade; it is purely an agricultural town. You will find also as regards relief districts, that in Stafford there is only one relieving officer for the whole of the union, and he has somewhere near 400 cases on his books; while in Atcham the districts are small and the relieving officers, instead of having hundreds of cases, only have somewhere under thirty.

5929. You mean each relieving officer in that case?—Yes, I think you will find it so. I have got the particulars of the relief districts here, and I see that in Stafford the relieving officer had, at the end of the year, 385 cases on his books.

5930. (*Mr. Phelps.*) By cases do you mean families, not individuals?—He had 653 individuals on his books and 385 cases; the area of his district was 52,634 acres and the population 31,302. There is only one relieving officer for that union. In Atcham there are three relieving officers, and the highest number of cases in any district there was twenty-nine; two officers had twenty-nine cases each and the third had twenty-six cases. The areas were large. One relieving officer had an area of 64,900 acres, another 53,194 acres, and the third, whose district comprised Shrewsbury town, had 8,366 acres; the population was in one case 10,321, in another case 8,722, and in the district of Shrewsbury town 30,397, but even in that district with a population of 30,000 odd the relieving officer had only twenty-nine cases on his books.

5931. (*Chairman.*) Are the boards of guardians in these two unions comprised of about the same number of guardians, or is there a larger board in the one as compared with the other?—The number of guardians is somewhere near the same in Stafford and Shrewsbury, as far as I can remember. Of course, it is very seldom that they all attend, and I am speaking of the average number of guardians one meets at the board. For Atcham there are 52 elected guardians and for Stafford 46.

5932. Should you say that in both cases the number of guardians was not in excess of business necessities?—They were not at all in excess.

5933. Now let us come to the two urban districts, Madeley, and Bucklow (which is outside Stockport). Are there any industrial conditions there which would explain the remarkable difference in the amount of relief given?—Bucklow is a good deal more of a rural character than Madeley, and it has a large area.

5934. It adjoins the Stockport union, I think?—It adjoins Stockport on one side.

5935. You would not call it an urban union then?—I do not think we could fairly call it an urban union. It comprises several small towns, Knutsford, Wilmslow, Altringham, Sale, and so on. Madeley is distinctly a mining district; the Colebrook Dale works are there, and there are coal and iron works there. As regards Madeley, the trade was very bad a year ago, and two or three works had to close altogether, which threw a great number of men out of employment; some of them came on to the books of the guardians, and some were relieved by private subscriptions outside.

5936. I see there has been a great increase there; in the last ten years the pauperism has nearly doubled?—Yes, but it is going down again now. Madeley used to be administered on very strict lines. Colonel Anstice was chairman in those times, and Mr. Layton Lowndes before him. Since Colonel Anstice has left, things have not been managed so strictly as they were before. There has been a good deal of distress in Madeley—much more distress than there ever has been in Bucklow; and what there was, was much more keenly felt than it would be in Bucklow, which is, I think, a richer union.

5937. Taking these six unions, would you say that the remarkable difference in the percentage of pauperism, to population was largely due to administration?—Yes. I may safely say it is largely due to it, especially in the rural unions; but when, speaking of Madeley, I would always have regard to the exceptional distress it has undergone of late years.

5938. Is it a mining and iron district?—It has mining and iron and pottery works.

Effect of strict policy as to out-relief.

5939. It is alleged sometimes that in those districts which are strictly administered there is temporary distress and hardship inflicted on those to whom outdoor relief is refused, and they possibly migrate to other unions. As you have in your district a certain number of unions which are, in the technical term, strictly administered, and others which are more laxly administered, have you been able in any way to ascertain whether strict administration does inflict hardship or drive the paupers out of one union into another?—It has been alleged several times, and I have examined into one or two cases, but I have never been able to substantiate it at all.

5940. Therefore, strict administration does not produce the hardship which is suggested, and which at first sight might seem to some minds to be probable?—I have never found it so.

5941. But it calls into existence moral forces which enable the district to support its own poor without outside help?—I think there is no doubt that where the workhouse test is offered, it often calls out people who are friends of the applicant for relief but who are not strictly liable in law; they come to help him, as they will not have the applicant sent to the workhouse.

5942. Is being sent to the workhouse generally considered in your district to be a stigma?—Yes. It is the reverse with out-relief.

Attitude of poor toward out-relief.

5943. Do they look upon out-relief as something that they are entitled to?—Yes. I am afraid a good many poor people look at it as a matter of right. They say,

"We have paid rates for so many years; therefore, we ought to have out-relief."

5944. Apparently the general tendency in your district has been to keep the pauperism somewhat level?—There has not been any large fluctuation.

Objections to over large districts for relieving officers and to pay stations.

5945. You have a strong opinion, I gather, as to the necessity of appointing an adequate number of relieving officers?—I think it is most important. I have very little confidence myself in pay stations. I do not see how we can do away with pay stations altogether; but where a relieving officer has such a large district that he cannot visit the paupers in their own homes, he is obliged to pay the greater part of his relief at the pay stations. At those pay stations it very frequently happens that the applicants for relief do not themselves appear, but they often appear through a messenger who takes the relief for a neighbourhood or a district, receiving I have no doubt (though I have no facts enabling me to say so positively) a penny in the shilling, or something like that, for doing it. Therefore, the relieving officer often does not see the applicant at all. I had a case which came before me not long ago, where the relieving officer had been paying relief at the pay station to a person for a considerable time, but it was found out that during the last eight months that man was not living in the union at all; the relief had been entirely received by relatives at the pay station, and the relieving officer had not seen the man.

5946. That would be an extreme case, I presume, and one not likely to occur often?—I happened to be at a meeting at a country union, and I asked the relieving officer when he had seen a certain case. He hesitated. I said, "Have you seen it in the last fortnight?" "No, sir." "The last month?" He could not quite say. "Are you sure you have seen it within the last year?" "I could not say so." In the application and report book he had put down that he had visited the case in the last week; but he had been paying relief the whole year and he had never seen that pauper.

Efficiency of relieving officers.

5947. Are you satisfied as a rule with the status and capacity of the relieving officer?—As a rule I am. We have had one or two who were not quite honest, but they were exceptions. We have got some excellent officers.

Adoption by Guardians of regulations for granting relief.

5948. In paragraph 24 of your memorandum you make a suggestion as regards the by-laws relating to outdoor administration; would you suggest that model by-laws should be issued to every board of guardians, or would you suggest that some by-laws that have proved to be effective in other unions should be made the general standard?—What I have always advised boards of guardians to do who have not got by-laws is to get by-laws from unions where they have proved to be effective, and pick out those which they think might be suitable to their own union. There are plenty of by-laws now which the guardians are able to adopt if they think proper. I do not think I would go so far as to say that the Local Government Board should issue a set of model by-laws.

5949. You would prefer to have something that has proved effective?—I think so—some that they know of in their own immediate district.

5950. Have the guardians responded to your suggestion by looking up the by-laws of neighbouring unions?—Yes, I think they have a good deal. We have not got many unions who go upon by-laws. I think I have only got fourteen unions who have written by-laws. There are several unions who originally adopted by-laws, but I am afraid they have been disused.

5951. Would it be advisable that every board of guardians should have by-laws?—I think so.

5952. Take the three highest unions in Mr. Booth's list—have Kington, Stafford, and Madeley by-laws?—Kington are acting now upon by-laws. Madeley in their returns have not sent me any by-laws, and I think they are acting more upon precedents than upon by-laws. Stafford have got by-laws.

5953. Then there are the three unions at the bottom of that list—Cleobury Mortimer, Actham and Bucklow; have they by-laws?—Atcham have got by-laws. Cleobury have not got any written by-laws, and they act more upon precedents than upon by-laws. I do not think they have any written by-laws at Bucklow.

5954. Turning to the children, there is only one workhouse school in your district now, I think?—Only one.

5955. Do you approve of the system of the guardians boarding-out children—we will take within the unions first?—Yes, to a certain extent. I do not think it answers where a Board of Guardians pass a resolution to board-out all the children that they legally can; but if they only board-out the children for whom they can get suitable homes, then I think it does answer. But if they all at once ask for thirty or forty homes, I think they are very apt to get homes of an inferior class. In almost every union there are a certain number of suitable homes and foster-parents with whom children could with great advantage be boarded-out—I mean within the limits of the union; but even then I would strongly advocate the formation of voluntary committees to look after those children.

Boarding-out of children within the union.

5956. Then effective inspection is in your judgment essential for the proper carrying out of the scheme?—Yes, it is essential. Now, without committees, the inspection is entrusted to the relieving officer once a quarter, and to the medical officer once a quarter, and to any individual guardian in the parish and neighbourhood.

5957. So the work may be very perfunctorily performed?—It is anybody's business and nobody's. In the case of a girl, I am afraid it is nobody's unless the guardian happens to be a lady, and that is rarely the case; I mean to say, a relieving officer cannot properly go and inspect a girl who is boarded-out and examine her clothing, bedding, and so on.

5958. Have there been any cases of ill usage which have come under your notice?—Not of late years. There was a case in the Nantwich union where two or three children were badly used by the foster-parents, but that was a good many years ago.

5959. Of course if there is anything like an advertisement from the guardians asking for anybody to come and take those children, the inducement in a good many cases would be to make some profit out of it?—Yes. A case came under my notice some years ago where a poor woman dropped her child at the door of the workhouse and ran away and left it there. She was arrested, and asked why she left this poor child there. She said "Nobody loves her children more than I do, but I feel I should not be doing justice to my child if I did not give it the same advantages as my neighbours have, and I left it to the guardians to board-out, like my neighbours are doing; I cannot go to the same expense and give it the same what you may call luxuries that these children have, and so I left it."

5960. That would imply that the class to which she belonged thought special care was taken of the children that were deposited at the workhouse?—Yes, no doubt that would be so, and it might imply that the boarded-out children were better treated than the children of poor cottagers, who paid rates. Most of the abuses that have come under my notice came before the orders of the Local Government Board; in fact I think some of the orders were framed because of those abuses. Several years ago we had to inspect all the children boarded-out within the unions; I inspected some 400 of them. In several cases we found they were very badly done by. But that is not so much the case since the orders have been issued. I am referring to the boarding-out within the unions orders. I remember before that time one case particularly. A child had been boarded-out at about six years old, and she was then thirteen, and she had never been to a school or to a place of worship since she had been boarded-out.

5961. What was the date of the orders?—1889, I think.

5962. Therefore the orders will have applied during the whole period of the boarding-out of any children that are now boarded-out?—Yes. These abuses were before the issue of the orders.

5963. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In the case of children boarded within the unions, do the guardians have

Mr. Richard Ingram Dansey.

13 Mar. 1906.

voluntary committees of their own, or when you spoke of committees were you thinking of boarding-out committees formed under the order ?—They generally form a committee consisting of a few guardians and ladies resident in the district.

5964. That is to say, a committee appointed merely by the guardians themselves ?—Yes.

5965. A voluntary arrangement ?—Entirely voluntary ; and they report to the guardians as to the conditions of the children.

5966. Does that work pretty well ?—Yes, very well. They take an interest also in finding the children situations afterwards.

5967. So that they would perform pretty much the same sort of duties that a regularly constituted boarding-out committee would perform ?—Just the same. Of course the committees are only formed compulsorily when the children are boarded-out without the limits of the union, but those voluntary committees perform the same duties.

Suitability of existing Poor Law areas.

5968. With regard to the size of the unions in your district, do you consider that, generally speaking, they are of a proper size, or would you advocate larger areas than the existing unions ?—I think there are one or two cases where a union might possibly be merged into another, but they are very few.

5969. Apart from that, you would not think it desirable to have a larger area of administration than what we may call the average union ?—No ; I should not go so far as the county area. I think there are very strong objections to that on the part of the poor themselves and the guardians.

5970. Taking the poor themselves, would their ground of objection be the separation from their relatives ?—Yes, and their not being able to see them as often as they could wish.

5971. Do the poor attach importance to that, in your experience ?—I think they do attach very great importance to it. A good many of the poor in my district have never been thirty miles away from home.

5972. And they would consider it a hardship if they were taken into an institution fifty miles off, even although that institution might in some respects be more comfortable than the original workhouse ?—I think they certainly would, because they are accustomed in most of the workhouses to visit their friends once a week or once a fortnight, and they could not afford the expense of going, say, fourteen or fifteen miles by rail and back.

5973. The workhouse is very often in the market town, is it not, and the people come into the town naturally ?—It is almost invariably in the market town. I gather that was the principle of forming areas, rather than following the boundaries of the counties.

Union areas extending into several counties.

5974. You have no case of an out-relief union in your district, have you ?—No.

5975. Do the boundaries overlap much with the counties ?—Yes. I have several unions in two counties, and one in three ; Tenbury is in three counties—Worcestershire, Herefordshire and Shropshire.

Segregation of sane epileptics.

5976. You referred to the hardship that sane epileptics sometimes have in workhouses ; have you ever considered what should be the remedy for that ?—I should like them removed to some other institutions where they can get more cheerful surroundings—a group of cottages, or something of that sort. But I am not prepared to say what combination should provide these cottages, whether a combination of unions or a combination of county councils.

5977. Supposing you had a county authority who provided these institutions, or even a combination of unions, would the objection that you were speaking of just now apply—that the people would be removed a good way from their relatives ?—I do not think so. These poor sane epileptics hardly get anybody to visit them ; they are treated as a sort of outcasts by their relatives.

Imbeciles in workhouses.

5978. Would the same sort of thing apply to imbeciles ?—That is a bigger question, and it seems to me a much more difficult question. In nearly all my workhouses the greater part of the work is done now by the imbeciles or the feeble-minded.

5979. In the rural unions you would have a difficulty, would you not, in the administration of the workhouse if these persons were all taken out ?—It would no doubt be more costly.

5980. You would have to get paid officers ?—You would have to get paid outside people in by the day, anyhow.

5981. As officers or assistants or whatever you may call them ?—Yes. I am not clear that the feeble-minded are not as happy in those workhouses as they would be anywhere else. At the same time, I do not think the means of classification in any of our small workhouses are sufficient for, may I say, the protection of the feeble-minded women.

5982. Is it possible in a small workhouse to have a better classification, or is the number so small that it is practically impossible ?—In a great many cases the number would be too small.

Infrequency of exercise by overseers of power to give relief.

5983. Going to quite a different matter, have you come across cases where overseers have given relief ?—I have come across such cases, but they are very few. I do not come across half-a-dozen cases in a year.

5984. You point out that in some of your unions the number of relieving officers is less than you wish, I think ?—Yes.

5985. Where that is the case, do the overseers give relief ?—Yes. They have done so in Stafford. It is very hard to educate people to the fact that the overseers have any power. The poor people as a rule fly to the guardian of the parish.

Relief by individual Guardians.

5986. What does he do ?—Does he refer them to the relieving officer, or to the overseer ?—He very often does not know what his powers are, and he gives an order. Really, the relief by the overseers is very small.

5987. (*Mr. Nunn.*) On whom does he give an order ?—He gives an order to the relieving officer, that is, he writes to the relieving officer ; or perhaps he will go and give an order for a trap to take the patient to the workhouse—I mean he would give an order at the nearest place where he can get a conveyance.

5988. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) He would not give him an order actually, or would he, for relief, say, in kind ?—No, he would not go so far as that.

5989. He would not pay anything ?—No.

5990. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Only in a case of emergency, he would take upon himself to pay for a conveyance ?—Yes.

The ideal number of cases for a relieving officer.

5991. (*Mr. Chandler.*) You speak of the relieving officer in one instance having 400 cases and 600 individuals on his books, and in others twenty-six and twenty-nine cases only ; can you suggest any happy medium that you would consider a sufficient number of cases to be competently dealt with by a relieving officer ?—That is a very difficult question to answer. One has to take into consideration the area and the population and very much the character of the population. I could not lay down a hard-and-fast line about it. You might take it off-hand that I do not think myself that any relieving officer, whatever his area is, ought to have more than, at the very outside, 400 on his books, if he is to do his duty by visiting these cases at their homes frequently.

5992. In regard to the last subject you deal with in your memorandum, namely, the unemployed, are the cases you refer to cases in which the guardians have found employment for the men ?—No.

5993. Then it has been done by local committees ?—Yes, by distress committees.

Effect of Workmen's Compensation Acts.

5994. Is it generally believed throughout your district that the Employers' Liability Act has had any effect in causing old men to come upon the rates, or have you

found any case yourself ?—I cannot say that I have investigated any case with that result, but I have constantly heard complaints of that nature.

5995. Simply rumour ?—I think it is more than that, especially in the Staffordshire potteries at Newcastle-under-Lyne, Stoke-on-Trent and Wolstanton and Burslem. I have been frequently told by the chairmen and clerks to guardians of men who are in the workhouse because they will not be received by employers of labour as they are getting on for sixty years of age or have perhaps some defect in their eyesight, or something of that sort.

5996. That would occur in almost all times of depression, would it not ?—Yes.

5997. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Are there many charities in your district ?—I do not think so; I think there are very few.

Relief in aid of wages.

5998. There is no centre of endowed charities in it, is there ?—Not that I know of.

5999. Can you tell me whether the guardians are in the habit of giving relief in aid of wages in any of your unions ?—No. I think they give relief in aid of what you may call earnings, if you can distinguish earnings from wages. By earnings I mean what they get from casual jobs. Supposing a woman goes out for a couple or three days' washing and earns perhaps 9d. or 1s. a day, they might give her something.

6000. Would you say that they would not pay the men, only the women ?—There are several weakly men who cannot earn an ordinary labourer's wages and who go out by the job; perhaps they are paid 1s. for a day's work, and they do that three days in the week, or two days in the week. The guardians will give such men something.

6001. Would that be at agricultural labour ?—Yes.

6002. So the farmers really get them at a very low rate of wages ?—They are not worth much, you see.

6003. In the Potteries I assume there are a good many women employed ?—Yes.

6004. Would they have their earnings subsidised ?—To a certain extent they would if they are very small, but the women who work for the whole week in the Potteries of course earn sufficient to keep themselves.

6005. In the slack times would they have their earnings subsidised ?—I have not heard of it.

Difficulty of providing for weak-minded female paupers.

6006. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) I think I understood you to say that the classification in some workhouses was insufficient for the protection of feeble-minded women ?—Yes.

6007. Supposing there were any enlargement of area, as was suggested by Sir Samuel Provis, that difficulty would be overcome, would it not, because then the feeble-minded would probably be gathered together in a suitable place, with female officers and so on ?—Yes; but then you would not get over the difficulty of the work of the workhouse having to be performed by outside people.

6008. But it is much better surely to pay officials to take care of the aged and infirm poor ?—If you could get a bigger rateable value, you could of course get a better workhouse and better means of classification.

6009. Just as in the infirmaries you have put trained nurses in place of pauper attendants, so you ought to have paid attendants for the feeble-minded for the same reason, ought you not?—I do not know whether the feeble-minded as a rule want paid attendants—they seem very happy and go about their work and so on; but they want to be protected from themselves. It is not safe to keep them in a small workhouse, nor is it safe to let them go out.

6010. That is what I mean, that a large number would be essential to these girls' safety ?—I have had several cases brought under my notice lately where a woman has taken her discharge and the guardians could not by persuasion keep her in. In one case the woman had an illegitimate child four years running.

Mr. Richard Ingram Dansey.

13 Mar. 1906.

6011. (*Chairman.*) Was she what you would call defective mentally ?—Yes; she would not be classed as a lunatic, but as weak-minded.

6012. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) You practically find some such cases in almost every workhouse, do you not ?—In nearly every workhouse, in fact, a good many workhouses would not get on at all without them under the present system, as they do most of the work in the workhouse.

The average relieving officer's capacity for visiting cases.

6013. I do not know whether this is an impossible question to answer: Taking an urban district, how many visits should you say a relieving officer ought to be able to pay in a week, taking one week with another; in other words, how many visits would you consider a good week's work ? Have you any standard in your mind ?—I do not think I could answer that question. The relieving officer has such a variety of cases to attend to; he has his sick cases and he has his ordinary cases. I should like him to visit each sick case certainly not more seldom than once a fortnight. In my district there are no rules about that, and the guardians have given the relieving officer no rules. In one union the relieving officer would visit once a fortnight, in another once a month, and in another once in six months. I have not answered your question, I know; I cannot.

Medical relief in Atcham union.

6014. (*Dr. Downes.*) Is medical out-relief strictly administered in Atcham ?—As strictly as they could do it.

6015. Do they have any permanent list ?—Yes, they have some on the permanent list.

6016. How long does the order run in Atcham for ordinary medical relief ?—It only runs from board day to board day, except it is a chronic case, and then it would go on for six months.

Cottage hospitals in district.

6017. Have you any cottage hospitals or infirmaries in your district ?—We have some cottage hospitals, but not many. There are cottage hospitals at Tenbury, Kington, Ludlow, Leominster and several country towns.

6018. Then you have a county infirmary as well, have you not ?—Yes.

6019. Do the guardians subscribe to these cottage hospitals ?—They do not generally subscribe to the cottage hospitals; in some cases they do.

6020. Do they subscribe to the infirmary ?—They subscribe, as a rule, to the infirmary.

6021. Have you any experience as to the effect of strict administration on what I may call provident medical clubs or friendly societies and sick relief societies ?—No, I have not.

Effect of strict Poor Law administration on wages.

6022. Could you tell us whether there is any difference in the wages of the strictly administered places, as compared with the wages in the other places that are more laxly administered ?—As Sir Baldwyn Leighton said, when they carried out strict rules as to the widows and children at Atcham, and instead of giving out-relief to widows and children, took a certain number of the children into the workhouse and left the widow to support herself with one or more children if she could, the wages at once went up. The widows, when they had all their children with them, were only able to earn about 9d. a day with food working from 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. and their children were consequently neglected; whereas, when a certain number of the children were taken from them, they were able to get out every day and earn regular wages, and their wages instead of being 9d. a day went up to 1s. 9d. and 2s. per day with food and the hours of labour were from 8 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.

Atcham.

6023. That was the experience of Sir Baldwyn Leighton at Atcham ?—Yes.

6024. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Might I ask whether any definite figures have been preserved as to the rate of wages going up ?—No. I can only quote this report, which is a report about the Atcham union under the late Sir Baldwyn Leighton. It has been issued comparatively lately; it was compiled by Mr. Bowen-Jones, who was chairman after Sir Baldwyn.

6025. (*Dr. Downes.*) Does that report give the statistics of the Atcham union ?—Yes.

Mr. Richard Ingram Dansey.

13 Mar. 1906.

6026. Should you consider Stafford a fair union to compare with Atcham in its various conditions?—No, not quite. I think, as I said, that Stafford town itself relies a great deal upon the boot trade, whereas in Shrewsbury there is no staple trade at all, although there used to be.

Comparison of Stafford and Atcham unions.

6027. It has gone away, has it?—Yes, it has gone away to America.

6028. They are both railway centres, I think?—Yes. Otherwise I should think they would compare, apart from that question of the boot trade.

6029. (*Chairman.*) If in the one case the trade has gone and in the other case the trade remains, would not Stafford be better situated than Shrewsbury?—Yes, except that trade has been very bad, and I do not know whether bad trade is not worse than none at all.

6030. Is the trade confined to Stafford, or does it extend to the villages all round?—It is only in the town. In the neighbouring union of Stone they also have it.

6031. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Is not Shrewsbury very full of charities?—I do not know that it is.

6032. (*Dr. Downes.*) Kington and Clun adjoin, do they not?—No, there is a wide interval between them; you have got Knighton between them.

6033. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Knighton is not one of your unions, is it?—No, it is not in my district, but it intervenes.

Comparison of Kington and Clun unions.

6034. (*Dr. Downes.*) Taking those two unions, Kington and Clun, are they fairly comparable, do you think?—Yes, I should think so, fairly. Kington is a bigger town than Bishop's Castle, which is the main town of Clun union.

6035. I notice that according to the figures pauperism has been going up in Kington steadily, but going down in Clun?—That I ascribe almost entirely to administration, and stricter administration is now decreasing the pauperism in Kington.

6036. What is the character of trade depression in Madeley; is it coal and iron they have there?—Yes. Two years ago I think two or three large works had to stop altogether and were closed, and the men were thrown out.

6037. Was there a similar depression in Wellington and Shifnal?—Not to the same extent. Wellington suffered somewhat, but not in the same way.

Conditions in Shropshire unions.

6038. (*Mr. Phelps.*) I see that in the unions in Shropshire in almost every case the population has been falling; is that owing to agricultural depression?—I find it all through the agricultural districts. I think the population is falling.

6039. Has Shropshire suffered much from agricultural depression?—Yes, I should think it has, very considerably; I think Shropshire has probably suffered more than Cheshire, and Herefordshire more than either.

6040. Do you think that the fall in population affects the pauperism?—It may; but I have not gone into that question.

Effect of strict administration on wages. Atcham.

6041. I did not quite catch what you said about the effect on the wages of women of taking widows' children into the workhouse?—What was said by Sir Baldwyn Leighton was that the effect of relieving widows of a certain number of their children was that the wages of charwomen in Shrewsbury went up, and the widows were able to support themselves and the one or two children left pretty well on the enhanced wages.

6042. That it raised the wages, not that it lowered the wages?—It raised the wages.

Medical loan relief.

6043. With regard to medical relief, have you any unions in which it is given on loan?—There are several unions which give midwifery orders on loan, but there are hardly any cases where the other medical relief is given on loan.

6044. Are midwifery orders often applied for in your district?—Yes, pretty often; they are given in several unions on loan.

Functions of medical officers as to relief.

6045. Is it the custom to insist upon the attendance of the medical officer at the meetings of the board generally?—No.

6046. He does not report on the cases in person?—Not generally.

6047. Where do they get their information with regard to them from?—He makes a report.

6048. A written report?—Yes, a written report as to his patients, which he sends in fortnightly.

6049. Does he often give advice to the board as to the method of treating a case?—I never heard him.

6050. Have you never heard him say "It would be better if this case were brought into the infirmary"?—He often puts that remark on his list, but he is not in attendance to say so personally.

6051. You have both urban and rural unions; what class of men do the guardians in the urban unions come from, should you say, as a rule, taking places like Stafford and Stockport?—All classes.

6052. Do you think that the Local Government Act, 1894, has increased the area in which an interest is felt in administration and in the Poor Law generally?—Yes, I should say off-hand it has.

6053. Do you think that the gain in that way compensates at all for any loss of good administration?—That is a very difficult question to answer, and I am hardly prepared to do it. I think any damage has been rapidly repaired; I would not undo it.

Frequency of Inspectors' attendance at Guardians' meetings.

6054. How often do you visit each board of guardians in the course of a year?—I could not tell you. I am bound to go once a year, and some unions I go to five or six times a year.

6055. Should you, for instance, prefer an arrangement by which the area was much smaller and you could visit them more frequently?—No, I should not.

6056. You do not think that would be a good change?—I do not. I think we can go too frequently to a board of guardians.

6057. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Might we ask why you think too frequent visits bad?—I think the board of guardians would say: "You have come for no purpose; you have nothing to do; why do you come here?" I should prefer to go on as we are. I think I may say that all these boards of guardians look upon the inspector as a friend; and not as a man who is going to pick holes; they rather look upon him as one who is going to help them in a difficulty.

6058. Do you not find that the more you visit a board of guardians the more work there is that you would like to do if you had the time for it?—I do not think so.

6059. (*Dr. Downes.*) If an inspector did the work, would there not be a tendency for the guardians to leave it to him to a great extent?—I could not answer that; the inspector does not do the work.

6060. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would there not be a tendency to throw the responsibility on the inspector?—I am afraid there would, and to my mind this is one of the greatest objections to visiting too often.

6061. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Leaving the feelings of the guardians out of the question altogether, do you think you could be of considerable use to a board of guardians by a frequent attendance; and not only of use, but that you would be able to ascertain more accurately the lines upon which the guardians administer relief?—I do not think I could do it by more frequent visiting than I do now. I know the district very thoroughly; I have been there for thirty-four years.

6062. (*The O'Conor Don.*) Does not your inspection serve as a check upon the officers of the unions to see that they do their duty?—Yes, it is a check in that way.

6063. I suppose you do not give notice when you are going down to a union?—I never give notice when I am going to a workhouse. I must distinguish between that

and a board of guardians. In the case of a board of guardians I very often write to say I am coming, or they write to me and ask me to come.

Frequency of inspection of workhouses.

6064. You do not inspect the workhouse at the same time that you go to the board of guardians, then ?—Not to make an official inspection. I sometimes go and run over it, if I want to see a particular thing, or for my own satisfaction.

6065. How often do you inspect a workhouse, as distinct from attending a board of guardians ?—Once a year at least; but in several cases one goes four or five times over, when one suspects anything is not quite right, or wants to see how some alteration has been done.

6066. Do you not think that more frequent visits to a workhouse would be better than once a year ?—It might be.

6067. There would be more check upon the officials in the discharge of their duties, would there not ?—Yes, there might be, but I think guardians and visiting committees would be more inclined to throw responsibility upon the inspector.

6068. You would come down upon them without any notice whatever ?—They never have any notice at all. I have been in a workhouse at twelve o'clock at night before now.

6069. (*Mr. Phelps.*) The officials of the workhouse are being constantly overhauled by committees of the guardians, are they not ?—Yes.

6070. The house is being constantly visited in one form or another ?—Yes, but as a rule most workhouse masters know when the committees are coming.

6071. (*Sir. Samuel Provis.*) Do the visiting committees always go upon the same day ?—The visiting committees too often go on board days, and in country workhouses in unions where the markets are held on board days it is very difficult to get them to do otherwise.

6072. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Have you any experience of voluntary committees working together with guardians in relieving poverty ?—Not a great deal.

6073. Not in your district ?—No.

6074. (*Miss Hill.*) With regard to the visitation of workhouses, is there no general practice of guardians having a rota for the visit of individual guardians on certain days, so that it practically comes to be a surprise visit ?—Yes, they have that in the urban districts; that is, where the guardians reside within a convenient distance of the workhouse.

6075. In London they even do it with the schools, when the schools are a little distance out, and I think they trust a good deal to that; that is not common in your district ?—It is in the urban districts, if you take Stoke-on-Trent and districts like that, where the area is small; but if you take a district like Leominster or Kington, or some of those agricultural districts, it would be almost impossible to do it, because the guardians do not come near the town, except perhaps on a market day, and they would have to come many miles to get to the workhouse.

Effect of Relief to School Children Order.

6076. I want to ask about the underfed children. Were the twenty-seven children you mention in paragraph 34 all in one centre, or were they scattered over the whole district ?—There were some in Birkenhead, some in Stoke-on-Trent, some in Congleton, and some at Wolstanton and Burslem. Those are the only unions.

6077. Were a larger number of children proposed and did investigation bring them down to twenty-seven ?—At Stoke-on-Trent the school attendance officers reported over seventy children as being underfed. The relieving officer had to investigate those cases, and he found out that a great many were beyond the provisions of the Act, and eventually only six had to be investigated by the board of guardians. At Wolstanton and Burslem they had six cases; they were only on for six weeks, and then they were taken off by voluntary effort. They had a conference there between the guardians and the school authorities, and at that conference it was decided that any distress of this kind should be met by voluntary effort outside. That has been the case in a great many unions. It was the case in Cannock, and it has been the case a good deal in Birkenhead and Wirral.

Advantages of rota Committees.

6078. (*Professor Smart.*) What do you consider the precise advantage of the rotating method of committees which you describe in paragraph 19 ?—Formerly, under the old system, each guardian sat for the relief cases of his own district, and the committee were entirely formed, as a matter of fact, from those guardians sitting for the districts for which they gave relief.

6079. It was a sort of ward system, then ?—Three or four committees sat in the same room. Guardians have complained to me more than once that they were blamed by their constituents, if I may call them so, for not giving them a fair share out of the common fund.

Boarding-out of children within and without the union.

6080. Do you approve of boarding-out within the unions ?—I do to a limited extent. I think in every union you could get a certain number of homes and a certain number of foster parents where the children can be very well treated within the union; but, as I said before, where a board of guardians pass a resolution to board out within the union, all the children who are legally capable of being boarded out, they are apt to get a lower class of home. Supposing in a union you knew of some twenty homes only, but you had to provide for forty children, you must lower the standard for the homes in order to get forty; and then I do not think it answers. I do not think it is ever quite satisfactory, except with the supervision of a committee, or, anyhow, some ladies, because I cannot believe in the proper inspection of girls except by ladies. I have had to inspect the boarded-out children, and I am perfectly powerless where I have to inspect a girl's surroundings.

6081. Then I take it you rather approve of boarding-out beyond the union ?—There are very few unions in my district that board out beyond the union, and I do not think the number boarded out beyond the union is on the increase.

6082. In Scotland we send the children as far off as we possibly can from the union ?—I should much prefer it to boarding out within the unions, particularly on the ground that relatives cannot then interfere with the foster parents—that is the great objection.

Adoption by Guardians of regulations for the granting of relief.

6083. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You said there were fourteen unions that had by-laws; could we have the names of the whole fourteen ?—I wrote to the boards of guardians in my district, and among other things I asked them to let me know whether they had any by-laws. The only unions who have sent me copies of the by-laws are these: Birkenhead, Ellesmere, Kington, Leek, Leominster, Macclesfield, Nantwich, Northwich, Runcorn, Stafford, Stockport, Stoke-on-Trent, Whitchurch, Wolstanton and Burslem, and Atcham.

6084. That means that Kington and Stafford, two of the highest in pauperism in proportion to population, have by-laws; how long have they had them in operation ?—Kington very recently has adopted by-laws.

6085. Then they have formed these by-laws with the object of reducing pauperism; is that so ?—Yes, it was very much with that object.

6086. Would you say that the pauperism has not grown during the time the by-laws were in operation ?—The Kington by-laws have been very recently put into operation.

6087. What about Stafford ?—Stafford have always professed to have by-laws, but I think they were unwritten rules at one time.

6088. Have you got a copy of the Stafford rules ?—Yes.

6089. Then they are written ?—They are written at the present time. The Stafford guardians took these questions of relief into consideration last year at a special meeting.

6090. Then they have been printed only since last year ?—I cannot answer for the date they were printed.

Mr. Richard Ingram Dansey.

13 Mar. 1906.

I had to call their attention to the enormous increase in the relief, and one thing I had to suggest to them was that they should have two relieving officers instead of one, but that was not acceptable to them.

6091. (*Mr. Booth.*) Does it follow that the fourteen or fifteen unions who responded are the only unions who have by-laws, or are they the only ones who thought fit to forward them to you?—I think they are probably the only ones who have written rules in existence. The others have had rules at some time or other, but they have not got them written now, and now are acting upon precedent. One often hears the chairman say, This is against our rules.

6092. And yet he may not have written rules?—Yet he may not have any written rule.

6093. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Did Stoke-on-Trent ever have written rules?—I do not think so. I had to meet them on this question of relief, as their relief was going up by leaps and bounds year after year till they got to a tremendous expense. I met the guardians, and they agreed to call a special meeting to consider the whole subject, and that one subject only; and they spent a lot of time over it.

6094. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I see the Stafford rules were adopted in 1902, according to the printed copy which you have shown me; those you would consider to be quite recent, would you not?—Yes, comparatively recent.

6095. Then really in that case they were formed because the rate of pauperism was high?—Yes.

6096. In the case of Atcham that is not so?—Yes; they have had rules pretty nearly ever since the union was formed in 1836, when the pauperism of the union was as high as 7·3 per cent. of the population.

6097. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Has any union to your knowledge abandoned rules since, say, the year 1895?—No, I do not think they have ever abandoned rules, but I am sorry to say the observance of the rules gets very lax. They are constantly making exceptions to the rules.

Plural'st relieving officer.

6098. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You mentioned one instance of a relieving officer who had only twenty-nine cases on his book; that was in Shrewsbury; has that relieving officer any other duties?—He is registrar of births, collector to the guardians, and assistant settlement officer.

6099. Does he hold any other appointment under the guardians?—He holds no other offices except those I have mentioned.

Type of person elected as District Councillor and Guardian.

6100. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to rural unions and urban unions, do you find any difference between the class of man who gets elected as a rural district councillor and a guardian, and the class of man who gets elected as a guardian only in an urban district, comparing the two men as administrators of the Poor Law?—I do not know that I could answer that question without giving offence.

6101. Mr. Davy drew our attention to the fact that the guardian who is also a district councillor was a better administrator than the guardian who was an *ad hoc* guardian; I only want to know whether that has come into your experience?—I think the man who is elected a district councillor and a guardian is, as a rule, a man in a better position than the other; but I do not say that he is a sharper man or a better man of business.

6102. Does he tend to be a country gentleman, or what does he tend to be?—He is not that, but he has a certain amount of influence in his own rural parish. He is very likely a churchwarden, and perhaps rents a good sized farm.

Tenure of office of Chairman of Board of Guardians.

6103. Do the chairmen of boards of guardians usually serve for one year only?—That differs in different places. In some unions they go on year after year till they have to retire, the same man being elected every year. In other unions it is the rule that they are only annual.

6104. Does that coincide at all with urban and rural, mean does the district councillor guardian tend to be a more permanent chairman than the urban *ad hoc* guardian, or less so, or do you not know?—I have not followed that at all. In the union of Bucklow the chairman retires every year.

6105. Is that man a district councillor?—No, he is not a district councillor as a rule.

6106. Then he is an *ad hoc* guardian?—Yes. In my own union of Ludlow the chairman goes on being elected every year.

6107. Is he a district councillor or an *ad hoc* guardian?—He is not a district councillor, I think.

6108. You have not noticed any difference between these classes of men?—No, I have not.

Pauperism through unhealthy trades.

6109. Is the white-lead industry in your district?—Yes, at Stoke.

6110. Have you noticed any cases of pauper sickness arising from white-lead poisoning?—We frequently have cases in the Stoke infirmary and hospital suffering from the poisoning.

6111. That does come under your notice?—Yes.

6112. Is there any other unhealthy trade that affects medical relief or infirmary accommodation?—No, not specially that I know of.

6113. But white-lead immediately arises to your mind?—Yes. The nurses always tell me what they are suffering from. That is confined to the Staffordshire Potteries.

Conditions in Atcham union.

6114. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I have been glancing at the Atcham report which you have shown us, and I see that in 1836, the year when Sir Baldwyn Leighton began his work in the Atcham union, there was a considerable number of benefit societies there; he names nineteen, from twelve of which he received figures; are those societies still in existence there?—I am afraid I cannot answer the question.

6115. You have no returns to date?—I have no returns at all.

6116. In considering the reduction of out-door relief in Atcham, do you think that the people's relatives have stepped in and given a certain amount of relief which was formerly given out of the rates?—I have no doubt they have in a great many cases.

6117. Do you think they do that now?—Yes, they do it now—and very often they are relatives who are not legally compellable to do so.

6118. But you do not know about any endowed charities?—No, I have no statistics on that point.

6119. Or any other voluntary charities?—No.

6120. You do not think they have entered largely into the problem there?—I do not think so. There was a Charity Organisation Society in Shrewsbury, but that I was told became defunct from want of applicants.

Rota relief committees.

6121. Can you tell us what you consider to be the ideal constitution of a relief committee in a rural union? Do you think this *rota* for going round the different districts which you mention in paragraph 19 is a good one?—I think it has answered exceedingly well at Stoke.

6122. Does that include the presence of local guardians?—They can come and give information.

6123. But they have no vote?—They do not vote.

6124. But they are selected?—They are selected, and they give information as to any particular cases.

6125. That does seem to anyone like myself with a little experience quite an ideal system: is that what you would recommend in a rural union?—I recommended it as an experiment, but I had no experience of it before, although I had heard of it in operation, I think at Bradford.

6126. And it has worked well?—Certainly.

Medical relief as the highway to pauperism.

6127. With reference to paragraph 23, have you any definite figures about medical relief being the starting

point for rather greater pauperisation in other directions? —No, I do not think I could give you any figures about it.

6128. It has not been traced at all; this is a sort of general impression?—It is a general complaint.

6129. Is it?—Yes. All chairman of boards of guardians who have been in office any time tell me that that is the most difficult relief they have to deal with, and they cannot check it.

6130. Are you speaking of Cleobury and Wolstanton and Burslem, or are you speaking generally?—Generally —all over the district.

6131. That is the beginning of it?—Yes. You see the relieving officer dare not refuse this kind of relief. I have never known a case where a relieving officer has refused to give an order for medical relief.

6132. Have you known any cases in which the guardians have reversed that decision and offered the house?— I have never seen one.

ccommoda-on for orkhouse irses.

6133. Are your nurses usually accommodated in a separate home from the workhouse infirmary?—No, not usually, but we have several now; I think there are thirteen or fourteen unions who have built these separate homes for them.

6134. Wherever it is tried, has it been considered an improvement?—The guardians are all very pleased with them and pleased with the results; and so are the nurses.

umber, laries, and cupations relieving ficers.

6135. (*The O'Conor Don.*) As a rule, in your district do you consider that there are a sufficient number of relieving officers appointed by the guardians?—I do not think there are enough now.

6136. Could you say what is the average salary of the relieving officer?—I should think they start generally at about £80.

6137. And they go up to how much; what would be the maximum?—They generally take on other duties —vaccination officer probably, and collector too. As relieving officer, pure and simple, they go from £70 or £80 to £120 or £130.

6138. As a rule, have they any other employment besides that of relieving officer, or have they to give their full time to the guardians?—In some cases they have a little land—not arable land. The Local Government Board do not allow them to have arable land, but I do not think they object to their having an acre or two to keep a cow.

6139. How do they distribute the outdoor relief generally; is it at the homes of the people, or are there certain centres where they meet and give the relief?—They have their pay stations.

Relief stations.

6140. Are those pay stations appointed by the guardians?—The pay stations are rented by the guardians.

6141. Is there much relief given in your district in the form of kind?—Very little. They do it in suspicious cases. Supposing they are suspicious that the applicant is addicted to drink, then the relief is invariably given in kind, if out relief is given at all.

Relief in kind.

6142. Have you formed any opinion as to which system is the best—giving relief in kind or in money?—It seems to be very difficult to give relief in kind in all cases.

6143. But in the large towns, would be there much difficulty in giving it in kind?—I do not suppose there would; but as a matter of practice very little is given, except that probably a loaf or two is given with the money.

6144. Have you formed any opinion whether it would be an advantage to give more of it in kind in the large cities?—I think the pauper is probably able to spend his money to the best advantage, if he is a good character.

6145. Do you think it would be a check upon persons who are really not deserving of relief? If they were to get it in kind rather than in money, they would not go in for it so much, would they?—No, perhaps not; but you must then take precautions against their selling their orders. When tickets for bread are given to vagrants we have found that the tickets were constantly being sold.

6146. That was the form in which the relief was given was it—by an order upon a shop?—Yes; I think those orders might go to a second person.

6147. But a system of distributing the relief actually in the form of bread, or whatever it is, has not been tried in your district?—No. There are so many difficulties about conveying the bread to the homes of the paupers.

6148. If the paupers go to a certain place to get the money, would they not equally go there to get the bread?—Yes, and they do convey a certain quantity of bread to the pay stations; but there are very few cases, except those of bad characters, who receive the bread or the relief in kind entirely, without any money.

NINETEENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 20th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I, etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. EDWARD DARLINGTON COURT, called; and Examined.

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.
20 Mar. 1906.

Extent and character of district.

6149. (*Chairman.*) You are a General Inspector of the Local Government Board, your district, I understand, including the greater part of the South Midlands, consisting of Cambridge (except the Wisbech Union), Huntingdon, Northampton, Bedford, Hertford, and Middlesex?—Yes.

6150. How long have you been an inspector in your present district?—Not quite three years.

6151. We have received your memorandum, and will take that as your evidence in chief. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIII. (A–H).) I propose to ask you a few questions in connection with it to obtain rather fuller information on certain points. The population of your district is mainly rural, excepting around Northampton and London?—Yes; and of course in one or two isolated places like the borough of Cambridge, which is a separate parish.

6152. There is a considerable variation in the amount of relief given in proportion to population between different unions; and in paragraph 9, in comparing certain unions, you have come to the conclusion that this difference is largely due to a stricter discrimination being exercised?—I think that is the only reason that can be given in those cases instanced.

Conditions in Northampton union.

6153. In Northampton, on the other hand, the rate of pauperism in proportion to population is exceptionally high?—Yes, one in twenty-two or twenty-three.

6154. Has there been a large increase in the population of Northampton from adjacent districts being added to it?—Not recently. The total area of the union is a little over 20,000 acres, but nearly all the population—I should think, all but about 5,000 or 6,000—are in the borough. I could not speak exactly, but I think that would be more than the numbers outside. The whole of the borough is included in the union. The union population in 1901 was 89,355; the borough population, 87,021; the 1905 estimate for the union was 93,819.

6155. The industry there is shoe making?—Yes.

6156. That industry is not confined merely to Northampton, but extends to the villages around?—Yes.

6157. That industry has recently undergone considerable changes, owing to the introduction of machinery?—Yes.

6158. Is the board of guardians in Northampton a large board in point of number?—About forty-eight I think. I have not the exact figure.

Size of Northampton Board of Guardians.

6159. Is that divided into committees for the purpose of superintending outdoor relief?—Yes, there have been three committees till recently. I believe that two committees only are sitting now. A resolution was passed a few months ago that the relief should be taken by two committees, and as there are four relieving officers, that two should go to each.

System of relief committees.

6160. Do they always take the same districts, or do they rotate?—I cannot say what they have done since the change, I have not been there since; it was about three months ago.

6161. Previous to that did each committee adhere to the same district?—I believe so.

6162. That was the district with which they were acquainted?—Yes, I think that might be said.

6163. From your experience, is it not advisable where you have a town like Northampton which can be sub-divided into districts, that the committees should take alternatively the different districts?—Yes, I certainly think that should be done.

Advantages of "Rota" committees.

6164. It checks any tendency there might be for the representatives of a particular locality to favour that locality at the expense of the rates?—I think so, but it is very difficult to get the guardians to see it in that way. They take the most interest in their own cases, and are not very willing to sit on the other committees and go away from their own cases.

6165. On the ground that they know their own locality better than the other locality?—Yes, and that they take more interest in it. I think they would chiefly give the ground that you give.

6166. Has the number of relieving officers in Northampton been insufficient in your judgment?—Certainly. I still think so.

6167. Can you tell us what proportion the relieving officers bear to the number of cases receiving outdoor relief?—It is at the present time about 1 in 800. On the 1st January 1905, there were 3,540 cases receiving out

Proportion cases per relieving officer.

relief, and there were three relieving officers: that gave 1,180 cases per officer. About 1,000 of the 3,540 were persons employed in the labour yard or their dependents, but still the giving of tickets and so on, and investigating those cases took up a great deal of the relieving officers' time, so that I think they might fairly be counted in the number, which makes it almost 1,200 cases per officer. Last year the guardians appointed an additional relieving officer, and the numbers also have somewhat gone down; there were 3,228 at the end of 1905; that gives 807 per relieving officer. It is very much the largest number in my district.

6168. What do you say is the right proportion of relieving officers to persons receiving outdoor relief?—I think you must take into consideration the area as well.

6169. Take a town or district like Northampton, where the population is not scattered; what would satisfy you now?—So far as I am qualified to give an opinion, I should think about 180 or so separate cases, which would probably mean about 330 or so, including children and other dependents. That would be about an average number I should think.

6170. Between 300 and 400?—Yes, up to that, including children.

6171. In your experience has the increased employment of relieving officers compensated the rates, so that the reduction in outdoor relief more than counterbalances the increase in salary?—I am afraid my experience is not long enough to give any useful information on that point. I have only succeeded in getting two or three increases in my district, and there has not really been time to see what the effect has been.

Lack of workhouse accommodation.

6172. In Northampton there would be some improvement, but the poor rate, in your judgment, will always remain heavy so long as the principles under which the guardians now give outdoor relief prevail?—That is so. The matter has been complicated (I have just referred to it briefly in my memorandum), by the want of accommodation in the workhouse, and even if the guardians wanted to offer the house as a test, they have not been able to do so. That is being to some extent remedied now.

6173. By increased accommodation?—They got rid of the children some time ago, and the children's block, which was a very satisfactory block, has been made into a female infirmary: the previous infirmary, which had been for both sexes, now being devoted to men only. With a certain number of additional dormitories which have been built in the last year, there will be room for about seventy or eighty more men, and that will allow a little more discrimination to be exercised.

Enforcement of "maintenance" of relatives an alleged cause of rural exodus.

6174. Coming to the rural districts, you state in paragraph 14 that it has been alleged that one of the reasons that induces the rural population to come up to town is to avoid the obligation of contributing to the support of relatives?—Yes.

6175. That is the impression of certain guardians, is it?—Certain boards of guardians; it was given at a meeting and received by the other guardians as correct according to their views.

6176. I suppose you have not been long enough in your district to express an opinion upon it?—I have been long enough to see that the guardians might test it a little more with advantage. I do not quite believe in it. I think it is partly because it is easier to let them go, that they do not follow these cases up thoroughly. There are guardians who do manage to get the money and do not drive the people away, but it is very hard to persuade some of the country guardians that stricter insistence upon the obligations of relatives would not drive them away.

Disinclination to maintain relatives.

6177. When they attempt to enforce the obligation on those who remove, is it resented, or is it responded to by those to whom application is made?—There is a good deal of struggling against paying, of course. I think in almost every case the man writes and says that though he is getting 25s. a week, his wife is always ill, that he has to put money by, that his rent is very high, that he is worse off than if he were at home getting 14s. and so on; and it generally ends up by his offering to pay half.

6178. You mean to pay half what is asked?—Yes. That is what I hear.

6179. Do you think the sense of obligation to maintain old relatives is diminishing?—I can only go as regards the past by what I have read and heard, but from what I do see there certainly is not any very strong sense of obligation either to contribute to or to nurse the parents in sickness, and so on. I should say it is very weak indeed in very many places.

6180. Do those observations apply to rural districts?—Rural and urban, or semi-urban, quite as much.

Effect on pauperism of sudden increase or decrease of population.

6181. There has been a certain movement of population, and when there is a movement of population, and the population diminishes, it means that the percentage of pauperism rises?—That you would expect, I think. It is not the old people or the infants who go away.

6182. The old people are left and the more enterprising go away?—And the old people return. If there is any moving back, it is the old people coming back to finish their lives. I have had that mentioned to me at Ampthill, and other places of the sort, as a reason for the high pauperism.

6183. Referring to those districts where the population is very rapidly increasing, the figures show an abnormally low rate of pauperism in proportion to the population?—I am afraid that does not quite follow so much; it does for a short time, I think. It certainly did at Edmonton, where the pauperism was 1 in 113, I think, shortly before I went to the district, but now it has got to about 1 in 70. As the families grow up and have children, and so on, a very short time after the district is first built on, the pauperism begins to increase. It is only just for the first rush that it goes down, I think.

6184. As the people get older and their families increase, so the proportion would rise?—Yes; that is what I should expect, and what I have found to occur in rapidly developing districts like the Edmonton Union and Willesden.

Conditions in Middlesex unions.

6185. Turning to the returns prepared by you which include Middlesex, the three populous districts of Brentford, Edmonton and Willesden have very rapidly increased in population within recent years?—Yes, they have. I do not show the present population in these returns; I simply take the Census of 1901. They have increased very rapidly, of course.

6186. The proportion, therefore, now would be lower, would it not?—You are taking the pauperism of 1905 and applying it to the population of 1901?—I do show a greater increase than there really is, probably, in pauperism.

6187. Taking Middlesex, you have these three big urban unions with a very rapidly increasing population; and you have two more or less rural unions—Staines and Uxbridge?—Yes.

6188. And the amount of pauperism in proportion to the population is much greater in these rural districts, where the population has not been so augmented, than it is in the urban districts?—Yes, it is greater, certainly. I might say that Staines is considerably more rural than Uxbridge, and its pauperism is the lower of the two.

Conditions in London suburban unions.

6189. Uxbridge is very high?—Very high. It is not so high all the year round: the July returns would not give such relatively high figures. Each of the last two winters there has been a labour yard open, mainly because the brickmakers were out of work.

6190. Do these very populous districts, such as Edmonton and Brentford, present any special problems as regards Poor Law administration and Poor Law rating? At present the rate is not high, but it will rise?—Yes, there is a very large margin at present as far as the rate for out-relief and in-maintenance goes. If you look at page 3 of my 1906 Return, in Brentford the expenditure for in-maintenance and out-relief came to a rate of 4½d. in each of the two last years. That is on the rateable

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

value; the actual rate in the pound would be higher, of course. Edmonton is rather lower, 4¼d. for 1904, and 4½d. for 1905, and Willesden 4¼d. for the first year, and 4¾d. for the second; 4½d. for 1904 and 4¾d. for 1905 are the average rates for Middlesex. Of course the other Middlesex districts are too small, really, to affect the averages very much, but, taking the whole of my district, they were 6½d. for the former year and 6¾d. for 1905, so that there is a very considerable margin still in favour of these populous unions before the question becomes serious.

6191. The peculiarity of the immigration to Edmonton is that they are nearly all of the same class, are they not?—Yes, mostly houses I should say let at 10s. a week and rated at £13, or 5s. a week.

6192. There is no exceptional burden placed on these districts so far as the poor rate is concerned?—Not so far as the poor rate goes.

6193. I only put this question generally, because it is outside your personal purview, but the rates are very heavy?—It is the education rate chiefly that is doing the harm there. I do not know whether you will consider I am going beyond my business in mentioning this, but at Tottenham a reason given about 15 months ago for the proposed purchase of a public park for £24,000 was to stop the place being built upon, with the result that the district would be saddled with the additional education rate for the children who would live in those houses. I think that is a pretty extreme case, if it pays people to buy up land to stop it being built on in order to avoid the education rate.

6194. The contention of a good many people who live there is that the population is increasing relatively much faster than the rateable value, and consequently the rates are exceptionally heavy, but from your evidence that would not apply to the poor rate?—Not to the poor rate by itself, but I should say that the rateable value is not increasing as rapidly as the population or the pauperism. The rate has gone up a little even in the last year. The rateable value of Brentford went up from £1,430,000 to £1,510,000, in the year. Edmonton went up only £40,000, from £2,090,000 to £2,130,000, in the year. That is not a very big increase, and the increase in population was considerably more than that in Brentford. Edmonton did not have a bad year, as a matter of fact, last year, partly through special circumstances. This winter a number of people were provided for by distress committees and so on, who probably would otherwise have come on the rates, and it made the number relieved rather lower than the year before.

6195. Are there in these districts outside London any local industries springing up, or are the overwhelming mass of the people who go to them persons who make their daily livelihood in London?—The usual statement of people who live in Edmonton and Tottenham, and I think it is more or less the same at Brentford, certainly at Willesden, is that most of the people do earn their living in London. In Willesden nearly all the better-class people work in London in different offices and so on, and, as I say, sleep in Willesden. There is a considerable number of factories in the Edmonton Union, powder and cartridge factories and so on; quite a number. Fifteen months ago I got statements from various people, and it was certified that 14,000 working men went up regularly by the Great Eastern Railway. I do not know how many would be going from other parts of the Union by the Great Northern Railway. Then there are the trams, that one could not get information about. I never was able to get any really reliable statement, because it was everybody's interest at that time, when money was wanted from the Central London Fund, to make the number of London workers seem as large as possible. It certainly is very large. There is a large number also who do not work at all.

6196. I think you speak of these portions of your district as the "dormitories of London"?—That is the local term for them, with a view, of course, of proving the point that they should have a share of any good thing going for London. There is a good deal, I think, to be said for their point of view.

6197. Was there exceptional distress in Edmonton last winter?—Not in the winter just over, but in the winter before there was a great deal of distress. In Edmonton it was coped with; there was never any great pressure on the guardians. A few people, I think a couple of hundred, of the more respectable were found work at the guardians' schools, trenching and so on, for wages, about 400 or so more—I cannot give the exact numbers now—were employed in the labour yard. That included doing work in the workhouse of various sorts, but the total number did not increase very much over the previous year. The total number relieved on the 1st January, 1905, was, outrelief, 3,297, and the previous year 3,198. There was very little difference in that way. In the indoor relief there was about 100 increase, but there were large numbers assisted by private charity. In Tottenham the matter was specially taken up by a London morning newspaper. I think the amount that they collected was £7,000; in addition to gifts of food to the value of nearly £3,000; and a good deal more was distributed towards the end of the winter, people have told me, than was required. People gave fifty sheep and so on at a time, and there was rather a difficulty in getting rid of them. This year there has not been anything of the sort.

6198. Did people flock into the district in consequence of that?—I never heard of that. I think it was pretty strictly kept to residents.

6199. This union of Edmonton, I think, includes Tottenham?—Yes. Edmonton is a smaller parish than Tottenham; very much.

6200. The distress in that union was, I suppose, largely caused by the reduction in the employment at the Government factories?—That would only apply, I think, to Enfield, another parish farther up. That was a cause, but the two most distressed parishes by far were Edmonton and Tottenham. I do not think they were affected at all, certainly not Tottenham, by Government work.

6201. It would be more the curtailment of employment in London?—Yes. I think a great many of these people are only casual workers at any time. They do a day or a day and a half in the week. In the summer they can manage more or less with that. They can manage with much less in the summer; they do not want coal and so on. They live in a hand-to-mouth sort of way in the summer, but in the winter, when the weather is worse, and there probably is rather less work, they have nothing.

6202. The source of employment of those people would be London, I suppose?—I should say many of them are van-drivers, outside porters, and so on. The Distress Committees' lists give bricklayers, bricklayers' labourers, general labourers, painters and carmen as specially numerous.

6203. Are there many connected with the building trade?—Yes, builders' labourers; and that trade has been bad for the last two winters—very bad.

6204. Are there many of the sort of casual occupations that surround society, waiters and that class of person?—I have not seen many old dress suits or shirts down there when I have been walking about; so I should not like to say that. One does not notice very many foreigners there. I do not say they are not there, but I have not seen them; Edmonton is not like St. George's-in-the-East at all.

6205. I think the Great Eastern Railway runs trains during the whole twenty-four hours?—I believe so.

6206. Every half hour?—I do not think every half hour all through the night.

6207. But they run all through the night?—The half-hourly all night service seems to be on the Walthamstow line only, which does not serve the Edmonton Union. On the Enfield line there is a four hours break after midnight.

6208. Looking at it from your point of view, do you think these out-districts ought to be considered for certain administrative purposes as part of London?—I should be very pleased to see them included in any advantages there are, but I do not know that they are very anxious to come in if they have to take their fair share of everything. At present their pauperism is better than in London; they would lose by coming in, because the London average is about one in forty, or something of that sort. It is by no means as bad as that yet in any of these places, Brentford, Willesden or Edmonton. I

Question of inclusion in London of suburban unions.

believe in Tottenham there has been some talk lately of applying to be included in London. The parish of Tottenham is on the fringe of London already, it touches London.

6209. It touches Finsbury?—Yes, Finsbury Park adjoins Hornsey, which is another part of the Edmonton Union, but Islington is on the south side of the Edmonton Union—Hampstead, Islington and Hackney, in a line.

Immigrants into London suburban unions.

6210. This immigration is almost exclusively of working class people. Take this as a test; should you say there was any considerable proportion of the increased population which kept servants?—No, I should think very few, except doctors and professional men, possibly a few solicitors. I think there are very few indeed of the new people. There are some houses being built farther out in the Edmonton Union, about Southgate, and so on, of a better class, and in Enfield there are very many good houses indeed—£120, or £150 houses; quite good houses; and then, of course, in Brentford there are some better properties. In Willesden there are many houses where I should say one servant is kept—quite half of them.

6211. The tendency, I presume, as facilities for locomotion increase, is to make districts immediately near London more and more inhabited by the poor as the well-to-do in those districts go farther away?—Yes.

6212. That has been the case at Tottenham?—Yes, I think that is so. Of course it is handy for them to be near, because of their work in London. That probably stops the emigration to a certain extent. Some fairly well-to-do people find it useful to be near their work, and not to go too far out. Of course there are local circumstances in all these cases. Near Finsbury Park, for instance, in the Hornsey District, there are some very good houses close to the New River which will probably continue to be inhabited by the same people.

6213. I suppose the sites that are attractive and favourable for good residential houses will remain?—For a considerable time, I should think, until they get quite surrounded by poor property.

6214. It is the poorer and lower districts of Edmonton, which are nearer the river, that are so rapidly covered with a cheap class of building?—Yes.

Effect on pauperism of Workmen's Compensation Act.

6215. In the evidence of other inspectors who have come before us there have been allusions made to the effect of the Workmen's Compensation Act. It is alleged in certain quarters that the tendency of that Act has been to reduce the age at which workmen and others are discharged, because the masters do not want to incur an increased liability from retaining oldish men in their employ. Have those remarks been made to you at all?—I have heard cases of it, but not sufficiently numerous for it to be worth making a point of it. In the boot trade the men fall out not, I think, on account of the risk of injury, but because they cannot keep up in the team work with the younger men; and then, of course, the agricultural labourer does not lose his work through it. That is not my experience.

6216. The agricultural labourer is now under the Compensation Act?—He is, in certain circumstances, under it.

6217. In the agricultural districts you do not think the Act has that effect?—No.

6218. In the others you have not seen enough to justify you in coming to any conclusion?—No, I have not.

Difficulty of recovering maintenance from relatives at a distance.

6219. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to paragraph 14, as to the desire of persons to move away so that they may not have to support their aged relatives, of course their liability to maintain does not cease because they go away from the district?—No, not at all.

6220. Is it a practical difficulty to get hold of them after they have gone; is that the point?—The first difficulty is, that they do not apply to some of the people while they are still in the district for fear of driving them away. That is what I had in my mind chiefly here.

6221. When they have gone away, what is it exactly that prevents their recovering the cost of the relief given to the old people?—I believe it is simply a matter of not taking the trouble, that they think they will not get it, and that it will be a lot of difficulty for nothing. They think the magistrates will not grant an order, and so on; but the main point there is that they are afraid of driving away the people who are actually in their district by asking for it. What advantage it is to them to keep the people who will not contribute I do not know, except, possibly, as individual employers of labour..

6222. In paragraph 20 you refer to the continued conversion of workhouses into infirmaries; do you mean that quite literally?—Not the whole of the buildings.

Conversion of workhouses into infirmaries.

6223. Or do you mean that the people who go into workhouses are more and more people who go in there because they require sick relief?—I meant it rather more literally than that. I meant the conversion of a considerable part of the building, or the addition of new blocks, almost entirely in the nature of infirmary blocks.

6224. Does that happen much in your district?—Yes.

6225. Conversion of other wards into infirmary wards is what you have in your mind?—Yes, and the addition of new infirmary blocks. There is the Northampton case which I have just mentioned for one, there is Willesden for another. At Edmonton a great deal is going on now, and at Kettering, and so on—there is a great deal being done.

6226. Have you much building going on since you have been in the district?—Yes, I am sorry to say so, and a good deal more will have to come in the next twelve months.

Guardians' attitude as to erection of workhouse buildings.

6227. Have you found the guardians willing to incur expenses in building, or have they been reluctant to do so, and have you had to do your best to persuade them?—They do not generally do a thing straight off, which is very proper, I think. As a rule they look very carefully indeed into a scheme. There are just a few Boards that I am rather afraid of suggesting anything to, they meet one almost too readily; but, as a rule, I think the guardians are very reasonable in carrying out a scheme when they have satisfied themselves that it is necessary.

6228. Have you, or have you not, found any tendency to excessive expenditure in relation to building?—Yes, I am afraid that that is the case sometimes.

6229. Have you had much in that kind of way, or only one or two particular instances?—I think I have only one instance really much in point where I consider the expenditure a good deal more than it need have been.

Variations in cost of building in London suburban unions.

6230. The cost of building is considerable, I suppose, in those unions which immediately adjoin London, is it not?—Yes; of course it varies with the rents, and the Trade Union rates of wages in the place chiefly. The effect is that there is at least 25 per cent. difference between one town and another within fifteen miles or so. I should say that in Watford and Barnet, for instance, the rents that the labourers have to pay are very heavy. In Barnet a very ordinary working man's flat costs 12s. a week. In a place like Luton work can be done for certainly as little as 75 per cent. of what it would cost in one of these places near London.

6231. The very considerable increase in the population of those unions near London has made additional building absolutely essential, I take it?—Yes.

Pros and *Cons* of enlargement of Poor Law areas.

6232. You have experience with regard to the variations in sizes of unions? You have one of the largest unions, or most populous unions, in the country, and I think you have also the very smallest?—Yes; Welwyn has only 2,265 people, so I should think it is that.

6233. Have you formed any opinion as to what is the best, or should be considered as the average, size of a union? Let me put it in another way; Have you any opinion as to the advantage of large areas for Poor Law purposes as compared with small ones?—I should say large ones are certainly more economical if they are properly managed, and certainly it should be easy to manage them properly, with a first class clerk and officers. I should say it is a very great advantage to have a large area, but there must be some limit in the area, of course.

6234. What do you say with regard to very large areas?—I cannot say that I have heard of, or that I have learnt of, any difficulty in the Newmarket Union, where the area is 100,000 acres.

6235. Suppose a very much larger area were taken, such as a county?—I think it would be only doing things

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

by committees again. I do not think it would make much difference.

6236. Management by committees you would not favour?—I should not think it would be any better.

6237. It is sometimes suggested that, supposing you had very large areas like that, and therefore classification of workhouses, the result would be that the poor would be separated in many cases from their friends, that is to say, placed at a distance from them?—Yes.

6238. Have you heard objections on that ground?—No, I have only seen them stated in print. I have never heard them.

6239. That does not come much your way?—No. I have heard of numerous objections to the sending of Londoners to country workhouses as "boarders."

Value of combinations of unions.

6240. Have you any combinations in your district?—No, none. For some purposes it would be very desirable to have some combinations, for the treatment of weak-minded people, and so on.

6241. Voluntary combinations under the Act of 1879?—Yes.

Inclusion in London of suburban unions and effect.

6242. A question has been raised, has not it, once or twice, as to how far these unions which immediately adjoin London ought to be brought into London?—I believe so.

6243. You said just now, in answer to the Chairman, they were not very willing to come in?—It is a financial matter, I think, largely with them. I believe that Tottenham now is rather desirous of coming in.

6244. Do they realise that if they came in they would have to come in for all purposes?—They would have to realise that, I suppose; nothing has been said to me about it.

6245. That it would be entirely contrary to all modern principles that there should be an overlapping of areas, that places should be brought into the County of London for one purpose, and left out for another?—I think they must know it, or they probably would have applied before.

6246. (*Chairman.*) They would like to be in London for the School Rate, and out of it for the Poor Rate?—Yes, I daresay, but I think they know better, they would have applied if they did not.

6247. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is it quite certain that they would not benefit for Poor Law purposes if they came into London and got a contribution from the Metropolitan Poor Fund?—No, I think they would not.

6248. The Metropolitan Poor Fund is raised according to rateable value; would not they benefit under that?—I do not think so. The Brentford rateable value is pretty high, and Edmonton is not very low yet—not for the whole union.

6249. If you take the rateable value as compared with the charge, would not a place like Tottenham benefit in that way?—Tottenham itself might, but not the whole Union, because, taking the whole of Edmonton Union, parts of it are wealthy and the average pauperism is low. Tottenham very likely would benefit.

Administrative effect of large Boards of Guardians.

6250. The number of guardians in the unions in your district varies a good deal, does not it?—Yes, it does.

6251. I have been looking down the list, and I see, for instance, that at Peterborough you have sixty-five guardians?—I think Peterborough is the largest.

6252. Would you say that the number of guardians was excessive in a case like that; I am not speaking of that particular union, but of a case like that?—I do not know of any harm that it really does in that particular union, or in any other in my district. I know the objection that they may, like some other people, come up on a special occasion and out-vote the regular members, but I have not heard of any complaints about that. I have, in that particular instance, seen allegations, but as a matter of fact, the numbers do not justify it; there are almost always at Peterborough, I think, thirty or forty guardians who attend. I have never seen any report of more than forty-eight voting on any one point.

6253. You would not be disposed to say that the administration was better where the numbers were smaller, or would you say that?—I take one practical instance; I could not say that the guardians of Edmonton, where there are only forty, manage their meetings any better than the Peterborough Guardians with their sixty-five. Peterborough is a large union, but has not many divergent interests and a place like that tends to be very much in the hands of, say, a dozen men; the other people understand that these dozen men amongst them represent them well, and they follow them largely. I do not think there is any more friction or waste of time through the excessive numbers.

Difficulty in obtaining quorum of rural guardians.

6254. Supposing it was desired to reduce the number of guardians some legislation would be necessary so as to combine parishes?—Yes. There is one point, as to the necessary quorum. I do not know if you are going to say anything about that. I have heard of trouble in one or two places. There is very great difficulty in some rural districts in getting the full quorum of one-third or seven, which is, I think, the alternative minimum. In the particular case I have in my mind there are twenty guardians and they are spread over a wide area, and they have very great difficulty sometimes in getting more than six. Then they have to send a relieving officer round on a bicycle collecting people. If any alteration were to be made in that way, it would be beneficial.

Loan medical relief.

6255. Is medical relief given on loan at all in your district?—In practically only two unions. In St. Neots it is given always on loan, I think.

6256. Do they recover the amount?—Yes, about 10 per cent. It is as much as that.

6257. Do they take proceedings, or are payments made without?—They take proceedings once or twice if necessary; after that they give up a case as hopeless, but they make a real effort first.

Casual work given by distress committees.

6258. In paragraph 32 of your memorandum you are referring to the Distress Committees, and you say, I think that in some instances only casual work has been given by the Distress Committees, not continuous work?—That is so.

6259. Is the payment made for that intermittent work sufficient to keep the people till they are employed again by the Committee?—I do not see how it can possibly be.

6260. If it is not, how do they live in the meanwhile?—I suppose they live on charity, the same as they would if there had been no Distress Committee. If you look at the figures on the next page for Edmonton, the average employment given was only three days, that is in a period of a month or more.

Regulations adopted by Guardians as to granting relief.

6261. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) We have been told, I think, by some inspectors who have already given evidence, that relief is administered in their unions sometimes by by-laws, or in accordance with certain by-laws which have been laid down with a view to regulating the administration of relief. Is there any such system in operation in your district?—Many of the guardians have what they call regulations—that would be the term I suppose; regulations largely following the Board's Orders, with just a few additional points.

6262. They are formed and prepared under the Board's orders?—They add a little more as instructions to the committees who are taking the cases.

6263. With a view to their guidance?—Yes, stating that certain cases must be referred to the full board, and so on.

6264. They are called by-laws?—No. All that I know of are called regulations. I hand in two specimen sets (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIII. (I. and J.).) I have no by-laws in my district that I know of.

6265. "By-laws" seems to imply a power to enforce them. Is there any instance which you know of where the by-law regulating the form of relief to be given in a certain case has been put into force?—I do not know of any. The guardians could give any instructions that were within the terms of the Board's orders to the committees, and call them what they like; but I have never heard of any by-laws.

Relief stations.

6266. In your district, is the system of pay-stations in operation?—It is practically universal. Of course, many people are paid in their own homes; but there are pay-stations almost throughout all the unions.

6267. As I understand, the object of paying them in their own homes is that, on the occasion upon which the

payment is made, the relieving officer shall see the condition of things in the homes ?—Yes, and see the state of the person's health, and all the rest of it, and see the person as well.

Value of surprise visits to paupers' homes.

6268. In your opinion, would that be as well done by a surprise visit, or surprise visits, on the part of the relieving officer on other occasions as at the time he is making payment of relief ?—I think it would be much better done if he could pay enough surprise visits, but he could not. His surprise visits are mostly once a quarter instead of once a week.

6269. A surprise visit once a quarter might be almost better than the ordinary visit once a week which is anticipated ?—That is what the guardians say; still, if the officer goes once a week—that is the point on the other side—they have to clean up once a week, as far as he does go, and that is a big point.

Methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

6270. As regards children in your district, what system is in operation there ? Is it a boarding-out system, or what is it ?—There is not much boarding-out outside the union. There are a certain number; I think I have given some particulars in this return—they are not very full. There are 550 children boarded-out either in or outside the union, out of a total of 2,750; 700 in the workhouse, and 1,500 in schools, and homes. Those in the schools are mainly in the big Middlesex establishments—Brentford, Edmonton, and Willesden. In Willesden, as a matter of fact, they are scattered homes.

6271. In Middlesex the boarding-out system is less in operation than in other counties ?—As to boarding-out, you might say so, certainly. Edmonton have succeeded in boarding-out a few recently. Northampton boards out a good many; they try every system.

6272. What is your opinion as to the relative merits of the treatment of children, as to boarding-out or placing them in scattered homes ?—As to the boarding-out outside the union, I think I can only take the opinion of the lady inspectors of boarding-out, and I cannot see much in favour of it from Miss Mason's, Miss Pell's, and Miss Evan's reports. There are so many cases where they do not seem to be properly looked after. It is very useful to have the power, of course, for a few cases now and then

6273. I suppose, in your opinion, it must depend really on the individual foster-parents who are selected ?—And the boarding-out committee who look after them. It is so difficult to get them satisfactorily looked after.

6274. The main thing to be kept in view by the guardians who decide upon boarding-out children would be to ascertain where suitable foster-parents are to be got ?—Yes.

6275. I think, in certain cases, that a resolution is arrived at by the boards of guardians, that a certain number of children who are found in the workhouse shall be boarded-out—say thirty or forty ?—Yes.

6276. Which leads one rather to think that the main object there is to get these children boarded-out, without keeping in view what should be the chief consideration that the foster-parents with whom they are boarded-out should be thoroughly suitable and reliable people. In your opinion, that is the main thing to be looked to; to see that the foster-parents are suitable ?—Are you referring to the practice of boarding-out in the union or outside ?

6277. I am talking of it generally ?—It would apply to both. The position is different, as far as the inspection goes. There is no official inspection at all of children boarded-out in the union, unless the inspector of the district has time to go, and that is practically impossible.

Separate provision for phthisical paupers.

6278. I notice that in the statement of suggestions received from chairman of boards of guardians, one suggestion is made that consumptives should be dealt with outside the Poor Law ?—Yes.

6279. Do you agree with that suggestion ?—I certainly do, myself. I have not seen the suggestion before, but I think it is a matter of national health. I am sorry to say in one place in my district, Kettering, they have just gone the other way. A couple of years ago they built very elaborate wards for ten phthisical men and ten phthisical women; and the tendency is for people outside, with a certain amount of money, to ask to come in, and it is very reasonable they should, because it is very difficult for people to find a place where they can be taken in for less than 35s. a week, and people with only that amount of money naturally want to come into a place of this sort.

6280. In your view, all paupers suffering from consumption or tuberculosis should be treated by the public health authorities and not by the Poor Law ?—Curable cases, I think—not the cases that ordinarily come to the Poor Law.

6281. Where do you put the incurable cases—people who are in the last stages and whose recovery is hopeless ?—If they are destitute, I think they should have an isolation department in the workhouse.

Objections to Guardians administering relief in cases from their own parish.

6282. (*Mr. Chandler.*) I believe you disagree with the principle of guardians administering relief in cases within their own parish ?—I disagree with that, certainly.

6283. You believe that the increase of pauperism shown in your return is largely due to that—in some cases, at any rate ?—I do not think I have ascribed any effect to it yet.

Causes of increased pauperism in Northampton.

6284. In answer to the Chairman you said it was due largely to that practice; I am speaking in connection with Northampton ?—I put it down to lax administration generally, not entirely to their taking their own cases. I do not go so far as that. I do not say there is any unfairness in it; I think it is the local feeling there, and so on.

6285. You would put it on lax administration generally ?—I should.

6286. Speaking of Northampton, the chief industry is boot and shoe making ?—Yes

6287. Has not this great depression in trade in the last five or six years reduced the demand for shoes from the factories considerably ?—No, it has not. The actual sale of boots has been considerably greater; but they have made much less profit on them, through the machinery and competition. The price has been less, but the output of boots has been greater.

Conditions in London suburban unions.

6288. Coming to those suburbs of London which you call the dormitories of London, Edmonton and Tottenham ?—I am only quoting.

6289. I take it there must be an immense amount of building going on in those districts ?—There has been a great deal, but it was checked about a year ago. The London County Council were opening up a large estate in Tottenham, but they stopped that altogether for a time.

6290. That would attract an immense number of workmen connected with the building trade industry ?—Yes.

6291. And that may account in a large measure for the increase of pauperism in those districts ?—I have not heard of a large deposit of stranded workmen like that—not of anything excessive.

6292. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Still going on with Edmonton and Brentford, who is there finds time to do the work of the guardians, say, at Edmonton ?—Would you like the conditions of the actual Edmonton Guardians ?

Appointment of ex-vice-chairman as relieving officer.

6293. I only want to know in general, whether they are shop-keeping or working classes ?—There are only four guardians for the parish of Edmonton itself; one is a clergyman, recently elected; the late vice-chairman of the guardians, who has been recently appointed relieving officer, was a news-stationer—he was a very well-known man; another of the guardians is a clergyman, Mr. Tom Collins; there is a socialist organiser, Mr. Mercer, and the last is a working man—he seems to find ample time to attend all the meetings; I have never known him not to be there—that is Mr. Barnes. In Tottenham there are eight guardians; several are either tradesmen or working men, of one sort or another, mostly retired or half-retired, I should think—men who do not have to attend to their business regularly.

Class of guardians in London suburban unions.

6294. Are there any outside people come in from London ?—Not from London. There are one or two residents of Hornsey who, I think, represent Tottenham. In Hornsey, of course, there are many people who work in London—barristers, and so on, I think—living in Hornsey and acting as guardians. Then, of course, there are lady guardians. I think there are six in the union, out of forty.

6295. From the conditions of pauperism, one would judge these are very well administered boards ?—Edmonton, Brentford and Willesden, I think I may say,

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

have been so far. Brentford is certainly very well administered. As to Edmonton, I had to sit at an enquiry for five days in October, hearing about the union and nothing came out against the administration at all—at least, nothing worth reckoning. In Willesden, if you are asking about that too, the constitution of the board has rather changed lately. At the last election I think five labour representatives were returned. I cannot say really what effect it will have. At present it has stopped the building of some blocks for the able-bodied which had been decided on, and the number of paupers has increased there very much this winter.

6296. In the other unions you would say there were very good instances of good democratic management on the board?—Would you say that I went so far as to make them out to be particularly democratic in those places? If you like, I can give it to you more in detail. At Brentford I should certainly say there were not more than two or three working men on the Board. There might be five, perhaps, out of forty or so. I think they are a very good mixture at all those boards.

6297. Very representative?—Representative of all classes, I should say, very fairly.

6298. You said, I think, that at Edmonton there were a large number of people who do not work at all. Did you refer to leisured people or unemployed?—They are both, I think. Some of them might be willing to be employed; I do not say they would not be. There are very few people who walk about, just to walk about and talk.

6299. They are not the rich unemployed?—No, certainly not—the poor unemployed.

Employment of women in district.

6300. Now I want to turn to women's work in your district. The straw plaiting industry is in your district?—Yes, at Luton, St. Albans, and Dunstable.

6301. Is that a self-supporting industry as carried on, or do you think it is subsidised by the rates?—No, I think it supports itself very well.

6302. The women do not get out-relief?—I do not think so. I have never heard of any cases of such people being relieved. There may have been relief to a family where some of the daughters may have been working and so on, or the mother may have been helped, possibly, but no actual worker has had help for herself.

6303. The work goes on pretty well all the year round? There are slack times, of course. In Luton they really do make provision, and that is the main centre, I think.

6304. In these districts near London, is there very much laundry work?—There is a good deal at Acton, in the Brentford Union. I understand the result of that is that in the winter there is a good deal of application for the labour yards from the husbands of the laundry workers.

6305. They really keep the men?—They keep them in the summer, when it does not want much to keep them, and in the winter they come up for two or three days' work in the yard.

6306. Do you think that industry is at all subsidised by out-relief?—I do not think so.

6307. In Northampton there are women employed in the boot-making?—Yes; I think relatively more, probably, in Wellingborough and Kettering than in Northampton itself.

6308. Do you think they earn enough wages to keep clear of the Poor Law?—I have always understood that the women do better. They drink less, of course, They keep themselves off the rates better than the men. I think.

Attractiveness of labour yards

6309. I notice in the Local Government Board Report you say some very interesting things about the labour yards that have been opened at different times in your district. You say cases are known of men who have actually thrown up regular work in order to be taken on there?—Yes, that was in Northampton, fifteen months ago.

6310. Do you think any actual evidence could be got of men having done that?—I do not know whether I could get the names of the particular men now, but I did have them told me at the time. I knew the employer's name, at any rate.

6311. Whose men had thrown up his work to get work in the labour yards?—Yes. I had the particulars given me by the relieving officer at the time.

6312. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Was that officially reported to the board of guardians by the relieving officer?—I am not sure whether it was; but I told them. I think they knew pretty well.

6313. He had made inquiries of the employer and reported them to the Board, I suppose?—I believe that was so.

6314. And the Board still put them on?—It is a very difficult position for them. The man cannot get his work then. They might prosecute him for not having maintained himself when he could.

6315. Or they might have offered him the House?—They had no room there at all—and the man may have had five or six children. Of course, they could have offered the man himself the house, and applied to the Local Government Board for leave to relieve his family outside; but then the guardians' feelings about the matter are not quite so strong as some of ours.

Effect of workmen Guardians on administration.

6316. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) You told us in one case the working men coming on to the Board stopped a building for the able-bodied. Do you mean by that that they did not wish the workhouse to be applied as a test?—I do not say that. I do not want to do them any injustice at all. If there is any effect they have had, it is in the want of continuity. This matter was passed last year, and the plans were decided on and actually sent up to the Local Government Board, then they held the matter over for the new Board to see what they would do, and they decided not to go on. A little more pressure was brought to bear upon them; it was pointed out to them that the existing able-bodied people were living in infirm wards, which was a very extravagant way, there were no workshops for them, and so on; and the new members recognised this after a time, and decided to proceed, and sent their plans up again. Then about a month ago they resolved not to go on. That is my point. There is a want of continuity in their proceedings.

6317. (*Chairman.*) If plans are once sanctioned by the Local Government Board, and the loan is sanctioned, is it in the power of the board of guardians to stop it?—The plans had been approved, but the actual sanction to the loan had not been given; the Order had not been issued. We had not got quite so far as that.

6318. It was in a preliminary stage?—Yes.

Charities at Peterborough and Ely and their effect.

6319. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I want to ask one question about the charities in your district. I suppose in some of the towns, Peterborough, for instance, and Ely, there would be large endowed charities?—In Peterborough there is a good deal. There are about seventy almshouses, some of them endowed, some of them not; mostly simply the rooms themselves. The Charity Commissioners are making a new scheme for Peterborough this year, taking up all the doles and applying them to the use of residents in the almshouses, and so on. Ely I do not know about.

6320. Do you think that these charities have a tendency to attract people to these particular places and keep a poor population there?—I have always heard so, but I have no information. I should think not in Peterborough. I think they are local people. There are outside the City of Peterborough in the rural part of the union several sets of almshouses of the same sort. I am told they really are occupied by Peterborough people of long standing. Of course, as regards the town, the scheme of the Charity Commissioners will ensure this system in future.

6321. Have you any instance where the guardians co-operate much with private charities and are able to refer their cases to private charities?—Do you mean through the Charity Organisation Society, or something of that sort?

Co-operation of Guardians with charities.

6322. Yes, that Society, or anything of that sort?—In Barnet the new cases are looked after by the Charity Organisation Society in the first instance.

6323. All the cases?—I am told all the cases.

6324. They really do the work of the relieving officer?—In conjunction with him. Where he has any doubt about a case, any thought that it may be respectable, he will refer it to them, and they will consider whether

they will take it on. I think the relieving officers do their work very well in Barnet; it is not shirking on their part; it is simply that they co-operate. In Cambridge there is a good deal of that, and Bedford. In Northampton they started a branch of the Society last year. I cannot say it has had any result yet, but a good many ladies are taking an interest in it here, and it may do some good.

6325. Do you think where it has been at work in Cambridge and Barnet, it has been of use in reducing the cases of pauperism more effectively?—The result certainly has been very satisfactory. Pauperism, in Cambridge till this year, has been exceedingly low—something like one in sixty-nine, which is about fourteen per 1,000. In Barnet it has been high lately, but rather lower on that account than it would otherwise have been. It is a place where, by its natural circumstances, you would expect a very high rate of pauperism, because of the high rents.

6326. I suppose in those cases the guardians feel that they can be strict without being harsh, because the charities will take up the cases that are good cases?—I do not think they go quite so far in that way as the Whitechapel Guardians used to do, or the Brixworth Guardians.

6327. But still, it does give them confidence?—Yes.

Infrequency of case-paper system.

6328. Do the guardians, in any of your unions, use case papers?—Brentford has been considering it for months and months, and I believe the Committee were going to make a recommendation to the Board this week in favour of it. I heard yesterday that at Bedford they were proposing to do it. No unions have actually adopted it yet.

6329. Not even Cambridge?—No.

Effect on pauperism of return of old people from towns.

6330. You spoke of the old people returning to the country very often after they are past work. Does it not often happen they return with a small pension or means of subsistence. I have known that happen in some districts?—Of course, they would not tell me about those. I complained to the guardians in places like Ampthill and Biggleswade of the very high pauperism, and they have given me this as a reason; they have pointed to the excessive number over sixty-five, and they say partly the young people go away and partly the old people come back; and if they do come back with a pension it is very seldom enough to keep them, I think.

6331. I have in mind a certain district very largely inhabited by old commissionaires and policemen, and people of that type, who have gone back. That would raise the average age very much, but they are all self-supporting?—Is that a country district?

6332. Yes, that is a country district?—I do not know any like that.

Conditions in Brixworth union.

6333. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) I notice the percentage of pauperism in Brixworth, which is a very famous union, is rising now. Can you tell us what that is due to?—I do not think it is too high now, it is about 1 in 47.

6334. It has risen suddenly?—It has been very much higher than that. At Brixworth the pendulum has moved backwards and forwards a good deal. After Mr. Pell's and Canon Bury's régime there came a very different one. It was very high then. It is pretty reasonable now. They have a good many old people there.

6335. Did the district rebel under the strict régime?—No; it was under a new chairman. It was largely due to the influence of a particular man.

6336. I did not know whether the district had rebelled against the strict policy?—I do not think so. If it did it found out that it was mistaken, and it went back pretty well to Mr. Pell's system afterwards.

Size of Inspectors' districts and effect on inspections, &c.

6337. Would you find it more easy to get a more uniform system of administration if your district were not so large?—No, I do not think so.

6338. You would not find it desirable to get round more often to some of these boards?—I beg your pardon; I thought you meant the unions. I think the guardians instead of welcoming one as they do at present, might, if one went round about once a quarter, think they were being unduly interfered with. I do not think it would do to go too often to the meetings. I do not think that the institutions really require inspecting more than once in eight or nine months. That is enough for most of them; if there is anything special, one goes round more frequently.

6339. You do not think it necessary to see more of the relieving officers or men of that kind, in order perhaps to instruct them? You told us of one person who was vice-chairman and was soon afterwards appointed relieving officer?—And he is a very excellent relieving officer too.

Ex-vice-chairman as relieving officer.

6340. You would not think it necessary to train a new relieving officer?—I think the man knows probably more about the district than anybody else in it.

Training and examination of relieving officer.

6341. As a district officer you would not think it desirable to train the relieving officer when newly appointed; otherwise new relieving officers have to buy their experience at the cost of the rates?—The question is whether someone else should not train the relieving officer, and whether he should not pass a test before he comes in.

Attitude of paupers towards "classification."

6342. (*Dr. Downes.*)—In going round the workhouses do you get many complaints as to classification?—If you mean from inmates, very rarely; I cannot call to mind any at all in the country.

Provision for imbeciles and infectious sick in London suburban unions.

6343. Taking what I may call the London fringe, do the guardians experience much difficulty in dealing with certain classes which are provided for in London by the Asylums Board?—Imbeciles and the weak-minded chiefly.

6344. For instance, there would be the infectious sick, fever cases, or cases for which there is no isolation accommodation?—I do not think they do. Joint hospital districts have recently been formed in Middlesex to provide for scarlet fever and small pox.

6345. The guardians send their cases to the public health authorities' hospitals?—Yes.

6346. Have they any difficulty in doing that?—I have not heard of any.

6347. Take the case of imbeciles, is there any difficulty with regard to them?—At Willesden they certainly have a number of imbeciles, epileptics, and weak-minded grouped together. There it is inconvenient.

6348. How do they provide for them at Willesden?—They are in one of the infirmary wards. I think I have seen five female imbeciles, and about the same number of sane epileptics there.

6349. I gather you think they are a class for which there should be provision apart?—I think so. I have noticed it more in the country than in the suburban districts really.

6350. Do not the imbeciles rather divide themselves into those who are objectionable to the people round them, and those who are really useful in the house and not very objectionable?—Yes. Many of the weak-minded, if I may say so, are much worse than the certifiable cases. They give rise to much trouble; they are cases which the doctor cannot certify, but which are still obviously troublesome.

6351. Now take the case of ophthalmic children or children suffering from ringworm. Do you find difficulty in providing for them in your district?—With ringworm children, yes, there has been a good deal lately. Willesden had cases, but they managed it. They have separate homes, scattered homes, and they put the children in one of them there until they were all cured. It took about a year. At Watford there are many cases now, and there are some at Edmonton.

6352. Is there any place they could send them to on payment?—I do not know of any, except the Leatherhead home, and that only takes girls and small boys.

6353. That is Miss Rendell's?—Yes. The Metropolitan Asylums Board are at present taking Edmonton cases.

Out-relief to phthisical paupers.

6354. You have mentioned the case of the phthisical. Do phthisical patients get out-relief to any considerable extent in your district?—Yes, in a good many cases they do. I always ask the guardians when I hear of cases if the surroundings are satisfactory, and the relieving officers say they are; one feels doubtful nevertheless.

6355. Attention is perhaps being drawn more particularly to them now to a greater extent than it was before. I gather that you consider it desirable that their surroundings should be looked into rather carefully?—Quite so, but it is difficult to get the guardians to bring them into

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

the workhouse infirmaries till they have provision for them, or, on the other hand, to make provision for them, Some of them are making provision now, I may say.

6356. You have told us there is a lack of cheap provision for that class of case ?—Yes, I know of very few places.

6357. Are there any special points in connection with medical relief to which you desire to call attention ? Let us take the case of the outdoor relief. Have you any district medical officers who give their whole time ?—I think none.

"Whole-time" district medical officer.

6358. In Leighton Buzzard there was formerly an arrangement of that sort ?—He gives his time to the workhouse and the out-relief. That is the only one.

6359. That is still the case ?—Yes.

6360. I believe that is a very old-standing arrangement, is it not ?—Yes, he used to live at the workhouse, and have quarters there. It is quite exceptional.

6361. Does he hold other appointments besides the Poor Law appointments ?—No, he is not medical officer of health.

Attendance of district medical officer at relief committees.

6362. Does he attend the meetings of the guardians when they are considering relief ?—Yes, he sits there during the meeting.

6363. Do you consider that there is advantage in that arrangement ?—I am not sure that there is, because it means that he has in the past made up his books during the meeting. We have advised him not to do that now. I think it will be all right in future. It is certainly convenient he should be there, because cases do arise every now and then.

6364. Cases in which the guardians wish to have information as to the condition of the particular case ?—Sometimes they only want to know the merits of Bovril or something of that sort, which he has recommended. He is able to explain for them.

6365. Does the arrangement work economically in the Leighton Buzzard district ?—His total salaries, I suppose, come to rather more than they would if the work was divided among outside men, but there must be economy in it in some way. They are certainly not a lavish board of guardians, and they have never suggested departing from the arrangement It is a difficult district to get over, and that is probably the reason.

6366. Are the medical extras high in that district ?—I should say not.

Arrangements for supply of drugs.

6367. With regard to the supply of drugs, how is that generally arranged in your district ?—As a rule the doctor still supplies them, except just the two old exceptions, cod liver oil and quinine. In a good many cases one or two additions have been made lately, and in three or four unions the guardians have appointed a dispenser, and arranged for drugs. Kettering is one of them. The practice is certainly extending, but very slowly, of finding drugs for the doctors.

Revision of list of chronic paupers.

6368. How do your guardians revise the permanent lists ? Do they take the whole list *en bloc*, or do they take a few at one meeting and a few at another ?—As a rule they do the whole list; some of the District Auditors have asked them to do it for convenience in checking the books.

6369. To take the whole list ?—Yes. I have suggested myself once or twice it would be better, so as to go through the list carefully, to take a few parishes at a time, but that reason has been given me for not doing it They vary very much. Quite a rural board that I attended the other day I find have a revision quarterly, and they have it at seven different places in the Union. As a rule, the revisions are made half-yearly, and in one or two places only yearly for practical purposes.

6370. I suppose the disadvantage of taking a long list at one meeting is that it is very difficult to get through ?—It is purely formal in many cases. In some of those cases it is alleged that the guardians of the parish have gone through the list beforehand, that the relieving officer has given them a list of their own cases, they have had time to look at them, and when the name is called over, if they have anything to say, they say it. That is what is said.

6371. Is that an effectual check ?—It would be if they went through them, I think.

6372. If they did it ?—Yes.

Conversion of workhouses into infirmaries.

6373. Speaking of the conversion of workhouses into infirmaries, have you met with much structural difficulty in that regard ?—I have one very difficult case on now, a difficulty in converting the building.

6374. Converting wards which are not intended for the sick into infirmary wards ?—Yes, there is a specially bad case now at Luton. The guardians have been to houses a hundred miles off honestly looking to find a good way of converting.

6575. As against that one bad case, have you any successful case of conversion ?—I think that is rather a point for the architect to answer. There are many things that I am satisfied with, because they have been done cheaply and provide the accommodation, which he, as architect, is not altogether pleased with.

6376. You mean the Local Government Board architect? —Yes. I think a good many places have been satisfactorily converted from the point of view merely of economy and utility.

6377. Are the medical officers satisfied in those cases ? —Yes, I think I might say so. Of course, there are difficulties in many of them; they are not so economical, to work, and they want a larger staff than a new building would, and so on.

Proportion of nurses to patients.

6378. In your return of the nursing, on page 7 of your Memorandum, there is a considerable difference in the proportion of nurses and attendants in different unions. May I ask if the sick include any considerable proportion of the infirm who are not bedridden ?—Yes, a very large proportion do in some cases. It is very hard to get a uniform description.

6379. I notice in the case of Edmonton you say there are 189 chronic convalescent cases ?—Yes.

6380. You have no return of the deaths here have you ? —No. I have not shown it there.

6381. That would afford perhaps some check on the class of sickness ?—Yes, I might include that in another return.

6382. Have you much difficulty in inducing guardians to appoint nurses and paid attendants ?—Not as a rule, I think. In some cases there is more obstinacy than in others. Where the salaries of the staff come out rather high it is hard to induce them to appoint more.

6383. What do you do in a case of that sort ?—After I have talked to the guardians, if they will not do anything, I generally ask the board's medical inspector to come and visit, and he makes a report. I have one case on now; I hope to be successful.

6384. Do the guardians' medical officers also draw attention to the want of nursing in the case of deficiency ?— In this particular case the medical officer does not want any more.

6385. He is satisfied ?—Yes.

Nursing of out-door sick paupers.

6386. How do the guardians arrange for nursing outdoor cases of sickness in your district ?—It is generally left in an ordinary case for the relieving officer to find the nurse, unless in cases where it is simply an infirm person and there is a district nurse, then the guardians, as a rule, having subscribed to the district nursing association expect the nurse to look in. If the sick person wants someone to be with her, it is left to the relieving officer to find the nurse.

6387. What class of person would that be ?—It depends altogether on the class of the district. It is very rarely a woman of any training.

6388. In the urban districts do they get nurses ?—Yes. Pretty largely now; the guardians are subscribing more and more every year to the funds of the nursing associations. I think Cambridge subscribes £100 a year, which is about the largest I have in my district.

Requisition of extra nurses by medical officer.

6389. Do the medical officers make use of their power under the Nursing Order to requisition a nurse in the case of emergency ?—I think so. I have seen several cases of that lately.

Non-Poor-Law provision for sickness.

6390. I do not know whether you have any information as to agencies in your district, other than the poor law, for providing for sickness. How are the classes off who are just above the level of pauperism ? Have they provision such as the poor law provides for the paupers ?—

There are only the general hospitals like Addenbroke's Hospital at Cambridge, the General Infirmaries at Northampton, Peterborough, and Huntingdon, the County Hospital at Bedford, and so on.

6391. They would not take chronic cases, would they; —No; those cases, I suppose, all over England, are in an unfortunate position.

Cottage Hospitals.

6392. Have you any cottage hospitals in your districts, small voluntary hospitals?—Yes; I could not give the number, but they are in most towns. Watford, I remember, has one, and Barnet, and so on; in all the urban places I should say there is one. In the Brentford Union there are half a dozen conveniently separated.

6393. Do you know anything of any provision by way of medical clubs and provident societies against sickness? —Not very much. In Brentford there are at least 3 dispensaries, members of which pay a penny weekly; there are also numerous slate clubs by which provision is made against sickness in Brentford, Wellingborough and other unions.

6394. Whether that sort of provision is extending or whether it is not extending?—I should say from what I have read, and heard, insurance apart from share-out clubs is diminishing in most towns certainly, and in the country districts I should say it is very little indeed.

Inspectors' knowledge of Guardians proceedings.

6395. Do any of your guardians print their agenda?—Yes.

6396. Do they send you copies?—No.

6397. Would it be of assistance to you if they did? —No, I do not think it would. Do you mean with a view to my attending?

6398. With a view to your knowing what is going on? —I would sooner have the minutes.

6399. You do not get those, I suppose?—No; if there is anything special, on the agenda, most of the clerks take the opportunity of giving me the information on the weekly A form, just before.

6400. There is a space for that purpose?—Yes; I should have gone to a board meeting to-day on a hint of this kind, if I had not been called here.

Interaction of ill lax Poor Law administration and inadequate housing accommodation.

6401. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In your last two reports to the Local Government Board you dwell a good deal on the state of the housing in your district. Do you think that stands in any relation to poor-law administration?—I think it does in the country districts very much.

6402. In what way?—I think the rural exodus is largely due to the difficulty in finding accommodation by young people. That is the first thing. Then the state in which they live is another very big question.

6403. In what way does the state in which they live affect the poor law, do you think?—I think you get immorality for one thing; you get disease, you get actual imbecility and all kinds of deterioration.

6404. Do you think that a bad type of cottage in the country is often kept alive by liberal outdoor relief?—Yes, of course it would be to some extent. If the people had not any money to live there, they would have to go out, you might say.

6405. And come into the House?—Yes.

6406. Have you ever had reason to think in the towns that guardians were interested in a poor class of cottage? —I have known cottages without decent sanitation and so on, some of which were occupied by persons in receipt of out-relief, and which belonged to guardians, but I should not like to say one way or the other.

6407. You have never had grounds to think that outdoor relief was given to tenants of persons interested?—No, I could not say one way or the other.

6408. Have you any remedy to suggest with regard to the housing of the poor in the country districts, from your experience?—No, I have not. I have seen many suggestions, but all that I have seen seem to me to be quite impracticable. I should like to put in extracts from recently issued reports by Medical Officers of Health for two of the poorest rural districts, Buntingford and Linton (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIII. (K).)

Peterborough charities and their effect.

6409. In the town you instanced with regard to charities, the town of Peterborough, I gathered you said that people were not attracted into Peterborough much by the existing charities?—Not so far as I know.

6410. Do you think people are attracted from one parish to another within Peterborough by the existence of charities?—I do not know; I have not heard of that.

6411. You would not say you find very often a bad class of houses tenanted in consequence of the charities?—I do not think so.

6412. You have no experience of that?—No. I rather think in Peterborough the town charities are all in one.

Conditions in Cambridge union.

6413. Take for a moment the case of Cambridge. You know the conditions of Cambridge; it is of course a university town?—Yes.

6414. The year is therefore divided into terms and vacations?—Yes.

6415. Does that make an appreciable difference in the industrial conditions?—I have never noticed any. I am in there pretty often, but I do not see more people loafing about.

6416. Do you find that the board of guardians have a greater number of applications in the summer than in the winter?—Certainly not.

6417. You do not find a tendency on the part of the guardians to help people tide over the long vacation?—No, I do not think so. They have been a very good board of guardians hitherto.

6418. Is the university represented on the board?—Not to any very great extent; the wife of one of the professors is a guardian, and one of the other guardians, Dr. Dalton, is always spoken of as a connecting link with the University, and that is all.

6419. Do you think that the casual character of employment in university towns is a factor in Cambridge?—I am told that a great many of the men there live on the women's earnings as bed-makers, and that does account for a number who come up in the winter.

6420. Is the proportion of able-bodied large in Cambridge?—No; very small indeed.

6421. You said at Cambridge the Charity Organisation Society worked with the guardians?—Yes.

Co-operation between charities and Poor Law.

6422. Do you know on what lines they work; is it by inquiry or relief?—I should say that it was more in the way of inquiry.

6423. Do you think, for instance, they take off the hands of the guardians aged and deserving cases?—I cannot give any figures.

6424. Have they a pension scheme?—That I ought to know, because I heard a paper read two years ago by a member, but I cannot give any particulars now.

6425. Have you any opinion as to how far that system could be carried, whether you could draw a clear line between the work of charity and the poor law?—If you had sufficient means from the charitable you could take all the deserving cases, I suppose, from the poor law altogether.

6426. You could make the poor law relief purely institutional?—Yes.

6427. Do you think that would be a good thing?—I doubt whether it would be practicable.

6428. Do you suppose that charitable funds administered in that way can do the work of the poor law as well as outdoor relief does it now?—Yes; I do not see why not at all.

Out relief and maintenance by relatives.

6429. You think that the system of outdoor relief checks assistance from relatives?—Yes; I am sure it does.

6430. You think a great deal more might be done in the way of making relatives support one another?—Yes; both those relatives who are legally liable and those who are morally.

6431. You were not in this district, were you, when Brixworth was under Mr. Pell?—No.

Cause of variation in numbers of sick paupers at Bedford and Luton.

6432. Could you explain from your figures why Luton has such a very high figure in its infirmary: if you compare the population of Luton with the population of Bedford the sick in the infirmary is abnormally large?—I am afraid for real comparison these figures are not thoroughly reliable. The master who furnishes the figures in some cases gives all the occupants of the sick wards and convalescent wards: sometimes he will only give the ones that either in his opinion or the medical officer's are

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

really sick. Luton I have got down this year, I think, as 149. That would be the total number in the infirmary wards on that date.

6433. Now take Bedford; Bedford is eighty-five?—I have got the previous year's return here, and Luton is eighty-five there. I believe there is actually an increase of ten or fifteen, or something like that, in the numbers in the infirmary wards.

6434. It is largely a matter of classification?—Yes, it is. I think you might take the numbers at Bedford and Luton as really not very different.

Nursing staff at Kettering.

6435. You know the infirmary at Kettering?—Yes.

6436. They employ probationers a good deal there, do they not?—Yes, but they have a number of other nurses. They have a considerable staff of trained nurses as well.

6437. Do you know the proportion between the nurses and probationers there?—I have in this return one superintendent nurse, and last year there was another certified nurse, she has gone, unfortunately, and they have not replaced her. I think that does rather bring out your point. There are seven nurses with more than a year's training.

6438. Have you much experience of the probationer system?—I should not like to pose as an authority at all.

Difficulties re settlement.

6439. Do you find any difficulties still arising from settlement in your district?—One often hears grumbles, and so on, but I have never heard of any really strong desire for the abrogation of the law of settlement; only just ordinary grumbles about cases.

Operation of Relief to school children order.

6440. (*Miss Hill.*) You refer in paragraph 34 to the Underfeeding of School Children Order, and you say it was used in one union specially. What was the process? The information was sent from the school, was it?—Yes.

6441. And then the guardians inquired into it?—Yes, the guardians inquired.

6442. Which union was that?—Kettering.

6443. I gather that very few of the applicants sent in were found really in need?—No, all that were sent in in Kettering were relieved except, I think, one family. Up to the 8th February application had been made on behalf of 42 children in 14 families; 10 children were added by the 20th February, and they were all found sufficiently in need to satisfy the guardians.

6444. That was not the case in another union?—No.

6445. Which union was that?—That was Northampton, the neighbouring union.

6446. There were very few found?—I think their applications were something like 200, but none at all were found to require it.

6447. None?—Some of them were actually children of parents in receipt of relief, so if they were dealt with it was under the ordinary out-relief order; all the Guardians had to do was to see that enough relief was given, and that the parents used it properly.

Operation of distress committees and results.

6448. With regard to the Distress Committees, I see you say a certain number in each place were willing to be emigrated. Would a good many of those be emigrated?—No. The one man in Northampton willing to be emigrated was emigrated. He was sent out to his friends in Canada. No others have been sent by Distress Committees at all. In the Edmonton Union in the Tottenham district a number of men were emigrated under Mr. David's scheme; about 50 families have been sent out. The scheme has been financed by Lord Rothschild, and they propose to send out 200 families.

6449. Will any of the others be dealt with?—I am afraid not.

6450. With regard to those put to the relief works, was there any necessary term of residence in the district before they were employed?—Yes.

6451. A year?—I believe they were strict on that.

6452. So that there is no evidence of people coming into the district for it?—No.

6453. In the summer is there any evidence of what has become of those men?—No, I think that really those men are knocking about in the summer, too.

6454. So that it will be much the same thing again in successive winters?—I see no reason to expect any improvement whatever in any of these districts. It is simply a matter of the building trade being better next year, perhaps. If the building trade is no better, nothing has been done this year to lift these people.

6455. In fact, something has been done having the directly opposite effect, that is what I should be afraid of?—I should think so.

6456. They will be looking for the same thing year after year. Is the work such that it really cultivates their energy and powers, do you think, or is it like so very much made work, not the same sort of discipline?—I do not think it has been made work that they have done as a rule; it has been mostly digging and wheeling, and so on. It is better than carrying a dumb-bell up and down a room, I think. They have had something to show at the end of the time; they have filled in culverts, and made banks up, and so on.

6457. Still I suppose the man who works hard and the man who does not work hard are all treated very much alike?—There is nothing like the stimulus of ordinary labour; the other workmen perhaps encourage them to do their share. I think public opinion represented by the other workmen is the only influence.

6458. Do you think that would come to very much where the work was paid for out of the Common Fund, and there was no chance of dismissal?—No, I do not think it is much good. I regard it as rather worse than a labour yard myself.

6459. So I gathered. That is the fruit, perhaps, of its being work without being work?—Yes, it is less regular and less compulsory.

6460. And there is less stimulus to do your best?—I think so; but it is a little better sort of work as far as it goes than you can give in the ordinary labour yard. I think it is a little better than stone-breaking.

6461. It is, perhaps, fairer on the men who have not been accustomed to stone-breaking. It is more work a man can do who has only a certain amount of muscular strength?—I do not think stone-breaking is difficult work. I have done a little of it. It is only because it is unprofitable and dangerous that I object to it; it is dangerous to the eyes.

6462. The man who is accustomed to do it can do it with great ease?—That is so.

6463. It tells very much more severely on those who have not done any before?—That is so.

Nursing st at Ketteri

6464. (*Mr. Phelps.*) I think there is some modification that you wish to make in an answer you gave to me earlier in the day about the nurses at Kettering?—Yes. You suggested that there were a number of probationers. I want to point out that while there are ninety-four sick cases, there is at the moment one superintendent nurse and no other certified nurses, but there are seven nurses with more than one year's training and one other with less; so that really there is only one probationer in her first year at Kettering. It is not the ordinary probation system that they have there, as they do not qualify for the post of superintendent nurse; but it is found very useful in practice to have these people instead of just the plain workhouse nurse. The total at Kettering is nine nurses by day and three by night. It really is exceedingly well nursed as a rule.

Permanent labour-yar at Northan ton.

6465. (*Professor Smart.*) Do I understand that there is a permanent stone-yard opened at Northampton now?—It has been open since May, 1904, but I hope it is not permanent. The numbers employed for the last week for which I have the returns—I think the returns are for ten days ago—were 160 or so.

6466. Is that going up or going down?—It is going down, but very slowly.

6467. Why was this stone yard opened at all?—Because of the depression in the boot trade.

6468. Was there not sufficient workhouse accommodation?—No, there was nothing like enough workhouse accommodation; the workhouse was very full indeed at the time.

6469. The guardians adhere to the orthodox principle, I suppose, that when there is workhouse accommodation a stone yard should not be opened?—I hope so, but at present the surplus will not be more than about seventy

or eighty beds when the infirmary is finished, which it should be in another fortnight or so, and there are at this present moment 160 men in the stone yard.

6470. (*Miss Hill.*) Would they all come into the workhouse?—They have been doing the work, and it has been a fair test, as labour yards go; it has been better than most—it is five days a week and ten cwt. of stone a day. They have been sticking to that for some time, and I am afraid a good many of them by this time will be willing to come into the House rather than go away and look for work—I am afraid so; but still I shall do all I can to bring pressure on the guardians.

Effect of new machinery at Northampton

6471. (*Professor Smart.*) Has there been anything in the nature of a crisis in Northampton?—Yes, through the introduction of improved machinery. At any time within the last three years, different firms have been forced by competition to introduce machinery of the latest type, and as they do that, the output is increased, but the number of hands has been reduced.

6472. That is likely to go on, is it not?—I think it cannot go on much further now, because practically all the firms have got up-to-date machinery. The machinery will not produce more, and I think the numbers of men will not go down further; I think they have got to the bottom at last. Of course this has mainly affected the older men—those who cannot keep pace with the rest of the teams.

Finance of Northampton labour-yard.

6473. Have you heard anything as to the financial results of the stone yard?—I have some figures here of the actual expenditure on relief. The yard was opened in the seventh week of the midsummer quarter of 1904, that is about the second week of May, and up to midsummer of 1904 £66 11s. 1d. had been spent—call it £66 for the first seven weeks, and the numbers of men relieved varied between twenty-four and forty. Then for the fourteen weeks ended at Michaelmas, 1904, the expenditure was £481.

6474. Was that in relief entirely?—Yes. The numbers of men then varied between forty-one and 186, the 186 being for the last week. For the year from Michaelmas 1904 to Michaelmas 1905, taking the full twelve months, the largest number at work in any week was 299, and the total expenditure on these able-bodied people in the yard was £3,205.

6475. That does not include the material, I take it?—There is a little profit made on the material, because they get a little more for the broken stone in Northampton than they pay for the big stone.

6476. Is that all one can say—"a little more"?—There is a little profit—I think it is about 1s. 6d. a ton.

6477. There is a little margin, you mean?—Yes, but out of that they have to pay the rent of the yard, which they hire from the London and North Western Railway Company, the superintendent's wages, the cost of building shedding all round to work in, barrows and so on. I think you must strike off any profit on the stone-breaking as against this cost of material and so on, and put down the £3,205 as the increase in relief. I think there was an increase in out-relief altogether of £4,000 in 1905 over 1904, and £2,700 of that was on the labour yard, the rest being spent on other cases. Since then, for the quarter ending Christmas last, the amount spent in relief of the able-bodied and their families was £1,050; that is rather less than for the quarter ending with the Christmas of 1904 when it was £1,216, so that it has improved by that much. That may be through the opening of the Distress Committee's work, but I do not think so.

6478. I notice that the Corporation Distress Committee are doing work at the same time?—Yes, they are doing work, but their work is laying out paths and so on.

6479. It is not stone-breaking?—No, it is not; it is supposed to be useful work. Then £720 has been given to the men at work in the stone yard since Christmas—in nine weeks.

6480. Can you tell me if the machinery that is employed in boot-making is machinery that requires fineness of hand?—I believe it does,

Effect of stone-breaking on skilled artificers.

6481. Then stone-breaking will certainly not do any good to the men?—If you mean, does it require fineness of hand in the sense that watch-making does, I do not think it is like that; but it does require quickness and so on.

6482. I meant what would be the effect of a long period of stone-breaking on the skill of these men?—I have not heard it alleged that it would prevent them from working in Northampton. It certainly has improved their physique. That is the only good thing I can say for it—that the men have really improved in strength. They are out in the open air instead of being in very badly ventilated factories. The latter is entirely through their own fault, as they will not have any windows open in the boot factories as a rule.

6483. You are afraid that there is some tendency towards pauperisation, I think?—I think it is becoming very permanent.

6484. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I find that the principal unions in your district are what might be termed out-door relief unions?—Yes.

Large proportion of out-door paupers in district.

6485. There is not a single union in your district, I believe, where there are more relieved in-door than out-door?—There are some country unions which come very near it. St. Neots is very near, though not quite; it is about 90 against 100. Edmonton is about one-third in-door I think. But it is as you say.

6486. That will mean that your attention will be drawn more particularly to the question of out-door relief than to the question of in-door relief, will it not?—I do not know that the mere numbers govern that, and that one would necessarily give two-thirds of one's time to two-thirds of the people. It might be so to some extent.

6487. Still you would deprecate a large number being in receipt of out-door relief, I take it?—Yes.

6488. You do not believe that out-door relief is really better than in-door relief and less likely to pauperise?—No, certainly not; but if you had relief limited to, say, 3,000 people, I would sooner have 2,000 out and 1,000 in than the other way about, because I believe that it would be cheaper. But then you could not of course do that; that is the whole point; you would get a great many more by having them relieved out.

Effect of out-relief policy in increasing pauperism.

6489. You believe in the theory that the policy of liberal out-door relief tends to increase pauperism?—Yes; I am afraid there is no question of that.

6490. If that be so, your attention would naturally be drawn to assisting the guardians as far as possible to reduce the stream of pauperism, as it were?—Yes.

6491. And in order to advise guardians, you would naturally look for the deficiencies either in administration or in the particular conditions of the neighbourhood where out-door relief is very prevalent?—Yes. I have consistently done that when I have had an opportunity

6492. Do you attend regularly the relief committees when you are visiting a board of guardians?—If possible I do always, and as a rule there is no difficulty. In country places, I am sorry to say, the relief takes up such a very short time that it does not make any inroad on one's day; but in some places such as Edmonton the relief committees meet at 11 o'clock, the guardians' meeting being at 2; and there I go at 11.

Conditions at Peterborough.

6493. You find that at Peterborough there is a very large number receiving out-door relief?—Yes, it is very large indeed—I think it is about ten out of eleven on the books.

6494. And the pauperism is 32 per thousand?—It is very high for a semi-urban union like that.

6495. Peterborough has a very large area, has it not?—One hundred and one thousand acres.

6496. And there are only three relieving officers for the whole of that area?—Quite so.

Insufficient relieving officers.

6497. There being only three relieving officers, would the practice of administration be that a great deal of discretion falls to the guardians of the parish in which the cases arise, for I take it that each parish in the area is represented on the Board?—The division is very uneven in this particular union. There are two officers for the rural districts; instead of their each having, as I have got it down here, 34,000 acres, probably those two men have about 45,000 acres each, with 400 cases each, including the children on their relief lists; it is not quite 400 each—one has 400, and the other about 370, I think. The numbers of paupers are not so very unreasonable, but they have a very large area. The town officer has

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

over 800 cases on his list, including children, and he has an area of about 11,000 acres; he has the town and some district outside. In Peterborough these relieving officers say what they have to say about the case, and then a guardian jumps up almost at once generally to support the application.

System of administering relief at Peterborough.

6498. Do all the relief committees sit together?—It is taken by one committee.

6499. Are the relieving officers present when the cases are dealt with?—Yes.

6500. For the whole area?—Yes.

6501. Does the relieving officer obtain all particulars concerning each case before it is dealt with by the Board?—Yes; and as a matter of fact he goes through the new cases with the Chairman, before the Board meeting.

6502. In the case of the two large rural portions of the union, is it possible that within his area the relieving officer can have visited all the new cases prior to their being dealt with by the Board?—I should think that those two districts being thinly populated, and the cases not very numerous, the relieving officers ought to be able to visit the new ones. I do not think there is as much difficulty for the two outside men with the big area as there is for the town man with the 800 cases. For two years I have persistently urged the guardians—and my predecessor, I think, did so too—to re-divide especially in the interest of the town. The numbers were going up steadily till this year by 100 every year, and an old relieving officer—a man who was past his work, I think—retired a year ago. The new man has kept the numbers down. I have been to see him at the pay station, and I have been round to some of his cases with him, and he tells me he thinks he can manage, and that he would rather keep on the whole district, so far as he is concerned.

6503. It seems to be very seldom that the house is offered, or there would not be so many people in receipt of outdoor relief?—The house is very full; they have not the accommodation.

Inadequate workhouse accommodation at Peterborough.

6504. Is that known?—Yes. The house is absolutely full; and I cannot yet see really any satisfactory way out of it, unfortunately. Peterborough is in a very difficult position, but he new relieving officer has had some effect, and if the guardians will back him they may keep the number down.

6505. Have they proposed adding to their accommodation?—They have done a good deal in the last two years, but unfortunately it has reduced the accommodation. They have put up a new dining-hall and a new kitchen and laundry and so on, and that has actually made the sleeping accommodation less.

System of administering relief at Peterborough.

6506. Could you tell us whether the Local Government Board upon your advice have made any representations to them to increase the accommodation?—Not at present. I reported the insufficient accommodation three times last year after inspecting the workhouse, but recommended that no official action be taken at present; partly because the new buildings and drains were not completely finished; partly pending the issue of the Vagrancy Committee's report. I have repeatedly warned the guardians that the accommodation, especially for the sick, must be increased, in fact I urge it every time I see them, and I am going to do it again next month.

6507. There are sixty-five guardians, so you have pointed out; do all these sixty-five guardians sit, or the majority of them, to hear applications for relief, or do they leave when the relief cases start?—They are better in Peterborough than in most rural places, certainly—much better. I do not think I have ever seen fifty guardians there, but I have seen forty-five or so; and I should say that the bulk of them—at least thirty—are there to the end. That is my recollection.

6508. I take it you think that the size of the workhouse rather than the size of the board accounts for the disproportion in the number of persons receiving indoor and outdoor relief?—I do not think it is due to the size of the board; but I believe that if they took the relief in smaller committees—that is quite against all proper theory—or if it were taken by the Chairman, the relief would be much less. Local feeling there is in favour of lavish out-relief I think, and if the guardians get up and say anything it is to say "Make it another 1s."! or "Put them on."!

Regulations as to granting relief at Peterborough.

6509–11. Have they any rules or by-laws?—The Peterborough guardians have no printed regulations.

6512. Have they a scale, or do they decide every case on its merits, as it is termed?—They have no printed, scale but practically they work to a scale, and it is a better scale than is adopted in most cases. It is not lavish even there; they give 3s. 6d. and 4s. as a rule to the old people and some of them get extra for a nurse.

Comparison of unions of lowest and highest pauperism.

6513. In paragraph 9 of your memorandum you say "Of the seven unions with the lowest proportion of pauperism only two, Oundle and St. Neots, are rural; while of the nine with the highest proportion all are rural unions except Northampton;" and you add, "I do not know of any reason for the comparatively low ratio of pauperism in Oundle, St. Neots and Brixworth except the strict discrimination exercised in dealing with applications for relief."! You appear to think, according to this paragraph, that the whole difference between these rural unions is due to administration?—I think so. I cannot think of anything else that would cause it, having regard to the circumstances of the places; I know of nothing else.

6514. The two highest are double the two lowest in pauperism, and still they are all four rural unions; are there any other conditions that would cause that?—There may not be so many old people in Oundle and St. Neots as there are in Linton, Ampthill and so on; I think there are not.

6515. Do you think those unions would form typical rural unions for a special inquiry as to the cause of the difference?—Yes, I think so. At St. Neots there is really nothing to take it out of the category of a rural union that I know of. There is a small town in the union, but not a town of any great size.

6516. Has the size of the Board anything to do with it?—No.

6517. Or the acreage?—No. If you will look at the last pages of my memorandum you will see that Oundle has a very large acreage, something over 60,000 acres, for a single relieving officer, but he manages to keep down the relief. St. Neots has 62,000 acres, and has at the present time a single relieving officer. There were two till this year, but there are only 152 cases there and the man can do it quite well. The other places are rather smaller. Linton has only 48,000 acres with two relieving officers, and Buntingford has only 27,000 acres.

6518. Which unions would you say of those that are amongst the highest in pauperism would be strictly comparable with Oundle and Brixworth? Could you give us two unions which are comparable as far as conditions are concerned? I think you do mention by name the highest rural unions?—I think I do. I have given the nine unions—Linton, Buntingford, Caxton and Arrington, Northampton, Welwyn, Royston, Wittlesey Ampthill and Biggleswade.

6519. Taking the unions with the highest proportions which are all rural except Northampton, you do not name the rural unions amongst those nine?—Those are all rural I have named, except Northampton.

6520. And amongst the highest on the list?—Yes, the highest in pauperism.

6521. Which two of those nine would be strictly comparable with Oundle and Brixworth, so far as concerns all conditions which tend to create pauperism?—I should say that Linton would compare best with Oundle, and Biggleswade with St. Neots. There is the school at Oundle, but I do not think that makes very much difference to the prosperity of the place.

Supply of Matrons and Superintendent Nurses.

6522. With regard to your nursing statistics, I find that there are eight workhouse matrons altogether who are appointed as superintendent nurses; are any of those matrons qualified?—Yes. The matron at Luton is, the matron at Newmarket is not, but on account of her experience she was allowed to act as superintendent nurse before she

was matron; she was allowed to do that as an exception to the Nursing Order, so I think you can reckon her as qualified. The Barnet matron I believe is fully qualified, though I am not quite positive. At the Brentford, Infirmary the matron is a highly trained nurse.

6523. Are most of them unqualified nurses?—No, not of these matron superintendents; I should say that they are mostly qualified. The Thrapston matron is qualified as a superintendent nurse.

6524. Having had three years training?—Yes. At Barnet and Hemel Hempstead I believe both have had three years training, and as I say I think you must regard the Newmarket case as the same, because the Local Government Board were willing to sanction her acting as superintendent nurse on account of her experience, though she had not got the three years training.

6525. I think the Local Government Board made many exceptions at the commencement of the Order?—But this case was a recent one.

6526. Those exceptions were made in order not to increase the number of the staff?—That may have been so.

6527. There are seven unions I see without a superintendent nurse which have three or more nurses; is that not contrary to the Order?—Are they described as nurses or as attendants? Of course it is contrary to the Order if they are nurses, but if they call them attendants it is not. I do not know whether it makes it much better to have three or four nurse-attendants and to get over the Order in that way rather than to have three proper nurses.

6528. I have taken a cross column, so that it includes that column which is headed "Other nurses and attendants," and still there are seven that have more than three nurses, but not a superintendent nurse?—Would you mind mentioning any of them?

6529. Biggleswade is one?—At Biggleswade technically there are only two nurses and a male attendant and a female attendant.

6530. Then Royston?—At Royston there are two nurses and an attendant. She really is an attendant there; it is not dodging the Order.

6531. Ware?—Ware is the same; there are only two nurses there.

6532. St. Ives?—St. Ives is the same. At St. Ives there are two nurses and one attendant.

6533. St. Neots?—There is one nurse there—that was really done I believe to evade the Order—and three attendants. There used to be two nurses and they were going to appoint a third, but they said, If we do that she will be no good to us as we shall have to let her off nursing to superintend; we shall have to make her superintendent.

6534. I suppose you have called the attention of the Board to the fact that in these cases they ought to appoint a superintendent?—The Board know all about these cases and they have considered this.

6535. I notice in one case at Edmonton you have still a large number of pauper attendants?—Would you say that it is a large number compared with the number of inmates?

Pauper nurse attendants at Edmonton.

6536. There are ten pauper attendants by night, is that not so?—I daresay it is.

6537. Is that not really exceptional?—I have pointed it out to the Edmonton Guardians, and have argued with their medical officer that they should have more night nurses, as a matter of fact.

6538. There are only three probationer-nurses on night duty and ten pauper assistants, which means that really all the attention that is given to patients will practically be given by the ten pauper assistants, does it not?—The medical officer says that they only call the nurses—that they do not attend the patients but only sit up. It is the medical officer of the Edmonton workhouse who is entirely responsible for this. I have urged it on the guardians, and Dr. Fuller talked to the medical officer with me one day about it, but he considers that three are quite enough. He says "We have few acute cases, and three are found to be quite enough." I have pointed out to him the difference between the proportion of night nurses at Edmonton and at Brentford, which comes next to it in the return; at Brentford one-third are night-nurses. But he was satisfied that three was all that was necessary. As a matter of fact, there were only two night nurses a short time ago, and the medical officer was not at all anxious to have the third put on; he was quite obstinate about any further increase.

Nursing of in-door paupers in district.

6539. Would you consider in a place like St. Neots, where you have fifty beds for sick persons and no certified nurse whatever, that proper attention is insured to those sick cases?—I think that the present nurse, though she has not a certificate is quite as good in her nursing as the woman who was there last year and who had a certificate.

6540. Take Royston and Ware, they are both in the same position, their nurses have no training whatever; is there the same explanation there?—They have only had a workhouse training.

6541. They have no certificates?—They have had no three years training, but they are fairly capable people at both places.

6542. Do you think that is satisfactory?—No, I will not go as far as that. I do not think that Royston is altogether satisfactory, but I would like to say in justice to the Guardians that there is very great difficulty in these small houses in getting a fully qualified nurse to come and live there. The life is dull and the cases are not interesting. At Royston there are only two or three bedridden people, and there has not been a single acute case at all of late. About Christmas there were some acute cases, and the doctor, I saw from his book, was then coming every day. Since that there have been no cases requiring much attention, and his visits have been much less frequent.

6543. Northampton is pretty much in the same position as Edmonton, with three night nurses and pauper attendants?—Two years ago there were three nurses for 114 people, one for night work, one for 44 women by day, and on the male side there was a nurse for seventy cases by day. You will see that the present proportion is fairly reasonable.

6544. Would you say all this tends to show that the indoor treatment is neglected, and that the attention of the guardians is more directed towards relieving people outside rather than in?—No, I do not think I could say that. Take that Northampton case; they have more than doubled their staff in eighteen months. Newmarket had one nurse two years ago and they have now got three, under the superintendence of the matron. I think that a great deal has been done in improvement. But I do not say that more should not be done.

Frequency of Inspectors' attendance at meetings of Guardians.

6545. (*Mrs. Webb.*) How often do you sit with the guardians? Take for instance Peterborough; would you sit more than once a year?—About once in eight months I have been getting round so far.

6546. Do you ever sit with them when they give their contracts?—Yes. They do not tell me as a rule when they are going to do that, but in the autumn and spring especially it very frequently happens that I am there on those occasions, and sometimes I am inclined to be rather sorry for it.

Procedure of Guardians as to contracts.

6547. Why?—Because so much time is wasted. There is often much desultory conversation and the consideration of relief applications and other work is rushed. Sometimes, of course, it is useful. At the last few meetings I have attended, contracts have either been settled or in some way considered, and I have taken the opportunity of giving advice.

6548. What is the usual procedure with regard to contracts? Do they ask a committee to report on them?—Yes: they generally ask a committee to go out into another room and look through things.

6549. On the spot?—Yes, on the spot.

6550. They do not have the tenders submitted to a committee for a written report?—No, not as a rule. That is done sometimes, but not generally in the country places.

6551. At Peterborough, for instance, where the contracts would be large, would it be done?—I do not think so, at Peterborough. The contracts are not so very large there you see, unless for the out-relief, and that is only for bread and a few things like that. They do not give much away in the shape of boots and so on; the numbers in the house are not large. At Brentford,

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

Willesden, Edmonton and Hendon they go into things very carefully, and there they do have a written report.

6552. And the officers are asked their opinion?—Yes. The clerk is always present with the Committee at Brentford. There was some little trouble about it on a recent occasion. He was not given information and he insisted on his right to represent the whole board. As a matter of fact in that case the guardians went through the contracts themselves as they were so dissatisfied.

9553. Dissatisfied with what?—With the action of the committee.

6554. Is there any attempt made to disguise the name of the person tendering, or do they always know the name of the person who tenders?—I think in country places they know. There are generally about three only for the popular things, and for some articles such as coffins you very often find there is only one. I think they do know, but as a rule they give it to the lowest man, unless they have some cause of complaint. Supposing he has supplied bad meat—it is generally a butcher that the trouble is with—they will not give it to him again even if he is the lowest. Otherwise I think they are not actuated unreasonably by local patriotism—at least not altogether. Of course they would lean a bit to the ratepayer, at least I am afraid so.

6555. Do you think that there is any considerable amount of collusion between members of the Board and the contractors?—I do not think in the country unions there is much, if any, of that done. If it is done at all it would simply be to oblige so-and-so—"He is a good fellow, and he supplies good things." I do not think any money would pass hands, or any presents or things of that sort.

Inter-change of information between Inspectors and auditors.

6556. Does the auditor who audits the accounts of the guardians communicate to you anything that he thinks desirable?—He might do sometimes, just in the same way that I should tell him.

6557. Is there much inter-communication between the inspector and the auditor on the character of the administration?—I should not like to go quite so far as that. There are three auditors in my district, and I have heard from all the auditors, and I have communicated with them about things.

6558. But you do not meet them regularly to discuss matters, do you?—Not regularly. One of them comes to see me occasionally when he is auditing in the part of the district in which I live—and then he tells me a good deal.

Type of *ad hoc* and rural district council Guardians.

6559. Have you noticed any superiority or otherwise in boards of guardians composed mainly of district councillors, as against board of guardians elected *ad hoc* for urban districts?—No, I do not think I have. Willesden is the only solely urban district that I have in mind as presenting peculiarities. As I have said before, I have suffered a little bit from want of continuity in their practice this year, but I do not think I could give an opinion until it has gone on longer.

6560. In the case of mixed boards, do you notice that the district councillors take less interest in Poor Law relief than those elected for the Poor Law alone?—No, I do not think so.

6561. You have noticed no difference?—No. I should not know one class of men from another if I was not acquainted with them.

Bad housing as conducive to pauperism.

6562. With regard to the conditions productive of pauperism, you lay great stress upon bad housing accommodation, do you not?—I did in my report last year. It struck me as a very important factor really.

6563. In the boot and shoe districts there is a good deal of home-work, is there not?—Yes.

6564. Do you consider that in any way indirectly or directly productive of pauperism?—I should not think so. As a rule the places I have seen are separate little flats built for it in the Northamptonshire villages. I do not think they would have that effect at all; I do not think they are over-crowded.

6565. You do not think they are specially unhealthy conditions?—I do not think it is unhealthier than it is in the workshops where they will not have the windows open. I am told that that is the reason why so many more men than women at Kettering come in with phthisis. The men will not have the windows open in the factories, but the women who work in the shoe, fustian, and corset factories have the windows open much more than the men, and so they fall ill less readily.

6566. Would you say that bad ventilation was the cause of exceptional debility?—I should certainly think so.

Type of recipients of medical relief.

6567. With regard to the medical relief, do you find that the persons in receipt of medical relief are often persons who do not otherwise come on to the Poor Law and are of a different class?—Yes, in the way of maternity orders, certainly, and things of that sort. In the outlying districts chiefly, quite an independent man in a way, but getting small wages, such as 15s., who has a large family, will consider it more or less reasonable to apply for relief for the children if they are ill, when he would not think of it otherwise.

Effect on administration of large railway rateable value

6568. With regard to Peterborough, I think there is a great deal of railway property there, is there not?—Yes, a great deal of their assessment is on railway property.

6569. Do you attribute some of the extravagance of the Peterborough guardians to the fact that they are dispensing rates which they do not themselves pay?—I am sure that the whole board have not that idea, because the country guardians try very hard indeed to keep the rates down. That shows that they feel they are paying their share. The farmers certainly are on the very parsimonious side, and I do not think that they feel that they are getting it all out of the railway company. Welwyn is a case where I think you might press the point perhaps. They get, I believe, over half their rateable value from railway property. I do not suppose that they consciously act on that view, but still I was thinking of putting it to them shortly that they are being a little more generous with other people's money than they need be—for instance there they pay 9d. per lb. for meat, which is a very unusual price in my district.

6570. It is very unusual, as you say?—Then I think there are seventeen inmates in the workhouse, which is a very small place, like an alms-house, and there are seventeen pints and seventeen half pints of beer, as far as I remember—every person having it, under the doctor's orders of course.

Excessive relief in kind

6571. Is there any kind of check on the amount given per person in kind to out-door paupers; is there any kind of maximum or minimum?—No; you can give as much as you like.

6572. Can you give as much in kind as you like?—Yes; I never saw any limit whatever—except the auditors' surcharge, of course.

6573. But he never does surcharge, does he?—This would really be on a medical officer's order or recommendation, would it not?

6574. I was not thinking of medical relief; I was thinking of the ordinary out-door relief given in kind?—Such as milk?

6575. Take milk and bread?—They do sometimes give more bread than they ought to, and it does not keep. I continually hear guardians say, "It is no good giving so much bread; it will only go stale." I think they are quite alive to that.

6576. Is there any attempt made to keep them right about the requisite amount of nourishment that should be given to out-door paupers? It seems to me very excessive sometimes; has the same thing occurred to you?—I think there is too much bread, and occasionally too much groceries given.

6577. A quarter of a pound of tea per person seems rather too much?—I never see tea given; that is a thing I have never come on at all. Of course the relieving officer may have done part of the groceries in that way. The only things I have seen given are sugar, milk, meat and bread.

6578. Have you seen butter given?—I have never seen that given.

6579. Would you consider it your duty as inspector to look into the amount of relief in kind given per person?—As far as I can, I regard it as my duty to look into everything on the books or before me; but one cannot always take every case. After you have inquired into about ten cases or so you have to let some go, or the guardians think you are going to keep them all day.

6580. Has the amount given struck you as a sort of evil?—Not in kind, except that too much bread will be given, so that the bread will go stale.

Conditions in London suburban unions.

6581. (*Mr. Nunn*). I should like to ask you just two or three questions about the general character of your district as it comes in contact with London. Practically you take from the Thames to the Lea, do you not?—Yes.

6582. And the bordering unions will be Willesden, Hendon and Edmonton?—Yes.

6583. Willesden is a very small union, and it is entirely urban, is it not?—Yes, it is in a corner up by Hendon.

6584. Hendon is rather larger and contains a considerable rural district, I believe?—Hendon is about half-and-half urban and rural.

6585. What would be the proportion in Edmonton?—In Edmonton there are three parishes that are recognised as urban entirely—Hornsey, Wood Green and Tottenham. Edmonton, I should personally consider as more urban than Wood Green, but at a recent inquiry it was described by some persons as semi-rural. Then there is Southgate, which is more or less rural, and in the northern part is Enfield, and the two outside parishes, Cheshunt and Waltham Abbey, which are almost altogether rural. There are big nursery industries in Cheshunt and Waltham.

6586. So that when one hears these districts described as the dormitories of London, really looked at as rateable areas, they consist of very mixed classes?—Yes, if you take them by area, but I was taking them by population when I called them the dormitories of London. The parishes with the largest populations are urban ones, and from the population point of view you might almost disregard Cheshunt and Waltham.

6587. Willesden has a very fair population, consisting of professional people and retired shopkeepers?—Yes, but not very wealthy, I should imagine, as a rule. I know that they raised a fund this winter for feeding the school children, and having done that, I was told by the clerk to the council and by various members of the Distress Committee that it was quite useless for them to think of asking locally for contributions to the Queen's Fund, because all the money the people had to give was subscribed to the Children's Fund, and there was really very little margin for other charity.

6588. Hendon would contain a very fair proportion of rich people, would it not?—Yes.

6589. Quite rich people, would you say?—Yes, I should.

6590. Is Edmonton the same?—Yes, taking a little bit of Edmonton. Taking it on the whole it is a poor union.

6591. Taking those three unions, do the better-to-do classes take a fair interest in their poorer neighbours, and does that interest take expression in institutions for their benefit?—I have heard a good many complaints in Willesden that the better class do not take their share.

6592. Willesden differs from the others I suppose in being able to tap London charity and London hospitals and London dispensaries?—Yes, I suppose that is so.

Class of Guardians in London suburban unions.

6593. In the other cases are the better-off classes fairly well represented on the boards of guardians?—In Brentford they are certainly; indeed I think they are fairly represented in both Brentford and Edmonton.

6594. Taking Willesden, I think the Willesden board of guardians a couple of years ago were themselves instrumental in starting a branch of the Charity Organisation Society, were they not? They kept it under themselves for a time?—Yes.

6595. And then it started on its own account in connection with the London Society?—I believe that is so.

6596. There they are fairly well provided with other institutions, are they not? They have dispensaries and a cottage hospital?—I believe that is so.

6597. Is the same true of Hendon?—I could not say

6598. Hendon includes Cricklewood, does it not?—Yes, except so much as is in Willesden.

6599. Cricklewood has a growing urban population, has it not?—Cricklewood is practically all built over now; it is all railways or houses.

6600. That is likely to be a sort of Tottenham in the future possibly?—It will be a continuation, I suppose, of Willesden, and possibly it will come into Willesden. The Hendon guardians have an idea of a further segregation before them all the time. Their workhouse is rather crowded—it is on the border line, and the infirmary is quite full; and when I ask them to increase, they say we must wait a bit longer.

6601. So that will become purely rural?—Yes, that is their idea.

6602. And Cricklewood will go to Willesden?—Or form a new parish.

6603. Tottenham is the lower part of Edmonton, is it not?—Yes, the south part.

Type of case admitted to workhouse infirmary.

6604. Is that fairly well provided with institutions for the classes that are a little above the poor law?—They have an excellent hospital, but many fairly well-to-do people go to the Edmonton infirmary. I think people go to whichever is the handiest for them. Some people from a distance will pass the Edmonton infirmary and go to the hospital. It just depends on their views, really.

6605. There are a fair number of industries at work in all three of the unions, are there not, so that they are not purely dormitories?—Yes.

6606. I think you mentioned that there is a certain amount of market-gardening at Edmonton?—In Enfield and Waltham and Cheshunt there are very large market gardening and glass house industriesf and then there are laundries and so on in the Acton part of Brentford. In Willesden, there are electric light works, I do not know of very much else; I have no doubt there are other industries, but I have not seen anything much.

6607. Do the market gardens in the northern part of Edmonton absorb any of the population of Tottenham?—Do the Tottenham people go and work there, do you mean?

6608. That is my question?—I have heard no statement that the men have been out of employment through being turned off from those places. I should think that they more likely draw people from Ware and other places in the country.

6609. So that they do not help Tottenham?—I do not think they do very much.

6610. Do you think the majority of the working classes in Tottenham come to work in town—it follows, I suppose, that they must?—Yes, if they do work; but I have some doubts whether the majority of the working classes in Tottenham do very much work.

6611. Are they very casual?—I think they are very casual.

6612. It looks like that when passing through the place. What sort of casual labour do they get?—I can only hear of their standing about holding horses' heads and things of that sort. That is the main thing I get told to me.

6613. Their wives work, I suppose?—Yes, they work a bit; but unless they take in each other's washing I do not know what they do besides charing. It is very hard to find out what they do.

6614. Apparently you feel that the population of Tottenham is quite at the bottom of the social ladder?—It is very near it, but yet the rateable value is not so low as it is in Edmonton—the next-door parish. The rateable value per head and the rents are a bit more, right through Tottenham.

6615. I suppose in a place like Tottenham you come across very little provident movement on the part of the workmen?—There are very few except the upper working class who come into London, who belong to any provident club?—Very few, I believe. There have been great charities there for giving free breakfasts to children and so on.

Effect of charities on pauperism.

6616. Are they "Express" charities, or are they local?—There are a good many local ones.

6617. Who gets them up?—Clergymen, and so on. Mr. Davids has done a great deal in South Tottenham.

6618. Are they clergymen who advertise largely and get their support from London?—They do a good deal of actual collecting; they even collect broken victuals from the houses. They get something, of course, from friends. Last year Mr. Davids got an "Express" fund of £7,000.

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

6619. Do you think that is both a cause and a result of the pauperism of the district, or do you think it is more largely a cause ?—I should think it is both. It certainly did harm as well as good last year. I heard of many people who did not want the food at all, but who were walking past and thought they might as well have it. Somebody told me only this week of people who had rather a difficulty in getting rid of the food that had been given to them. In the end they had to ask the "Express"! to stop the fund; it is not often that that is done, I think. This year they have managed to get along quite comfortably, and there has been no fund, although the numbers on out-relief have been distinctly less than last year; so that the demoralisation has not done very much harm. In Edmonton I believe that one reason why the pauperism has not increased is the action of the Social Democrats. They will not allow their men to apply for relief, because of losing their votes. That has had quite a good effect there. In one case, however, it culminated in a prosecution; that was the case of a man whose child died. I think the assistance they got from London has been more got by the people of Edmonton and Tottenham themselves, by walking in processions and holding out boxes with bad remarks about charity—but still asking for contributions to be put in. They collected a good deal.

6620. Do you consider Cricklewood is in such a bad state as Tottenham ?—I should not think so at all.

6621. Nor Willesden ?—No. Willesden in actual numbers is getting rather high now; I think it is about one in sixty. But in Cricklewood they are mostly very good houses. The Willesden guardians have a number of scattered homes there for which they pay a rent of about £35; they are not bad houses at all.

6622. You have spoken of the co-operation that exists between the guardians and charitable organisations at Willesden and at Barnet; is there anything of the same kind at Edmonton ?—I have not heard of it except as regards individual districts; but there may be, of course.

6623. Do you think there is the same disposition there on the part of the guardians to co-operate with outside bodies, or are they more concerned with their own powers ?—I think Edmonton is very much broken up. The guardians of the different parishes are willing to co-operate with any local people, but the component parts are really quite different, and they have three distress committees in the union now.

Maintenance by relatives and modes of enforcing it.

6624. I think you spoke of relatives who were morally liable ?—Yes, I meant brothers and so on.

6625. Do the guardians get much out of them ?—Very seldom, I think.

6626. Do they try ?—Not often, but some guardians do.

6627. From what you said I gathered that they made a systematic attempt in some unions to get contributions from them ?—No, and I do not recommend that they should do that. I do not think it would be any use their doing that. You want to influence public opinion, so as to make these people feel that they ought to contribute. The only way the guardians can get at it is by offering the workhouse only, where the person is living with a relative, and there is plenty of money coming into the house. That is as far as I should go.

6628. Would you be in favour of any alteration of the law, so as to make grandchildren responsible for grandparents, in the same way as grandparents are responsible for grandchildren ?—I do not think you could do any harm by making that alteration and it might be very useful.

6629. Would you be in favour of any alteration in the direction of making brothers and sisters responsible ?—I think not.

Erection of workmen's cottages by London County Council.

6630. (*Chairman.*) You stated, I think, that the London County Council had commenced building a very large series of workmen's houses, but that they had stopped ?—Yes. They were big blocks of cottages. I believe they have commenced again lately. They took something over 200 acres of ground, and after building 140 houses they stopped altogether. There was not a demand for them and the rents were too high, though they were hardly high enough to give any profit. They have reduced the rents and have got the houses occupied, and now I believe they have begun to build some fresh blocks of larger houses on the same site.

6631. Did they finish the blocks which they actually commenced ?—They built four little streets really, but they laid out new roads for the whole of those 200 odd acres.

6632. You assume that the cause of the cessation of the work was that the houses which had been built did not pay or did not meet the want of the particular class for whom they were intended ?—They could not find tenants at all until they reduced the rents for them, although they had been put at as low a price as they could be so as to give a profit.

6633. Do you remember what the rents asked were ?—I think they averaged 9s. 6d. originally—they may have been 10s. 6d.—and that they were reduced to 8s. 6d. They are houses of six rooms as a rule. People describe them as wardrobes and so on. They do not look bad, they are not so very small to look at, and they are solidly built. According to a published letter from the clerk to the Tottenham Urban District Council, dated 27th January, 1905, the rents range from 6s. 3d. to 9s. 9d. a week.

6634. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) What was the cost per house, do you know ?—I could not say, but it was very high indeed. They will probably last as long—well, as long as—the county council, at any rate.

Need for power to compulsorily remove old and infirm cases to workhouse.

6635. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Have you come across in your experience any cases in which you thought that the guardians ought to have powers of compulsory removal ?—I am much obliged to you for asking that question. I have come across numbers of cases, and, of course, they are continually cropping up at meetings of the guardians. A person is offered the House who will not take it, then the case is left to the relieving officer for a time, and if the board of guardians is a very strong one they may win; but in the cases that I have seen as a rule it has been the other way. It has sometimes been a woman with illegitimate children; she has declined to come in, and she has been relieved for a time by the officer in kind; they then put her on for a fortnight at a time in kind; and ultimately they say, "What is the use of going on like this week after week and meeting after meeting ?"—and then they put her on regularly. Then there are other cases which I think are much more important. Those are the cases of people who ought, for their own sakes, to be moved into the House, under restrictions. I had some cases mentioned to me in a letter which I received only this morning, which I should like to read, if I am not occupying too much time.

Instances.

6636. (*Chairman.*) It would be important if you could give us one or two typical cases ?—These are cases in the Bedford Union, and they are all cases of persons who were living in circumstances of dirt and neglect, who certainly ought on their own account to have come in, but who would not do it till they were in such a feeble state that they could not refuse to come in any longer. The worst of them perhaps was an old woman who died in the Bedford Workhouse two or three months ago. I was looking round the house with Dr. Fuller, the medical inspector, and in examining the books we came on a report from the medical officer of the workhouse that this person had been admitted in an indescribable condition; she had been in a fearful state of neglect before coming in, and died about two days afterwards. I asked the relieving officer to give me a report about it. He told me it was a case I had been to myself with him about two years ago, and he had pointed it out to me as a specially bad case. Then he gave me the report. This was Sarah Sergeant, a widow of seventy-seven. It runs: "This old woman was put on the out-door relief list in 1902, when I reported:—'Grand-daughter lives with her, and house has a questionable reputation,—grand-daughter being a married woman not cohabiting with her husband, by whom she had two children. At the March revision, 1904, my note is 'Shares house with grand-daughter, who has two children and lives apart from her husband. She (old woman) has also an illegitimate child there, for whom she gets 4s. House filthy.'" That child was not her own; it was a boarder. "Again, June, 1904: "The two children are away, but house is filthy. She ought to be in the workhouse. One illegitimate child, for whom she receives 4s., remains.' July, 1904, 'No change.' She was then at 89, Pilcroft

Street, and moved towards the end of July, 1904, when I reported 'no change.' During the whole of this time I had been trying to get the old woman to go into the house, without success. At the March revision, 1905, I report: "Is dirty as usual,' and still tried persuasion. In December, 1905, she became ill and I tried again. Early in January, 1906, I met the medical officer there, and he agreed that it was imperative that she should go to the workhouse infirmary. The house was then filthy beyond description and very stinking. The district nurse whom I met at the house a few days later said that the place was so dirty and the old woman in such a state that she really could not continue to attend it. After a great deal of persuasion the old woman consented to go to the house. I arranged with the lady superintendent of the St. John's Ambulance Brigade for her removal on an ambulance, and sent my usual woman to get her ready for removal as well as she could. In doing so the woman slipped through the boards of the floor and badly bruised her leg. She is used to this kind of work, but said she had never had to deal with anything so filthy. It turned her sick. In the evening, the removal having been carried out in the afternoon, the lady superintendent of the Brigade came to me and said that she had been made quite sick and ill over the case, and that even the children who had gathered round the house either went off or held their noses. I should state that the old woman had a very bad leg. The lady superintendent at once reported the case of the house to the medical officer of health." There are two other short cases:—"Eliza Ruth Harlow, widow, sixty-six: Receiving out-door relief, has been so ill for the past seven or eight weeks that she is quite unable to do for herself. She has been living alone, but her state is such that for nearly three weeks I have paid a woman to sleep with her. The old woman is quite helpless, and I have been trying for weeks to get her to the workhouse infirmary, but she absolutely refuses. She is now confined to bed and there is no prospect of improvement. I also begged her months ago to go to the house." The last case is that of John Potter, fifty-nine, and Louisa Potter, of the same age: "The man, afflicted with paralysis, woman weakly and filthy, had out-door relief for some years and could not be persuaded to go to house. At last out-door relief was stopped and woman got their living by begging. On July 25th, 1903, I reported—referring to funeral order for the man: 'Formerly had relief, but I got it stopped on account of filthy state of house, her begging and drinking. House was in such a state that undertaker's men refused to fetch the corpse down from upstairs. Place was verminous and filthy.' I paid two men 1s. 6d. to fetch the coffin downstairs and to put it in the yard; the undertaker refused to do further parish work." "In August, 1903, the widow applied for out-door relief, when my observation was: 'This is the woman whose house was in such a filthy condition when the undertaker went in. If she has relief it should be in the house.' The Relief Committee took my advice. She refused to go in, and on September 5th, 1903, I was fetched to the house (which was said to have been cleaned after man's death) the woman being very ill. Her personal condition was verminous and dirty beyond description and her bedroom stinking and loathsome. She was removed to the workhouse on the advice of the district medical officer and died within a few hours." That is the kind of case in which, for the sake of the persons themselves, it is very essential that there should be a power, properly safeguarded, to remove say, on the advice of the relieving officer, approved by the district medical officer and the medical officer of health, under a magistrate's order, a person who has no visible means of subsistence and is in a filthy state like this.

6637. Are those cases all from one union?—Yes, these are quite recent cases from the Bedford union. I have seen some of these cases. I can trust this relieving officer absolutely for truthfulness.

6638. Do you think that in these other unions, if you investigated them, you could find cases almost as bad as those?—I should think so. I have seen some myself in one or two other towns—not so bad as the worst of those Bedford ones, but still very bad. I should think there probably are worse ones. Taking the average cottages, those in Bedford are better than those I have seen in another town near.

6639. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) May I ask why the sanitary authorities do not take action when cases like those are intimated to them?—I cannot say. *Mr. Edward Darlington Court.* 20 Mar. 1906.

6640. Is there no power to make them take action?—There might be a great deal of vermin and so on without the house being absolutely in a state of danger to health, I think.

6641. (*Mrs. Webb.*) They have no power to deal with a person's dirtiness; it is only the house that they can deal with?—It is only the house. They could close the house, but that is not quite enough. You have got to find somewhere else to put them in; and then you have not altered their habits.

6642. (*Chairman.*) They would go to another house?—Quite so. It is a very cumbrous thing, I think.

6643. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to Peterborough, have you ever made inquiry as to the charities at Peterborough?—I could not say I have made enquiries, but I met one of the Charity Commissioners several times in the winter who is drawing up a scheme to amalgamate all the Peterborough charities. Charities at Peterborough.

6644. Did he, so far as you know, propose that there should be on that scheme some method of co-operatino with the board of guardians?—I think the idea was to separate the cases rather from the guardians.

6645. So that the charities should deal with one group of cases and the poor law should deal with another?—Yes.

6646. But there should be some sort of co-operation, in the sense of each knowing what the other did?—Quite so.

6647. With regard to Edmonton, the increase in the population masks the increase in the pauperism when we come to your percentages, does it not?—Quite so. Conditions at Edmonton.

6648. Having regard to the class of population which you described to Mr. Nunn, do you look forward to the place growing in the manner it is now growing?—I am afraid there must be an enormous increase in pauperism. My returns show that the increase is bigger than it really is, because I allow nothing for the increase in population. I take the population of 1901, and then I give the result in the last two or three years as being about one in eighty to one in sixty-nine.

6649. Compared with what it may be in the future, there is a chance at present of stopping an evil development, is there not?—Yes, but it will require a great improvement in administration to stop it, I think. The natural tendency would be to increase as the place gets poorer.

6650. What are the guardians proposing with a view to prevent this happening?—They are continually increasing their indoor accommodation, and they have got about 60 of their people now boarded out at Maldon They give the house test as far as they can.

6651. It does not appear, does it, from the figures that they are holding the tide, as it were?—It has been a very difficult thing for them with the population increasing quicker than they could increase their buildings.

6652. Do you rely chiefly upon the buildings as the dyke, so to speak, to stop the pauperism?—It is the ultimate thing, is it not? If you have not got your house to offer, what can you do?—I think the relieving officers there look into the cases fairly well.

6653. To take first that point of investigation, what is the number of cases to a relieving officer in Edmonton now?—About 400. They appointed a new man, only the other day. Methods of investigating applications at Edmonton.

6654. 400 cases per man is surely very high even with the new man thrown in?—It is high, but the area is only 6,000 acres to a man.

6655. Are references taken up in these cases; is there verification?—They had a superintendent relieving officer who attended to that. They have not one at this moment, as the appointment is in abeyance. They appointed a man about a year ago, but he obtained another post and resigned The Guardians did not altogether like him, and they are rather hanging back from appointing another man, but I believe they will do it.

6656. Was the man who was appointed skilled in inquiry?—The last man was very satisfactory, I believe, but he did not quite please them.

Mr. Edward Darlington Court.

20 Mar. 1906.

6657. Was he too satisfactory from the point of view of suppression?—They are all strong on one point, namely, getting hold of deserters; they really are quite strong on that, and some of them wanted the superintendent relieving officer to occupy his time in doing nothing but that.

6658. Did he raise the standard of inquiry in the union by supervising what the other relieving officers did?—From what the clerk tells me, I think I might say that he did.

6659. From your point of view—having rather a high standard for investigation, do they come up to it?—No I could not say that, but I think they are improving. Some of their relieving officers who were appointed were not at all good men at the time of their appointment—they were people who had been lunatic attendants in the workhouse and so on; but I really think that all of them are turning out fairly well and that they are improving. That was one reason why we wanted a superintendent relieving officer so as to educate these people first of all and then to supervise them.

Conditions at Edmonton.

6660. In the appointment of this superintendent relieving officer was there any large external selection?—No, I am afraid not; there was too much from the inside.

Value of superintendent relieving officer.

6661. Would it not follow with a combination of difficulties such as these, where there is an incoming poor population, that the evil tends to create itself by reason of the fact that such things as good inquiry by trained officers chosen out of the largest field become less possible?—Yes. I have every hope that the new superintendent relieving officer when they appoint him will be an outsider.

Suggested supervision of relief by county council.

6662. Have you ever thought whether there might be any county control over the whole of the unions in an area, so as to prevent what you might call the degradation of administration?—That would be coupled with county contribution, I suppose?

6663. Yes or no—put that point aside for the moment?—I should certainly think if the two went together, it might be a very good thing indeed. I have thought of it in that way.

6664. If that were so, would you think it compatible with county control that there should be some person who should specially investigate into these cases?—Yes—a cross-visitor.

6665. A moveable person?—Yes, I should think so, if he had not too big an area.

6666. Supposing that were one element of reformation in a place like Edmonton is there any other element of reformation that you might suggest?—I think ultimately the union will have to be broken up.

Labour yards.

6667. Granting that, let us take, for instance, last winter or the winter before, when there were the labour yards to which you referred; did you inspect those labour yards while they were full?—Yes, I saw them on one or two occasions at work.

6668. When they opened a labour yard, did they add anything to their staff with a view to controlling the labour yard?—Yes, they had a superintendent.

6669. Was he a competent man?—I think so.

6670. Was there any laziness or insubordination in the yard?—I did not hear of any insubordination there, but at Chase Farm where the people were employed for wages at 3s. 6d. a day there was some friction.

6671. Suppose a large unskilled population increases in this place, and at times there is the pressure which we know too well, then what would you propose as an alternative to a labour yard?—I should offer the house.

6672. Have they accommodation now for such a purpose?—They are going to provide infirmary accommodation for 800, and this will set free a good deal of room in the house. I am expecting to go down on Friday with the architect to finally settle some plans for recommendation to the board.

6673. Will the guardians offer the house?—I think so. I think they are quite sound on that.

6674. Have they ever adopted the plan of sending a man who is somewhat lazy, or anything of that kind, in the labour yard to the house or offering him the house so that the house is behind the labour yard?—I think they did have some able-bodied men in last year, but they used not to have any able-bodied men technically in the house at all. That was when I first came into the district; then nobody was shown in the weekly return as able-bodied. This year they arranged to put any able-bodied labour yard men who gave trouble, to break stones instead of gardening at Alexandra Park, but it has been unnecessary. There have been very few applicants.

Pauper children at Edmonton.

6675. Are there a large number of children amongst the paupers at Edmonton?—There are about 600 in the school at Chase Farm.

6676. Is the number increasing?—It is increasing rapidly. That is one thing that the guardians are very strict about; they will not give out-relief to improper people for their children. They have taken a very strong line about that, and that is how these numbers in the schools continually increase. They had to take two extra cottages at Enfield for them last year, and they are proposing some increases now in building for children.

6677. Are these children the children of people who are receiving outdoor relief?—No. There might be a widow or two from whom they have taken two children and left her with others; but I do not think they give that relief in any other way.

6678. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do they take the children as a form of out-relief?—Yes.

6679. They would take a widow's children off the widow's hands?—Yes.

Poor Law outlook at Edmonton.

6680. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the persons in receipt of relief, can you compare past and present? Is there a larger number of shiftless but more or less able-bodied people coming on to the rates in Edmonton?—I do not think there is. I have been astonished in the last two years to find how few applications are made to the guardians by these people of the able-bodied class. The only thing I can think of that has kept them off in the parish of Edmonton is the influence of the Social Democrats who will not let them lose their votes. In Tottenham I think they manage to get it out of charity. The numbers have been distinctly less this year than last year, and last year they were hardly any more than the year before—not so much as I think the increase in population would be expected to account for. I am talking of the numbers at Christmas.

6681. Then on the whole you would look hopefully towards the clearance of the pauperism of the place by decrease if a strict policy is adopted?—I think it must become poorer if London does not improve. I think the circumstances of the place will go down. The value of the houses is continually going down in the greater part of the union, and unless the administration is extraordinarily improved, I do not see how pauperism can go down.

6682. Some of these workhouses have a very small number of inmates in the country unions of your district, I see?—Yes.

Possibility compulsory amalgamation of some unions for special purposes.

6683. Is it in your view desirable that there should be any county arrangement for these unions, so that the unions might be utilised for other purposes; or anything of that kind?—I should like very much to see some unions that could be used for imbeciles and so on for a whole county; but there are no empty workhouses in my district like there are in some districts, and you would have to convert one workhouse entirely from its purpose in order to use it as a joint house.

6684. Under existing legislation, with all the consents that have to be obtained, do you despair of doing that?—I think that it would be simpler to put up another place somewhere for a number of unions. I was thinking especially of Northamptonshire, where there are quite a number of weak-minded people, imbeciles and so on in workhouses.

6685. You would not be in favour of the county authority having something like compulsory power with a view to re-adjustment?—Compulsory power over what cases?

6686. Over unions where there are small numbers within the workhouse and a complete staff; so that the workhouse might be used for some other purpose?—I do not know; I think there would be a great deal of outcry, and I do not think the county would carry it.

6687. Then you look forward to having to build extra institutions always for all new needs?—I think as regards this district that there is very little room to spare,

so that there would not be much extragavance in doing it. There are only about four or five workhouses in my district who are taking boarders from London, and practically all that have room are so using it at present. I used to think that Welwyn, for instance, or some rather larger house, would do for that kind of thing.

6688. Welwyn was the sort of place I had in my mind ?—But the local people would not be pleased.

ble-
ied" at
nonton.

6689. (*Mr. Bentham*). You have told us that the able-bodied did not appear in the half-yearly return at one time; I should like to ask how they were classed at Edmonton ?—They told me that there were not any in the workhouse. But that was before my time, and I cannot say from the classification that there was nobody put down by the medical officer as able-bodied. My statement referred not to the half-yearly, but to the weekly return.

6690. Did they appear in some other classes ?—One simply got "Adults not able-bodied" and "Children" in the house. That was all that was shown.

Mr. GERHARD STOLTZ, called; and Examined.

Poor
administion in
gen.

6691. (*Chairman.*) As we are inquiring into the system of Poor Law administration in this country, and as we heard that you had a somewhat exceptional experience of the Poor Law administration of Bergen in Norway, we thought we would ask you to be kind enough to give us the results of your experience, particularly as your office and the work you have been doing are somewhat dissimilar or at least not quite analagous to anything that we have in this country. As I understand, you are an overseer of the poor in Bergen ?—Yes.

6692. Is that an unpaid office ?—Yes.

6693. Is any citizen in Bergen who is qualified compelled to take that office ?—As a rule we are not compelled, because it has been found by experience that a man who is compelled to attend to it is not very successful; so now we are appointed, generally speaking, only if we declare ourselves beforehand willing to do the work. But we may be compelled.

6694. Is there any great difficulty in getting gentlemen ready to undertake this work ?—It has proved very difficult indeed.

6695. Would you please explain what is the system of Poor Law administration which is followed in Bergen? As I understand there is a municipality and part of the duties of the municipal authorities is to relieve the poor ?—Yes.

6696. They have a special committee for the purpose, have they not ?—Yes, appointed by the municipal council.

6697. Are you an officer of that committee ?—No.

6698. You are independent of the committee, then ?—Yes. No overseer is on that committee. That consists of one of the clergymen of the town, a schoolmaster and some business men generally.

6699. Your profession, I think, is that of a teacher ?—Yes.

6700. You would work, I suppose, in co-operation with that committee of the municipal council who deal with Poor Law questions ?—I am responsible to that committee in every respect, but they do not generally interfere They meet twice a month, when I may bring any subject that I like before them and explain matters if I do not feel quite sure myself what to do and how to do it; but years may pass without the overseer coming in contact with the committee.

6701. In the meantime, between the meetings you administer relief according to your discretion ?—Yes, absolutely, within certain limits.

aritable
titutions
indoor-
r.

6702. Have you any in-door institutions, such as there are in this country ?—The municipal council has not many, but private trades unions and charitable societies have, where we may send our infirm or destitute.

6703. Are these institutions supported entirely by the charity or the union ?—Yes.

6704. Does not the State contribute ?—No, not at all.

6705. If a case came up before you, would you have to get the leave of the union or charity to whom the hospital or the house belonged, before you could send it there ?—Yes.

6706. Is that leave given as a rule ?—It depends upon how many belonging to the trades union are applying for admission to the house.

thod of
aining and
ninister-
relief.

6707. Would you please describe what would be the nature of your duties as an overseer ? It would be known that you are an overseer, I take it ?—Yes.

6708. Would anybody who wanted help or relief have to come to you ?—Anybody in my district. The town is divided into a certain number of districts, and the overseer has absolute control in his district. Everybody within its limits will go to him if they want relief, or if there is anything coming on suddenly between the meetings which we have every fortnight.

6709. These fortnightly meetings are held by whom ?—By the overseer and his assistants. Those are quite separate from the committee meetings of the Poor Law Guardians.

6710. I suppose you have an office, and there is an address known ?—Yes; the house where I live.

6711. Anybody wanting relief would come to that office ?—They would come to me, or they might go to my assistants. They generally come to the overseer.

6712. When a case comes to you, you would, I assume, investigate it ?—Yes.

6713. Assuming you thought it was a deserving case, would you have the power to give relief ?—Yes, at once.

6714. Is there any limit on the relief which you can give ?—Yes; we have our regulations.

Nature and period of relief.

6715. Do you give it in money ?—Either in money or in kind. It depends on what the family wants, or what sort of person it is who comes to me.

6716. How long would you give the relief for ?—Till the next meeting.

6717. Would that be the next meeting of the overseers ?—The next fortnightly meeting with my assistants.

6718. Do not the overseers meet together ?—Only now and then, when there is a question of particular interest which we wish to discuss. But that is quite at our discretion, and takes place when we want it.

6719. Having discussed the case at the meeting, you would either continue or discontinue the relief ?—Yes.

6720. If you continued the relief when the council met a fortnight hence, would you come up and state what you had done ?—No, I would not; but my book, in which everything is reported, is taken into the office, and the secretary makes his remarks, and if he thinks it worth while he reports the case to the guardians. Generally they do not hear anything about it; they will, as a rule, hear nothing, unless I write specially to them to ask them their opinion in some way or other.

6721. Do they ever disallow the relief that you have given ?—They may do.

Finance of relief.

6722. Does the relief come out of sums levied on the town, or who finds the fund ?—The municipal council votes every year a certain amount of money for poor relief, and it is doled out to the overseers from the office.

6723. Do you get so much a month ?—We get so much every fortnight.

6724. Can you distribute that very much as you like according to certain rules ?—Yes.

6725. Is the amount sufficient, or do you often find more applicants than you can relieve ?—I can ask for any money that I want. If there are more applicants I ask for more money. I can go to the office and get money any day I want it.

Assistant to overseer.

6726. Who appoints your assistants ?—The municipal council, on a recommendation from the guardians.

6727. What sort of persons are they ? Are they of all classes of life ?—Yes. Everybody, man or woman, above twenty-five years of age may be elected.

Mr. Gerhard Stoltz.

20 Mar. 1906.

6728. Have you many women among your assistants?—I have three.

6729. How many assistants have you?—Twelve.

6730. Do you work at all in co-operation with charitable institutions?—Only when I find it necessary. My district is so well known to me and my assistants that we generally know if any of the poor get relief in other ways. We visit them very often.

6731. Are your assistants paid?—No.

6732. How many hours a week have they to give up to this work?—It differs. It depends upon the families they have got to look after.

6733. And it would depend very much upon the state of distress and the general condition of the town, I suppose?—Yes, of course.

Size of overseer's district.

6734. What size would your district be; how many people would it contain?—It is considered that on an average every assistant ought to have four families to look after. Some districts have fifteen assistants and some have less, but fifteen is considered the most, because a larger number would give so much trouble to the overseer who has to look after them all.

6735. As you have twelve assistants who each look after four families, that means that you have about fifty families under your supervision?—I have about sixty families; some of them are single persons, bachelors, widows and so on. But they live among other people who are not relieved, so that the district contains many more.

6736. The population under you would be about 300, I suppose?—No; about 180 is the number that I have had on the average to look after.

6737. Bergen is a big place, and it must have a good many overseers of the poor?—There are about forty overseers, and they have twelve or fifteen assistants each.

6738. Then the system is one of what we should call minute subdivision?—Yes.

6739. I think you told me there was a difficulty in getting so many to do this work?—Yes, it has been very difficult.

6740. Is that difficulty increasing?—Yes. In most cases they will not be re-elected. They have to serve four years and then they may be re-elected, and if they are willing they always are, but it is proving very difficult to keep them for more than the four years.

6741. If a person is not willing and has no aptitude for the work, it is work which he would not do well?—Yes; and then we will not have them if we can possibly do without them.

6742. Does the Bergen system generally prevail through Norway?—No. It has been carried out only in Bergen and one or two small towns. It has been tried in some other places, but it has been given up because it was found too difficult to get overseers and assistants.

6743. Have the overseers any compulsory powers? If a man comes to you and wants relief, can you make him work?—Yes.

Public farms for the "able-bodied."

6744. What sort of work would you put him to?—If he is an able-bodied man, I can send him to a farm where he will have to dig and cultivate the farm. It is a farm supported by the guardians or by the poor relief committee. If he is not able-bodied, if he is a weak man, we can send him to a workshop where they sew flour-bags.

6745. Are there places where an able-bodied woman can be sent?—Yes, she can go to that workshop for sewing bags.

6746. Have you a farm, or part of a farm, at your disposal to which you can send these men?—Yes. It is at the disposal of the municipal council.

Result of Bergen Poor relief system.

6747. What has been the result of the system in Bergen? Has it been satisfactory; has it reduced the number of paupers?—It has not reduced the number, but morally I think it is much better than the previous system we had. As to the amount of money spent, that is much larger under this system. It has been very difficult to keep the amount of money spent on the poor at a fairly average level with the amount of money that was spent before.

6748. I understand there was no subdivision under the previous system, and that the council voted a certain sum?—Yes. The secretary, or the chief inspector and the secretary distributed everything. They were paid officers. We have kept the secretary, but the inspector has been given up.

6749. Socially, this scheme must have worked well, for it makes many more people interested in the Poor Law does it not?—Yes.

6750. And they have got to know those who are in want better than they did before?—Yes. They never saw anything of them before.

6751. It has not kept down the expense, however?—No, it has increased the expenditure.

6752. Nor has it kept down the number of paupers?—No.

6753. Nor the number of applicants?—No.

Punishment of paupers refusing to work.

6754. If an able-bodied man will not work, can you punish him?—Yes. I cannot do it myself, but I write to the secretary at the office, and he sends my letter to the police with his recommendation that the police must take the man and punish him. He is compelled to work in a sort of workhouse kept by the police.

6755. I suppose the work that he would do there would be harder than the work that he would do on your farm?—Yes, it would be much harder.

6756. And the food would be less attractive I suppose?—When he works on the farm he has to provide his own food, or rather he would get it from us.

6757. But the conditions of work under the police would be harder?—Much harder.

6758. That is known, I suppose?—Yes.

6759. And acts as a deterrent?—Yes. They hate very much to go to the workhouse.

Number of applicants for relief in Bergen.

6760. What are the numbers of applicants for assistance and relief, as compared with the population of Bergen?—The population of Bergen is 75,000, and on an average 10,000 men, women and children will be relieved in the year.

6761. 10,000 separate people; or would some be counted twice?—They would not be counted twice.

6762. So that 10,000 people out of 75,000 would be relieved annually?—Yes.

6763. In winter I suppose employment is scarce in Bergen?—Yes.

6764. The place is frozen over then, is it not?—No, the harbour is not frozen. Most of the unskilled labour is dependent on the herring and other fisheries.

6765. I suppose the demand for labour in Norway contracts during the winter?—Yes.

6766. And there is less of it then?—Much less.

6767. So that assistance is always required, unless people have put by some little savings during the summer?—Assistance is not always required. A man who finds permanent employment during six or seven months generally will do without help at all.

6768. He will have saved enough for the winter?—Yes.

Absence of benefit societies.

6769. Are there many societies—we call them "Benefit Societies"—by which working people are able to insure against illness or lack of employment?—No.

6770. You have no assistance of that sort?—We have nothing of that kind. They may go to the ordinary insurance companies, but they do not do it generally.

6771. Do the insurance companies insure against non-employment?—No, you cannot insure against that.

6772. Do they insure against sickness?—Yes.

6773. But those schemes, I rather gather, are not very largely in operation?—No; it is the exception to find a man who is insured against sickness. Those who belong to trades unions sometimes are.

Age of paupers.

6774. Are any large proportion of the people that you help old people?—Most of them are.

6775. What would you call old—over sixty?—Yes.

6776. Do you help the children of those who come to you?—Of course, if they need it. If the husband dies

and his wife is left with more than one child, they will generally have to be relieved. I have known instances where the mother has been able to provide for two or three children under fifteen, but that is an exception.

6777. How do they help the children; do they pay their schooling?—No, that is free; and they even get their meals at school four days a week, if they want them.

6778. In Norway every man over twenty-one has a vote, has he not?—No; over twenty-five.

6779. If a man gets help in this way, does he lose his vote?—Yes.

6780. For a year, or for how long?—For as long as he has relief I think, but I confess I am not quite sure.*

6781. If he was relieved for one month in a year, say in the month of February, he would then be disqualified, but supposing the relief stopped in March, would he then be qualified?—I should think he would become qualified again, if he ascertained himself that his name was struck off the list in time for the next election.

6782. He is not struck off for a year and then has to be put on again, as is the practice here?—No, I do not think so.

6783. Is the list of those who get relief posted publicly?—No. It is kept quite privately.

6784. Whose business is it to make a list of those who get relief?—It is done in the office by the secretary.

6785. He sends that to whom?—He sends it to the bureau where they keep the list of the voters in the town.

6786.—And then he is struck off at once?—Yes, as far as I know.

6787. (*Mrs. Webb.*) What is the population of your district?—I should say about 3,000, but I am not quite sure.

6788. And you have got about fifty families out of those 3,000?—Yes, I should think that would be the number.

6789. (*Mr. Booth.*) I should like to ask whether your assistants look for the cases of distress or whether they wait till they have applications made to them?—Generally the paupers themselves apply; when they feel that they cannot go on any longer without being relieved they apply. We may look into the case ourselves, if we find it necessary.

6790. Would the neighbours come and tell you if there were some cases of distress?—Yes, they often do.

6791. How are the sick and the old dealt with; is it always in their own homes or is it at institutions?—The sick ones are taken to infirmaries.

6792. Public infirmaries?—Yes.

6793. (*Chairman.*) Are those infirmaries under the town?—Yes.

6794. And supported by the town?—One of the infirmaries belongs to the municipality, but there are others.

6795. Are they paying infirmaries or are they free?—They have to pay.

6796. (*Mr. Loch.*) When you send a patient to the hospital, do you not pay for him out of the poor money that is assigned for that purpose?—Yes, but I do not pay it; the secretary at the office pays it. As soon as a person leaves my district, I have nothing to do with him.

6797. Therefore in that way all the persons sent to the town's hospital would be paid for out of the poor relief money of the year?—Yes.

6798. In regard to the man you described as sent to the workhouse, would he be brought before a magistrate by the police, or would the police deal with him on the reference from the secretary?—The police would deal with him according to the letter they have got from the secretary. He is summoned before the chief of the police and asked some questions and reprimanded for his behaviour.

6799. Then he goes before the chief of the police?—Yes, he has to do that.

6800. He has not to go before a magistrate with a view to committal beyond the police committal?—No, not beyond the police committal. I do not know how long the time is, but I think six months is the most that they have dealt with a man.

6801. Is your law about that like the German law, that is to say, that you can continue the sentence if necessary over and above the six months?—Yes, we can do that.

6802. Is that done as a police affair solely?—I do not know of any case where it has been done, unless there has been a week or two's interval between the sentences. A man who has been sentenced to six months' labour in a workhouse, and then comes out and gets drunk the day after, may be taken in once more, but then it is under a new sentence which has been passed upon him after he has completed the old sentence and has left the workhouse.

6803. With regard to the workshop you have referred to, who runs it? Is it a town affair, a council affair, or is it in private hands?—It belongs to the poor relief. Workshop for paupers.

6804. It is part of the poor relief machinery?—Yes.

6805. What is the poor relief machinery in the way of institutions? First, it has this workshop?—And the farm.

6806. And a hospital?—Yes; for sick people and for aged people it has infirmaries and hospitals. Institutions available for paupers.

6807. Has it any other institutions?—I do not think there are any other institutions, so far as I can remember.

6808. Practically this out-door relief system which you have described has behind it a whole group of institutions which you utilise?—Yes; you must have them. They are not all run by the municipality or poor relief system, and then the paupers must pay the same as others.

6809. Amongst those is there a poorhouse?—Not a poor house in the same way that you have it here. It is only for the aged who cannot look after themselves any longer.

6810. That is the sort of poorhouse I meant?—For them there is a room called a sick room that they are sent to—or two rooms rather.

6811. Are they compelled to go there, or is it simply an offer made to them?—It is an offer made to them which they may refuse; but generally they are not offered it till they are so weak that they cannot provide for themselves any longer. If they have no children that will look after them, they must go there, but they object to it very often till they get there, and then they feel very pleased and will not leave it any more.

6812. What number is there in the poorhouse?—About a hundred.

6813. Then it is quite a small place?—Yes, it is very small.

6814. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) If they refuse to go there, do you give them any other kind of relief?—I may, and I may not.

6815. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Supposing they die after they have refused, what happens; are you responsible?—I could not tell, because that has never happened as far as I know.

6816. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Has a man a legal right to relief?—No, he has only a moral right. The nature of the "right" to relief.

6817. Then he cannot legally require you as overseer to give him relief in kind if he is destitute?—No, he cannot.

6818. (*Mrs. Webb.*) You would not be tried for manslaughter like our overseers are if they died after refusing to go to the poorhouse?—No.

6819. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) You would not allow a man to be absolutely destitute even although he refused to go to the workhouse; you would give him some kind of relief, would you not?—Personally I would.

6820. You would relieve him from starvation at any rate?—I would personally, but I cannot answer for anybody else, because we are only morally responsible.

6821. (*Mr. Loch.*) Has Bergen many endowed charities dating from previous centuries?—No, not many.

6822. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is all this that you have been telling us a matter of regulation by the county council under what we should call statutory power?—Yes. Regulations of relief by the local authorities.

*In a letter dated 28th June, 1906, Mr. Stoltz stated, with reference to the question of disfranchisement, "I have now ascertained that the relieved person is struck off during the whole year in which he has got public relief except for municipal votings."

Mr. Gerhard Stoltz.

20 Mar. 1906.

6823. It is not regulated by the State generally, nor by the Norwegian Parliament?—No, that has nothing to do with it.

6824. It is simply done by the local authorities themselves?—Yes. The rules have to be sanctioned by the Minister for Instruction and Worship. They are only sanctioned by him.

6825. (*Mr. Booth.*) What happens in other towns where the system that you have adopted at Bergen does not exist?—In the other towns they have an inspector and a secretary paid to look after the poor, but in the country they have a body of guardians who are not paid and who meet every fortnight or every month, and the chairman of that body has the real power of giving relief.

Disfranchisement by medical relief in institutions.

6826. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) You told us the sick and infirm go to the infirmaries; does that disqualify them from voting?—Yes.

6827. Medical relief then disqualifies?—Not medical relief given in their homes.

6828. Do you give medical relief in their homes?—Yes, sometimes. We can give any kind of relief, and there are in Bergen five or six doctors who look after the poor when the overseer or his assistant asks him to do it.

Out-door medical relief.

6829. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Do you pay those doctors?—Yes, out of the poor relief money.

6830. Do you pay them a salary, or do you pay them by the day?—They are paid an annual salary.

6831. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) It comes to this, that medical relief or assistance given in their own homes does not disqualify them from voting?—That is so, if they get no other relief at the same time.

6832. But if it is given in the infirmaries it does?—Yes.

Treatment of infectious diseases.

6833. I suppose you do not send to the infirmaries cases of infectious disease; they would be treated by the public health authorities, would they not?—We have a special infirmary for infectious diseases, to which such cases are sent; but that is a sort of relief, and, therefore, in those cases they are disqualified from voting.

Period of disfranchisement by relief.

6834. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Did I understand you to say that a person was not disqualified from voting except at an election that occurred during the time he was receiving relief?—Yes. As soon as he proves that he is working for himself and is supporting himself and his family, he may go and vote again. I must confess, however, that I am not quite sure of this, as there has been some uncertainty.*

6835. (*Chairman.*) Has he to prove that, or would the fact that he is no longer on the overseer's list be sufficient?—That would be sufficient, but it would take some time before it was brought in order.

6836. Would the overseer or would the man himself take action in order to get his name put back, or who would report?—The secretary would report.

Finance of relief.

6837. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you make an estimate each year of the amount of money that you will want from the council?—No; I do that every fortnight.

6838. Then there is really no estimate for the year, and you can get what you want each fortnight?—Yes.

6839. Are the regulations that you work under printed?—Yes; there are printed rules for the use of the overseer and his assistants. I shall translate them and send you a copy. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIV.)

6840. (*Mr. Loch.*) Your council makes an estimate every year, does it not, of the amount that it will give for poor relief?—Yes; it makes an estimate of the total sum.

6841. And then it comes specially before them, does it not, if there is any change, and an amount is asked for over and above the estimate?—If in the course of the year more is asked for than has been voted, they will have to give an extra vote for more, and they will do that on the application of the board of guardians.

6842. So that the council really has the purse strings in its hands?—Yes.

6843. (*Mrs. Webb.*) But as I understand it the council cannot limit the amount of poor relief given in the year?—It has never done so, and I do not think it would.

6844. (*Mr. Loch.*) It has not done so, but it would be within its power to do so?—Yes, it would be; but I do not think that case would ever occur.

6845. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What is the average amount which you give; can you give us any indication of that?—The total number of persons, men, women and children, under my care in my district varies from 150 to 200, and every fortnight I give 300 kroner or £15 in cash, and £2 or £3 in kind (which means coals in the winter, food and medicine now and then).

Sphere of operations of assistants to overseers.

6846. (*Chairman.*) Earlier in your examination you told me that each of your assistants had four families under his care; are those selected families of poor people, or are they families living next one another in the street?—Generally they are living in the same house or in neighbouring houses.

6847. Would each assistant overseer have a little block of buildings to attend to?—Yes.

6848. And out of that there might be four families that he would have to look after?—Yes.

6849. But those four families would not be the only people in that block of building?—No; of course not.

6850. So that in your district you will be looking after from fifty to sixty families out of a population of how much?—I should think about 3,000.

Scale of relief.

6851. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) About how much per week do you think that a man with a wife and two children can live on in Bergen?—About 10 kroner a week.

6852. Do you ever give as much as that?—Not if the man is able-bodied, but if the man is unable to work or dead, and his wife is left with three or four children, I should give the full amount.

6853. Would you give her enough to keep her?—I should give her as much as I am legally authorised to give, if she cannot earn anything herself.

6854. Is there a limit then to the amount that you can give?—There is a limit laid down by the guardians.

6855. What is the highest that you can give?—That would be the highest.

6856. 10 kroner a week?—Yes, for a man, his wife and two children.

6857. (*Mr. Loch.*) If they have less than 10 kroner is it your rule to give them up to something like 10 kroner?—Yes.

6858. That is the ordinary lines of the scheme you follow?—Yes.

6859. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Do you think prices are higher or lower there than here?—The money goes twice as far there as it does here.

6860. Then that would represent 20s. a week?—I should think it would represent nearly a sovereign. House rent is very cheap there, and so are meat and bread: very cheap.

Finance of relief.

6861. (*Dr. Downes.*) How does the county council raise its fund for the money that it supplies you with?—From the rates.

6862. Does it possess any property?—No, nothing worth mentioning.

6863. Or any income from old endowments?—It has some few, but they do not count really as income.

6864. You send your patients to the public hospitals, I understand?—Yes.

Classification in public hospitals.

6865. Are the wards in those hospitals graded according to the class of person who is in them?—There are two different wards for two classes, the better and the simple. They pay in both wards, but there is a difference in the amount of the payment.

Boarding out of children and adult paupers.

6866. Do you board out any of your paupers?—We board out children very often, but not in the town, always in the country.

6867. Do they in any parts of Norway still board out the adult paupers with families?—They do it in the country at some places, but they do not like it. There are some places where the population is so thinly scattered about that they still have to do it, because they have no workhouses and no unions and no other places to take them in.

* *See* foot-note on page 325.

TWENTIETH DAY.

Monday, 26th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. PHILIP HENRY BAGENAL, called; and Examined.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

6868. (*Chairman.*) You are the Local Government Board Inspector for the Yorkshire District?—I am.

6869. According to the practice of the Commission, the written memoranda of the inspectors are taken as their evidence in chief: you have furnished us with a very full and interesting statement. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (A–I).) I will only call your attention to those points in it which seem to us most worthy of attention, or which may require rather further explanation. I see by paragraph 6 you attach great importance to publicity. The fact that the papers report and comment upon Poor Law administration is, in your judgment, a healthy stimulus and assistance?—Yes.

Publicity of Poor Law proceedings: results a stimulus to good administration.

6870. As a rule, are the Poor Law proceedings sufficiently published?—They are generally fully published in small local newspapers, but in a place like Leeds, for instance, where the guardians have to deal with a very large budget, you very seldom have an extended notice of the proceedings of the guardians: in fact, there is very little in the Press about the proceedings of the guardians.

6871. Therefore, if some method could be suggested by which the proceedings and discussions of Poor Law Guardians were more widely known and distributed, it would be advantageous, in your judgment?—Yes; and I think that every union ought to be made to publish statistics and abstracts of their dealings with the different departments of Poor Law administration. In Yorkshire they do to a very great extent publish very good reports; I can put in specimens, but some unions do not publish anything at all.

6872. Would you like to make it an obligation on all boards of guardians to publish in certain specified or well-known newspapers their periodical proceedings?—It has not occurred to me to publish them in that way, because they would have to be paid for, and that would be a very heavy expense. I think that the proper way would be to make it incumbent upon them to publish in pamphlet form, available to the ratepayers, the main details of their expenditure, and the statistical reviews of pauperism.

6873. How would they be circulated? To whom would they send those reports?—They could hang them on the church doors. A great many guardians publish the name of every pauper in receipt of relief. I can put in one of the Wakefield annual reports, where they publish the name of every pauper and the amount that he or she gets. That is available to every ratepayer.

6874. I will now pass to the various tables you have put in. The figures relating to relief show a continual increase since 1881, but the rate per £ of assessment of the West Riding is practically the same as it was twenty-one years ago?—That is so: it is a point lower.

6875. So that the increased assessable value has just met and counterbalanced the increased expenditure in the West Riding?—Yes.

6876. In the East Riding there has also been an increase in pauperism, but there the rate in the pound has considerably risen?—The assessable rate has.

6877. From 6¾d. to 8·7d.?—Yes.

6878. Going back to the West Riding, I see from paragraph 17 the indoor relief has increased in a higher ratio than the outdoor during that period?—Yes.

6879. Coming to paragraph 26, you point out that the rural paupers on the average are considerably older than the urban paupers, and that there is apparently a larger percentage of old people. That, no doubt, would account for pauperism being higher in the rural districts than the urban districts?—Yes.

Old age of rural paupers.

6880. The movement of population affects the ratio of pauperism in this way, that a decrease of population as a rule tends to raise the rate, and an increase of population tends to diminish the rate of pauperism?—I think so. My observation has always been that in the rural districts, where the population has decreased owing to migration to towns, the result has been to leave the most pauperised classes of the community in that rural district, therefore there is bound to be a heavier rate of pauperism.

Effect of variation of population on pauperism.

6881. And reversing it, it is the more intelligent or the more progressive who have moved, to another district, and they, as a rule, may not have carried their old people with them?—I should say they certainly do not carry their old people with them. They very often send contributions for their maintenance, but they do not take the old people with them.

6882. Therefore the variation of the population has to be taken very much into consideration in comparing the ratio of pauperism in one district with another?—Yes, I think so.

6883. In paragraph 39 you draw a contrast between two districts, Barnsley and Pontefract, and you think one contributing element to the better position of Barnsley is the number and influence of its friendly societies?—Yes: and I have confirmed that by a further study of the friendly societies' blue-books, in which they give the name of every registered friendly society in these two unions, and in fact you can get them in every union in every county. I find that Barnsley has considerably more friendly societies than Pontefract. That can be verified of course by the Commission by a special inquiry into the friendly society movement.

Friendly and co-operative societies in Yorkshire.

6884. The beneficial effect of friendly societies and cognate societies is alluded to, I think, further on in your evidence, and you attribute to the large number of successful friendly societies which are in existence in Yorkshire the low general rate of pauperism?—I do. It is a very strong factor. The co-operative movement is a very strong movement in Leeds, Huddersfield, and Halifax; and in all the West Riding industrial centres the various forms

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

of providence, thrift, and co-operation are very strong indeed. I attribute the low rate of pauperism very largely to that. There is a point I want to mention later on as to a very curious movement in pressing out-relief by the friendly societies in Huddersfield. I do not know whether this is a good time to take it?

Policy of friendly societies to increase out-relief in Huddersfield and results.

6885. I think it would be, because the friendly societies in Barnsley tend to diminish the poor rate, and it would be interesting if you could give an illustration of where friendly societies had operated in the other direction?—That is exactly the point I wanted to show. In 1901 there was a movement in Huddersfield on the part of a certain number of the friendly societies to bring forward candidates specially representing the friendly societies at the board of guardians' elections; they held a public meeting in the Friendly and Trade Societies' Hall in Northumberland Street, and they made a very strong appeal to the electors to return friendly society men, because, they said, that the policy of the board of guardians had been based on narrow and niggardly lines as far as outdoor relief was concerned; and they said that they did not administer the law as intended by Parliament. They asked them to send the friendly society people to office in order to materially increase the amount of relief given to deserving people. I wish to call attention to the terms of the resolution which was passed: "That this meeting is of opinion"—this is a big public meeting of friendly societies—"that there should be a more liberal distribution of outdoor relief"—as if it was a fund which you simply distributed all round—"and pledges itself to support the friendly societies' federation's programme and its candidates." Then the gentleman who proposed it, Mr. Pontefract, went on to say that in 1871 he found that a sum of £16,000, was expended by the Huddersfield board of guardians in outdoor relief, while in 1894 it had dropped to £8,500, and last year, that is 1900, there was distributed in the union the princely sum of £7,350 in outdoor relief, an amount which was less, by more than 55 per cent., than the expenditure in such relief in 1871, while the total revenue had jumped from £29,000 to £31,000; and it was made a grievance that the poor had been deprived of the balance between the £16,000 a year in 1871 and the £7,000 odd which was then being, as they called it, "distributed." I put in a handbill issued on behalf of the Friendly Societies' Federation of Huddersfield and District in connexion with this election. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV (J).)

6886. What was the effect of that appeal to the electorate?—They immediately returned all these friendly society candidates, and they immediately set to work to distribute outdoor relief, and it jumped up at once £1,000 to £2,000 a year more. I have the figures here. I think that is one of the most extraordinary things, having regard to the fact that the friendly society movement was supposed to be the child of poor law reform, and by it the people were thrown on their own resources. Here you have a body of men who have sent up the outdoor relief: in 1900 it was £7,385; in 1902 it was £8,469; I know it is much higher now, although I have not the figures at this present moment. It has gone up certainly by over £1,000 a year. What is more, administration has gone back very much. They give relief to people who live in lodging-houses. It is quite a common occurrence. I went down there and investigated the whole question, and the relieving officers gave me a list of the people. I have here a copy of the application and report book, with certain cases which I think are quite unfit and undesirable cases to relieve. The whole administration has become exceedingly lax. One of the relieving officers says: "In my district, No. 2 Huddersfield, I have eight males and two females who are receiving outdoor relief and living in the Corporation model lodging-houses, and two cases in common lodging-houses." The workhouse as a test for destitution is very rarely offered in Huddersfield, as the majority of the guardians are not in favour of it. I have specimen cases here where wages earned by members of the family are supplemented by outdoor relief, and there has been a distinct deterioration of administration in that union ever since the friendly societies came into power. (Papers handed in, see Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (K) and (L).)

6887. This is a local movement of friendly societies, which, I understand, is opposed to the general attitude taken up by friendly societies in other parts of England?—I could not say that. I do not know anything about the motives, except that the leader of the movement is a member of the board of guardians, and he has been joined by another leader, and they have practically increased the relief all round. They sit in committee, but the committees do not rotate, the same guardians deal with the same class of people in the same district, or parish, you may say. They do not always agree; the different committees have not the same views of how to treat similar cases.

6888. The friendly societies who acted in this way in Huddersfield are not confined to Huddersfield, are they? Are they branches of big societies?—I have not been able to get the names of the societies, but that is a point which I think is very important, because they may be dividing societies or bad societies: they may not be some of the important societies, who, we understand, are very much against laxity in Poor Law relief. I suggest this Commission might go into this matter.

6889. What was the date of this meeting?—This was 1901, and there has been another election since. This placard was put out in March, 1904. Perhaps I might read it: "Election of Guardians: March, 1904. To the Electors of the Huddersfield Poor Law Union. Ladies and Gentlemen, In connection with the above, the friendly societies are bringing forward candidates, whose names will be submitted very shortly, in opposition to the usual policy of the present Board with regard to outdoor relief, which in most cases is very inadequate"—that is the idea, that it was inadequate—"the friendly societies advocate that the minimum relief given to a destitute deserving person should not be less than 5s. per week. They further advocate that a working man with a small wage and a family dependent on his earnings shall not be compelled to impoverish his family by being called upon to contribute to the maintenance of parents who may be applicants chargeable to the union. On behalf of the friendly societies we earnestly ask for your support for their candidates, all of whom have definitely pledged themselves to support the above policy." Then that is signed by ten gentlemen. I think you can gather from the initials what the societies are: A.O.F.; that is, I suppose, the Foresters: N.U.O.F.G., B.U.O.O.F. M.U., that is Manchester Unity; G.U.O.O.F., A.O.F.; N.I.O.F.; and R.A.O.B. Those are the societies. That, as an electioneering placard, I look upon as a very extraordinary one: a minimum of relief at 5s. a week to a destitute deserving person is a statement which can be enlarged very conveniently on the platform.

6890. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Do you think the moral effect of that is any worse than: "Vote for so and so old-age pensions"?—I think it is a pity that the friendly societies go in for this form of propaganda, considering that the friendly societies are supposed to be advocates of self-help, independency and thrift; and the more you give in out-relief the more unlikely people will be to join these societies. Why should they? It seems to me that these friendly societies must be cutting their own throats in the end.

6891. (*Chairman.*) Has the number of outdoor paupers increased in Huddersfield?—My comparative figures might perhaps show that in my classification of unions.

6892. I do not know if you have seen Mr. Booth's figures: according to those the total number of paupers has fallen in the last ten years in Huddersfield?—I can give you the figures of the number relieved in Huddersfield for the last five years, which covers the point. On the 1st January, 1901, there were 1,441 persons in receipt of out-door relief: in 1902 it rose to 1,559; in 1903 it was 1,565; in 1904 it was 1,720, and in 1905 it was 1,911. That is a continuous and progressive rise.

6893. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Have you the figures for January 1st, 1906?—The figure is 1,934.

6894. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) At the same time the population has been decreasing?—Huddersfield is the only place in Yorkshire where the population has been stationary. I do not know that it has been decreasing.

6895. According to your figures here, in 1891 there was a population of 168,000, and in 1901 it was 166,000. That is a decrease of 2,000 in ten years?—The Mayor is trying to increase the number of the population there by a system of feeding babies.

6896. (*Chairman.*) Do you look upon the action of the friendly societies at Huddersfield as a demand not merely for adequate out-relief, but for an extension of the system?—In practice it has been an indefinite laxening of the whole policy of the administration. I want to add that that is a very large board. It is an enormous board. You will see from my figures of the numbers of guardians it is a very large and unwieldy board, which I always maintain is one of the worst features in Poor Law administration.

Method of electing guardians.

6897. How are they elected at Huddersfield: one-third each year?—No, they are elected all at one time. I do not think there is a single union in my district that does not elect its members all at once.

6898. We may leave Huddersfield with this observation, that the action of the friendly societies there, so far as you know, is contrary to that which they have been taking elsewhere?—I cannot say that, because I do not know anything about what the friendly societies do elsewhere. I have never found anywhere else in my district a friendly society movement of that character: I will not go further than that, and I deprecate it very much.

Beneficent effect of friendly societies.

6899. You have laid stress on the beneficent work the friendly societies have done in other parts of Yorkshire?—Certainly, because I believe that their action is to decrease the dependence on Poor Law relief, and I attribute the lowness of the pauperism to that fact, and when I see a crusade of this sort accompanied by results of increased pauperism, I fear very much for the results everywhere else?

6900. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Might we before we pass from Huddersfield, have the indoor relief figures for the same five years?—I will give you the 1st January figures: 1901, 491; 1902, 516; 1903, 512; 1904, 499; 1905, 529. I keep all these statistics in books for every union for five years, so that when I go to the guardians I can deal with the statistical period.

6901. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I have here for 1905, 447 indoor?—I am not responsible for these, they come to me from the clerks of the guardians. There are very often small discrepancies between these and the Parliamentary returns.

Conditions in Sheffield, York, and Bradford.

6902. (*Chairman.*) You draw a contrast between three great towns in your district, Sheffield, York and Bradford. Sheffield, you point out, does not afford much opportunity for female labour; Bradford does, and Hull, on the other hand, is not only a great seaport town, but is the centre for a large agricultural district. Contrasting the three together, the pauperism in Bradford, I think, is the lowest, then comes Sheffield and then Hull. You speak of there being no regular female labour in the East Riding. The amount of relief given in Hull is higher than in the other two districts, and, turning over to page 12, you give a list of the statistics obtained from unions which have conditions common to those existing in Hull. I assume that the expenditure on pauperism in these unions is a good deal higher than it would be in unions which were situated inland on account of their being, as there always is in seaport towns, a large amount of casual labour. Would not that be so?—I do not say anything here about the conditions being the same; I simply say they are seaports, and seaports have different characteristics; for instance, you could not possibly compare Liverpool with Hull. I do not go into anything; I have simply got these statistics as seaports. There are always certain conditions in seaports the same. I was anxious to see what other seaports did: that is all; but Hull being backed with a hinterland with a purely agricultural population, no doubt it does attract a very great deal of casual labour from the agricultural population of the district.

6903. Now we come to the combination of unions. You have only one combination for common purposes, and that is York?—Yes.

Question of transfer of Poor Law to county and town councils.

6904. You deal with that separately. It has been suggested to us from various quarters that the administration unit might be largely increased, and that the larger the area the more effective will be the administration of the Poor Law. Have you any views upon that point?—I am not in favour of transferring the Poor Law administration to county councils.

6905. Or to anybody elected on the same principle?—I have not considered that, but I am quite clear that county councils and urban town councils are not the people to manage the Poor Law. In the first place, they are already very much overworked, and in the second place I think that it would be a very dangerous principle indeed to entrust to them the material relief of a very large number of people who have nothing to give in return, and it would have, I think, a very corrupting influence upon local politics.

Need for larger electoral units.

6906. You are not prepared to make any recommendations as regards any general change of area?—I feel very strongly upon this particular point, which I am going to state; that the areas which elect guardians are much too small. You ought to have larger areas with less representatives and more manageable bodies. You would then remove the parochial influence to a certain extent. You might get a better class of men, if there was a larger district to represent. You will see, in my lists of unions, the enormous bodies which exist. They are quite unnecessary. Vast numbers of them do not attend except when there is something to vote for in the shape of an officer or probationer nurse they want elected, or something of that sort, and if you would reform the areas in that direction, I am exceedingly with you on that point; but I think the Poor Law ought to be an *ad hoc* body; the administration of the Poor Law ought to be done by people elected for the purpose.

Ad hoc guardians.

Difficulties in enlarging Poor Law areas.

6907. The larger the area the easier becomes the classification of paupers?—Yes, but then you may classify a person out of his home surroundings; you would put him somewhere where he could not have a visit from anybody. That is the local objection.

6908. That local feeling prevails strongly?—I think so. It is certainly a very strong one on paper.

6909. It would prevail, I suppose, more in the rural districts than it would in the urban?—Yes.

6910. Any very drastic change of boundaries or areas would meet, in your judgment, with a good deal of local opposition?—You cannot alter any area in England without the most extraordinary hostility on the part of the people. I have held local inquiries, and it is as much as your life is worth sometimes to suggest any alteration. If one union wants to get a parish there is always a public inquiry, witnesses and speeches, and they blow off steam until really you do not understand the English love of parochialism until you hold an inquiry of that sort. There was nearly a free fight in Suffolk when I held an inquiry once, owing to the local feeling.

6911. Now we pass on to friendly societies. I think we have had your opinion upon the generally beneficent effect they exercise. You make a suggestion here that the establishment of sick and benefit societies for women might be encouraged and extended. Are there any societies now that are engaged in the work of helping or insuring women?—Yes, I believe there are. It is a slowly growing movement, but it does exist. My attention was called to it first by the extraordinary excess of female pauperism as compared with male. You will find in every classification of sex that the female paupers are very much in excess of the male paupers.

Friendly societies for women.

6912. In agricultural as well as in urban districts?—I think as a rule you will find it. That is my experience. It has always struck me that that must be one of the reasons; that the friendly society movement has really not touched women, except during the last decade, I believe. The domestic servant ought, above all classes, to put by something out of her wages; but you very seldom hear of a domestic servant who puts by anything in a friendly society; yet they are the class who ought to do it, because they very often come on the rates afterwards.

Comparison of pauperism and number of friendly societies in each union county.

6913. Coming to page 14 of your Memorandum, you show the proportion of pauperism to the estimated population in union counties, and the number of industrial and provident societies and friendly societies in each union county. Yorkshire, with the single exception of Middlesex, comes out, upon that basis, at the top of the list?—Lancashire, I think, must be given the palm.

6914. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Does this include trade unions and co-operative societies?—No, not trade unions. I must say that this is really a very amateur statistical attempt; I do not want to put it as anything more than a private examination of my own. I got the figures

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

out of our own Blue Book for the ratios, and the others I have got out of the County Returns of the Friendly Societies and Provident Societies which are published by the Registrar. They ought to be revised and corrected, but I put them in really only as a suggestion.

6915. (*Chairman.*) In this table, Yorkshire, taking the ratio per thousand of all paupers, comes out best of any county, except Middlesex?—Yes, according to pauperism. I was thinking of friendly societies. As to pauperism, I quite agree we are the lowest, except Middlesex.

6916. Middlesex,—the county which stands ahead of Yorkshire in this respect, is we know a county in which there has been an enormous influx of population in recent years?—Yes.

6917. And that influx of population has very materially altered and diminished the ratio of pauperism to population. Assuming that your premises are sound, it would follow that these industrial, provident and friendly societies have, according to this table, generally a very beneficent effect in checking pauperism?—I think so, and you will find them nearly always existing in great industrial centres.

Rota relief committees.

6918. Now we come to the administration of out-door relief. I think you advocate the system of Rotation Committees?—Yes.

6919. Is the out-door relief, in most of your large unions, administered on that system?—You will find in the large sheet I give at the end exactly the numbers that there are, and the relief in practice. Under the head of Query 2, if you run your eye down there, you will see how very few of them do rotate. There are only six.

Need for assistants to general inspector.

6920. The suggestions you make for the improvement of the administration of this branch of the poor law are, that you should have an assistant inspector under you?—Generally speaking. I want an assistant inspector now, because I have 144 institutions to inspect every year, besides attending boards of guardians. My time at the present moment is very largely taken up with inspecting children's homes, rate-supported homes, of the guardians with from eight to fifteen children in them. I have fifty or sixty of those. With all submission, without desiring to be egotistical, I think that I could be better employed in higher work than in going and investigating small homes of that description. I should like to devote my time a great deal more to the supervision of out-door relief, which is a great national problem. An assistant inspector, or a lady inspector, could do these homes just as well, or better, than I could, and I should be liberated for more pressing or important work. That is as regards myself. It is a very long job, going round twenty homes in one town. You have to take two or three days to do it, because you have to do it in two particular hours, if you want to see the children; in the dinner hour, or at tea-time. Therefore, I say it is economic waste to have me doing that sort of work.

Functions of inspector in regard to out-relief.

6921. Have you found that you have been able, by your presence at the meetings where outdoor relief is being discussed or cases considered, to influence the guardians?—We are not supposed to influence actual cases, and I never do intervene until the case is over. The inspector is not supposed to interfere, and really it is the guardians' duty and responsibility to decide cases of relief and to give what ought to be given. But very often, when a case is done, I say: "Well, I do not think that was right, and I will tell you why," and I state the other point of view, and I have found sometimes that that is a useful intervention.

Contrast of out-relief systems in York and Pocklington.

6922. In this report you give two illustrations further on as to different methods of giving outdoor relief. One was in the rural district of Pocklington, and the other was in the combined union of York. There seems, from reading these two different methods of distribution, to be little in common, either as regards the idea on which relief was given, or in the result obtained. In Pocklington the relief seemed to be given more in the shape of an old-age pension?—That is the way it worked out.

6923. And the houses that you visited did not show signs of destitution?—They were exactly the same as ordinary labourers' dwellings.

6924. Were most of the occupants of those houses labourers?—Nearly all agricultural labourers.

6925. The relief there was adequate, because the people were in a condition of comfort?—Certainly. There were several houses which were exceedingly well furnished, and with more room than they wanted. They said they had their son or daughter come and stay with them.

6926. In York, at any rate, you visited a number of houses where the inmates were in considerable if not great destitution?—Dire poverty.

6927. And the amount of relief administered, as I understand from your account, was hardly sufficient to enable those to whom it was given to make adequate provision for themselves?—I give the details, and it is obvious. Those were cases I absolutely visited myself.

6928. Therefore, the inspector has to deal with practically every form of relief nominally given under the same head, but prompted by different motives, and resulting in establishing quite different conditions?—Certainly; but it is very seldom that the inspector does these sort of things. We have not time to go and inspect the homes of the poor.

6929. I am not criticising that?—But I should like to say that, if we had time to do it, we could do a great more good and should know more than we do about the condition of the people.

Adoption of rules for administering out-relief.

6930. Would not there be some advantage if more uniform rules were drawn up for the administration of out-door relief?—You can very easily draw up a set of rules, but you cannot get the guardians to keep them, as a rule. That is the trouble. There are numbers of them have drawn up rules, but I do not think there is one in 100 that keep them. They hate keeping rules. I quite admit it is a good thing to have rules, because they give a chance to a man who has fixed views upon the principle of poor law administration, and he can perhaps allude to them, but I am afraid, as a rule, you want to educate boards, of guardians before you give them rules and regulations to go by. That is a very invidious thing to have to say, but it is true of many guardians. When they come on the board they are not acquainted either with the history of poor law or the principles of Poor Law administration or the methods of relieving. They do learn, and very often become excellent administrators.

6931. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) They learn it at the expense of the ratepayers, do not they?—Naturally. We do not mind their doing that, because they are volunteers, and that is part of the way we pay their salaries, I suppose.

Beneficial results of appointment of additional relieving officers.

6932. (*Chairman.*) The appointment of additional relieving officers seems generally to bear satisfactory results?—Yes, I have never known a case where it did not have a satisfactory result.

6933. And the relief to the rates fully compensates, in most cases, for the increased charge of the salary?—That is my experience. The suggestion I want to make is about an absolutely new officer. I think there ought to be in every union an inspector of out-relief, whose simple business would be to cross-visit in every union in my district, or in any inspector's district, and to report to me upon the books of the officer and the character of the officer, upon the practice of the officer, and upon the methods of relief and the administration of relief, pay-stations, and all the rest of it. Upon that information I could go to the boards of guardians and advise them in a way which it is absolutely impossible for me to do now without that detailed knowledge, which I have not time to get, and the getting of which ought not to be put upon the inspector, because it would take up the whole of his time. This officer I say is urgently needed at the present day, in order to bring some kind of supervision, close and personal supervision, upon the relieving staffs of the country. As a rule, a rural relieving officer is absolutely under no supervision whatever. The guardians may have supervision to a certain extent, general supervision, but they do not supervise, and we are absolutely out of touch with the details of out-relief in the country. That is the point I want to make strongly before this Commission; and until you get in close touch with the details of out-door relief, it will always be in the air; we do not know what is going on. Proposed inspectors of out-relief.

6934. This assistant would be your eyes and ears as regards out-door relief?—Yes.

6935. Now we come to old-age statistics. The figures you give are interesting, and they show, as I think has

before been stated, that the number of aged persons is very much larger in the rural than in the purely urban districts?—That is so.

Compulsory removal to workhouse of old and infirm paupers.

6936. I pass on now to paragraph 78. It has been urged upon us by other inspectors that the guardians should have power to compulsorily remove to the workhouse aged persons who are unable to take care of themselves or live in filthy and insanitary conditions. Do you agree with that?—Yes, I do. They no doubt are exceptional cases, but they are nearly always cases which give a great deal of trouble and anxiety to the guardians.

Merits of various methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

6937. I think the various other suggestions you have made carry their reasoning with them. Have you anything to say in addition to what is contained in your memorandum with regard to the working of the children's homes? It seems to me the various systems, the cottage, scattered, and grouped, all give satisfactory results?—I do not think you can say of any system that one is very much better than the other, except upon this particular point, capital expenditure. I think that the scattered homes system has the advantage over all the others that there is less capital expenditure. If we are going to have any progressive and continuous decrease of childhood pauperism, and if all the philanthropic and educational agencies of this country are going to work any good at all, it will be in the direction of improving the conditions of child-life and lessening the chance of their becoming paupers. If that is so, in process of time, this vast capital expenditure on children's homes and grouped cottage homes will be, to a certain extent, thrown away. If we want to depauperise all the children of the country, and can do so to a large extent, to that extent these homes will be wasted money, unless you can use them for other purposes. That was the argument I used a few years ago in the Ecclesall Bierlow Union, near Sheffield, when they decided to go in for grouped cottage homes. I warned them it would be a very costly thing. It has been, because, when you go into the grouped cottage home system, you are always going to have a large and increasing expenditure; the staff is very big, and it becomes institutional, and it is very difficult to curb the institutionalism of grouped children's homes. All the officers seem to think that some other person has got to do some other part of the business, and the staff increases, and the wages and salaries increase; therefore, I say that the scattered home system is manifestly the most economical. I am in favour of it also because I think the home life is, on the whole, better, although they perhaps do not get the same good industrial training. Those are my views on the children's homes question.

Out-relief and its distribution by one relieving officer at Pocklington.

6938. I think we have dealt with the Pocklington outdoor relief?—I have a map of Pocklington which shows you exactly the journeys that are taken, if you like to have it for reference. I have shown the journeys of the relieving officer, which can be traced from my evidence, to show that it is possible for a man to go to the home of every one of his people and pay the money. It is possible; it is a great trouble, but it can be done. There is the workhouse exactly in the middle of the union. It is a very large acreage, and these lines are the journeys he takes in and out. He does it all in a week.

6939. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) How many relieving officers are there there?—One.

6940. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) What is the extent in miles across?—There is no across; he always starts from the middle.

6941. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) How many cases are there?—I cannot tell you. I took this union because it was well administered and the relieving officer was a good one, and the whole thing lent itself to a description. I thought if you followed the way in which this rural union was done you would know really exactly how a typical union was worked, and with what officers.

6942. (*Chairman.*) Is the principle which governs the distribution of outdoor relief in Pocklington also in force in other unions?—I think so. That is very typical of a purely rural constituency. Most of the men are old agricultural labourers, and the farmers are getting old-age pensions for their employés at the expense of the ratepayers. That is what it comes to.

6943. There are full accounts given of the various systems of administration of Sheffield and Bradford. We now come to charities and the Poor Law. There are three districts where there are large charities: York, Hull, and Beverley. The endowed charities in York, you think, have attracted pauperism there?—I think so. It is only an opinion, but that is my belief.

Conditions in York Union.

6944. Though the system of Poor Law administration in York seems to be faulty, the result, if we test it by pauperism to population, is not very unsatisfactory. I see that York is half way down your list of unions?—Yes.

6945. Would you call York a very poor place?—I call it a very pauperised place. There is a market there, the largest cattle market in England, and that means a great deal of casual labour about the market. There is a considerable population that practically lives upon what they can earn at the market, just looking after the cattle and driving cattle backwards and forwards in the districts or from the station, and so on. There is a vast amount of casual labour of that sort, and it is the lowest class, and very badly paid.

6946. What other occupations are there that absorb any amount of casual labour in York?—I do not think there is much other casual labour absorbed. There is agricultural labour; there are women who go out and work in the districts, and men too. There is agricultural female labour of that kind all through the East Riding. They get from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a day.

6947. They work in the fields?—Yes. There is a great deal of female labour in the fields in the East Riding, but the majority of the labour in York is in Rowntree's Chocolate Works, the North Eastern Railway Engineering Works (which are now being moved away, I believe), and there is laundry work; but there is not very much industrial life in York. It is the concentration of the poor. I brought this map to give the Commission exactly my idea of what the fault in the York Union is. There are forty constituencies in that, and each of them has a member. I have marked on the map the amount of relief going into each district for a quarter, and the number of electors for each district. It might interest the Commission to study that. It is really a compendium of my views about the unsatisfactory state of the areas of the boards. (Handed in. For table showing chief particulars contained in the map see Appendix Vol I. (A), No. XV (M).)

Disadvantages of small electorate for a guardian.

6948. What do those figures show: that the representative of each district has made a struggle to get what they thought was their fair proportion?—No, what I mean is: there are too many guardians. There is a guardian elected by 200 or 250 people. He becomes the almoner of a small district. It is a personal matter. He is the man to go to, and they do go to him and have always gone to him, as you know by my account of it.

Guardians as semi-official relieving officers.

6949. (*Mr. Loch.*) He also makes the inquiries, does he not?—Yes, in many cases.

6950. So that you have that double position of the guardian so elected being also *quasi* relieving officer?—Certainly, and they prided themselves on it. They used to say it is the best possible system; no other system like it. There is one particular district marked there which has an enormous amount; it is the worst slum in York: Hungate. Vast sums of money pour into that place, with the worst class of recipients. I say, break York up into wards, and let four wards elect four or five people, and you would reform the administration of the Poor Law right away.

Charities at York.

6951. (*Chairman.*) Have you anything to say with regard to how the charities of Hull and Beverley are administered?—That was hardly on charities. I think the charities of York have intensified the whole pauperism of the place: each parish has got its own charities.

6952. It is a combination of the two?—The two are interlocked in such a way that you could not rescue that population from pauperism unless you got the Charity Commission to work to recast the whole of the charities, pool them, and make old-age pensions; then you would do something.

Effect of Mr. Chap'in's circular

6953. Coming to paragraph 176, in which you say, "Amongst other contributing causes to the increase of outdoor relief was the circular of 1900"; that circular, you think, has been a good deal misunderstood?—Yes.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

6954. The object, I understand, was to call the attention of guardians to the necessity, in certain cases, of giving adequate relief in outdoor cases. It has been interpreted as advocating a general extension of outdoor relief?—Certainly. I think it has altered the general standard of everything and everybody. That has been the result.

6955. The standard of outdoor relief has gone up?—I think so, and in some cases I think rightly. For instance, children were given a very poor pittance, so much a child. I think that has been improved, but certainly the argument has been over and over again: "Well, the Local Government Board have told us to do this." That is the sort of generalisation. Then you have got to get up and explain to them it was no such thing. You have the circular in your pocket always, and you quote the classes for which it was formed; but it has no effect.

6956. Did the system of outdoor relief in Pocklington prevail there before 1900?—I do not think there has been very much difference. They may have raised the amount by 1s., probably they have.

Effect on pauperism of workmen's Compensation Acts.

6957. From the various inspectors who have come before us we have obtained opinions as regards what is the impression concerning the Workmen's Compensation Act. There seems to be an impression in certain quarters that that Act has resulted in workmen being discharged at an earlier period than before. Have you heard anything on that point?—It is a very common remark that the Employers' Liability Act is responsible for a considerable amount of the middle-age pauperism. There are men who have something the matter with them, who are not really efficient, who have a screw loose, or are lazy, perhaps, or bad workmen; and then they say: "Oh, well, the master has got rid of him for fear he might come under the Employers' Liability Act." I have heard that over and over again, but I have no specific evidence to prove it.

6958. Does that idea at all prevail in the minds of guardians?—Yes, in the minds of guardians and relieving officers, and I would take their evidence as more important. I should recommend you to get relieving officers as witnesses upon that point, because they must know better than we can.

6959. You think it is not merely the allegation of the men, but you think there may be some substance in it?—I think it stands to reason. I think it is a probable thing. On the doctrine of probabilities, if an employer has some men who are not satisfactory, who may become a possible expense to him by accident or injury in some way or other, if he is a hard man, with nothing but the cash idea in his head, is not it likely that he would say, "Well, I shall replace this man with a more efficient person, and I will minimise my risks to that extent"? I should say it would be a natural thing for the modern employer to do, who did not care anything about his work people, but his profit, and had no social bond between himself and his workmen.

6960. The Act now applies to agricultural labourers, but only recently; have you heard the same sort of allegation with regard to them?—Nothing at present.

Attitude of the poor towards in- and out-relief.

6961. What is the result of your general experience?—Do you think that there is less reluctance now to apply for poor relief amongst the wage-earning classes than there was before, and that the tendency, under pressure of public opinion, to make the institutional buildings more comfortable, and more up to what are supposed to be modern requirements, has increased the wish to be inside them?—Taking outdoor relief first, as far as I can judge there is not any very great objection to asking for outdoor relief amongst certain classes; there will always be the aristocracy of the poor who will not do it, but I think there is an increasing number of people who consider that what with the old-age pension cry, and all that has been written, they have a right to some assistance from the rates. It is a very common thing to hear: "I have paid rates for so many years and I have a right to relief"; there is not the smallest doubt about that. Then comes the question of the indoor relief and the comfort of it; I think that the loss of liberty as a rule is the thing which is most feared, and the hours which they have to keep; the regularity of everything is contrary to an Englishman's idea of freedom. They do not like that, and I do not think that mere comfort makes up for the fact that they are at home in their own homes and surrounded by the people they know, and have liberty to do practically what they like in most things. It is the small things of life which constitute real comfort, and as far as my experience goes, in the provinces at all events, I do not believe that the enhanced comfort has to a very great extent increased the indoor poor. There is only one union where the indoor poor has increased by leaps and bounds, and that is Ecclesall. I do not know why, but actually they do not know what to do there: the people want to come in, and there is no doubt it is a very comfortable place. That is the only place I can lay my finger on. The vast majority of the comfort, of course, is in the sick wards, in the hospitals; and people go in now more than they used to, to be medically treated. No doubt there is that increase, but, generally speaking, I do not think that the class of people who go into the workhouse is very much attracted there.

Deterrence of medical relief.

6962. Having regard to medical relief in the infirmaries, is there a rather higher class of person applying for those benefits under the poor law?—I cannot very well judge about that; but I think what would keep the better class out is the disfranchisement that is attached, and if you suspended the disfranchisement for going into the hospitals you would have them absolutely crowded up with everybody; they would become State hospitals, as they really are, to a certain extent, now. I want to add too, that the Sheffield guardians, who have recently separated the administration of the sick wards from the main institution, have been very anxious indeed to try and get in the thin end of the wedge, and to abolish all disfranchisement for hospital treatment; and at Birmingham the revising barrister, I understand, has knocked it on the head, and they go in there and do not lose their votes. It is a legal question, and it is quite a controversial question; and the Sheffield guardians very much want the Local Government Board to enable them to call their hospital by a name like "St. Luke's Hospital," or something of that sort. I was told this by one of the guardians; they said if they did that they would get more people to come in and be treated. That is the reason why I say that if the disfranchisement were suspended I think you would have the medical wards and the surgical wards of all your poor-law hospitals crowded with people, and that you would then practically have established State hospitals.

Returns of pauperism received by inspector.

6963. (*Mr. Booth.*) In paragraphs 24, 25 and 26 of your memorandum you refer to the returns of outdoor paupers for the six months. You refer to the six months' count as differing from the single day's count, and you say there is no difficulty in getting the figures. Would you kindly say how they are got?—They are kept by the relieving officer in his out-relief list. Every relieving officer is bound to keep it.

6964. The information comes to you probably on the Form A that you refer to?—No.

6965. In what way does it come to you?—It comes to me on a circular which I prepare from the form to which I allude, the form in the Order. I compile the form giving these classes, and he fills them up.

6966. You are fairly satisfied of its correctness?—It must be correct; it is exactly what is in the relieving officer's books.

6967. The reason I ask is that we are told there is a great deal of difficulty in getting it. It is a piece of information we should like to have for the whole country, but we are told it is difficult to get it correctly?—There is absolutely no difficulty, it is there, the relieving officers have it all in their books. It is one of the things which every inspector ought to have; it is a mirror. This sheet which I give you is an absolute mirror of the pauperism of every district.

6968. It is precisely what we want. The table of statistics (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV (B)) mentioned in paragraph 22, and the table of figures (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. C-D) mentioned in paragraph 24, I think you have prepared copies of, and will hand to the Commissioners?—Yes.

6969. What is the Form A that you refer to?—Form A is the form which is sent by the clerk of the guardians to the inspector every week.

6970. You say "Every morning I receive by post a certain number of weekly returns (Form A)"?—Yes,

I have brought a few of them to show the Commission. They give the figures for the week of the indoor poor, classifying them according to adults, able-bodied, health, disabled, and so on, youths, boys, girls, infants, and vagrants; then the outdoor poor they classify as to male and female, and whether they are able-bodied; and there is a comparison with the same week of the former year, so that at a glance every week I can see exactly how the pauperism has moved for a year.

6971. This is a return that is made by the guardians' clerk to you?—Yes; and also, I think, it is sent up to the Local Government Board. Sir Samuel Provis will probably be able to correct me.

6972. The return you refer to in paragraph 24 is the number of outdoor paupers, exclusive of pauper lunatics, relieved during the half year, is it not?—Yes.

6973. The table of statistics referred to in paragraph 22 you say contains the area in statute acres; present assessable value, population at the two last censuses, etc.?—That is so.

6974. Referring to the same subject, paragraph 58, you speak of the 60,331 inmates of the forty-six workhouses in your district: "This does not represent anything like the admissions into these workhouses for a half year, much less for a whole year." Then you say, admissions would be of different individuals?—Yes, each individual.

Inadequacy of a one-day count of paupers.

6975. That is to say the total number of individuals returned in six months, or still more in a year, greatly exceeds the one day's count?—Yes.

6976. And your statistics referred to in paragraph 24 would show to some extent what that is?—Certainly, it would give the number of people who received outdoor relief in the West Riding for six months, which is a totally different thing from the count of one day.

6977. But you have not the same figure for a whole year?—No, because I only want to take this one half-year as a specimen.

6978. Over the next six months' count there would be a further increase to some extent?—To some extent; the vast body of these outdoor paupers are permanent, therefore you only have the new cases which are coming on.

6979. And the new cases would naturally be fewer in the second half year?—Yes.

6980. With regard to the greater number of women than men among the paupers, this is mainly in outdoor relief, is it not?—Yes.

Conditions affecting method of relieving paupers of different sexes.

6981. Is there not to a certain extent the opposite found in indoor relief?—That depends on the district; curiously enough, the occupation of the people to a great extent governs the sex of the inmates of the workhouses.

Preponderance of women among outdoor paupers.

6982. Are the women more naturally relieved outside the workhouse because they are more able to take care of themselves?—I could not say that.

6983. Can you account for the fact that the sex makes a difference in the mode of treatment, indoor or out?—People are very unwilling to break up homes, you know, and they very often have children with them who help to support them. I cannot give you any reason at present why women should be paupers, except that they are not self-supporting so much as men.

State of pauperism in East and West Ridings of Yorkshire.

6984. As to the general results for these two Ridings of Yorkshire, we cannot help seeing that on the whole they come out very well, compared with other districts in England?—Certainly they do.

6985. The figures you give at page 14 show that?—Yes.

6986. Therefore, when you find fault here and there, you are testing them all on a higher standard, the standard of your own neighbourhood, rather than on the standard of all England?—The standard is higher because the standard of the habits of the people is higher.

Comparison of Yorkshire and East Anglia.

6987. The table at page 14 shows that the counties in which you were doing work of this sort before, Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, are as distinctly at the top of the table, having the highest degree of pauperism, as the West Riding of Yorkshire is at the bottom?—Yes, I have had experience of both kinds of district.

6988. Therefore, you can very well compare a generally pauperised district, such as Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, with a generally very less pauperised district, such as Yorkshire?—Yes, I think I can.

6989. The proportion of out-relief to in-relief is no higher in Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex than it is in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Very much less relief is needed or given in the West Riding of Yorkshire than in these other counties you have been connected with, but the proportion between the two methods of treatment remains the same? It is the same all through the country, in my opinion.

6990. Not altogether?—It is very much in that direction, is it not?

6991. The ratio of outdoor paupers for the West Riding of Yorkshire is 12·3 per 1,000, and in-door 6·7; roughly speaking, there are double the number of out-door that there are in-door. In Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex certainly the ratio is greater, but not so very much greater. Then if we take your other district, the East Riding of Yorkshire, there you have a still greater preponderance of out-door paupers, and yet even there, on the whole, the district is not highly pauperised?—That is so.

Influence of race on the tendency to pauperism.

6992. I would like to ask you with regard to the general race characteristics, quite apart from industrial causes or the administration of the Poor Law, is there not some connection between pauper habits and the race, that is to say, the North-countrymen are more independent-minded than the East or the South?—I suppose they are by habit. I was told in Pocklington on that point, by the relieving officer, that there was a very distinct difference between the people who live on the Wolds and the people who live in the lower part; that the Wold men would die rather than ask for relief; they are a much more independent and hardier race.

6993. The Wold is in the North?—It is the range of hills nearest the East Coast.

6994. If you take the whole of the East Riding, the tendency is to greater pauperism?—That is so. That is because there are more old people.

6995. Solely?—I think so. The old-age test is the same in all these; I do not think there is so very much difference in the race characteristics. The East Anglian is very much like the Yorkshireman to a certain extent; he has not got the same education, and he is not so quick.

6996. Apart from administration, you would attribute the difference to the larger proportion of old people, or to some indefinite question?—I think it is an indefinite thing which is at the bottom of it, and the policy.

6997. And the policy of administration?—Certainly, it is guided by better brains, and also the knowledge of their own people. They know their own people pretty well.

Density of population a factor of pauperism.

6998. Does not the greater difficulty of dealing with the problem, that is to say, the greater mass of poverty and the greater number of people in need, itself affect the administration of the poor law? You say that better brains prevent it. Would not the same brains find that the policy needed was different where they had to deal with greater difficulties?—I think the difficulties of poor law administration are identical all over the country, and it takes experience of the habits and customs of the people to deal properly with each case. I think that the better educated and more intelligent a board of guardians is the better the administration will be. The more dense the population is, the greater the pauperism; that is nearly always the case. Density of population brings pauperism.

6999. That is not the case in comparing the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire?—There is a greater number.

7000. The dense population has the lower pauperism?—If you take any particularly dense part: in York, the denser the population, the more pauperism. You may take a very large area and reduce your average, but if you can get particular parts, you find the more thickly they are on the ground the more pauperism there is.

7001. (*Chairman.*) You were thinking of urban districts when you said "densely populated"?—I am now thinking of urban districts.

7002. (*Mr. Booth.*) Comparing urban with rural, that would not be true?—No, because it is not the same.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

Then the old age question would come in; when you get into the towns there is not the same old age.

7003. There is one curious little point in paragraph 53. Is the comma put in the place it was intended to be: "The guardians as a rule meet once a fortnight at the workhouse of the union in rural districts and in towns, sometimes in offices away from the workhouse"? Should not the comma be after "districts" instead of after "towns"?—It applies to both, as a matter of fact.

7004. It is correct as it is?—They do meet at the workhouse of the union in rural districts and in towns.

7005. I thought it was a misprint?—"Sometimes in offices away from the workhouse" does apply to towns altogether, not to rural districts.

Proposed assistants to inspector.

7006. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Your plans for increasing your own power in your district are three or four, as I understand them; first of all you propose two sub-officers, one an inspector of outdoor relief, either a lady inspector of institutions or——?—I did not mean necessarily a lady inspector.

7007. But an assistant inspector?—I mentioned that a lady might perform the duty. There is an assistant inspector in Lancashire.

7008. We have one in London who is a lady. With regard to the certificated schools, would you leave them rather in the hands of the assistant inspector?—These certified homes as a rule are very small places with about twenty or twenty-five children in them. There are a few big homes, such as the blind school at York and the deaf and dumb school in Sheffield. Those are large certified schools. I have only three or four of them, the others are the ones you mention.

7009. An inspector of outdoor relief would not be like a superintendent of relieving officers to a union; he would be a much higher official appointed by the Local Government Board?—I have not thought of the sort of man he would be, but he would be a sort of higher cross visitor.

7010. He would be a more cultivated man than that, and take a wider view of things, I suppose?—I should think so.

7011. Did you also suggest smaller districts in addition to that, or do you think those would meet the pressure of work you have on hand?—I do not want to say I am absolutely pressed with my work. I can do my work, but I think the greater part of it is not done adequately. That is what I mean. I do not wish to say I am overworked, but I think it is badly distributed.

Difficulties inherent in voluntary nature of guardians' office.

7012. You spoke of the education of guardians; have you thought of any scheme by which that might be effected besides their doing practical work?—They are voluntary workers, and you cannot find fault with them and tell them they want this, that, and the other. I do not think there is anything that could be done. I think they are very anxious to do what is right.

7013. Do you think they do it rather in the spirit of voluntary charity than in the spirit of magistrates who are administering the law?—They certainly do not do it in the spirit of magistrates administering the law. That is the only thing I will say as to that.

Possibility of administering out-relief magisterially.

7014. Do you think a possible reform of the Poor Law might lie in the direction of administration; that outdoor relief ought to be administered by one or two persons in a magisterial capacity, leaving persons who want to distribute alms to do it in connection with charitable societies?—It is not practicable, I think.

7015. You do not think it would be practicable?—No.

7016. Why not?—Because people would not have it; public opinion would be up in arms. All the boards would hold their fortnightly meetings, and they would be principally occupied in discussing this encroachment upon their liberties, and then all the daily papers would report the proceedings of the guardians for that occasion.

Efficacy of rules as to out-relief if drawn up by Local Government Board.

7017. You spoke of rules made by boards of guardians being rules only, and they were not carried into practice very often. They make the rules, and in actual practice they tend to drop them. Supposing those were orders of the Local Government Board from which the relieving officer could not depart without coming across his auditor, then the rules would be in a totally different position, would not they?—Certainly they would.

7018. Whenever the guardians inclined to drop a rule, the relieving officer would come up against him, and say he could not do it?—Yes.

7019. If a moderate set of rules were drawn up by the Local Government Board in that way, and became orders for the relieving officer, they would have a very much better chance of being carried out?—Certainly.

7020. It has been said that as soon as guardians discover that a thing is actually sanctioned or imposed by the law, they fall in with it with quite surprising readiness. Has that been your experience amongst guardians?—Yes; the clerk rules that they must do it.

Effect of charities on pauperism.

7021. With regard to the endowed charities, you spoke of the recoordination of the endowed charities by the Charity Commissioners. You said, I think, that the endowed charities in certain parts of your district were practically producing pauperism?—That is my opinion. I do not give it as more than my opinion.

7022. You have not traced the actual applications of persons in receipt of endowed charity to the guardians?—No, I could not do that.

7023. You think it comes of a slackening of the personal character of the recipients?—Yes; I think the asking there is a habit of asking.

Co-operation between charities and the Poor Law

7024. I do not find in your report any account of any methods of co-operation between charities and the guardians?—I am a very strong advocate of that if it can be properly done, and there has been a movement in Bradford to that effect, which I think it would be worth the while of the Commission to investigate. That is the Guild of Help. It is an attempt to graft the Elberfeld system on the existing Poor Law by communication with the Poor Law.

7025. Do they inter-communicate by means of lists of relief?—I do not know exactly what the method is. You have a member of the Bradford Board of Guardians here who could tell you all about it.

7026. Have they marked any lines of demarcation between the Poor Law and the charities?—I think so.

7027. And they tend to observe them?—They are trying in that direction. That is the object of the formation of the society.

7028. You are not acquainted with any union in your district where the guardians employ voluntary helpers to carry their outdoor relief?—No; there is no such system.

7029. Do any charity organisation societies in any part of your district take up cases from the board?—Charity organisation in the provinces is not as efficient, I think, as it is in London. I do not wish to say anything more.

Benefit societies.

7030. With regard to the benefit societies, you have not given us any tables in which the time element is an important factor. You have not given us any tables by which we could get the mutual influence of the benefit societies' formation, and the administration of the Poor Law in successive years?—I had only a short time in which to prepare my evidence. I have had no opportunity of going into a question which would really require a very long investigation, and a great deal more attention and ability than I have been able to give to it.

7031. I suppose those figures might be traced if time were available to do it?—I should think they might. I think there is a great deal that might be traced.

7032. May I ask whether there are very few women's benefit societies in Yorkshire. I understand that there are?—There are a few.

7033. I think you said that women made far more application to the Poor Law than men?—Yes.

Causes of preponderance of women paupers

7034. I suppose that is due partly to the fact that there are more women than men?—Partly, and partly owing to the fact that the head of the house dies, or is injured or disabled, and so on, so that they are bound to apply. That is perhaps an answer I ought to have made to Mr. Booth.

7035. Amongst the causes which have led to a very much smaller development of the friendly society movement amongst women, have you been able to trace any in particular such as that sick benefit is not so valuable to women as to men?—No, of course the physical question comes in, and the actuarial calculations with regard to women's

illness are much more complicated than they are in the male sex. That has been a great drawback up to the present time, but they are now working out the actuarial principle.

7036. Do you find women are more against insuring and more given to saving than men ?—I have not had any actual experience.

ublication Annual eport by uardians.

7037. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) You laid considerable stress upon the importance of publicity in Poor Law administration and said you would like all guardians to publish something in the shape of an annual report?—Yes.

7038. You do not suggest any means by which you can get that to the ratepayers you want to instruct. You said it might be put on the church door, but nobody ever reads what is put on the church door ?—You could send it to the newspapers, and they would make a feature of it. If the clerk were worth anything he would go to the editor and say—"Here is something you must make a feature of."

ublication names of aupers.

7039. You approve of the principle adopted by the Wakefield Union of publishing the name of every pauper ?—I think it is a very good thing. It is done in a good many unions, I think.

ffect of eap lodging uses on auperism.

7040. With regard to paragraph 41, might I ask whether one may gather from your remarks on the lodging-houses, that the setting up of these places does increase pauperism in the neighbourhood; a Rowton House, or anything of that kind ?—I should be sorry to give any opinion upon that, because I have not really the necessary experience. The probabilities seem to me very much in that direction, because I show the extraordinary cheapness of the living. The shelter and living attracts a destitute and houseless and homeless class who do not want a house and do not want a home, who can get a larger margin for their personal indulgence by living in a lodging-house than in any other place. It seems to me that it stands to reason that it would be so. That is all.

7041. With regard to the action of the friendly societies at Huddersfield, have you been able to discover in any way whether it was rather for ensuring adequate relief to existing cases than to extending the number of cases to which out relief was granted which caused them to act ?—I am not dealing with motives at all; I am dealing with the actual facts. I find that the number of persons has enormously increased, and the number of unsatisfactory cases has increased. That is all I have dealt with.

frequency tripartite tirement of ardians.

7042. I believe in all your unions there is not one single case where one-third of the guardians retire every year ?—I do not know of any case; there is a general election.

7043. That being left to the guardians, naturally enough, as a rule, they would desire to be all in for three years ?—Yes.

7044. It is not a natural thing that they should generally adopt the other plan ?—They would probably say it spoiled the game if they did it the other way.

7045. You say you would not like the duties of guardians transferred to either county or borough councils ?—Certainly not.

ffect of ansfer to unty uncil of oor Law ministra-on.

7046. But at the same time you feel strongly that you do not now get as high a class of guardians as you would like ?—One always likes to get the best people to do this work.

7047. Would not you be more likely to get a better class of administrator of Poor Law relief if it were in the hands of the county council ?—No, I do not think you would a bit. I do not meet very many county councillors, but some of the guardians I meet are county councillors, and I do not think there is very much difference, perhaps.

7048. In paragraph 176, you quote from a speech by Lord Beauchamp in 1897 at a Poor Law Conference for the West Midland District. That which you quote from him is in perfect agreement, is it not, with Mr. Chaplin's circular. "Maintaining not only the bare existence, but the respectability of the aged, infirm and orphaned poor rather than the repression of the rogue and vagabond." There is nothing inconsistent with Mr. Chaplin's circular in that statement, is there ?—I suppose you might say so.

nount of pector's ime work.

7049. In regard to your duties, I rather gathered that one might sum up what you think about it in this way; that you are obliged now to give a larger amount of time to mere routine and less important duties ?—Yes, that is what it is. I know every part of the workhouse, and all the institutions, and it is very largely travelling about from one to another of them.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

Conditions in Driffield and Wharfedale Unions.

7050. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) On Mr. Booth's table showing the percentage of pauperism to population, Driffield stands at the top and Wharfedale at the bottom; if you compare the number of people over sixty-five years of age in the two unions, will that give any reason why the pauperism in the one place is higher than in the other ?—Wharfedale is in the West Riding, with a large industrial population as well as some rural population, and with a lot of wage-earners; but Driffield has a diminishing population and is purely a rural district, with a large number of aged people in it.

7051. So that you would not attribute the large amount of pauperism in Driffield to bad administration ?—No. I think on the whole that the Driffield people administer very much on the lines of the Pocklington people. They have recently built practically a new infirmary, which was badly wanted. I have no fault to find with the Driffield people. Driffield is on all fours really with Pocklington.

7052. Then it is not a question of bad administration there as against Wharfedale's better administration ?—You cannot compare the two districts; Wharfedale and Driffield have nothing in common, I think.

Conditions in Pontefract and Barnsley Unions.

7053. You are also comparing Pontefract and Barnsley, but are they comparable ?—Yes; and they are comparable in a very remarkable way, because they are both districts with a great deal of mining, in fact, mining you may say is one of the greatest industries in both.

7054. Even there I think you will find there is a larger number of old people in the one place than in the other; it is not a large number in itself, but it works out to 9 per 1,000 more in a smaller population ?—Barnsley is 1·6 in pauperism.

7055. And 49 per 1,000 over sixty years of age, whereas Pontefract is 3·1 and 58 per 1,000 respectively ?—I think the two unions are very comparable.

7056. But in the one place there is bad administration ?—I think that the Barnsley administration is more definite; I think they stick to their policy more strictly. Undoubtedly in Pontefract until quite recently when they reformed their administration—they now work in committees which rotate—they have in my view been rather lax.

7057. Do you think they are getting better now ?—I do.

7058. Do you agree with committees ?—I do agree with committees, properly guarded by rotation.

Analysis of Bradford pauperism.

7059. Then take Bradford: Bradford has a pauper population of 65 per 1,000 over sixty years of age, and the number of people who are in receipt of relief there under sixty years of age is rather large, is it not, namely, 56 per 1,000 ? I see 28 per cent. of the paupers are children who are under sixteen, and 28 per cent. are paupers from sixteen to sixty. Would that not mean that the large number there under sixty would be made up in the main of widows and their children ?—I have got my own analysis, which gives the exact details, and I prefer to deal with what I know. I can give you exactly what Bradford is. There were on the books 117 widows and 275 children dependent on them in the half year ended Lady Day, 1905. If you keep your left hand on this section of the table and follow it up, you will see all the classes which are dealt with. There is first the old age section and the permanent disability section, then the section for destitution caused by death and absence or desertion of husband or father. You will see there are 117 widows and 275 children dependent upon them, and nine unmarried mothers.

7060. That is another point I wanted to get out, namely, that out of that number of women and children there are only nine mothers of illegitimate children ?—If you look all along the line, you will see that on the whole there are very few.

7061. You say that in your memorandum, do you not ?—Yes.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

7062. 106 is the total for the district apparently?—Yes, for the whole district there are 106 unmarried mothers. Of course there are unmarried mothers who do not come under the Poor Law; this only gives those who do come under the Poor Law.

7063. And that is what we are concerned with just now. Turning to the next section, adult males relieved on account of their own sickness, that number is swelled up, is it not, by their wives and dependents, lower down?—Yes.

Absence of able-bodied paupers.

7064. So that the bulk of all that relief is formed purely of aged people, widows, children, and sick persons, and there are practically no able-bodied men there at all?—That is so.

The scientific theory of relief and its practicability

7065. You say in another part of your memorandum that guardians do not pay much attention to scientific methods of relief; would you mind telling us what you consider scientific methods of relief?—I have here the model rules for the administration of out-relief which were drafted by the Yorkshire Poor Law Officers' Association. That is a body of men containing experts—relieving officers largely, and clerks. They ought to know what exact scientific principles are with regard to the administration of relief. I do not mean to say that this is a perfect thing, but it is an effort to bring together the results of the experience of men who are practically engaged in Poor Law administration. That is what I should call scientific methods of administration—science with practice.

7066. Only we have not seen how that which is put down on paper can be acted upon?—I quite agree that theory and practice are very different.

7067. You agree, I suppose, that you can discriminate between cases?—Yes, I think you can.

7068. And you can test the deserving and the undeserving?—I think so.

7069. How would you test a deserving case?—You cannot test anything without knowledge. The essence of scientific administration is knowledge—the knowledge of each case, and the knowledge of each person connected with the case, and the knowledge of his life. A biological study of the family or the person in question is really what it comes to—the knowledge of his life and his habits and his point of view. Information ought to be forthcoming on all those heads, I think, in the case of a man who claims to be supported by the State.

7070. I am not querying whether it ought or ought not; I am only asking you whether you think that any board of guardians, not the present, but any other board that could be set up, is capable of doing all that?—That is another question. You asked me my definition of scientific administration, and I have given it to you. Whether the people who are set in authority have sufficient ability or will to carry it out is another question.

7071. It may be my density, but you have only told us that it is science in practice, and I have not seen how that is reduced to any sort of rules in practice?—That is so.

7072. You have not told the Commission how you propose to carry out scientific methods, or what are scientific methods; that is really what I want to get at?—I suggest you should read these rules for granting outdoor relief, or the rules used in any of the well-administered unions where they use regulations. The Manchester rules were I think the first drafted; Ipswich has another excellent set of rules. You will get that information from those. I can put these model rules in, as an interesting contribution to the solution of the great problems of relief. (Handed in. See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV (N).)

7073. You do think that it is possible to discriminate in cases?—Yes.

The criteria of good and bad administration.

7074. Then what do you consider the test of good administration?—The test of good adminstration I should think was the percentage of pauperism to population.

7075. But you have already told us that that varies because of the conditions?—Yes, and you know what those conditions are; or a well informed person can find them out.

7076. Your idea is, that a board is not necessarily a badly administered one, because it gives a large quantity of outdoor relief?—I should want to know a great deal more about it than that before I gave an answer.

7077. You know about your own two districts, do you not?—Yes, I do.

7078. They both give a good deal of outdoor relief, I think?—Yes, they do. I think there is hardly a union that could not improve its methods.

7079. On the average would you consider them well-administered?—I think that the Yorkshire boards are very much better administered, as a rule, than the boards I was acquainted with in the eastern district. There is more care and attention to details given, which is of the essence of good administration.

7080. Only that does not mean, does it, if it is merely abolishing out-door relief? That is the point I want to get at, whether a board can administer the Poor Law properly and efficiently, and also give outdoor relief?—The answer to that is that between 60 and 70 per cent. of the relief of the country is at present given in outdoor relief.

7081. That is not the answer to it at all; because I might answer, as is answered, that they are not administering it properly, and that that is the reason we have so much pauperism?—It might be reduced by 25 per cent., I have no doubt, by a proper staff of relieving officers.

Deductions to be drawn from decreased out-relief accompanied by increase in in-relief.

7082. You will excuse me, but the only point I want to get out from you is whether there are any of the Boards in the Yorkshire district who are giving outdoor relief, but are in your judgment administering the poor law in an efficient manner?—Of course there are.

7083. In a table on page 3 of your memorandum you show the percentages of outdoor relief; I see that in 1881 it was 82·3, and in 1905 it was 72·8, showing a decrease of about 10 per cent., and yet the persons relieved indoor had increased from 7,000 to 13,000?—Yes, that is so.

7084. Then I take it you will not agree with the argument that the lessening of outdoor relief also lessens indoor relief?—I have found that the case very frequently.

7085. I am putting that to you on these figures?—If you take these figures as conclusive, perhaps you could argue that; but I do not think that it would hold water.

7086. What are we to gather from these figures?—You are to gather exactly what they show—that there has been a certain large increase in indoor relief, which is mainly, I have no doubt, in the sick, owing to the increased and improved hospital accommodation. The sick are better looked after and better treated now. That is one conclusion I should come to as explaining the indoor increase. Then you get an increase also in the outdoor from 33,000 to 35,000; I fancy that is mainly owing to the distress arising from want of employment in the last few years. There is not a very great difference between the 1905 and the 1881 figures.

7087. I am taking the percentages rather?—Percentages are misleading, sometimes.

7088. But do you say that they are all right; because they, of course, tell us just the same as any set of figures that comes before us where we get percentages given us?—I see your point. You want to controvert the general theory that if you reduce out-relief you will, side by side, reduce the recipients of indoor relief?

7089. I want to know what your figures here (which I do not want to use one way or the other) really mean; it struck me that they tell against that well-accepted theory?—You are taking the bulk of a whole district, and not individual cases.

7090. Still, after all, the average is what you should judge a district by, I should think. Turning to the cost of indoor pauperism in these two districts, I see that has gone up pretty considerably?—Yes, it has.

7091. And the increase has been in the main on the indoor?—Yes.

7092. Do you put that to the improvement in the accommodation for the sick?—Partly to that, but there has been improvement all round. There have been great building extensions, as you will see by the list at

the end of my memorandum. That list shows, I think, on the face of it, that there have been very great expansions of the buildings, and many general structural alterations in workhouses in Yorkshire during the last twenty years.

'ause and stification f increased ost of relief.

7093. You might look to the table on page 4 of your memorandum; you will see a little clearer there what I mean about percentages. The West Riding percentages are rather extraordinary as shown there. You show there that the increase in the population is 25·9 per cent., in the out-door relief 6 per cent., and in the indoor relief 83·9 per cent, with a total increase, in and out, of 19·8 per cent. You put the expenditure down to the better class of buildings that are now put up, I think?—Yes, certainly; and as I said in another part of my evidence, it is also owing to the increased cost of necessaries, such as coal and all the great articles of consumption.

7094. The prices of the articles consumed have distinctly increased?—Yes, they have.

7095. Do you think that the guardians who have been spending those large sums of money have spent them wisely on the whole?—Yes, I think so. The Yorkshireman always thinks before he spends,and he thinks a good deal, and he takes uncommonly good care that he gets value for his money. As you may have seen lately, they have been building because prices were low and labour was cheap. They have got their buildings put up at 25 per cent. less than they could have done otherwise.

7096. So that this tremendous increase is one that could be justified?—I think every item almost could be justified, except the few cases where the standard of comfort in setting up receiving wards or something of that sort has been, I think, higher than it ought to have been.

7097. But, on the whole, you think that the guardians have spent the money wisely?—Yes, I do.

7098. They have not recklessly thrown it away?—As regards Yorkshiremen, I do not think they spend money recklessly. The difficulty is to get them to spend any money at first, and then, when they begin spending, to stop them spending.

rien lly cieties in arnsley and ontefract.

7099. About friendly societies, you contrasted Pontefract and Barnsley in this respect; according to the figures of the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows, Pontefract had at least as many relatively to population as Barnsley had?—But, on the other hand,there are a great many friendly societies,

7100. Only two, I think, according to your list, and I am only taking your list?—I do not wish that list to be considered as exhaustive at all.

7101. Then I will not pursue that, except to point out that at Pontefract the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows has more members in proportion to population than the other people?—I should be very glad indeed to have the whole details of that question thoroughly elicited.

7102. Are you not rather hard on Pontefract in that respect, if you have not got the actual figures before you?—I have verified the figures as far as I can; they show that there are more in one place than in the other.

7103. Turn to page 16 of your memorandum where you give the figures. You will see that Pontefract in this respect is just a shade better than other unions which you are comparing it with?—Yes.

7104. Then there are the Rechabites, of which Pontefract has none, and the Sons of Temperance. The Sons of Temperance from what I remember do not provide for old age at all, and neither do the Rechabites, do they?—No, I do not think they do.

7105. So that it really comes back from that point of view to the Manchester Unity, and in membership of that body I think you will find that Pontefract is a little higher than Barnsley, at any rate I have worked it out that it is so?—I do not want to be hard upon one union as against another; I do not want to be invidious at all.

7106. I think in that respect that you are rather hard upon Pontefract; I think the facts as given by yourself do not bear out your statement?—Perhaps I shall be able to supplement them.

7107. Turning now to the women, your view is that more women should come into friendly societies, yet you have already said this morning that there are a variety of reasons why they do not. Is it not the fact that the large bulk of those women who become chargeable in any way are widows or aged people?—Yes, no doubt a very large proportion of them would be.

Benefit societies for women.

7108. I think, therefore, a friendly society would not come in quite with a woman at home; there are a variety of reasons such as children and that sort of thing?—That may be so; but I do not know why women should not join friendly societies when they are young, and keep up the payments in spite of the change in their position.

7109. And in spite of the wages the husband might earn?—That, of course, is an additional tax, but they get additional benefits. It is not a very great tax when you come to work it out. Sir Edward Brabrook says 32s. a year is enough to cover all the necessary outgoings for friendly societies.

7110. For the man and the woman?—No, for one person.

7111. Then it would be 32s. for a man to pay in addition to his own friendly society contribution. Take the case of the East Riding where you have a large number of agricultural labourers—how could they do that with the money they will be earning?—Of course I was not thinking so much about the rural districts where the population is small; I was thinking of the working population of the towns. There are large numbers of domestic servants who earn excellent wages for a great portion of their lives and yet put by absolutely nothing.

Domestic servants becoming paupers.

7112. Do you think what you said this morning is true, that a large number of domestic servants become chargeable?—Yes, I do.

7113. That is your experience in Yorkshire?—I think a great many of them have been in service.

7114. Those would be the aged people?—Yes, I think so; of course that is only an opinion, and I have no means of testing or proving it.

7115. It comes back, does it not, that you are thinking of single women when you are talking about friendly societies?—There are a great number of single women on the rates; and if there are a great number of single women on the rates, that would only prove my case.

7116. But are there a great number on the rates?—I think there are.

7117. We were just now speaking of Bradford; the bulk of the women there would be aged women or widows, would they not?—That is a point, no doubt. My figures dealing with destitution caused by old age do not show whether women of sixty-five and upwards are widows or not.

7118. Mr. Bentham points out to me that Bradford is the lowest for aged people generally; and if you take the next table you will see there are comparatively very few women without husbands?—Look at the line "Destitution caused by Old Age." There are in the East Riding 3,061, aged sixty-five years and upwards, and 1,196 under sixty-five. I cannot tell you how many of those are single, I have no doubt a great many of them would be.

Difficulties of wives contributing to friendly societies.

7119. The whole point I think, in the case of married women, is that the question of whether they can belong to friendly societies depends upon two things: one is what the friendly society can afford to take the married women at, and the second what wages the husband is earning—whether they are such wages that he can afford to pay another 32s. a year out of them?—I quite agree with you. In the case of married women the additional charge upon the budget is no doubt a point.

Attractiveness of medical relief.

7120. Do you think that the increased comforts in infirmaries—hospitals as you call them—have really induced people to tumble on to the rates?—I think they have to this extent, that in order to get people, very often, to take the benefit of the good treatment and sick nursing that there is there, the guardians and relieving officers are always impressing upon the applicants for relief that it is not like the workhouse

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

7121. And there is a general sort of feeling that they have paid for it in their rent and the rest of it, and they have the right to use it?—There is that general feeling of right which does not exist of course in law, but which is a sentiment that does exist.

7122. There is a sentiment that they have helped pay for it, and they might just as well have the benefit of it?—Yes.

7123. There is not anything very bad in the idea, I mean people are not morally bad who go to an infirmary of that kind?—I do not suppose they are, if you put it that way. It is a difficult question to bring it within the sphere of morality.

Rota committees and guardians as advocates for relief in individual cases.

7124. Referring to relieving officers and the administration of out-relief, I notice you are very strongly in favour of committees rotating so that they do not take their own cases always?—So as to remove the personal element.

7125. There are not relief committees anywhere, are there, for each ward?—Do you mean committees that would always take the same number of people?

7126. I am referring to a union which is split up into wards?—We have not got that except in Bradford. Elsewhere they are practically all parochial representatives. There is very little else in poor law in my district but the parish representative. They divide these committees so that a certain committee takes certain parishes and the representatives of those parishes sit on the section and deal with all the cases in their parishes. Unless they rotated, that would be really making it worse than the original practice of the whole board itself dealing with the relief, because you would be removing from the consideration of those cases the people who would be most impartial, that is, the people who had no personal connection with them.

7127. Do you think that the guardians in a town like Leeds or Bradford or Sheffield do know all the cases that come up before them?—It is wonderful, but they certainly do know a great many, and they can make it their business to know them if they want to do so.

7128. Yes, if they want to do it?—If they want to have a personal influence they will go and do it.

7129. Do they do it?—I think so; in many cases they do.

7130. To a very large extent?—I cannot say to a very large extent, but they certainly do it. They will tell you that they know their cases in their different parishes; they certainly do in the country—that is obvious.

7131. I know that is so in the country, but I am rather thinking of the towns just now; take a town like Leeds?—It is a common thing for a man to go to the guardian himself first.

7132. Where there are thousands of cases?—There are not so many as thousands in each section.

7133. All right, then, take hundreds if that would be nearer. What I want to point out to you is that in the worst of these places where you have not wards, but where you have parishes you have more than the guardians of one parish sitting together?—Yes, you have.

7134. And they all have to take part in administering the relief?—That is the point. In committees it does not work out that way; it works out that a few people come and do the work—about three only.

7135. How long have you been in this district?—Five years.

7136. How often do you go to a relief committee—frequently?—Very frequently, nearly every time I can. When I go to meet a board of guardians I always attend the relief cases whether they are taken by the board or whether they are taken in committee.

7137. How often would that be in a year at any particular union?—Not often in a particular union, because one is not supposed to go; in fact; I would not have the time to go more than once a year to each.

7138. Remember, I am not thinking about country guardians, because their population is more sparse and scattered. I am thinking of guardians in towns. Is it not rather a sweeping assertion to say that deliberately the committees are set up, and then just as deliberately the guardians look out for cases and there is a kind of patronage about giving the relief?—That is the danger.

7139. I know it is a danger; but what I want to get from you is what evidence based on your experience you have to give us to show that this sort of thing does go on, and whether there is any district that we might go and see where it is going on?—I should recommend you to go to Huddersfield and attend the relief committees there. It would be most instructive and interesting too.

7140. Do you think that at Huddersfield the guardians deliberately know the cases, and just as deliberately go and give the relief to them?—I do not think I could say that.

7141. Is that not rather the point of it all?—My generalisation is that the possibility of it ought to be prevented.

7142. Why generalise about something which we are not sure exists? You could generalise that the bulk of the guardians are thieves, and that you ought to take measures to prevent them thieving?—Laxity of administration is a thing which you can get to know and understand by experience at boards of guardians. You can know the weak points of a system, and if you do know the weak points of a system it is only common-sense and sagacity to take precautions to prevent those weak points becoming emphasized or increased.

7143. Still the weak point here is a weak point which is in your mind; and what I am anxious to do is to get some evidence as to how it works, that is, that there is a danger of guardians looking after their friends as a matter of fact and looking after people whom they want to put on to the rates?—That is human nature.

7144. I know; still, Huddersfield is the only case you can give?—There is the York case, which I have described in detail. Until quite recently the York system has been in full vogue. You could not have a better illustration of the dangers of the personal intervention of guardians in relief, because there each guardian appeared as the advocate of the case.

7145. I have read your account of that, which is a very extraordinary one, I admit; but you are not recommending us now to go to York?—No; because I think they are just on the eve of changing that system.

The principle of relief.

7146. That has been knocked on the head?—Yes; but one cannot see that sort of thing in existence without feeling that one ought to take uncommonly good care that it shall not occur anywhere else if one can help it. That is what I am for. My appointment is to supervise the administration of the Poor Law. The Local Government Board have acted for many generations on certain principles which are thoroughly understood, and it is my duty to try and see that those principles are carried out and to make such representations as will ensure their being carried out.

7147. What are the principles that the Local Government Board want carried out?—Sir Samuel Provis is perhaps the more direct authority for that.

7148. But he is not the witness?—I can refer you to all the circulars which I have here pinned together, which contain all the directions.

7149. They are rather varied, are they not?—They are.

7150. If a board of guardians set to work to carry out all those various principles?—They would learn a great deal.

7151. And they would end by what? Which system of administration would they carry out—the strict one of offering the house as a test of destitution, or would they give outdoor relief to deserving cases, and so prevent such cases coming into the workhouse?—That is a conundrum which would be answered in a different way in different unions.

7152. But still you are a gentleman who has got to answer that to the boards of guardians, and I should like to know how you answer it to them?—I should have to send you a volume of my speeches.

7153. Of course this is all very funny, but just in a rough sort of way you could tell me exactly what is the policy you recommend to a board of guardians. For instance, you are laying down here that relief is now given to poor people and not to destitute people, and that it is given to aid poverty; I should like to know whether that is according to the principles of the Local

Government Board?—The practical working of the Poor Law is in the hands of the guardians themselves, and I am no party to intervene in any specific case of poverty or destitution. I have to lay down certain principles of outdoor relief—the dangers of laxity in outdoor relief, the necessity of testing cases which come up which are suspicious cases and in which it is desirable to offer complete relief in an institution, and generally to see that the staff is complete, and every information that can be got about every case is before the guardians. After all, those are important principles.

Relief in aid of poverty.

7154. If a board of guardians gives relief in aid of poverty and not to relieve destitution will they be acting in accordance with the principles laid down by the Local Government Board?—That is a matter in which every case would have to be sifted. I do not think you will find in my memorandum any absolute statement about that poverty question.

7155. I think there is, towards the end—and I read over your memorandum twice pretty thoroughly?—Can you refer me to anything that has struck you?—I think in reference to Pocklington I said that it would seem that relief was given in aid of poverty rather than in aid of destitution?

7156. Do you agree that that is done—because that will get us to it easily enough—that relief in your district is given in aid of poverty rather than in cases of destitution?—You are asking me to put a construction upon the action of the guardians.

7157. It is Pocklington, I think, where you give a series of cases in which you point out that there was no evidence of destitution?—By that I meant that there was furniture and food and everything that the ordinary necessities of life required, and that the people looked to be living comfortably and home-like. That is what my evidence came to.

7158. You considered that they were all right?—I had no fault to find with the conditions.

7159. And that they were quite good cases to give the relief to?—They were old and deserving cases—that of course is a condition—and had been there for something like twenty years probably.

7160. I am sorry to press this, but I really want to get from you whether the outdoor relief in your district as a whole to aged people is given to really destitute cases, or whether it is given to cases which are in a condition of poverty?—They must have been absolutely destitute before they made the application. When persons had some belongings, as these old people evidently had, furniture and so on, the guardians did not compel them to sell all their furniture before they applied for the relief. If you like to construe that into relief in aid of poverty instead of destitution of course you may be justified in doing so. I am only citing those cases as an illustration of how they deal with individual poverty.

7161. I quite understood that. You do not disapprove of that method of dealing with old-age poverty do you?—Certainly not. If I had disapproved of it I should have criticised it severely.

7162. If you were a guardian there or a member of the board you would have administered it in the same way?—I should not object to it.

7163. So that really you do not object to outdoor relief to aged people of that description?—No.

Wages paid to paupers at York.

7164. Then take the York cases in Paragraph 143. I do not quite understand the third case there, which is that of the man who had task work at the workhouse at 2s. 6d. a day?—That is a system which I look upon as a very bad system—indeed, it is a scandalous system. It was practically the system of paying a pauper good wages, because these men who went up and did a very easy day's sawing—it was not a test of work at all—got 2s. 6d. a day, and they would not have been able to have earned as much as that.

7165. I wanted to ask you whether the man got 2s. 6d. in actual money?—Yes, it was paid to him at the end of the week by the master of the workhouse until I stopped it. They had the system there that the workhouse master paid it out and was reimbursed. That was one of the instances of extraordinary administration at York which we found out by degrees; but they stopped that. That was the way he got his half-crown per day.

7166. Was that not in defiance of the Orders of the Local Government Board?—Yes, that was in defiance of the Orders.

7167. Was anyone surcharged?—Yes; there was a surcharge of £300 or £400.

7168. Did you collect it?—It was remitted.

7169. Did that get into the newspapers of York?—It may have.

Specimen out-relief cases at York.

7170. It was not that point that I wanted to ask you about. You go on to say, "Wife, and a boy working at Messrs. Rowntree's, and earning 5s. 6d. a week." Does that mean that the wife was earning 5s. 6d. and the boy 5s. 6d., or that the two were earning 5s. 6d. between them?—I think it was the boy only, and that it simply means that there was a wife in the case.

7171. And there were three other children dependent, is that so?—Yes. These I may say were all in the very worst slums in the city.

7172. The next case also I do not understand: "M.L. earns 2s. a day for four days a week at a laundry. Relief 2s. 6d. Lives with her mother. House fairly clean." Who is M.L.? Is she a single person, and does she get the relief of 2s. 6d. because she only earns 8s. a week?—I I think the relief was to the mother. She lives with her mother, and I think the relief must have been given to the mother.

Deterioration in dominant factors at guardians' elections.

7173. You told us that at Huddersfield some friendly society people had been doing some mischief from your point of view?—I did not say mischief.

7174. They had been inviting people to elect them?—I said they adopted an extraordinary policy—I think I used words to that effect.

7175. And also you read out a leaflet which you considered was not a very good one?—Yes.

7176. I only want, from that point of view, to put it to you that all elections are fought on those kinds of things just now; it is not only a board of guardians that issue posters and addresses appealing to the cupidity of the electorate?—I may assent to that.

7177. I only want to point out that the morality of elections is about equal all over, whether they are Parliamentary, municipal or otherwise?—Yes; but then the Poor Law guardian elections used to be rather clear of that. The introduction of this sort of appeal to the material side is a very unfortunate innovation in Poor Law guardians' elections. It is an absolute direct appeal for more money to distribute.

7178. How long have you been connected with the Poor Law?—Ten years come November.

7179. Ever since you have had anything to do with it there has been this sort of feeling in it, has there not?—What feeling?

7180. The feeling that at election times it was out-relief or non-out-relief that the elections were fought out on?—I do not think that is absolutely true of a great number of places. I think it has been coming up very recently.

7181. In the last ten years?—I should date it more from five years back; that is my experience.

7182. I only want you to give us your experience of course?—The interest in Poor Law elections has not been very great, in fact, I think it has been rather unduly small.

7183. I think so too, only I should have gathered from what you said this morning that it was much larger?—Of course the interest in these elections will be larger if you advocate the distribution of money.

7184. Are you really aware what percentage of people vote even in that kind of district—can you tell us how many went to the poll out of the electorate even with that inflammatory poster that you have there?—No, I could not tell you that.

7185. It is a question whether that sort of thing really had any effect?—They returned twenty men.

7186. They may have returned twenty men, but the thing is whether it aroused very much interest to return those and whether the bulk of the people did not stop at home?—That may be.

Relief to occupants of cheap lodging houses.

7187. You went on to say they actually gave out-door relief to people living in lodging-houses—is that so?—Yes.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

7188. You said the Corporation lodging-houses ; would those be lodging-houses run by the Corporation ?—I think I said model lodging-houses.

7189. I thought you discriminated and said so many in the Corporation lodging-houses and so many in the common lodging-houses ?—Perhaps I did.

7190. And I noticed that the figure for the common lodging-houses was much smaller ; can you tell us what kind of relief that would be and whether it would be because of sickness or what it was ?—I do not know ; I should think it would be money to get necessaries of life.

7191. It is rather important to know what form that relief really took, is it not ?—Yes.

7192. Would those be aged people ?—No, I should not think so.

7193. Would they be able-bodied people ?—I think probably corner boys or people of that sort—hawkers.

7194. To whom they were giving money ?—Yes.

7195. And they would be under sixty years of age ?—I should think so, but that we can easily ascertain for you. This is the only extract I have relating to those cases. " In my district I have eight males and two females who are receiving out-door relief and living in the Corporation model lodging houses and two cases in common lodging houses." Of course I could get the particulars of those ; I have not got them, as they are not within the list of unsatisfactory cases which I had sent.

7196. Is Huddersfield a union where you can give out-door relief to able-bodied men ?—Do you mean under a Test Order or under the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order.

7197. There were two orders—I forget the names of these orders—under one of which you can prohibit and under the other of which you cannot prohibit ; which is Huddersfield under ?—It is under the Regulation Order.

7198. What I should like to ask you to do if you would is to get us particulars of these cases, whether they are aged people, whether they are getting relief in money or in kind, or whether they are sick, so that we might just see what is being done with them ?—I will obtain that information for you.*

7199. Then you refer to deterioration in administration ; what does that really mean at Huddersfield ?—I think they are lax in giving relief to certain classes of people. They do not test the cases sufficiently by offering the house in order to test the genuineness of the application. They hardly ever apply the workhouse test. The object of the existence of the workhouse is largely as a sort of insurance against imposition.

Effectiveness of workhouse as a test.

7200. Is it not the fact that the workhouse nowadays is much more looked upon as a place for old people, sick people, children, and that sort of thing ?—Yes, to a certain extent, but it also is the barrier across the path of the impostor.

Conditions in Huddersfield Union.

7201. What is the percentage of people in Huddersfield who are getting relief now but who ought not to be getting it ?—I could not tell you that without going through each individual case and forming an opinion upon it.

7202. I know, but you are very determined in your strictures on Huddersfield ; you must have some information on which you base your criticism ?—I speak to the relieving officers and I ask them their opinion, but of course I do not want to give away the relieving officers to the guardians, who might call them up.

7203. I do not want to do so either ?—I have information from officers of the Local Government Board, and I base my opinions largely upon that, because I know that they know the facts.

7204. Do you think that the guardians wilfully blind their eyes to the facts at Huddersfield ?—They are filled with the milk of human kindness and they are giving relief in a way which requires supervision. That is my opinion.

* Subsequently sent. (See App. Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (L).)

7205. How is the board composed ?—Do you mean of what classes ?

Size of Huddersfield Board of Guardians.

7206. How many are there on the board, in the first place ?—It is a very large board, consisting of seventy-one guardians.

7207. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) It is much the largest of all your boards, is it not ?—It is the largest except York.

7208. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) They have co-opted one member, have they not ?—They seem to have done so.

7209. What kind of people are these seventy ?—I cannot tell you that now, but I can get from the Local Government Board Reports the exact trade and calling of each member, because they send a return every year of that to the Board. I do not inquire into what the position and trade of every member of a board is, and I could not remember if I had ascertained it. There would be a number of farmers on it, as there are a good many men from the rural districts. Huddersfield is a very remarkable district, because it consists of an aggregation of small manufacturing villages and townships, and I could not tell you whether they are farmers or manufacturers or tradesmen or shopkeepers without inquiry.

Qualities of an ideal guardian.

7210. This morning you told us we would have to have a higher class of guardians, and I rather wanted to find out from you what you considered a higher class of guardians ?—To have read and thought something about social problems, and to understand the history of the Poor Law and the reasons for its passing, would be a *sine qua non* in my opinion of a good guardian.

7211. That would not mean, would it, that it would have anything whatever to do with his social standing ?—No, because some of the best informed guardians on those points that I have met are working men.

Conditions in Huddersfield Union.

7212. What I wanted to get at was who were these dreadful people at Huddersfield who were throwing the money away in this sort of fashion ?—The twenty-two members of the friendly societies.

7213. In answer to Mr. Russell Wakefield you said something which rather modified that, which was that it may have been that they wanted adequate relief ?—I have no doubt the motive was excellent.

7214. No one will disagree about that, only now it is a question of paying out money to undeserving people. What I cannot understand is that, if there are seventy-one people there and a considerable number of them are small farmers who will directly be having to pay that out of their own pockets—that is the theory—why they should want to do it ; that is the thing that is rather puzzling me ?—It is always easier to give than to refuse.

7215. I do not think so ?—That is my experience of boards of guardians.

7216. It is not so when you give your own money, is it ?—But you are giving your neighbours' money in these cases.

7217. Certainly, but you are giving your own too ?—Some of them are.

7218. You say that this union is made up of a set of villages, and that there are a number of farmers there ?—And manufacturers.

7219. It seems to me that it is just the kind of board that would be careful ; but still we are going to get, are we not, some more particulars about this board ?—I think you ought to visit Huddersfield and attend the committees there, and really investigate the whole thing. It would be most interesting.

7220. Of course your district industrially is better than the southern part of the country ?—Yes.

7221. It is not because the people are so much better that they are able to make as much provision as they do for themselves, is it ?—Better in what way ? Do you mean better morally ?

The Yorkshire character as a deterrent to pauperism.

7222. I do not know how to put it. I once talked about moral fibre here to someone, and I was sat on. I hardly dare to put it to you that the people in Yorkshire have a stronger moral fibre than the southerners have, and therefore, have more independence of character and the rest of it ?—They are a very hard-headed race, and they

know what they want, and they try to get it. Then they work very hard; they are very laborious people, and the men who make the people are always working. I think that laboriousness is one of the great characteristics of the Yorkshire people. But as to moral fibre, I do not quite agree with you. That moral fibre is a very difficult thing to define.

7223. I am glad you do not; it is rather cheerful to find someone who does not. In districts other than Yorkshire, where pauperism is higher, are the people there less self-reliant and less independent than the people in Yorkshire?—I can only repeat that I think the people in Yorkshire have attained to a habit of mind which tends to thrift and providence; and that if they have arrived at that by some means in Yorkshire which has not been attained elsewhere, I cannot explain it, but I think that they have. They seem to me to be able to provide for themselves better.

7224. But you see that even in Yorkshire that does not work out?—I am not a Yorkshire man.

7225. Neither am I. In the East Riding, pauperism is higher than in the West Riding, is it not?—It is, the reason being largely, I think, the old age factor.

7226. Might that not operate in these other districts where pauperism is higher than in the West Riding of Yorkshire?—Old age is a very great factor in the eastern counties—in East Anglia where I was—particularly in Norfolk.

7227. Is that not rather the answer to it all?—If you like to make that answer, of course.

7228. I do not want to make it; I am putting the question?—I will not make that answer.

7229. Then please tell us why, in Yorkshire, you have the variation in the two sides of the county?—The variation may be accounted for by the fact that the industrial life of the West Riding has produced that habit of accumulation and providence and thrift which operates in the way we have described, whereas the absence of the industrial element in the East Riding may have had the opposite effect.

7230. It means that in the East Riding they do not earn as much money, and they have not the means of earning as much money as in the West?—They go west.

7231. Certainly—in order to earn it?—Yes.

Effect on pauperism of opportunity to earn high wages.

7232. Is not the difference between Yorkshire and other counties in England this—that there are better means of earning more stable and regular incomes there than in the eastern and southern parts of England?—I do not know. I should have to study all the other industrial centres before I could answer such a question as that.

Comparison of East Riding and East Anglia.

7233. But you have been in the eastern counties?—Yes, but East Anglia is not an industrial centre. My point is that the West Riding is an industrial centre, and we should have to compare all the industrial centres in England and see how it works out, in order to answer your question.

7234. Taking the East Riding, there your pauperism is lower than the pauperism of Suffolk, Essex, and Norfolk; what is the reason?—I suppose we must fall back upon the superiority of the Yorkshire moral fibre. There that is against you, you see.

7235. The average wages are higher, and the opportunities for people to earn money and to develop self-reliance and all the rest of it are greater in Yorkshire than they are in other parts of England?—I could not answer that, because I am not acquainted with many other parts of England.

7236. People never do answer my questions when I put straight questions?—It is not a straight question.

7237. It is perfectly straight?—I should have to know all the other industrial conditions of all the industrial parts of England, and I do not.

7238. There is a district which you went from?—Yes.

7239. Compare that with the East Riding?—The rural conditions of East Anglia are very like the rural conditions of East Yorkshire.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

7240. Has agriculture decayed in the East Riding as much as in those other counties you went from?—Certainly; the farmers are just as complaining.

7241. They complain everywhere; I did not ask you about the farmers complaining?—Yorkshire is not as near to the London Market as East Anglia. There is the biggest market in the world at the doors of East Anglia. But I do not think there is any difference in that respect, because all the great towns in the West Riding are very good markets for the agriculture of Yorkshire.

7242. I should think they were, too, and I should think that agriculture is not in so parlous a condition in the East Riding of Yorkshire as it is in East Anglia?—It may not be.

7243. I should think you knew that?—I do not; I am not a specialist on agriculture.

Model rules for and scales of relief.

7244. (*Chairman.*) Will you put those model rules in?—Yes. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (N).) I have a number of scales of relief which have been adopted by different boards of guardians, which I can also put in; indeed, I have a large quantity of those sort of documents, but I am afraid to overwhelm the Commission with them.

7245. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Might we have two or three specimen scales of relief typical of the different kinds of administration?—Yes. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (O).)

Figures as to increase of pauperism.

7246. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Referring to page 3 of your memorandum, and taking the number of in-door paupers, from January 1, 1881, to January 1, 1905, I see a very large indoor increase is shown, but the outdoor pauperism has shown a much less percentage of increase. Just now you were asked a few questions with regard to this point with the object of showing that the policy of in-door relief did not necessarily decrease outdoor relief. I notice that the population has increased 25·9 per cent. and that pauperism during that period has increased 19·8 per cent, which shows that the increase in pauperism is much less than the increase in population?—That is so.

7247. The natural increase in pauperism has been in in-door relief and not in out-door relief?—The figures show that.

7248. You do not give us the number of lunatics in asylums, do you?—No.

Increase in number of lunatic paupers.

7249. Do you not think that the increase in lunatics alone from 1881 to 1905 would make up the whole difference?—It would certainly account for a very considerable proportion of the increase.

7250. Although these figures are exclusive of the lunatics in asylums, there are many lunatics included which affect these figures very largely I think?—Yes, there are.

7251. They are kept in the Yorkshire workhouses and they are included in those figures?—Yes.

7252. Could you give us any idea as to the number?—I could not, but I have them on record. Every inspection that I make I put down the number of certified lunatics in the workhouse. The information is accessible, but it would have to be made up.

Position of Yorkshire as to pauperism: the irreducible minimum.

7253. My point is to show that the natural increase in pauperism in Yorkshire has practically been indoor and not outdoor, and that the pauperism being low is almost at its irreducible minimum?—Do you mean that we are not likely to get any lower percentage of pauperism?

7254. That we are not likely to get any lower practically?—I have not seen very much difference I must say, and except that there may be a more careful examination of cases in the matter of out-door relief, I do not think that you can get very much lower.

7255. It appears that the cases which make up the increase are principally those that need to be dealt with in-door rather than out-door?—I have referred to the sick.

7256. Then the children have made a great difference, have they not?—The children have increased. I have not touched upon the reason of the increase in the number of children, but I should like to make a few observations upon that

Bradford staff for out-relief.

7257. I have a question to put to you a little later on that point. At paragraph 148 you begin to deal

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

with the case of Bradford, and in paragraph 149 there is a description of the staff which is not quite accurate in a sense. The number of officers is down here, but still they are not specified properly. You say, "In 1881 the Bradford Union employed for the work of outdoor relief a staff of three relieving officers and a pay clerk. In 1882 it was increased to four relieving officers. In 1896 one cross-visitor was added and a second cross-visitor in 1897, while in 1901 a superintendent relieving officer was appointed." That appears as though there were two cross-visitors, but really there is only one, because one is a collector?—But is he not sometimes used as a cross-visitor?

7258. Sometimes; it looks as though there was not a collector of repayments?—Ought it to be "A second cross-visitor who acts as collector?"

Revision of relief lists.

7259. It is the first cross-visitor who acts as collector. In paragraph 53 you say there are twenty-two unions who revise their cases every six months, three every twelve months, and eight every three months. Does that mean a revision that is made during the running of a period of relief, or is it what is termed a roll-call when they go through all the cases in the house, and ascertain why they are there, how long they have been there, etc.?—The practice differs. I do not think all the unions adopt the practice of taking a roll-call. What I meant to say in that paragraph was, that as a rule at the end of those periods they revise the cases in point, and they go into the circumstances of the cases.

7260. Does that mean that the whole board revises them, or the committee that granted the relief in the first instance?—It does not take the form as a rule of a revision by the whole board of the whole circumstances of each case. The relieving officer says, "This is a case which comes up again; there is no change in the conditions, and we recommend a renewal of the relief." That is about all it amounts to.

7261. It is not a revision of the case with an independent report of another investigator?—No.

7262. Is there any such case in your district?—I should think that Bradford would probably have a more extended method.

7263. Administering relief in accordance with fixed regulations and the periodical revision of cases is comparatively new, is it not?—It has been growing during the last five years, I think. In my advice to the boards I have laid a good deal of stress on the necessity of investigation and that knowledge of the cases which you cannot get without a periodical revision of the cases and the facts.

Trade, pauperism, and administration at Huddersfield

7264. With regard to Huddersfield, is it not a fact that the state of trade has been very good during the last three or four years?—The whole of the heavy woollen trade in the West Riding has been extraordinarily good ever since the beginning of the war, because they had to make blankets and uniforms for the Japanese. There was a great deal of activity in the dyeing works resulting from that, too. The trade in the heavy woollen districts has been remarkable, and has never had any depression in the worst times.

7265. I have received the figures this morning, and I find that the outdoor relief cases in 1901 were 1,411, and in 1906, 2,312?—That shows that the upward movement is continuing.

7266. Out door relief has nearly doubled, that is to say, there has been an increase of about 80 per cent. in out-door relief alone as from 1901, and that during a period of growing and improving trade?—Of course I do not want to make an absolute statement about Huddersfield trade, because I do not pretend to be a trade expert having a knowledge of each trade; but if the heavy woollen trade has been improving, and I believe it has, then Huddersfield has shared in the heavy woollen prosperity.

7267. I think I know that to be the fact?—You would know more about that than I do.

7268. Side by side with these growing out-door figures the in-door figures have not gone down, but are much larger than they were in 1901, being now 532. Do you attribute this increase to administration or to any other theory? You have given us a good deal of evidence on administration as causing these increases; but, seeing now that we have the new figures, I would like you to say definitely whether you think this is due to administration entirely?—I do not see what else I can put it down to.

7269. Is it not a fact also that the guardians themselves have become alarmed recently and are considering the advisability of having regulations?—I am not quite certain whether they are, but I think they were. They had an inquiry two years ago into the whole thing, I think; so they were alarmed two years ago.

7270. Have you any knowledge that the nominal leader of the friendly society movement on the board is now advocating a rotation of members on the Relief Committees in order to reduce the numbers on the out-door list?—No, I do not know that as a fact.

Effect of few determined men on boa of guardian

7271. Is it your experience that a few determined men can either wreck or make a policy on a board of guardians?—I think a few determined men can go on until they tire the majority out. I have seen that over and over again, especially with regard to the administration of out-door relief. Determined men who want to give relief nearly always succeed in giving it, because they use arguments which react upon the other more strict people, and it gets known outside and has an effect on public opinion in that way—for people become more and more unwilling to appear as denying relief if it is really wanted.

Effect of M Chaplin's circular.

7272. With regard to the circular of 1900, which is known as Mr. Chaplin's Circular, I think you said that that circular had been entirely misunderstood and that there were very rare cases, if any, where it had been acted upon in the proper spirit. Are there any exceptions to that in your district?—No. I think the general impression left upon the minds of the guardians by the circular was that it gave them a dispensing power, as it were, in the matter of out-relief—that they were more or less dispensed from the strict administration of out-relief which it was believed had hitherto been the policy of the Local Government Board.

7273. Do you think on the whole that it has been mischievous rather than helpful?—I think to a great extent it has resulted in a certain laxity, yet on the other hand I think it has done good in relieving certain forms of pauperism which I think were stinted before, and particularly I have mentioned the allowance for each child. I have always felt that the children of the out-door poor had never been properly done by or looked after.

7274. Has it been the means of increasing the amount per head of out-door relief in any of the unions? I think you have only mentioned one union where you give the amounts per head in certain years. Has it generally increased the amount per head?—If you mean to each person receiving relief, yes, it certainly has—as much as 1s. per head in some cases. In Hull they used to give the old people 2s. 6d., and now 3s. 6d. is the common amount.

Effect of hig scale of out- relief.

7275. In the table of expenditure in out-relief in Bradford union during the ten years 1895-96 to 1904-05 you mention 2s. 10½d. per head as the average cost per person relieved in the first week in January, 1904-05; are there other unions in your district where the amount is so high or higher?—I do not think I ought to make any statement on that, because I really do not think I have the data for making the comparison.

7276. You have not the information?—No, I really have not. As a general rule when I have made the comparison I have found that this is generally supposed to be the highest. The Bradford scale is looked upon as a very high scale to certain classes, because you classify your out-door poor, which they do not do anywhere else except in Sheffield.

7277. You would consider, would you not, that the higher the scale the more danger there is in an out-door relief policy?—It might become so heavy that the burden would be intolerable.

7278. But does it not lead to a better discrimination of cases?—You reduce the number of persons, but you increase the amount given, and of course it is the more deserving people who get better treated.

7279. When the scale is high has not that also a tendency to influence guardians in granting relief to cases that really ought to be dealt with inside rather than out?—Yes, because it would become an intolerable burden if they did not.

7280. Therefore the tendency is towards more adequate relief, where it is needed, and no outdoor relief given to persons who would be better dealt with inside than out?—Yes.

7281. You approve of that policy, I take it?—Yes, I do. Frequently in talking about principles to the Guardians I have over and over again said that it is far better to give more to the few deserving and to cut off the wastrels either with nothing at all or with offers of the house—throw them on their own resources, as was done immediately after the reform of the Poor Law.

7282. Do you take this large amount as being evidence of the fact that the circular of 1900 has been misunderstood?—You may say so, I think. It is an undoubted fact that it was misrepresented and used in a sense which it was not meant to have by the framers of it.

7283. Have you ever seen the Bradford regulations with regard to that circular?—Yes, I am familiar with those.

7284. Do you think a policy of the kind indicated would be likely to lead to abuse in attempting to grant a sufficient amount of outdoor relief to the more deserving class?—No. I should say that it ought to indicate the more desirable thing for the guardians to do.

7285. That is to discriminate very carefully between the applications?—Yes, though of course it is contrary to the old hard and fast Poor Law principle, that you have nothing to say to character and that you have got to relieve destitution. That is the old Poor Law principle.

7286. Is there not a tendency as we are going now to give out-door relief only to those who are in themselves deserving and proper recipients of out-door relief, leaving the rest practically to be dealt with by other means?—That is I think a very growing policy with all guardians.

7287. If the policy adopted has that effect, would you consider it a right policy?—Certainly.

7288. That clearly shows that it is not an evidence in itself that the circular has been misunderstood, so that your assertion is rather sweeping that you did not think there was an exception?—I have been met on such frequent occasions by men saying, "Well, it is your own circular," and interjections of that sort, that it is impossible to get out of my mind the fact that it has been either misrepresented or interpreted wrongly.

7289. But that could only apply to cases where out-door relief ought not to be granted at all?—I do not quite follow that.

7290. There is no mischief in granting a sufficient amount of out-door relief to a case of a deserving character?—No; that is all right.

7291. If the numbers are reduced to those that come under that category it will then be a healthy sign of better discrimination in the administration of out-door relief?—Yes, I agree with that.

The right to relief.

7292. You said in answer to a question that there was a common idea that there was a right to relief. I would like to ask you if it is your opinion that that feeling is growing or diminishing?—I could not give any opinion as to that. It is a common opinion, and I believe it is a revival from the old Poor Law handed down from father to son, that there are rights on the Poor Law which they cannot define, but which they believe exist.

7293. Do you not think it was really dying out until the recent revival of the idea?—I have not been sufficiently long in actual Poor Law work to be able to say that.

7294. Does not the revival of that idea date from recent times?—I do not know, and I have no means of saying. I have heard it ever since I have been in the Poor Law.

High percentage of child paupers at Sheffield.

7295. With regard to the children, there are all forms or methods of dealing with children adopted in your district. We find that in Sheffield the number of children is far larger than in other unions with a similar population, how do you account for that?—I cannot account for it, but I have a feeling that the one weak point in the growing disposition of dealing with pauper children by more improved and better methods, giving them, in fact, a very much better chance in life, has to a certain extent weakened the sense of parental responsibility. People are probably more willing now to throw their children on the rates in the hope of getting them better looked after. That is a warning note I always strike when speaking to guardians on their methods of dealing with children. I agree that you do get better value for your money than is the case with any other Poor Law entity, but at the same time I think that the Sheffield figures are a warning that unless this is very carefully guarded you might be inducing people to throw their children on to the community for their ultimate good, in order that they might get better fed, clothed, and educated.

High standard of relief to children an incentive to desertion.

7296. Do you mean there will be a larger number of desertions of children?—There will be more desertions and more intentional desertions with that object.

7297. Have you any particulars of the numbers of children deserted in the different unions?—No, but if you will look at my figures with regard to the Sheffield Children Homes I think you will find them very interesting. I particularly asked that those figures should be furnished to me.

7298. I find that the number of children deserted in the Sheffield union in 1905 was eighty-one. Do you think that the method of dealing with children in scattered homes or in village communities has a tendency to encourage desertion, owing to the fact that the parents of the children know where those children will be and know where to find them when they want them?—That is an inference you might take, but I have no means of knowing it.

7299. Are you aware whether in the unions where deserted children are invariably adopted and boarded-out, the number of desertions are fewer?—I have no comparative statistics of that sort. If I had had a year to prepare my evidence I could have got all these details, but really I have not had time to go into them all.

7300. I think this is rather an interesting point?—I think this part of the question is worth the Commission's attention, especially having regard to the weakening of parental responsibility, which I think it undoubtedly growing.

7301. Could you give us a return of the number of deserted children in typical unions in a given period within the last ten years, separating them into those who were sent to scattered homes and those who were adopted and boarded-out?—Each inspector could get that for you, I think.

7302. (*Chairman.*) Would there by any difficulty in getting it for your district?—I think I could get it for my district.

Cause of increased expenditure on child relief.

7303. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is it not the fact that the large increase in expenditure has been due to the large capital outlay for homes, and in obtaining better provision for the children?—Part of it no doubt has been due to that. I include that in the general building expenditure.

7304. Practically every one of the schemes for dealing with the children in your district, with the exception of Dewsbury and Sheffield, have been undertaken since 1894?—I do not exactly know the date, but a great many of them have taken place since I have come into the district.

Misleading effect of expenditure from Poor Rate on non-Poor Law purposes.

7305. Do you find a very great discrepancy between what is levied as the poor rate, and the amount that is actually handed over for Poor Law purposes; and is that not often misunderstood by the people, who think the whole poor rate is for the relief of the poor?—Yes, that is a very common mistake indeed, and it is a mistake I am continually being confronted with. People say what a scandalous thing it is that such an amount is spent upon the Poor Law. It is very difficult to refer them to Blue Books, but I have worked out that principle in a table which shows in several typical unions the amounts raised as poor rate and how the moneys so raised are applied in a certain year. In this table (*handed in*, see Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (P).) I show the amount spent in relief of the poor, the amount spent for county council purposes and the amount spent for town council purposes, also for rural and parish councils and for school and burial boards. All these charges come under what is called the poor rate, although it is obvious they have nothing what-

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

ever to do with the maintenance of the poor. Besides those there are the expenses of the overseers. Take Bradford, for instance. The total payments by the overseers there in the year 1904 was £317,699, and the amount paid to the board of guardians for relief of the poor was only £54,000, yet the guardians are credited with the spending of the £317,699.

7306. (*Chairman.*) Where did all that money go to? Could you give us one or two of the big heads?—There was £54,000 for the relief of the poor, and £258,000 for the Town Council.

7307. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The demand note would always show that, would it not?—Yes, but it is called the Poor Rate.

7308. Merely because it is the one rate which is levied in the parish to meet the expenses of the local authorities in that area?—Quite true, but then it is a thing which is called the Poor Rate, and so it will always be put down in the mind of the ordinary citizen as being spent on the poor.

7309. Not if he looked at his demand note?—But they do not look at their demand notes.

7310. (*Chairman.*) Is it not officially headed "Demand Note for the Poor Rate"?—Yes.

7311. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would not the Rate be headed "An Assessment for the Relief of the Poor and other purposes chargeable thereon"?—That may be, but I have heard this complaint raised over and over again by different people.

7312. You might get over it as they do in London, by naming the rate a General Rate?—Yes, that would meet the point. I think the present terminology is an unfair handicap on the Poor Rate of the country.

7313. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is it your experience that people do look at their demand notes?—I do not think they do.

7314. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Does it not also occur, in cases where there is an additional rate, that that makes the difficulty all the more; for instance, there is a rate in Bradford besides the Poor Rate called the "General District Rate," is there not?—That is not shown on the Table that I have here. I think that would be the Town Council rate; that absorbs the bulk of the money.

7315. Where there is both a General District Rate and a Poor Rate, are not the people rather more likely to think that the Poor Rate is actually made in relief of the poor?—That is what I think.

Relief granted to enforce maintenance by relatives.

7316. Do you find in dealing with cases of out-door relief that there is a practice of granting out-door relief in order to settle family affairs, that is, not because such relief is actually needed, but because the sons who are married and away from home do not contribute as the people think they ought to contribute; therefore relief is granted where it is not needed, with the sole object of getting it repaid from the sons and daughters?—That is a common occurrence.

7317. Would you say it is a very common occurrence?—I have noticed that there is a growing disinclination on the part of sons and daughters to help in contributing to the maintenance of their parents. I have over and over again heard family disputes of that sort settled. I think Yorkshire is almost the worst place there is in that respect; they are growing exceedingly lax in that way.

Relieving Officers: their qualifications, duties, etc.

7318. I take it you agree that the relieving officer's work is most important—almost the most important of any officer's under the board?—Yes.

7319. Do you think that the status of that officer is what it ought to be, and that the remuneration is as good as it ought to be?—The answer to that question is that the thing is governed by the higgling of the market. The guardians find that they can get any amount of applications—from 150 to 300 applications—if they put an advertisement into the paper for a relieving officer at such-and-such a sum; and the result is that they will not give more. It is the financial view that governs the whole thing.

7320. That will only obtain when the guardians do not specify that they require a person with experience; and that is not often done, I believe, is it?—Advertisements are framed widely sometimes, and they are not sufficiently precise. Then there is no method of testing a man's experience. It is a most difficult thing. I should like to see some certificate issued by some new educational authority, which would stamp a man as having gone through a certain curriculum, at all events, of social work—some work connected with the relief of the poor.

7321. Do you find that most of the new appointments of relieving officers are given to men who have had no experience whatever in poor law?—A great many are given to men who have had no experience whatever. That is most common in country districts.

Objections to pluralist relieving officers.

7322. Do you find that the relieving officer in many cases has other duties besides those strictly defined by the Orders?—Yes, and I think that is one of the great objections to the multiplication of these offices. A relieving officer ought to have nothing whatever to do, if possible, except the business connected with the relief of the poor. When you add to that—which is a very important business—the collection of the contributions from relatives, which takes up an enormous amount of time, and when you give him the vaccination officer's work and the registry of births and deaths, you can easily see that it is impossible for a man to do all these things and keep all the books that are required, and at the same time to carry on the work of relief. The clerical work thrown upon relieving officers is enormous, and ought to be reduced. I think a very great drawback to their services is the amount of clerical work they have to do in connection with all these offices. I gave some little idea of the books that the man at Pocklington had to keep; the number was astonishing—he had to keep twelve or thirteen great books besides sending out circulars. That is one of the reasons why relieving officers do not do their duties—because they have not time to do them. I am very strong upon that point.

7323. What books are you referring to?—The statistical books of the relieving officers and the entering of all the money they pay. Then they have certain books to keep for vaccination, and the collection entails a great deal of correspondence. Then they have to do all these wages notes. There is really a vast amount of clerical work which relieving officers have to do, and it ought always to be considered how they are handicapped in that way.

Adequacy of existing discretion of guardians.

7324. You agree, I think, that the guardians have a very large discretion left to them now as to the persons who are really eligible for relief and as to the amount of relief they may grant and the method of doing it; do you also agree that any limitations are necessary to restrict the guardians in that discretion in dealing with administration generally?—First of all in what direction?

7325. In any direction lessening the amount of discretion which they have at the present time? They are the sole judges of a person's eligibility for relief, and the sole judges of the kind of relief they may grant to a particular case?—I do not see how you are going to draw any line; it is very difficult to draw a line.

7326. Would you extend the discretion they have already; do you think it would be safe to do so?—I do not see how you can extend it very much. They have full discretion now, have they not? They can deal with all cases.

Type of persons becoming nurses and probationers.

7327. In selecting nurses or probationers to come to the training schools to be trained, do you find that they are getting the class of nurses that you think is desirable?—I do not think they get that class of young person which is the sort who makes a good nurse. They are selected very often because they are the friends or acquaintances of the guardians. The result is they have no idea of discipline, and they kick up their heels and go off at a moment's notice. I have had to hold two inquiries during the last year with regard to nurses, and so I have learnt a great deal. In both these cases—certainly in one—the whole trouble arose, I think, from laxity of discipline which was caused by the probationer—nurses feeling that they had a home close by, and that practically they could go off at once if they wanted to; and so they did not care about staying if it was not exactly to their taste. The best way of doing it is to get the superintendent nurse in all cases to choose likely candidates, and to have them on trial for a month or two months and then report to the guardians as to their capabalities. There is no body in the world that is so badly equipped for judging of what a probationer ought to be as a board of guardians.

7328. Do you think when it is left to the discretion of the superintendent nurse that they get a proper amount of applicants for the position ?—I think so. I think that the people who go there then feel that they are going to be tested at all events on their merits.

Out-relief and other provision for phthisical paupers.

7329. Is anything done inside any of the larger hospitals or infirmaries for the treatment of phthisis, I mean in cases where they have not a sanatorium of their own ?—Yes. In Wakefield they have got a few shelters outside on the grounds of the premises, and they have a very good shelter at Keighley where they treat all the phthisis cases, and they are talking of the same thing in other places. It is very easy to put up a hut or shelter and treat a few cases.

7330. Is there anything at Rotherham in that direction ?—No.

7331. Have they a large number of phthisis cases there ?—There is a great deal of phthisis amongst the outdoor paupers in Rotherham, and I had an interesting communication from the relieving officer on that point. He called my attention particularly to the fact that there was a vast amount of phthisis among the outdoor poor, and that it was impossible to deal with them, as they were bulking more and more in the sickness returns.

7332. Then they give them outdoor relief ?—Yes, they are given outdoor relief.

7333. In a known case of phthisis, would they not order the house ?—The fact is, that they are so crowded in the house at the present moment that they do not know what to do.

7334. Then they really grant outdoor relief in a case of that kind, because they have not proper accommodation for dealing with it ?—That is so.

7335. Does that not apply to other places besides Rotherham ?—I think it does; but you see the hospital accommodation every year is becoming more crowded. The crux in all these unions is the phthisis.

7336. Do you not find there is a great disinclination also on account of the expense ?—Yes, the expense is very high.

7337. Had you an instance brought to your notice where a board of guardians delayed a case for a year for consideration ?—Yes. That came before the board quite recently. The clerk advised them, I think, to begin with, that it was not a legal case, and the guardians would not relieve this man by sending him to a sanatorium. It was proposed to send him to a phthisis sanatorium, and the guardians refused to have anything to say to it. Then they were called in question by, I think, a lady guardian, and they wrote up to the Local Government Board, who gave them the law on the subject. The real reason, I am sure, why they refused it was that it would be a precedent involving a very heavy expenditure, and that if they relieved one man who was suffering from phthisis, at a cost of about £1 or 24s. a week, there was no logical reason why they should not relieve fifty others who were also suffering from phthisis. The whole question of phthisis in Poor Law is a very growing and a very serious one, because of the expense.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

26 Mar. 1906.

7338. (*Chairman.*) Is the number of cases increasing ?—No, because all over England the phthisis statistics are on the downward grade happily; but there is a great quantity of phthisis cases in all the industrial parts of my district. That is a most important factor on the medical side.

7339. (*Mr. Bentham*). There is only a limited number who are suffering from phthisis who are eligible for treatment under the Poor Laws; would that number be large enough, do you think, to frighten off guardians from dealing with the problem ?—It might not, if they came to examine it. There is an absence of accurate knowledge on the subject.

7340. Is it not the fact that the Board you mention have deferred further consideration of the case for a year ?—Yes, they have deferred it for twelve months.

7341. What may happen to the man in the meantime ?—He may get worse and he may die, of course.

Class of persons receiving medical relief.

7342. Just one other question with regard to the hospitals. Do you think that the better treatment inside the workhouse infirmaries and hospitals has tapped a new stratum of pauperism which is likely to tend to a large increase in numbers ?—I think it has to a certain extent tapped a new stratum which may increase.

TWENTY-FIRST DAY.

Tuesday, 27th March, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
MR. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. PHILIP HENRY BAGENAL, recalled; and further Examined.

Adequacy of existing discretion of guardians.

7343. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In answer to a question which I put to you yesterday, I think you said that you did not see any necessity for further limitations being put upon the discretionary powers which boards of guardians now possess for dealing with applicants for relief ?—Yes, I did.

7344. Neither do you think it necessary to relax the restrictions which are now placed upon local administrators by the central authority ?—No, I do not.

7345. Do you believe, generally speaking, that as the Statutes and Orders now stand, if wisely administered locally, there is sufficient elasticity in the system to cope with any sudden demands made upon it caused by any sudden dislocation of industry, a long frost, or a general trade depression ?—I think that the guardians have sufficient powers to deal with all those things if they really go into it in a sufficiently thorough and effective manner; the trouble is that sometimes they do not.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal

27 Mar. 1906.

Scope of the Poor Law.

7346. Do you adhere to the principle that the relief of indigence in any form from the public funds should be done by the Poor Law authorities and not by several authorities ?—As against relief in aid of wages, do you mean, or in aid of poverty and not destitution ?

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

7347. I mean relieving destitution due to poverty of any kind through the public funds; do you believe that that should always be done through the Poor Law?—The Poor Law is there *ad hoc*, and it ought to do the work.

7348. It ought to cover the whole field?—Yes, as far as destitution is concerned.

7349. Do you consider any relief of indigence from the public funds is pauperism, whatever name it might be known by, and that the more its real significance is obscured the greater the danger of an extension of pauperism?—I think there is a great danger of the extension of pauperism by the demands upon the public funds of all kinds and conditions, which are increasing. I think that anything in that direction is bound to increase pauperism, familiarising the people with the idea that they can get what they want by asking for it without working.

7350. And by obscuring the fact that it is after all Poor relief?—Yes.

7351. And pauperisation?—I agree.

7352. At all times do you think it possible with good administration to relieve promptly and adequately all cases of destitution, without at the same time manufacturing the cases which it is intended to relieve?—The last part of your question touches the whole difficulty—whether you can extend the area of relief without increasing the demands for relief. It all depends upon the policy of the board, whether you do it or whether you do not.

7353. Then you would put adequacy of relief, particularly if it is out-door relief, in the same category, as being dangerous?—I would, because the question of adequacy is one which people differ upon, and a board may be elected which will consider 7s. 6d. adequate instead of 5s. or 3s. 6d.

The test of "good" administration.

7354. Do you think the nearer that object can be approached, that is, to relieve adequately and promptly without at the same time increasing the number who rely upon it, is the test of good administration?—Yes, and it can easily be done by an efficient staff; that is the point.

Effect of Act of 1894 on administration.

7355. (*Professor Smart.*) You said that 1894 may be looked on as a starting point of a new policy and new views of administration; I suppose you mean, not that the law was changed, but that new readings were taken of the law?—Yes, I do.

Elasticity of the Poor Law.

7356. Do you mean that the Poor Law is of such a nature that its provisions may be carried out in different ways and with different expenditures?—Yes; I think that the Poor Law is one of the most elastic laws that was ever put upon the statute book.

7357. Do you mean that changes in the Orders from headquarters in 1894 necessitated larger expenditure, if the provisions were to be carried out?—Certainly. How can you advocate better treatment to the sick, without at the same time increasing the accommodation for the sick and providing adequate nursing?

7358. Then the large expenditure was a necessary result of the change in 1894?—Undoubtedly.

7359. And that change came from headquarters?—I was not a member of the Board at the time, but I think the change in the position of the guardians in 1894 was due to the passing of the Parish Councils Act, which changed the constitution of the *personnel* of the boards of guardians very considerably.

7360. But it did not change the law?—Certainly not.

7361. I am trying, as a stranger in this country, to find out what is meant nowadays by good administration. Do you consider that the administration before 1894 was good or bad, or merely different from now?—I am not able to give you any information from personal knowledge of what the administration was before 1896, because I only became inspector in 1896.

7362. Before 1896 was willingness to enter the workhouse the sole test of destitution?—That was the ordinary acceptation of the term.

Desuetude of workhouse test.

7363. Is that so now?—I think that the use of the workhouse test in all my district has largely fallen into disuse. Of course the ultimate test of a man's absolute destitution is the fact that he will enter an institution which gives him food, shelter and clothes; if he is absolutely destitute and cannot get those necessities of life anywhere else, he will undoubtedly come into the house. That was the object of the original workhouse test. If he found that he could make shift without coming in the workhouse, the argument was that he was able to maintain himself. The result of the Poor Law Amendment Act was that vast numbers of the working classes who were paupers were absorbed into the working population of the country.

7364. Do you think that now the word "destitution" has been changed into the word "poverty"?—No, I do not think so. The law stands exactly as it was, but it is interpreted in a different way. You see there is a discretion in the guardians whether they give out-door relief or indoor relief, and they can do just as they please in the matter; but they will not offer the workhouse in as many cases as I think they ought to, in order to test the *bonâ fides* of the application.

Indoor-relief to part only of a family.

7365. You spoke of the elasticity of the law, and I was led into asking that question by a fact of this sort: In very early discussions on the Poor Law a regulation was made, or seemed to be made, that if any children of a poor man with a large family were taken into the house, the whole family must go; but the relaxation was made afterwards by a special letter to certain unions allowing them to take, in, say, the surplus children. I find that in some boards that liberty is allowed, and in others it is disallowed; that is surely a very elastic reading of one law?—It is elastic. The reason why I say it is an elastic law is, that there is discretion allowed to the guardians as to the way in which they give relief; that is the elasticity.

The essentials of "good" Poor Law administration.

7366. Is there not a common idea abroad that stern administration is good administration; is that not what we very often mean by the term "good administration"?—Yes; and for this reason, that the ideal condition of citizenship is an independent man living in his own home and supporting himself without help from his neighbours. That is what we want to perpetuate. We want to enlarge that idea of citizenship. Therefore, any help that is given to people who are in want should be so given as not to make that ideal difficult or less common than it ought to be. Consequently, your relief system ought to be such as to make it to the advantage of the applicant not to avail himself of the Poor Law, because he can get on better without it.

7367. That is one side of it. Take what are sometimes called progressive unions, where a good many experiments seem to be making. Do you consider that a good many of these experiments, even when accompanied by a large expenditure and by increase in the number of people seeking relief, may yet be good administration?—That is the experiment which is now in action, and it is very difficult to say how it will end. We know exactly where we were under the old idea of the Poor Law; but there is a new school of Poor Law reformers now, who seem to think that there is a permanent state of pauperism inherent in the human race. They under-rate the capacity for self-help in the British working men; I do not under-estimate that capacity myself, because I think they have an extraordinary capacity for accommodating themselves to circumstances. This new school say that help must be given on all occasions to everybody who asks for it who has done anything towards paying rates. That is the idea—that they have paid into a public insurance fund; they look upon the rates apparently as an insurance fund. I do not agree with that; and I think that these experiments, unless they are very carefully guarded by a large staff and by very strigent superintendence, will turn out to be a very great burden upon the ratepayers.

Tests for the more attractive forms of relief at Bradford and Sheffield.

7368. But then would you say it is quite possible to call this good administration?—I think it is. For instance, Sheffield and Bradford, I think, have good administration, because they do all they can to assist the people who have assisted themselves. In their classification they exact a test in the shape of twenty years' residence. The man must have done something to help himself. All the conditions which have been attached to old-age pensions in theory are attached to the relief which is given in these well-administered unions.

Administrative latitude possessed by guardians.

7369. Then evidently you do not think that when a man becomes a guardian he becomes an officer of the law, and has to put aside his own feelings of what he thinks should be done with the poor; there is a large latitude of interpretation given to him?—I think so. I do not think you can give people the alternative of out-relief and indoor relief without connoting that.

7370. Then a guardian is very much in the position of a Member of Parliament; he is not sent there with a definite mandate, but is told to do his best?—He is there to conduct a policy of relief, which ought to be conducted for the benefit of the community as well as for the benefit of the person who applies. You ought not to assist a man on his own conditions. The worst of outdoor relief is that there is an idea abroad that when a man applies for outdoor relief he ought to get it because he asks for it, instead of saying: Is this man going to be an evil to the State by getting out-relief?—if he is, he ought not to have it, but he ought to be offered the house. That is my view.

The essentials of "good" Poor Law administration.

7371. Do you not think there is another tendency—to judge administration, and to decide whether it is good or bad, by the rates; that is, to say it is good administration if the rates are kept down, and bad administration if the rates go up. That is a popular view, is it not?—Yes, it is; but you must raise the rates to a certain extent in order to improve your equipment. I think myself that we are coming now to the end of the demands for equipment. I think the requirements of equipment in my district, for instance, are nearly satisfied, and that our capital expenditure will probably be very small in the coming years, because most of the workhouses are now properly equipped. That will all be paid off as the loans are paid off, and I look forward to the time when, if there is good administration, the rates ought to go down.

7372. But then in the meantime an increase of rates may mean good administration?—This is an increase which I say was inevitable, owing to the necessity of bringing up the equipment of the workhouse to the standard which was required by the new thought in Poor Law—the new humanitarian view which people have been holding.

7373. I rather gather from you that a good practical test of the administration is, where the outdoor relief comes down and at the same time the indoor relief comes down?—Where the number of persons comes down—that is the point. If you could reduce the number of people who are dependent you must then obviously be increasing the number of independent people in the community. You may give those persons whom you relieved a better scale of relief, because they deserve it or ought to have it. The criterion ought to be the number of persons who are on the rates; then you are getting some idea of the independence of the population.

7374. Might this not be driving destitution underground and making destitute people rather suffer than approach the poor authorities?—No; because you are giving their neighbours a chance to help them.

7375. Then it may be forcing these people on the support of other people on whom they have no claim?—That support will do the giver and the receiver good. That is what Chalmers said.

7376. Then you would not call an increase of outdoor relief in itself a sign of bad administration, would you?—That all depends upon the factors of which it is made up. It depends upon the class to whom it is given.

7377. You would not call an increase of in-relief a sign of bad administration, would you?—No; because that in-relief may be largely to the sick.

Effect on indoor relief of increase in out-relief.

7378. Do you think that the proportion between the two is an important question?—You know that great controversy as to whether increased out-relief results in increasing the indoor relief. I have certainly seen that happen. Wherever there is laxity of administration—and what I mean by that is when there is not sufficient distinction made between the wasteful and the deserving poor, and when everyone gets relief—you will find that the area of pauperism has increased, and that then they naturally come into the house when they cannot keep them outside any longer. In that way it re-acts on indoor pauperism. You get a larger *nidus* for the indoor than you would if you had a smaller number of people on out-relief; and the tendency, therefore, is to fill the workhouse if you fill your out-relief lists too.

7379. But you would have no hesitation in saying that anything that manufactures paupers is bad administration?—No.

7380. The law itself which you administer may be bad, and it may be defective?—Do you ask me whether I think the Poor Law defective?

7381. No: I say it may be?—Of course, any law may be defective.

7382. If the law is bad, a lax administration of it may have better results than a stern administration of it?—I do not know that I should assent to that.

Scope of general inspector's functions.

7383. As an inspector, do you consider that you have simply to carry out the letter of the law in its widest interpretation?—I have not to carry out the letter of the law at all. I have no right to interfere in any individual case.

7384. You have to criticise?—I criticise *ex post facto*; but you know what that means.

7385. I want to see what your criterion of criticism is in such a very wide latitude?—My criterion of criticism is the general atmosphere of a board of guardians, and the general way in which a relieving officer does his work. I look at his books, I question him, I sometimes go with him. There is a certain indefinable knowledge that one gets which I cannot describe to you. I may have means of drawing inferences from people: one gets a great deal of experience with men after ten years' dealing with a large number of men and officers: one gets to know things. I tell you I know them, and I know that some things require criticism, and I criticise.

Elasticity of Poor Law

7386. The general reason why I ask these questions is because I hear the expression used amongst guardians very commonly that they stretch the law just as much as they think necessary?—That is because of the elasticity I have mentioned: they have that stretching power. The Poor Law is such a very difficult subject, and the whole question of relief involves such tremendous problems that I do not see how you could do it by hard-and-fast regulations, because there would always be some hard case, which would be seized upon and made capital out of, and there would be a wide-spread indignation because of that exceptional case.

Effect on cost of relief of rise in price of commodities.

7387. I was a little surprised by your statement that one of the causes of increased expenditure in workhouse was the rise in the price of commodities consumed in the workhouse?—And of necessaries.

7388. Do you think that is quite borne out by the figures that you give from Rotherham and Bradford?—I think you will find that is the case in regard to many of the articles, coal particularly.

7389. I think if you compare 1896 with 1905, you will find it is the case that commodities have risen: but if you compare 1900 with 1905, you will find that this can scarcely be said. I find, for example, that between 1900 and 1905 there has been a fall in cheese, butter, meat, split peas, coke, coal and soap. You are aware, of course, of what is called the price level as determined by index numbers?—Yes, I am.

7390. Will you take this from me—that we usually start from a price level determined by the average of the years between 1866 and 1877 and call it 100?—Yes.

7391. That works out as making 1871 the starting year, where the level is 100. In 1873 the prices went up to 111, in 1874 they came back to 102, in 1875 they were down to 96, and from that time there was a rush down to 68 in 1887, the lowest level being touched in 1896. Of course, that is all familiar to you. From 1896 there was a rise till 1900, then a fall again till 1903. For example, in the decade 1888–97 the level was 67, and in the decade 1893–1902 it was 66. The rise in these last five years has been very little; in fact, the level for 1905 was 72, while for 1900 it was 75. I would, therefore, suggest that any rise in expenditure within the last five years cannot be accounted for by a rise in the price of commodities?—I am quite prepared to take that from you.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

7392. I should like you to think that over, and I should be glad to hear if you see anything in it that I have omitted. It seems to me that it is rather important that a rise in expenditure, if it has occurred within the last five years, should not be credited to a rise in price ?—I will think that over.

Effect of Poor Law administration on character of people.

7393. (*Miss Hill.*) I suppose you would say that character, conditions and administration are all factors which bear on pauperism ?—Yes.

7394. And that one may argue for a long time in what proportion they affect pauperism in a given union ?—Yes.

7395. I suppose that the conditions and the administration would affect character ?—I do think so.

7396. Then, as administration is the factor most within the control of the Poor Law authorities, therefore it is the one they are particularly bound to fix their attention upon ?—It ought to be.

7397. I should think it would have struck you that some people manage so far to rise above their conditions that they will often be better off in bad conditions than other people in good conditions ?—Yes, that is so.

7398. I suppose you would hold that people can really, if they put out their strength, as a rule, provide far better for themselves by thrift than they can ever be provided for by the Poor Law ?—I should hope so. I should like to think that of the population.

7399. Of course there must be exceptions ?—Yes.

7400. But at the same time it is a more satisfactory way of meeting their wants, as far as it will go ?—Yes.

7401. Therefore it is very important not to discourage it ?—That is my point all through.

7402. So that it is by no means only for the sake of saving money, but because it is believed to be in the best interests of working people that a stricter administration is advocated by most Poor Law reformers ?—I think so. It is in the interests of the community and of the people themselves.

7403. Of the people themselves ?—Certainly; and not merely for the saving of the rates.

7404. It is not merely a question of money only ?—No.

Instructions to assistant commissioners in 1840.

7405. (*Dr. Downes.*) The paragraph in your statement as to the work of an inspector struck me as of interest in connection with the instructions that were given to the assistant commissioners in the early days of the new Poor Law; therefore, I would rather like to direct your attention in that relation to a circular which the commissioners issued in 1840, in which they say this: "An additional field of usefulness is open to the assistant commissioner," the assistant commissioner being, as you are aware, the same in those days that the inspector is now ?—Yes.

7406. "If he avails himself of the means at his disposal to investigate the causes of pauperism." They then go on to point out that in the application and report book, and in the admission and discharge book, columns are appropriated for the entry of the causes of the pauperism of the applicants; I think that is so to this day, and that those columns remain ?—Yes; I have specimens here.

Scope of general inspectors' functions.

7407. They continue: "This information was required not merely in order to enable the guardians to verify the truth of the applicants' statement, and to prevent fraud, but with the hope that the pauperism would thus be traced in many instances to causes which might be diminished, if not entirely removed, by precautionary regulation, or by the suggestion of practical measures, which admit of being effective through the influence of the guardians." Do you agree in the advisability of such instructions being given to inspectors at the present time ?—I think an inspector labours under a certain disadvantage when entering upon his work, by not having his functions mapped out. It is very difficult sometimes to know at what end to begin. I think the social conditions of the people, and the questions of labour and everything else connected with the people, have such a great bearing upon poverty and pauperism that they would naturally—they ought to do so, certainly—pay a great deal of attention to them. I do not think that the mere business of inspecting institutions ought to be the end-all and the be-all of an inspector's life.

7408. It may only be a very small part of the problem which is presented to him ?—I hope it is a very small part. The longer I am in the business, the less I think of the institutional side of it, because it is defined, and it is there, and you know exactly what it is. But you have got this enormous mass of pauperism outside, and the inspector really does not know anything about it. He has not the time to devote to the examination of the causes—and we are not asked to report upon the causes—of pauperism; we have to deal with the result of pauperism, which is destitution.

7409. In dealing with destitution, which would you consider came first—the study of the causes, or the study of the treatment ?—You can always be studying causes. You may never arrive at any very final conclusion on it, but I think that there are certain causes, such as intemperance, for instance, feeble-mindedness, and a great many others, which I think every man ought to take an interest in and try to make some generalisations from. We are not set to do that work, but we do that on our own motion at present. I have taken an interest in these questions for a long time, and it has been a part of my work which I like to do. It interests me, but I do not know whether it would interest every inspector.

7410. I gather from your statement that you feel that you are rather hampered by want of time in following up studies of that sort ?—Of course we have to get about the country. I have got two Ridings, which form a very large district, and if one is travelling three days a week and inspecting also and writing reports, one wants a day off at home, and then there is a good deal of correspondence to be got through, and so you have not the time to investigate these things, and the result may be very small after you have been investigating them for a long time. That is, I think, the result of a good deal of sociological labours.

7411. Assuming he had the time, should you consider an inspector was in rather an exceptional position for the study of problems of this sort ?—I think he occupies a very remarkable position for doing that, because he has access to people. One has only to say he is an inspector of the Local Government Board, and the people, I am bound to say are, very glad to give you every information possible.

7412. I think that was the view of the Commissioners. I will continue what I was reading. They say: "In conclusion, the commissioners desire to impress upon you that the peculiar nature of your office gives you opportunities which fall to the lot of few other public functionaries, of acquainting yourself with the condition of the working classes in your district ?"—That is perfectly true.

7413. These instructions were issued in 1840, and I believe they were rescinded in 1846 by instructions which did not take so wide a scope. I suggest that that may be one reason why the earlier broad view that was taken by the Commissioners does not, perhaps, hold to the same extent at the present time. May I ask you whether it is not a fact that of more recent years the conditions of the local administration have extended: for example, public health statutes have been passed, and public health authorities have come into existence ?—That is so.

Workhouse buildings subject to restriction and inspection under Public Health Acts.

7414. Workhouses are not exempted, I believe, from the operation of the Public Health Acts ?—I have never known a sanitary inspector go into a workhouse and find fault with the guardians.

Effect of local by-laws on cost of buildings.

7415. If you are building a new workhouse in your district, is it not subject to the by-laws ?—Yes, it is. In Leeds they are now making buildings, and one of the explanations of the architect for the price of the buildings, which we thought rather big, was that the by-laws were of such a character as to necessitate the class of building which was put up.

7416. I do not know how it may be in your district, but certainly in London if questions of drainage arise the authorities who have the last voice in the matter are the local sanitary authorities ?—Yes; but you see in the country the local sanitary authorities are the guardians, and they are not likely to interfere with their own work in another capacity.

7417. At the same time, my point is that there is a local machinery for dealing with certain points, which formerly

were specially dealt with by the inspectors in their inspections ?—To that extent that is so ; but, as I say, the two authorities are the same. I remember on one occasion they kept pigs quite close to the workhouse ; I addressed the guardians, and told them that as a sanitary body they had no right to have pigs so close to the workhouse. They took the pigs farther away, but as a sanitary authority they never interfered with their own pigs.

7418. What does the medical officer of health do ?—The medical officer of health does not go inside the workhouse.

7419. Is there anything to debar him from going inside the workhouse ?—No ; but he never does.

7420. Not in your district ?—Certainly not ; I have never heard of it.

7421. Is there any reason why he should not ?—I suppose not, except that he takes it for granted that the medical officer of the workhouse is doing his duty. You know medical officers do not like interfering with each other ; and if a medical officer of health were confronted with the medical officer of the workhouse, there would be wigs on the green.

7422. I have been a medical officer of health in my time, and what I have always found is this, that the medical officer of health in dealing with a case usually does so with a certain amount of tact and discretion. Is there any distinction between the medical officer of a workhouse and the medical officer in attendance on a private case in relation to the medical officer of health ?—I candidly confess nothing of the sort has come under my personal observation. In all my experience I have never heard a word about a medical officer of health, except as regards his sanitary business. He comes and attends to the sanitary work after the meeting of the board of guardians is over, but I do not think he takes the workhouse into his consideration at all, as far as I know—at least not in practice.

7423. The gist of the argument which I have tried to embody in my questions is that there is nowadays a local machinery for dealing with that branch of workhouse inspection—whether it is used or not is perhaps another matter ?—That is so. My opinion is that it is not so used.

Inspection of workhouses by lady guardians under Sir H. Fowler's circular.

7424. Then you have now, I think since 1894, lady guardians, have you not ?—Yes ; in my district since 1887 or 1888.

7425. Do you find that the lady guardians exercise a useful supervision in the course of their duties as guardians ?—What I have to say about lady guardians is this—that when they are good they are very, very good.

7426. I think the powers of the guardians' own inspection of workhouses have been extended by Sir Henry Fowler's circular giving the right of entry ?—Yes. Personally I think that has been of great use.

7427. Does not all that tend to relieve the inspector to some extent of the burden of inspection which formerly rested on him alone ?—I think it ought to do so, and I think to a great extent it does. We really can take it almost for granted now that in well-administered unions the workhouses are thoroughly well looked after and inspected. I felt myself very often out of place in going round a well-managed workhouse, where my inspection visit is largely a matter of form ; I feel that everything that I see is uncommonly well done. That is a very common experience with me.

Expert assistants for general inspectors.

7428. Should you be in favour of a system by which if an inspector required expert assistance in any point of inspection he might obtain the same from the central department ? To some extent, I think, that is already the case, is it not ?—I was going to say that that is the case with my colleague, Dr. Fuller, who is the medical officer for Poor Law purposes. I think, in common with all my colleagues, I have had the greatest possible assistance from him. He comes six times a year to my district and inspects six workhouses. I have learnt a great deal from him, and he has been of the greatest possible assistance in finding out defects in medical matters and equipment business, which I natura'ly would not know. I think an expert of that sort, working in company with the inspectors, is of very great value.

7429. Do you find that occasionally guardians are glad to have the advice of an expert who is working with you ?—I do not know whether they are as much as I am. I do not think they care about experts, because experts mean expense. I may, perhaps, on that point, say, what I have not had an opportunity of saying before, that I think the architectural department of the Local Government Board would be greatly strengthened by a member of the architectural staff who could do more personal visiting when building is afoot in any union. We find great difficulty in keeping down expenses, and I think if there was a travelling architect who acted on the instructions of the Board's architect and attended the meetings of the committees who have charge of plans, and who would inspect the building after it was put up to see that it had been carried out on the lines that were sanctioned, that would be a very great advantage indeed. As it is at present we have no guarantee in the least that any building is built according to the specifications or estimates. It seems to me that there is a weak point there. We do not get sufficient control of the details of the building. I think, whenever I have had an architect down on the spot and got him in touch with the guardians, or had them up here to speak with the architect, we have had a great deal less correspondence and very much more satisfactory results.

7430. (*Chairman.*) Would you recommend that the architect should visit after the plans have been sanctioned and while the buildings are in course of construction ?—Certainly.

Inspection of outdoor cases by general inspectors.

7431. (*Dr. Downes.*) With regard to medical relief in your district, you give us in Paragraph 143 a few examples of the cases, that you went round to ; will you turn to No. 13 ?—Yes, that is a very bad case.

7432. There a man was dying of senile decay. You say : "He was upstairs in bed and was nearly falling out of bed when we came up. Mr. Mann lifted him into the middle of the bed. He groaned dreadfully, and Mrs. H. said he had a bad bed sore," Do the York guardians require their district medical officer to make any report to them on the condition of the cases under his care ?—I think in the original application there is always the medical officer's report on the case. The medical officer that I allude to there has since resigned. I found a great deal of fault with the whole of his work, and that was one of the reasons why I went round. This is a case where I made special investigation myself, and I was confirmed in my belief that he was not doing his duty by several cases that I saw, which ought most certainly to have been sent into the workhouse for treatment. This was a shocking case.

7433. Does not this indicate that the inspection of outdoor cases might be extended a little more than it is if the inspectors had time ?—That entirely confirms my own statements that I have made before. There are lots of cases where the sick have been neglected and great sufferings have ensued.

7434. Do any of the guardians in your district systematically require medical officers to report all cases of that sort, or to bring them to their attention ?—As a rule, I think the medical officers do their work well. It is just a case where sometimes you get a bad one, and you have got to find it out. You cannot do that without having information.

7435. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) In this case just quoted there were two paid officials—the relieving officer and the doctor ?—Yes.

7436. Both of whom were the people who should have given the guardians information ?—Yes. There was an excuse for that in the case of the relieving officer—he was tremendously over-worked at that time, and my visit with him proved that he was over-worked.

7437. Still, there were two people who should have given the information in any case, namely, the relieving officer and the medical officer ?—Yes.

7438. Both paid people, and servants of the guardians ?—Yes. They appointed a third relieving officer after my report.

7439. Is it not rather unfair to generalise on a particular case in this sort of way ? The whole point of the examination of Dr. Downes is that there should be an inspector

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

appointed who should overhaul out-relief cases, I understand?—That was my original suggestion.

7440. I only want to interject that there were two paid people already who ought to be doing their duty?—I quite agree that the two officers were responsible.

Power to compulsorily remove cases to workhouse.

7441. (*Dr. Downes.*) I think some questions were put to you in your examination-in-chief as to the desirability of guardians being empowered to obtain the compulsory removal to a workhouse or infirmary of cases living under unsatisfactory conditions, such, for example, perhaps, as the one we have just been speaking of?—Yes.

7442. Are you in favour of some such power, properly safeguarded, being accorded to them?—I think it would be a good thing—in the interests of the people themselves as much as anything.

7443. If such power is given to guardians, would it not imply an obligation on the guardians to provide properly for such cases if they had obtained their removal?—I think they have that obligation now, to provide adequately for all sick.

7444. It does not follow that they always discharge that obligation?—No, but they are increasingly doing so.

7445. You give us, for example, the case of the Pocklington union?—Yes. That is a case where they will not treat the women as well as they treat the men. That is a pure question of expense, they say.

7446. I can understand that there might be hesitation on the part of a magistrate, or whoever it may be who signs an order for compulsory removal, if he was not quite satisfied that the condition of the provision for the sick in that particular union was what it should be?—He would have to exercise a discretion then, I suppose.

Return of number of visits to cases made by district medical officer.

7447. Still, that is a point that would have to be kept in mind. In a return of the number of visits paid by the medical officers, which you append at the end of your memorandum, I see there is a considerable difference in the numbers in the different unions?—I do not think that return can be taken as anything but tentative. I do not think they understood exactly the query, and some of them made mistakes. When I came to think it over afterwards, I saw it was a difficult thing to get. To answer your question: they no doubt do differ, but still this shows that there is on the whole a great deal of visiting.

Dispensaries.

7448. Have you any dispensaries in your district?—Yes. In Leeds and in Sheffield there are dispensaries at the central relief station where the doctors attend to see patients, and there is at the dispensary a qualified chemist who makes up all the medicines for the outdoor poor. In Sheffield they have another dispensary in the workhouse.

7449. In your opinion is that system working satisfactorily where it exists?—Yes, very satisfactorily indeed. I wish it was extended.

7450. Referring to paragraph 130 of your memorandum, you say, "There are certain points connected with the nursing question which I can develop in my oral evidence." Is there anything that you now wish to add on that point of nursing?—I said something, I think, yesterday with regard to the practice of obtaining the services of probationer nurses, which I need not repeat.

Nursing for outdoor paupers.

7451. How do the guardians provide for the nursing of the outdoor sick generally in your district?—In the large districts of Sheffield, Bradford, and Leeds, they subscribe very largely to nursing associations. They find that a very satisfactory way of getting the poor nursed, because they get qualified nurses, who cover a great deal of ground. They pay, I think, very large subscriptions, amounting to £100 or £200 a year in some cases, and then they get the services of the nurses of these associations, and the outdoor poor get great benefit from that. There is an Order of the Local Government Board empowering boards of guardians to employ district nurses for the outdoor poor, but it is a curious thing that that Order has never been used to any extent, though they avail themselves of the same system by subscribing to these associations.

7452. Are you aware of any reason why they should be?—No, I do not see any reason for it, except that it is a new thing, and there are conservative views, and it is very difficult to get a brand new system started.

7453. Taking the more rural portions of your district, how do they manage there?—The nursing of the rural poor, I am afraid, is done entirely by the people in the village; at any rate, a great deal of the nursing is done by neighbours who are brought in, but that is not skilled nursing, of course.

Difficulties attending workhouse nursing system.

7454. Are voluntary agencies for providing village nurses extending in your district?—There are some, I believe, but that is a point which I have never had time really to investigate. I may say, with regard to the nursing, that the great difficulty is to make the superintendent nurse and the master and the matron work in harmony together. That is really a great difficulty. I have one or two cases at present which are giving me a great deal of anxiety and trouble, and it is very difficult to know what to do in regard to them.

7455. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Are those in the smaller workhouses?—No.

7456. Are they in the big ones then?—Yes; it is the big ones where there is very great importance attached by the master to his functions, and by the superintendent to hers.

7457. And by the matron, too, to hers?—Yes.

Return as to workhouse nursing in district.

7458. (*Dr. Downes.*) Those are administrative difficulties?—Yes. I have put in a nursing return (see App. Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (G),) which shows that the nursing in Yorkshire is very good, I think something like twelve patients per nurse, which is an extraordinarily good percentage. I may say that I do not think there is any district except Lancashire which is as well nursed as my district; and that is entirely a growth of eight or nine years.

Cost of administration of separate infirmaries.

7459. Have you any information as to the cost of administration of the separate infirmaries in your district?—No; except as to one, which is exceedingly high; that is Halifax.

7460. Are there any special reasons why Halifax should be so costly?—No, except the very large extra staff. When you set up an absolutely brand new establishment and have a very large staff, it means running up the expense. That is what has happened there. Then, of course, there is the payment every year of the loans and the sinking fund. Then Sheffield will be very expensive. They have separated the administration, and that will put on, I should think, £1,000 a year, or something like that, extra at once. You must pay for these things.

7461. What steps do the guardians at Halifax take to secure that their infirmary is not used by classes who could afford to pay for their medical relief otherwise?—I am not aware that they have taken any steps.

7462. Is there a tendency of a hospital of that sort to be, I will not say abused, but to be used by a class for which it was not originally intended?—That I cannot tell you.

7463. You have no evidence on that point?—I have no evidence whatever on that point.

Methods of dealing with particular classes of sick paupers.

7464. Do the guardians in your district co-operate in any cases systematically with voluntary hospitals or other agencies for sick relief?—Do you mean by sending patients and so on?

7465. They may do so perhaps in several cases, and they may subscribe?—They subscribe for the right to send a patient, the use of one bed, and so on. To some extent they do that.

Phthisis.

7466. Taking special cases such as phthisis, do they do so in those cases?—The cost of that is prohibitive, in the view of the guardians, and I think there is very little done. The weak point in the treatment of phthisis is that the people return to exactly the same conditions as they were in when they contracted or developed the disease, and unless you can get a phthisis patient to put on a new life with a different environment, he is as likely as not to come back again with a repetition of the same thing.

Infectious diseases.

7467. Have you any difficulty with regard to other classes of sick? Take the infectious sick; what do the guardians generally do with cases of fever or infectious disease? Do they send them to the sanitary authority's hospitals?—Very often, and I am always urging them to do that. I do not think that the infectious wards

of hospitals and workhouses now are used, except for measles and the minor diseases of children. I think anything like scarlatina or any of the other infectious diseases they try to send to the sanitary authority.

Tuberculous children.

7468. Have you any difficulty in dealing with such classes as tuberculous children? Have you any seaside homes or places of that sort to which the guardians can send such cases?—There is a seaside home, I think, at one or two places in Yorkshire, and they do send a child occasionally; they can, at all events, whenever there is room, but there is not sufficient of those establishments to meet the demand, I think.

Ringworm.

7469. Then you have that troublesome class of children suffering from ringworm or ailments of that description; how do the guardians in your district deal with them?—I do not think there is any special treatment for them. They try and isolate them always.

7470. Do they educate them while they are isolating them?—No, I do not think they do. There were some cases at Halifax that you remind me of now. There were children there for months and months running about the grounds without any instruction; and I suggested to the guardians that they should try and get them taught something—they were simply running wild.

7471. The loss of education, I think you will agree with me, is a serious matter?—Very much so.

Need for inspection of out-relief.

7472. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Did your experience in East Anglia lead you to think that an increase in the inspectorate with a special view of out-relief was desirable?—I certainly think so. I think there are lots of places there where inspection would have been very desirable indeed.

7473. That is to say, in those unions where perhaps the level of administration is lower than it is in Yorkshire, you felt more strongly the need of assistance, especially with reference to out-relief?—Certainly. My remarks apply quite as much to my former district as to where I am now.

Advantages of "whole-time" clerks to guardians.

7474. As regards the clerks in the East Anglian unions, they, I suppose, only gave part of their time to the duties of their office?—I cannot tell you exactly how many did, but there were certain clerks who were solicitors and did not give their whole time to the office.

7475. I suppose in your present district they generally give their whole time, do they?—The very large majority do, I think; but that I could verify easily. My own opinion about it is that a clerk *ad hoc* is the best clerk

7476. And that when you have a clerk *ad hoc* who really cares for his work the level of administration inevitably rises?—Yes.

7477. The clerk does not necessarily dictate the policy, but he constantly and continuously improves the manner of administration?—Yes, and takes an interest in the work of all the committees and everything connected with it—that is my experience. Such men may not be perhaps as good advisers on the general law, but they get to know the particular law very soon, and I think they display a very much greater interest in the social side of the question.

7478. And the guardians really get very much more help from them?—They do.

Proper number of cases for a relieving officer.

7479. In paragraph 131 you tell us that a good relieving officer can look after 300 cases, assuming that he has no other duties. I am afraid I am very stupid, but will you kindly tell me what you mean by looking after 300 cases?—I think you will see that is quoted from "A very experienced superintendent."

7480. I do not want to press you as to a particular number, but I should like to know what you would mean by looking after 200 or 300 or 500 cases?—Cases mean the applications in the report book—not the number of persons, but the number of houses. I call a house a case.

7481. Would it be the average number, the mean number, from the 1st January to 1st July?—No, not at all. Here is an application and report sheet; *that* is a case, there are three people there; *this* is another case, and there are six people there. A case therefore may mean three people, or more, or of course it may only mean one.

7482. At what period of the year do you say that 300 is the number he ought to be able to look after? Is it the average number between July and January?—I never thought of it from that point of view, but I should say 300 on his books at any time.

7483. At any one time?—Yes.

7484. Including applications?—They would be included, I suppose.

7485. And including those who were simply referred to the workhouse?—A good many of course would be given workhouse orders and dealt with at once, but others would require visiting. It all depends upon the density of the population and the size of the area. A good relieving officer can do a great deal more work in a small densely populated district, than a man who has a large area to compass.

7486. Of course in a rural area he would have a much smaller number of cases?—Yes. Look at the distances in Pocklington that the man there has got to walk.

7487. I think you have told us that in your judgment you recommend that the relieving officers should be relieved of their duties as registrars and assistant registrars?—You cannot give a general rule for that, because all these unions have special characteristics; but I think wherever a man has a large amount of relief work it is inconsistent and incompatible for him to have these other duties.

7488. And that the whole tendency should be to get these duties undertaken by other people; for instance, the vaccination work might be transferred to the county council?—That I do not know; that goes into another question.

7489. But it does bear, does it not, on the duties of the relieving officer?—Of course you must find somebody else to do it.

Question of transfer of administration of vaccination.

7490. All I was going to ask you was whether in your opinion it was desirable that questions like vaccination policy should be mixed up with guardians' elections?—I do not think they should myself. I think that the Poor Law ought to be divested of all other entangling issues, and vaccination is a very entangling issue in some districts.

7491. It becomes a test question at elections, does it not?—Yes.

Inspection of children boarded-out within the union.

7492. As regards inspection of children boarded-out within the union or in scattered homes, I think the same remark applies, does it not, as applies to the general increase of the inspectorate; is it possible for you to inspect as much as you would wish the children who are boarded-out within the unions?—I do not know that it is my duty to inspect them more than any other outdoor relief cases. These boarded-out children are practically all outdoor relief cases.

7493. At the present time the only persons whose duty it is to inspect the children boarded-out within the union are the relieving officers?—Yes.

7494. And the guardians?—The committees of the guardians.

7495. It is their duty to visit?—Yes; and then there is the district medical officer.

7496. When you are visiting a union, is it possible for you to test how far this work is done?—I have only, I think, on one occasion made a tour to see the boarded-out children, and I certainly found two out of eight or ten in homes which I should not have advised putting them into. That is all I can say. The rest were very well and satisfactorily done.

Record of after-careers of Poor Law children.

7497. Are any records kept, as far as you are aware, of the subsequent careers of the children who have been brought up in these kinds of institutions or scattered homes?—Yes, I always make a very great point of that. The necessity of after care in the case of these children is almost as important as the bringing of them up.

7498. Is there any special form of record which is used?—There is a register which is published by the law stationers called the Register of Young Persons, which they can buy and enter up, showing where the children have gone to and what has become of them. A good superintendent or matron or other official very often does keep in touch with these children. I know one case at Hessle in Hull where they have a *reunion* once a year of old boys who come back and see the superintendent; and so they keep in touch with them.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

7499. May I say that in the majority of your unions, supposing you call for this record book five years hence, you could find practically what had happened to all the children who were in the school say five years ago?—Yes. I think there are a great many of these Yorkshire unions where they do make the children a special thing, and I fancy they would be able to tell you pretty clearly what had become of nearly all the children. The most hopeful side of the Poor Law is the children's side.

7500. What I have learnt from one or two other inspectors is that they do not seem to think that the subsequent records of the children are very carefully kept?—Perhaps they are not in a great many cases; in some of the rural workhouses where they keep them in, I should not think they were.

7501. Or even in some district schools, which are on a much larger scale? The inspectors think records exist there, but I am not sure they do?—I do not know as to that.

Female labour and wages in East and West Ridings, and their effect on pauperism.

7502. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) It was suggested yesterday that there was a large superfluity of female pauperism over male pauperism in Yorkshire, and I see there are twice as many women as men in the West Riding and three times as many in the East Riding?—Yes, that is so.

7503. You have handed me a very interesting document giving the particulars of female labour in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire, which I have not had time to study. (See Appendix Vol I. (A), No. XV (Q).) I see from it, however, that the highest wage earned by women is given as 22s. per week, and the average, as far as I can make out, has been about 12s. per week. Do you think the lowness of the wage would be one reason why the women are not so self-supporting to the end of their lives as the men?—I have no means of testing that supposition.

7504. Take this statement of yours—"The reason why pauperism is less in some of the textile districts is largely owing to the amount of female labour, the wages of which often and often keeps a family from the parish. When the female wage-earner falls ill there is nothing for it but the relieving officer"?—I repeat that statement, because I have heard it over and over again from relieving officers.

7505. Would that be in cases where the men were earning as well?—Possibly; but sometimes they have their family earning a lot of money—father, mother, and children are all earning sometimes, and they have a very large sum going into the house when they are all working. The case where the relief comes in is generally where there is only one child earning and the rest are dependent. Those are the cases that I have mentioned, and if that wage earner is stricken down by illness or anything unfortunate, then they come on the rates.

7506. What I want to suggest is that the reason why women do not hold out to the end is that they are not expected to be self-supporting. That is to say, their money goes very largely while they are earning to the support of their families, and as you pointed out yesterday it does not go into benefit societies for themselves?—That is so.

Former female benefit societies.

7507. At the end of the 18th century there were a very much larger number of female benefit societies than there are now, and a great many women in them, but the wages were very much lower then. Would you agree with me that that rather points to the fact that it is more a question of what a woman is expected to do in the way of making provision for herself, than of what she is able to do?—I do not suppose she ever was expected to do it until very recently.

7508. My point is that at the end of the 18th century she was expected to do it and did do it?—How long did it last for?

7509. It had been going on for a very long time. You mentioned to us three towns where you consider the administration is lax, especially in relation to relief, those towns being Huddersfield, York, and Pontefract. Looking through your list of women's wages I find that the lowest point touched is in those three unions. For instance, in Huddersfield, jam factors earn from 6s. to 8s., and bookbinders from 5s. to 9s. a week?—Those may be girls. You must take those figures as including girls and women, and I fancy that the lower wages are always earned by girls of fifteen and sixteen.

7510. The highest in the jam factory is 8s., and the highest in the bookbinding is 9s. The jam factory is also a season trade, is it not?—Yes.

7511. Is bookbinding a season trade?—I should not think so.

7512. Then if we turn to Pontefract we find that the agricultural wages, which in other rural unions are 2s. a day, fall as low as 1s. 3d. That is the union in which I think you pointed out that there was lax administration?—There has been in the past. I think it is improving.

7513. Then wages may possibly rise. If we turn to York we find the lowest point touched in private laundries, where the women work sixty hours for 5s. a week?—I was told that by a relieving officer. He said they worked very terrible hours for very low pay.

7514. Of course it is impossible for them to live upon that?—Yes.

7515. Do you think that would be subsidised by Poor Law relief?—I have no doubt that the way they have got those facts is that they have come before the relieving officers. All these figures that I have got have come from the wage-earning notes of relieving officers, so that they really are correct, I think.

7516. The labour in the fields around the York out-relief union also falls as low as 1s. 6d. a day?—1s. 6d. to 2s.

7517. The confectionery works in York, I believe, are a great feature of the city?—Yes. Messrs. Rowntree have developed very large works there.

7518. I see the girls there earn 5s. to 8s. a week?—Yes. Rowntrees are the best wage payers in York.

7519. I suppose 5s. to 8s. a week is not a living wage, even in York?—No, but it probably helps to keep the house going. There are probably sisters working together in the factories.

7520. I see in the three districts of Halifax, Bradford, and Hunslet, widows with children may work in the mills, but are mostly employed as charwomen earning from 7s. to 8s. a week?—That is in Hunslet.

7521. Those would be receiving out-relief, I take it?—Those figures, no doubt, were founded on out-relief cases.

7522. Where the women do largely work in mills, could you tell us what the effect is on the homes?—I do not think I can say that, because I have no personal knowledge, as I have not investigated the conditions of the homes. I have frequently heard from the matron of workhouses that girls who have been in mills never know how to sew, and that they really are quite devoid of the domestic requirements for keeping the house going. When the mill life begins very early, it has a deteriorating effect to that extent.

7523. Can you tell us to what extent generally married women work in the mill?—They very often work in mills.

7524. Is there any system by which they provide for the care of the children in their homes?—That I do not know.

York and Sheffield as fields for investigation.

7525. Should you suggest that one of these districts, say York, would be a good one for investigating the relations between wages and Poor Law and charitable relief?—I do not think you can get a more interesting place to investigate than York. It has already been done, as you know, on a very detailed scale by Mr. Rowntree. Any of the West Riding towns would give scope for an interesting special inquiry, I think, with regard to the Poor Law. Sheffield perhaps would be the best of all, because there are so many different kinds of administration there, particularly as regards the children. One union adopts the case paper system, which I could give the Commission full particulars about.

Case-papers.

7526. I was going to ask you whether you use those papers?—There is one place where they are used, and I have got a full description of it from the man who put it into effect, showing the cost of it. I think that would be very valuable.

7527. Will you put in those case papers?—Certainly. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV (R).)

Low cost of food.

7528. On p. 52 of your Memorandum you tell us a great deal about the dietaries of the people, which is very interesting, and you point out the cheapness of the food which can be got by those who know how to buy?—I do not think there was ever a time when you could buy so much for so little.

Workhouse dietaries misleading as scale for minimum cost of food.

7529. Do you consider that by taking the workhouse dietaries and prices you can get a real test of what the poor can live on by themselves?—No, not at all. I am afraid that would be a very misleading standard.

7530. That is the standard which has been used in the inquiries in York, is it not?—Yes, I think it is to a certain extent.

7531. I think it was the basis of all Mr. Rowntree's calculations?—Yes. I think, in the light of the latest medical knowledge—and of course the latest medical knowledge may always be altered by new medical men—there really is no settled theory of nutrition. I think Professor Chittenden's experiments have proved that.

7532. Moreover, the workhouse authorities cannot buy as the people themselves can buy?—Quite so. They would not be allowed to.

7533. Then you would not necessarily draw the conclusion which has been drawn that the amount of pauperism in York is due to under-feeding?—I do not think it is a bit more underfed than any other town. In fact, I should think that with all the charities it has there is always something going. That is my view.

7534. (*Mr. Chandler.*) I think that with one or two exceptions your opinion is that the administration of the Poor Law in your district is satisfactory?—I think it is on the whole very satisfactory.

The irreducible minimum of pauperism.

7535. Mr. Bentham yesterday referred to one or two unions in which pauperism had reached the irreducible minimum, and you confirmed his view upon that?—I think so.

Effect on pauperism of thrift and membership of friendly societies.

7536. That you attributed largely to the industrious and thrifty habits of the people in your district?—Yes, I think those are factors.

7537. I think I may also assume from your evidence that one feature of thrift is the extent to which they have in your district taken advantage of the friendly societies which provide for sickness?—Yes.

Operation of Outdoor Relief Friendly Societies Acts

7538. Can you tell me from your own personal knowledge what has been the general attitude of the guardians in Yorkshire with regard to the Out-door Relief (Friendly Societies) Act in dealing with cases where members of friendly societies were in receipt of sick benefit?—I think the general view of the guardians was that a great slight had been put upon them by the Act.

7539. I mean the Act of 1894, which left it optional for the guardians to take these amounts into consideration, which was amended in 1904?—It did not alter the practice as far as I know. Ever since I have been in Poor Law, whenever a man has shown that he has belonged to a friendly society or has done something towards his own advancement, they have given him the best terms, so to speak, and they have disregarded perhaps half of the club allowance.

7540. There has been no rigid rule?—No; that was the general custom and practice, and therefore they felt that it was a slight upon them. There was, in fact, a new class of persons invented by Act of Parliament who were beyond their ken, and they were not allowed to deal with them upon their merits.

7541. Taking that as the practice of boards of guardians in your district, at the same time you will be aware that a majority of the guardians' representatives at Poor Law Conferences voted against the amendment of that Act?—Yes, I know.

7542. Might that not have accounted for the agitation, and election incident at Huddersfield in 1900, which you deprecated so much; might they not then have been trying to force public opinion in support of the amendment of that Act?—I do not know that, but it may have been so. I quite admit that it might have had something to say to it.

7543. As a very old member of a friendly society I was rather impressed with the incident, and I came to the conclusion that really the object of it was to focus and force public opinion in support of the amendment of that Act which was then before the country?—That does not account for the continued laxity of administration after it.

7544. Are you aware of any institutions which deal with distress arising from want of employment?—There are the trade unions.

Value of membership of trade unions.

7545. You recognise the trade unions are doing their work?—I think so. I think everybody ought to recognise that if men will join a trade union they are providing for the term of disemployment; and if they do not join a trade union they ought to have a similar duty imposed upon themselves of trying to provide for the term of disemployment.

Sentiment against applying for relief.

7546. I am very glad to get that admission from you. I agree with you thoroughly. In reply to a question by Mr. Booth in reference to the independent characteristics of people in Yorkshire, you said you had heard of instances where men stated that they would rather die than apply to the guardians for relief; was that entirely due, do you think, to the independent character of the people, or was it due to the manner in which some relieving officers and some boards of guardians deal with applicants?—Perhaps I may go so far as this with you—that the manners of relieving officers during the time when the deterrent system was in vogue were perhaps harder than they are at present, and that the reputation of that has descended, and that it may have operated in that way to prevent a man asking for relief. But I do not think that applies at all now.

7547. But the sentiment is there?—The sentiment may be there, and also the natural sentiment of not wanting to go to the parish.

7548. It is not a sacrifice of human life that is necessary, or that we should advise any individual to make however much we may admire the independence or the heroism of the man?—Quite so.

Pros and *cons* of cottage homes for children.

7549. As far as the grouped cottage homes are concerned, I gather from your remarks that you are not in favour of that system—largely on the score of expense I think?—Yes, and also because of the aggregation of children.

7550. I think you admitted they have better training in homes?—They have. The great argument on paper in favour of it I think is that they are better industrially trained.

7551. Better fitted for becoming useful citizens in after life?—For trades, yes; because they do not get into the casual labour market, which is the great thing to be avoided. The great curse and source of pauperism largely is casual labour; it spoils a man when he is about eighteen or nineteen, and he is no good afterwards.

Possibility of accurate count of total number of separate paupers in a given period.

7552. (*Mr. Loch.*) You gave us a chart showing the pauperism in the East Riding and the West Riding on the 1st January, 1904 and 1905, from which I see that the West Riding total out-door relief figure on the 1st January, 1905, was 35,116?—That is so.

7553. Then you have also given us a six months' return of out-door relief, from which I see that the six months' total out door relief figure for the West Riding for the half year ended Lady Day, 1905, was 54,158?—That is so.

7554. Can you say whether the figures exclude all duplication of cases; that is to say, whether the first it clearly a day account, and whether the second is clearly a six months' account, without any duplication of cases?—That is a statistical point which it is rather difficult for me to elucidate, because I have not got the means of testing it. It could be tested no doubt by an examination of the relieving officers' books, and by getting from him the facts of duplication, if they exist.

7555. Should we treat that comparison of the day account and the six months' account with some reserve, then?—I think so, having regard to the case that you put of the possibility and probability of duplication.

7556. Do you think you have at present in the Poor Law system an enumeration of the paupers at hand, by which a six months' account or a year's account of paupers could be made by the use of the present books?—I do not know that I could give you a satisfactory answer to

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

that. I have not considered it. I am depending upon the clerks of the unions for those figures, and unless I went to the clerks and put these points before them and asked their views upon them, I do not think I could give you a satisfactory answer. Of course I can go to them.

7557. (*Mr. Booth.*) I think the statement which the clerk makes here is that he does not pretend to discriminate between the cases that have come before him during the half year, and those that have not?—I think that is so.

7558. Therefore the total that he gives is the total number of cases, entirely irrespective of duplication?—That is, irrespective of whether they have been on the books a long time or a short time; but they are there, and they are the people that he had to deal with.

7559. I am talking of the figures which you gave on this form A, which does not indicate at all whether any of the cases came twice in the same half-year?—Certainly it would not. It is not the clerk's business to discriminate.

7560. (*Mr. Loch.*) May we say the presumption is that if this half-yearly return is kept accurately, and if there is only a single entry in regard to each person, there are no duplications?—If it is the fact, as has been stated, that there is only a single entry for each application, then this return would give the proper number of persons dealt with in the half year. But of course it is possible that a man might get relief within the half year three different times, and therefore you might duplicate that man to a certain extent.

7561. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) And he might be relieved in a different union possibly, if he went from one union to another?—Yes, if he were getting non-settled relief.

Relation between low rate of pauperism and low percentage of out-relief.

7562. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the figures you handed in (see Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (E)) respecting groups of unions, the first group you form is "rural or mostly rural"; look at the last two columns giving the percentage of cost of out-relief to total cost of in-and-out-relief; if you take those two columns, and if you also take the percentage of pauperism to population, does it not appear that the four lowest in percentage of pauperism to population, namely, Settle, Sedbergh, Ripon, and Selby, give the lowest amounts of outdoor relief?—Yes.

7563. Taking that as a test, and taking your next group, you have the same phenomenon; where the percentage of outdoor relief is low the total relief is low, as in Rotherham (West R.) and Tadcaster (West R.)?—They do show that movement.

7564. If you take the fifth group the same thing is shown, is it not—you have Knaresborough (West R.), with the percentage of out-relief the lowest and the percentage of pauperism the lowest?—Yes.

7565. If you take your sixth group you find an exception in the case of Barnsley; there you have a lower pauperism to population with a higher percentage of out-relief to total relief?—That is so.

7566. But if you take your next group, the urban and semi-urban group, there you find Ecclesall Bierlow with a low out-relief as compared with its in-and-out-relief standing low in regard to its pauperism, and you have the same in the case of Halifax (West R.)—though you have exceptions in Wharfedale and in Keighley?—That is so.

7567. Then if we take your urban groups, we have the same phenomenon shown. Take Leeds (West R.); there you have a low out-relief to the total relief with, again, a low pauperism; Sheffield (West R.) shows the same result, and so does Bradford (West R.); and Halifax (West R.) is nearly on the line. Not to push the argument too far, it is a coincidence, is it not, that in all these cases where the amount of out-relief has been low compared with the total relief the pauperism has been less?—That would appear to be so.

7568. I want you now to turn to Table A (West Riding), which is on page 3 of your memorandum. The last column of that table gives the percentage of outdoor relief; I take it that those figures, and the other figures which, so far, may represent some result, are blended figures; that is to say, they stand, not for one union, but for a group of unions with different policies?—Yes, it is a bulk percentage.

7569. Therefore the figures could not show the tendency of any policy, because the figures represent not one policy but a mingled policy?—Yes. This table does not bear on policy, it bears on the bulk of pauperism.

Relation between pauperism and thrift.

7570. On page 14 you give a table showing the proportion of pauperism to the estimated population in union counties. May we not say that if we take the mean in that table, which is marked by a line about London, there is a very much larger number of provident societies in the least pauperised districts which are below the mean than in those which are above the mean?—Yes.

7571. So that, as a general rule, this table itself shows in its bearings that there is a relation, or a presumed relation, between the existence of opportunities for thrift and a decreased pauperism?—That is the object of my putting the table in. I got the rest of these figures because I got out Yorkshire first, and I was struck with the result; then I said, Now I will see what information I can get elsewhere, and I will see how the Yorkshire figures are borne out by the figures of other unions. The result of that inquiry was this table. But I do not put it in, as I have said, as a complete table; I simply put it in as a contribution to the inquiry.

Treatment of ins and outs.

7572. I only want to give point, so to speak, to that. Then in paragraph 79 you refer to the ins-and-outs; I take it for granted from your statement there that you think that the period of detention is a real difficulty in Poor Law administration which has to be faced. You say that the period might be extended?—I want to correct a misprint or mis-statement there. The period of detention has been increased, I think, up to 168 hours.

7573. Granted that it is 168 hours now, do you think a yet further extension of the period of detention under present conditions in workhouses would meet the difficulty?—I think that the moral effect of it would be very considerable. It would indicate a policy, and a policy has a deterrent effect.

7574. I put an alternative suggestion to you: Why should not these ins-and-outs be dealt with, after a certain repetition of their incomings, under the Vagrancy Act as vagrants?—I agree there—or under any legislation that may be foreshadowed by the report of the Vagrancy Committee. They really come under exactly the same denomination of human being.

Tendency in public opinion towards increased power of detention of certain classes of paupers.

7575. Then with regard to the group referred to in paragraph 80, you would include, I presume, persons of feeble mind who could not provide for themselves as being possibly liable to detention?—Yes. I gave evidence before the Royal Commission on the Feeble-Minded—and rather extended evidence—upon the whole of this question. I think I was the first inspector who ever wrote upon the question of the feeble-minded pauper.

7576. Does not this suggest that there is a certain quantity of pauperism which is of an irretrievable type, and that some of that pauperism in self-defence the community tends to be inclined to shut up in some form, or to punish, to a degree that at any rate has not been done in the past?—I think public opinion is ripening in that direction very fast.

7577. That of itself would alter the problem of the Poor Law on one of its most difficult sides, would it not?—I think it would relieve it enormously and clear the way a great deal for the satisfactory treatment of other classes.

Conditions in York Union.

7578. Now, turning to the case of York, do you think that the peculiar conditions of York are due in part to its being a great cattle market and to its charities, these having brought together a considerable amount of unskilled labour dependent on casual earnings or gifts?—Yes. After three years' residence in York the strong impression left on my mind was that that was a very great reason. Then it is a cathedral city, with all the inherited traditions of getting things for the asking, which is very probably as old a thing as there is in the world.

Inter-action of charities and pauperism.

7579. Had you noticed in your previous district the effect of charities, in Norwich, we will say?—Norwich is a place that would repay investigation, I think. I made a long investigation of the out-relief at Norwich, and I certainly thought it was a town with something like the same characteristics as York.

7580. Then may I conclude that you cannot in these districts deal with the Poor Law problem unless you deal with the charitable problem, that is to say, the endowments of the district are acting more or less as a provocative towards pauperism?—I quite think so.

7581. If that is so, what would be your proposal for, as it were, stopping this source of social irritation that leads to pauperism?—You must knock the parochial system of administration of charities on the head.

Question of co-ordinating charity and Poor Law.

7582. Then in York, for instance, or we will say in Norwich, you would have to bring the moneys that are now available for charities more or less into one control?—You would have to pool them and administer them.

7583. You referred quite rightly to the charity organisation societies in many of these towns: but I would draw your attention to the fact that they have no responsible duty in the sense that the guardians have, and that one of the difficulties in regard to all charitable relief is that while the Poor Law has a status, charity has none. Do you think, therefore, that you could get out of the present dilemma by organising the York charities in such a way as to give them a public responsibility in relation to the administration of Poor Law relief, or in some other way?—That could be done, I suppose, by the Legislature or by the Local Government Board, by increasing the power of co-opting members of guardians—that, is instead of making it voluntary to make it mandatory to co-opt certain members as guardians: and amongst those you might ear-mark the trustees of a charitable fund administered as you say.

7584. This line might be adopted—that the guardians should deal, as they do necessarily and mainly, with destitution, and that the preventative work and other work of that type might fall on charity, and in that way the burden of the guardians would be more or less reduced?—Yes, I think so.

Reform of practice as to relief of widows with children.

7585. In one of the cases which have been mentioned—it was not a York case—there was a widow of twenty-four who was having relief immediately on widowhood. In the case of widows, is it not a common practice for the widow to make her application immediately on widowhood, and then for the Board to say, "We will give immediate interim relief pending the settlement of what we will do for you and your children"?—Yes.

7586. In those cases, if the woman is young, is it not possible to do better than to give her an allowance practically for a very long period?—Do you mean by dealing with her in some other way?

7587. By dealing with her in some way which would lead to her self-maintenance?—By trying to get some work for her, and putting her on the road of self-support?

7588. Yes?—That would be eminently the work of such a body as you have foreshadowed—a charitable board, or something of that sort.

7589. One great burthen of the guardians is the widow, I think?—Yes.

7590. If by the co-operation of the authorities that class could be dealt with in some such way, there again there would be a great relief?—Yes. If you will look at my analysis you will see the number of widows.

7591. With regard to these York cases, which have suggested a great many of these questions, would you not say that several of those cases suggest what one might call bad work?—Yes.

7592. All I want to make clear is that the Poor Law authorities in York—I am thinking of the relieving officers at the present moment—really have had a very poor chance to do their best in these cases?—They have not had half-a-man's chance.

Sufficiency of Application and Report Book.

7593. Now I want to ask you one or two general questions with regard to the forms we are using, particularly the Application and Report book form. Do you think that that as it now stands is in its best form?—If you take the Application and Report book and only use one page for each case, you can put all you want into it. But they will not do that: they keep putting three or four cases on a page. That is the difficulty I have with relieving officers—they will not give themselves room.

7594. One point which is immensely important in Poor Law work is verification, as indeed it is in all inquiry: do you find, as a matter of fact, that, partly owing to the form of book, the entries do not show verification?—I think a good relieving officer is able to get a great deal in. I have seen some excellent work done on Application and Report books. But that is not always the case. The case paper system no doubt does give a great deal more information, and information which is more readily accessible afterwards. A point, and a most important point, is the accessibility of information with regard to individuals.

7595. Take such a very important question as the verification of the wages of children; very often that verification is not down, is it?—That is so. They could not put the wages notes in.

Supervision of relieving officers.

7596. Take the case of the supervision of inquiry; does the clerk of a board by any means necessarily as a part of his duties undertake the supervision of investigation?—No. Special clerks will, because they are interested in it, but it really does not fall under them.

7597. Should not someone be made absolutely responsible locally and in connection with the board of guardians, for that being properly done?—That is so, sometimes. There are a certain number of unions in my district who have superintendents of out-relief.

7598. Should not the clerk or somebody as head officer of the whole administration be responsible?—Yes, I think so.

Disregard by guardians of relieving officers' advice.

7599. With regard to the relieving officers, have you found this happen at all at your boards—that the relieving officer is rather put aside and the applicant cross-questioned, with the result that what the applicant says at the moment is taken rather as a counterweight to anything that the relieving officer has found out?—Yes, and I think it goes further than that—I think that they will over-ride the plain facts of a relieving officer's statement, and deal with a case contrary to his advice.

7600. Does that not, from the point of view of the development of the ability of a man, deter him from doing his best?—Yes, very often they are greatly put back in their work, I think.

Qualifications of relieving officer.

7601. With regard to the selection of these men, is there any recognised Local Government Board standard of what a man to be a relieving officer should be?—I do not think so. I think that the Local Government Board would hesitate to refuse any respectable man who applies and who was thought by the people on the spot who know, or who are supposed to know, to be competent. After all, it is to be local government, and they ought to know if a man is a fit man for their job.

7602. Apart from a particular man, there are certain conditions which the duties of the office will require him to fulfil?—You and I think so.

7603. Could we not go further and say, as in other professions, that there are conditions which should be fulfilled and which the guardians should be persuaded as far as possible, to put it mildly, to adopt, because, as I understand, there are no such conditions at present in vogue?—As a matter of fact there are not, but I think some guardians, at least in my district, do certainly take pains to get a good man. However, there is no standard, as you say; there is no college of out-relief, there is no faculty.

7604. It is the ones which are tempted to do the wrong thing that one would influence on this line I am suggesting to you rather than those who are doing the right thing?—Yes.

Sufficiency of relieving officers' salaries.

7605. With regard to the emoluments and so forth, is the position of relieving officer good enough to get the best men?—I answered that before by saying that the salary gets so many applicants for it that the guardians naturally say that the salary is enough.

7606. The salary that is now offered is the salary in the open market for more or less unqualified talent?—That is so. I say that a good relieving is worth anything from £200 to £500 a year if he does his duty, because he saves the money to the ratepayers.

7607. If you insist on getting qualified men, they would ask for and get a better salary, would they not?—I think so.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

Operation of Relief to School Children Order.

7608. With regard to the Underfed Children Order of 1905, do you think that Order is necessary under our present law? It is an order by which, as you know, the child can be treated, not exactly apart from the parent, but under it the tendency is to consider the destitution of the child, and then, to come down on the parent—if you will, to make him a loan, or to prosecute him. Do you think that we want this Underfed Children Circular, if boards of guardians do their part properly in their districts?—That opens up a very controversial question, and I do not know whether I ought to give my opinion as a private person on an Order which I, in my official position, ought to help to administer.

7609. Then I would put it in this way; the question of the neglect of the parent arises at once on this Order, does it not?—Yes, I think that the laws of the land are perfectly adequate for bringing every man who neglects his children by starving them, to the police court or to the bar of public opinion. If the law was stringently administered, I believe you would stop the starving of children to a great extent.

7610. The guardians already have power, have they not, if they hear of a man who is starving or neglecting his children, to bring an action?—They can certainly bring an action, or they can get the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children to do so.

7611. Therefore, to that extent, the Order is only emphasising in a new direction a power which the guardians have already, that is to say, a power of prosecuting when to their knowledge there was this neglect?—Yes, and they had a power of relieving.

Effect of "Employment Relief" by non-Poor Law authorities.

7612. Take another question in which you have a concurrent method if I may so call it—concurrent to our ordinary Poor Law methods. In the case of another movement, the case of the unemployed workmen, you are creating, are you not, a concurrent authority for the relief of presumably destitute people—or at least an authority which is in great measure concurrent to the Poor Law authority?—Yes.

7613. If this policy of concurrent administration is carried out, will you not, by that very method weaken or break your central and local Poor Law administration, by reason of the fact that you are creating outside the circle of pauperism which you can definitely count, new circles of dependants, as you may call them, which you cannot definitely count, so that you may never know, as you do now, the actual limits of pauperism?—Practically one of the sections of my analysis, that is, Destitution owing to Want of Employment, has to a certain extent been taken out of our hands and handed over to the corporations.

7614. Destitution owing to the want of employment as you say has gone over to the corporations, and the question is how far is that affecting the statistics that we are now using?—For instance, would the statistics of able-bodied pauperism in your towns have been much higher if it was not for that?—No. They have not applied to us, but they have applied to the corporations, and so it is only relieving them by another hand, and that a hand which does not disfranchise.

7615. Do you conclude from that that we are really creating a pauperism which does not appear on our books, as it were, in addition to the pauperism which does appear?—I thought so last year. I attended the Bureau of Labour at Bradford, and the Bureau of Labour at Leeds, and I heard cases come up, and saw them dealt with in both those bureaus. They were absolutely the same class of cases as those which come before the boards of guardians; for instance, a woman with a child in her arms came and said she had had nothing to eat all day, and the man could not find work, and they were set to work by the corporation. They were really Poor Law cases.

7616. I take it you would approve of the policy of concentration on Poor Law lines, that is, of co-operation with institutions, rather than of the policy, if I may so call it, of dispersion which I think these measures suggest?—I think so. I think it is a mistake to break up your problem like that.

Qualifications for "aged and deserving" relief.

7617. With regard to the Aged and Deserving Poor Order, can you say what have been the tests of deserving or the definitions of "deserving" with your boards?—I do not think anyone can say that. It all depends on what you think.

7618. Take one definite matter—that there is provision for a family when members of it can help; would that be taken as a test?—How do you mean, provision for a family?

7619. In the case of aged persons, when the members of the family can assist, that whether they do or do not assist should be taken as a test of whether it is a deserving case?—I think as a rule guardians are quite willing to help in those cases where they get the relatives to contribute. A great many boards are getting a great deal more money than they ever did from relatives—it is an increasing figure.

7620. Would thrift be a test?—Yes; a man who helped himself by belonging to a friendly society would be taken to be exercising thrift.

7621. Would the converse be held, namely, that persons who had not done these things should not be treated as if they were deserving poor?—To a certain extent, yes—in Yorkshire certainly.

Question of applicability to England of Danish system of old age relief.

7622. Then with regard to the aged poor, are you in favour of a system like the Danish system, giving a statutory claim at sixty, conditional on inability to provide what is necessary for maintaining oneself and one's dependants?—I do not think I should be inclined to give my assent to any of those propositions, or to any of those large sweeping measures. I do not think you can argue from Denmark to London or England.

7623. The whole of the poor law system is based on its being discretionary in regard to outdoor relief, is it not?—Yes.

7624. This, in the main, is an outdoor method of relief to the aged poor in Denmark—not necessarily so, but in the main; therefore if this were adopted it would be adopted, as it were, quite in a contrary spirit to the discretionary nature of our Poor Law, would it not?—Certainly.

7625. Therefore, so far as the aged poor were concerned, when they had reached a certain age, all that would fall out of our poor law administration, *ipso facto*?—By its statutory character.

7626. The only thing that would be left to do would be to make the arrangements. Do you think that any such scheme as that would be desirable from the point of view of the thrift and well-being of the people?—It is a matter of pure speculation, but I do not think so.

7627. One other point as to the financial side of the question: I think you said that you were opposed to there being a county council authority in charge of the Poor Law?—Yes.

Larger areas for special Poor Law purposes.

7628. Do you think that a county authority representing the Guardians would be of assistance in Poor Law administration for such purposes as those institutions which are better provided by groups of unions, rather by single unions for themselves; such institutions, for instance, as might deal with the feeble-minded or with phthisis or with with ringworm cases, or whatever it might be; for that purpose, do you think that a county guardians authority—not a county council, but a representation of guardians on a common county body—would be of service?—Do you mean elected from the guardians of the county?

7629. Yes?—I should have to consider the pros and cons of that. I do not think I could give any opinion on that until I have considered it.

7630. And you have no suggestion to make for a central county organisation of these institutions other than that which you have already in your mind?—No. The local animosities and jealousies and antipathies are very great, and the love of their own union and the authority of their own union is the strongest thing in local government. You break that down when you propose to elect a new county authority for anything. I do not think it would be considered—that is my first impression—I think it would be opposed right and left.

7631. Do you think, taking the whole of the afflicted cases, which are also an important factor, that an authority

like that might be formed for them?—That is a different thing, because there is an accepted feeling about those. They have to be dealt with. There are no two questions about that. In regard to those cases I think that suggestion might be adopted.

Control of pauper lunatics.

7632. Including lunacy?—All pauper lunatics, I think ought to be under our own control.

7633. Under the poor law control?—Yes; we pay for them.

7634. In accordance with this county suggestion, if I may so call it, would it fall in with your views if lunacy and all other forms of affliction, such as the epileptics and feeble-minded, were dealt with by one authority?—Yes.

Exchequer grants for Poor Law purposes.

7635. And that a county authority?—That, I think, is decidedly a matter to be considered.

7636. With regard to grants from the central Government towards Poor Law purposes, what grants do you get?—We get the officers' salaries as they were in 1888.

7637. And besides that?—The Agricultural Rates Act.

7638. And then there is a Lunacy grant?—Then there is the Lunacy grant from the county council of 4s. per head for those who are kept in asylums. Those are the main grants.

7639. You do not get a grant per inmate of the workhouse as we do in London, do you?—Nothing of the sort

7640. Do you think that these special grants for particular purposes are advisable—I am especially referring to the first you mentioned, the officers'?—I do not think that the Guardians, as a rule, appreciate the fact that that grant is paid. They look upon the officers as being paid by themselves, and they are always complaining of the salaries as if they paid them. They do pay the difference between the salaries now and those of 1888, but I really do not think that a large number of the Guardians at all appreciate this fact, and to that extent they act really as if the salaries all came out of the rates.

7641. Would it matter very much if the salaries did come out of the rates, and that grant were withdrawn?—I do not think it would.

The lunatic grant.

7642. Take the 4s. grant for lunatics. Do you think that principle is good of paying for the individual in that way, or do you think that it tends to filling lunatic asylums rather unduly with cases somewhat unsuitable for lunatic asylums?—Of course getting that 4s. in aid is an inducement to a certain extent to the guardians to send those patients; at the same time a great number of harmless lunatics are kept in the workhouse, and they are maintained at very much less in the workhouse than they are in those institutions.

7643. Suppose we dealt with the question a little more broadly from the point of view of the afflicted classes generally; what would you say to a suggestion of this kind—that a grant might be made from the Exchequer in the nature of an open grant, subject to report, instead of on the basis of the 4s. payment, on the understanding that the grant were made in accordance with the number of the afflicted class in the county?—Do you mean on an average.

7644. Yes?—I have not considered that.

7645. I am assuming that the 4s. grant is open to considerable criticism, and that possibly some alternative to it should be suggested with a view to two purposes, namely, with a view to meeting the want as it arises for the different classes of the afflicted—not merely for lunatics but for other classes—and to provide the special type of institution that the special sort of infirmity might require; and also possibly with a view to this happening, that the county may from voluntary sources raise money for some special purposes, such as, for instance, for the epileptic, and that the grant available from the Exchequer should be used somewhat as an addition to that, with a view to provoking voluntary effort?—I have not considered that suggestion. Would this suggestion be in connection with the body that you foreshadowed to deal with the afflicted classes generally?

County authority for dealing with "afflicted" paupers.

7646. There might be a county committee or a county council committee, but I take your evidence to be directly opposed to a county council committee?—Yes.

7647. It would be some county organisation that would supply these institutions which a union might not or could not well supply for itself?—I have no objection to the suggestion that you make to the erection of a county board, as it were, for dealing with the afflicted classes, because I think that would be a very useful form of co-ordination; but I am not prepared to say how financial aid should be given by the Exchequer at present—I should like to consider it.

7648. One effect of this would be that probably the lunatics who are even now retained in the local workhouses might be removed from them, thus in some measure, at any rate in many unions where there is no special provision for lunatics, leaving a large amount of space for the workhouse proper?—There is no doubt that all the space we have in our workhouses is badly wanted, and that we should be very glad to get more room without spending more money. At the same time I think that to a great many of these lunatics and harmless imbeciles who are in the workhouse, it has been their home for many years, and they use it and look upon it as their home, and I think it would be rather a hardship for some of them to go away.

Increase of rateable values.

7649. Those that are there now, certainly. With regards to grants generally from the Exchequer, is it not true that local rateable values are increasing very much?—They certainly have been increasing, as you will see by my figures, in Yorkshire.

7650. To a great extent might not the policy of central grants be limited, because one criticism of the policy generally is that they tend to extravagance?—That is the great objection to a national rate for the poor, of course.

Question of limitation of Exchequer grants.

7651. Therefore, might not the policy be rather pushed of throwing the maintenance of the poor still further than it is at present on the local bodies—purely on the rates?—You might try and see what they say about it.

7652. I understand that ultimately the question that you yourself brought up is a question of economy. The question of Poor Law expense is a very important one, because it is increasing largely, year by year; therefore, if one is to tackle that problem, does not this seem to be almost on the threshold of the question?—Limiting the sum that is to be spent?

7653. Limiting the sum that is to be granted from Exchequer sources?—That is all on the assumption that the present guardians have been looking upon this as an extra aid from outside which they can rely on, and that they do not mind spending it. But I do not altogether agree that they look upon the grant in aid as anything but part of the ordinary income. I do not think half of them know where it does come from.

7654. Then I should infer that there would be the less trouble in withdrawing it?—If you could say nothing about it, it would be all right.

Possibility of economy in connection with Poor Law buildings and staffs.

7655. Again, is there any other way in which economy of Poor Law relief could be adhered to?—I have suggested a closer knowledge and inspection of all architectural work, and insisting upon sketch plans being always submitted before anything detailed is done. I have known of very highly prepared plans being sent which were not at all desirable, and all that money was wasted; that could have been obviated by consultation with a travelling architect.

7656. I have noticed in your own Memorandum, in regard, I think, to grouped cottage homes, how very large the staff is?—It is enormous; that is, because of the foster-mother system in the grouped home system. You will find that each family has a foster-mother, which makes it a sort of cross between the scattered home system and the grouped home system. You get the home life and you get the mother, the individual, looking after the family; but when they go out of doors, they are in another class and are a sort of community with other officers common to all.

7657. In the table that you give on page 33 of your Memorandum, you say, "It will be seen that there were twenty-three officers with salaries amounting to £600 to look after 101 children?"—That is at Ecclesall. I think the guardians are now beginning to see that.

7658. Is there any kind of method of preventing what is after all a permanent expenditure to that extent?—The Local Government Board have always gone on

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

the principle that they do not favour any particular system of dealing with children. They say the systems are all good, and you may choose such as you think best for your locality. This locality said, "We think, after a long examination, that the industrial side of this system is the best and most improving for the children, and we will adopt it." I spent a long time trying to show them that there were other and more economical ways of doing it, but they would not listen to me. The idea had taken hold of them, and they carried it out.

Publication of particulars of cost of various methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

7659. Is it possible to do more in this way, namely, to have the various methods and the expense of them set out in some very simple form for circulation to guardians?—There would be no difficulty in doing that. Anybody could draft a Memorandum of that character who had the proper information.

7660. Would that not be of some assistance?—It would certainly be a form of intelligence which would be very easily got out and circulated.

7661. And the Press might have it too, possibly?—Yes, certainly.

Labour yards.

7662. With regard to those times of difficulty when there are unemployed and so on, so far as the paupers are concerned, are you in favour of the labour yard?—A labour yard is a thing that has to be very carefully guarded and watched, because there are certain classes of the community who are perfectly willing, for some curious reason, to live on the most ridiculously small wage, so long as it is regular. They can get a regular subsistence out of a labour yard as long as it is there and they can go to it. Those sort of people become stereotyped, and unless you deal with them in varied ways, they will be on top of you all the time.

7663. If you found the same man coming again and again, could you not offer him the house?—I was going to say that the only method of dealing with such a man is to say, "Well, I am afraid you must go up to the house." They do that in Sheffield, and the relieving officers there say that is the only way they can deal with it.

7664. Would you retain the labour yard as a method?—I think it is most important to have the labour yard. I think if they have the machinery ready to put it in work at certain periods, it would be a valuable aid, because then you will have something enabling you to say, "Here you can come and do something."

7665. Do you find that the guardians, when they open a labour yard, increase their staff in order to supervise it properly?—They always have a superintendent of some sort, because that is one of the conditions which the Local Government Board will insist upon.

7666. Will that be irrespective of the number admitted into the yard?—I think so. They must be superintended.

7667. You may want a group of three, four or five superintendents if it is a very large yard?—I think as a rule, experience shows that the numbers do not go on increasing.

Danger of too lavish "employment-relief" in labour yards and elsewhere.

7668. Is the borough relief for the unemployed that you have referred to in any degree—apart from the question of the political franchise—more attractive than the labour yard relief?—I am afraid it is. I am sorry the Chairman of the Bradford Board is not here. I sat at a Relief Committee in Bradford the other day—quite by accident I went there—and two cases came up, of men with wives and families. These were Poor Law cases, but the same principle holds good. They were earning nearly as much at the test labour as they could earn outside when they were in full work. They appeared two very bad cases, so much so that I wrote to the Chairman, Mr. Bentham, and asked him to bring it before the Revision Committee, because I thought if this was going on to any very great extent, it was a very bad business. [The facts I have since ascertained to be as follows:—Both men when in full work earned 24s. per week. When on test A got 20s. 10d. for nine persons, of which 5s. was in school meals for children, and 10d. consumed as soup at noon by himself daily. The balance was represented by 7s. 6d. in money and 7s. 6d. in kind. B got 17s. 10d. for eight persons, of which 3s. was for school meals, 10d. soup. The balance was 7s. in money and 7s. in kind. These figures no doubt alter the complexion of the cases. The point of importance seems to be what the average wage of these men would be in Bradford in winter. What I understood at the Committee when I attended it was that they would not be able at that time to earn as much if they were in work as they were getting on test.]

7669. That was a Poor Law Committee?—Yes. I do not know what sort of work the men do for the borough, but I should imagine that very much the same remark would apply to that; at any rate they are getting wages paid out of the public funds.

7670. The labour yard system, which is payment half in kind and half in money, is a juster system, is it not, than the wage system applied to relief works?—I do not know. Those cases worked out most unjustly to the independent labourer, because they were in a much better position than the independent labourer, or than they would have been themselves if they had been engaged on wages.

7671. That is to say, the guardians had fixed too high a remuneration?—They gave too much. Each child was getting 1s. every week for breakfast. Under the Poor Law Underfed Children Order each child on the relief book was getting 1s. for breakfast, so that the more children there were, the more the man got. It was quite like the old pre-Poor Law days.

7672. It was not the labour yard, so to speak, but it was the labour yard crossed by the School Feeding Order that made the difficulty?—Yes.

Effect of Dietaries Order, 1900

7673. What has been the effect of the new dietary on your unions: has it raised in any way unnecessarily the scale of expenditure?—I think it has certainly raised it to some extent: in some unions I think it must have done so: but then, on the other hand, there has been some economy effected by the better methods that were introduced. There is very little waste now in the dietary owing to the regulations. They can get just as good a dietary now, and they can get a cheap dietary under the wonderful variety which is afforded to them, if they will only take the trouble to go into it.

7674. Do they?—I do not know. I think they have gone on very much as they began: there has not been very much alteration, I think.

7675. Is it desirable that anything should be done, as you have suggested in regard to investigation, by someone under the inspector being prepared to go and explain that kind of thing, so that it might be brought before, not merely the guardians, but also the officials?—I do not think I suggested anything of that sort.

7676. You made the suggestion in regard to the investigation for the purposes of relief: I am suggesting it with regard to other matters?—Of course you might get an expert who would report upon dietaries, but I doubt very much whether it would be advisable. I think inspectors, if they were fortified by a Memorandum from the medical side of the Local Government Board, would be able to work that sufficiently.

Effect of out relief on friendly societies.

7677. You were asked a question about the Outdoor Relief (Friendly Societies) Act and you put before us a policy of outdoor relief to the "deserving poor": do you not think that the members of friendly societies would be tempted more and more to become paupers in the strict official sense of the word, if the system of outdoor relief is based on the lines of "the deserving poor"?—I do no know that they would: the amount of people who would get the increased relief would be so very small that I do not think it would have that effect.

7678. You are not afraid of creating practically a class of "deserving poor"?—No, I do not think so. My experience in Pocklington is that it is not a very large class, and I think on the whole it seemed to be a very humane way of dealing with those old people, who after all had spent their lives on the land.

Proposed re-apportionment of lunatic grant.

7679. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) With regard to the point with which Mr. Loch was dealing a little while ago, am I right in assuming that you acquiesce in the view that it would tend to better administration if the grant of 4s. per head for lunatics were to be done away with, and instead a lump sum were given which was distributed all over the country proportionately?—He did not put it exactly in that form. That does, I suppose, put

shortly what he did mean. I really have not considered that question. I do not think I can say that I have any preference either one way or the other. The 4s. grant is a very convenient way of estimating it.

7680. I am sure we should gratefully accept such a grant in Scotland, because the footing upon which we stand now is that we have a lump sum, and I am sorry to say that owing to the large increase in lunacy the amount per head is of course very considerably reduced as the years go on?—So you are in the same position as the guardians are with regard to the officers' salaries; they are only getting what was given in 1888.

Question of prescription of further rules by the central authority for administering relief.

7681. As regards the administration of different boards of guardians, I understand you to say that at present there is a great deal of licence and elasticity in the discrimination meted out to and the treatment received by those indoor and outdoor cases?—Yes, I think there is a great deal of elasticity there.

7682. I think you are of opinion that it would be well if general rules and regulations were made, according to which a distinction or line were drawn between cases which were appropriate to outdoor relief and those which ought to receive the house only?—Yes; I am in favour of classification and treatment under regulation if possible.

7683. I think you would suggest that they should be uniformly applicable to all unions, would you not?—I think I qualified that by saying that it was very difficult to lay down any stereotyped set of rules for unions varying so much in character as you must see my district does; but I think each union ought to be able to frame a set of regulations suitable for that union. I do not think you could issue from the central authority any regulations which would do anything but excite very great criticism; I think you must allow the guardians to make those regulations, they having full knowledge of their own conditions and circumstances.

7684. Do you not think that the central body could lay down certain general lines upon which relief could be administered?—They could make suggestions perhaps, and they could frame scales, and so on; but then you know the conditions vary.

7685. Assuming that they did so, would it be a proper power to give to the inspectors—if they do not have it already, perhaps they have—to report to the central body when relief was administered otherwise than upon those general lines?—It would be rather difficult for an inspector to ascertain that, because they might keep straight when he was there.

Assistance to inspector.

7686. But he would know generally whether those lines were being departed from?—He might examine all the books, but it would take a very long time. That brings me to the point again that I want some man to do that sort of thing.

7687. But do you think it would be a proper thing to do?—I think we ought to get more information as to the way in which relief is administered in the unions.

Question of further power to Local Government Board to compel right administration of relief.

7688. If those general lines were transgressed, do you think it would be a right thing that the inspector for the district should so report to the Local Government Board with a view to their taking steps?—He should, I think, first bring the matter before the board locally, and talk to them about it, and give them counsels of perfection. That is all we can do at present.

7689. I am leading up to this—whether, supposing a board of guardians did continue to give relief otherwise than upon these lines, the central authority should not have certain powers given to them with a view to having the relief put upon a better system in that union?—They have of course certain powers in that direction, but they are only powers of expostulation.

7690. Do you think that further powers should be given?—No, I do not think you can give them. This is local government, and local government means that the people on the spot have got to do the job, as they presumably know more about it than do the people up here. That is the theory of local government, is it not? The more you trench upon that, the more unpopular the central body becomes and the more difficult it is to keep and carry on the business. Our business is to smooth things and get things done without trouble. Directly you have a manifesto from the board or a letter, or correspondence or circulars, you immediately rouse all the antagonism of the English local feeling, which is the strongest thing in the country—the jealousy of external interference.

7691. I rather understood you to say, in the previous part of your evidence, that where the boards of guardians were told that they must proceed according to the law, they were always very pleased to know that there was a law affecting the matter?—Yes, a law that they can understand.

7692. And that they at once acquiesced?—If it is a law which is absolutely mandatory and allows no shifting or alternative, yes. But it is very difficult to do that when you are dealing with a case where different views are taken of the case.

Power of central authority in Scotland to enforce execution of Poor Law.

7693. Then you are not in favour of a provision such as that which exists in Scotland to the effect that "where a parish council refuses or neglects to do what is herein or otherwise by law required of them, or in case any obstruction shall arise in the execution of the Act, it shall be lawful for the Local Government Board to apply to the Court?" You do not thinkthat a provision of that sort would be advisable in England, do vou?—What court do you apply to, may I ask?

7694. By the Statute to the Supreme Court?—I am afraid that would be considered a very drastic thing in this country.

Duties and qualifications of relieving officers and clerks to guardians.

7695. As regards the relieving officers, I understand that there is no profession, so to speak, of relieving officers in England—I mean that there are no essential requisites for qualification for such a post, nor is it recognised as a profession with certain duties and with promotion from one union to another union where the pay is better; there is nothing of that sort here?—No.

7696. The relieving officer in the union in which he is relieving officer is not so important an official as the clerk, is he?—No, nothing approaching to the clerk.

7697. Although I suppose the relieving officer, as being the officer who has to do with relief, has extremely delicate and difficult duties to perform?—His duties are very difficult and very delicate.

7698. The clerk's duties, I suppose, are to attend at the meetings of the board of guardians, to keep their minutes, and generally to do the clerical work which is appropriate to such a post?—Yes, and the legal work; he is their legal adviser in everything, so that he must have a knowledge of the Poor Law.

7699. It would occur to one—I do not know whether you would agree in that—that the relieving officer's duties are really the more important of the two?—I have always held that the relieving officer's duties are of the very greatest importance, and require a very high class of man indeed. One of the reasons of our failures, I think, is that that class is not as good a man or as well paid a man as he ought to be. I was told when I was in Scotland—it might interest you to know this—that there are very few Scotsmen in the Poor Law service in England, and a workhouse master in Edinburgh told me that the reason was that the salaries here were so low that the Scotsmen would not look at them. They pay much better in Scotland than they do in England.

Status of inspectors of poor in Scotland.

7700. The inspectors of the poor, I may say, are very much better paid, and they very often do the work of the clerk also; the clerk's duties are not so important as those of the inspector of the poor, who in many instances holds a very considerable position in the parish in which he is inspector. You have given us, I think, a list of the number of relieving officers in certain unions in your districts of the East Riding and the West Riding?—I have.

Staff of relieving officers and their functions.

7701. I think that in Leeds there are five or six relieving officers?—There are six certainly, and a cross-visitor and pay clerk besides.

7702. Do these relieving officers attend the meetings of the boards of guardians, or the committees of the boards of guardians, when they are dealing with relief cases?—Always; they are, in fact, the main sources of information on each case.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

7703. Are they all present at each meeting?—No; they only deal with a section. They have a district, and the poor of that district come before the district committee, and the relieving officer attends all cases from that district.

Offices of superintendent of outdoor relief.

7704. Is there no principal relieving officer, no head forthe five or six?—Not there. I was very much disappointed that they did not appoint what we call a superintendent of outdoor relief. They appointed a cross-visitor, and the clerk is supposed to be a superintendent of outdoor relief there. We have in Sheffield and Bradford an officer called the superintendent of outdoor relief. He drives the out-relief coach, and all the relieving officers are responsible to him and report to him. I have a specimen here of a report of the year's outdoor relief, with all the statistics of the districts and everything connected with it. That is a most valuable post, and a most necessary post. The appointment has to be by a special order of the board, and in my opinion in large urban unions there ought always to be a superintendent of outdoor relief.

7705. To whom the other relieving officers are not responsible, but to whom they would report?—They are under him. He may order them to be cross-visited by a cross-visitor. He goes into their books, and if he does not think certain cases are satisfactory, he calls them up and says: What is the reason of this case? You get then a close supervision.

7706. Do you approve of that system being introduced into all the unions in your district?—No; because there is not the work for it in all of them.

7707. Would you approve of it where there are more than two or three relieving officers?—Yes; in that case I think one of them ought to be superintendent.

Method of reducing size of boards of guardians.

7708. You have also told us, I think, that you are of opinion that for good management and for effective and business-like administration the numbers of the boards of guardians are much too large at present?—That is my opinion.

7709. But at the same time you have said, I think, as I understand it, that as each parish is at present represented on the board of guardians, you would have very great difficulty in inducing those parishes to give up the right they have to nominate a member?—I think that would have to be done by the board. Unfortunately, I think, the county council has the power to reduce these parishes, and to reduce the areas of these parishes, and the Local Government Board has not got the power.

7710. Is that the way in which you would proceed to reduce the numbers on the boards of guardians?—Yes; I should proceed to make three or four parishes into one electoral unit.

7711. Do you think that could be done without much friction or dissatisfaction?—I think that is a case in which, if you said you are going to do it and did it, it could be done and there would be no more heard about it, because the public would not take very much interest in it.

7712. I do not think you have said in your evidence anything about the boarding-out of pauper children, although you have told us a good deal about scattered homes and cottage homes?—I have given you the numbers, that is all.

Comparative merits of various methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

7713. The scattered homes and the cottage homes seem to be conducted on very extravagant lines. You have told us, I think, that eight out of ten of the boarded-out children whom you visited were, you thought, very comfortably housed and looked after?—Yes.

7714. Have you had any experience outside the union of boarded-out children?—No, I have never had any experience of boarded-out children outside the union.

7715. Have you ever heard it said, or do you know whether the system is successful or not?—Miss Evans, one of my colleagues, who is boarding-out inspector, very often comes to see me when she is in my district, as I like to get all the information I can from everywhere. I see all the cases that she reports upon. They all come to me and I read them, so that I am fully acquainted with the conditions, but I cannot say I have been personally to see the homes. I think that, on the whole, the boarding-out system has been worked all right. There are always bad cases every now and again, of course.

7716. And of course it is a very much less expensive system than any of the others?—Much less.

7717. It also has this merit, has it not, that the children are removed from the district where they have been brought up, and are free from the taint of pauperism and the stigma of pauperism, which must attach to them at their own homes or near their old surroundings?—Yes, that is so.

7718. That is a very important matter as regards the future of these children, is it not?—Yes. I should like to say, with regard to boarding-out within the union, that the guardians do not, in all cases, have committees, and then the supervision is rather lax. In a good many unions that is so; the children are left entirely, or very much to the relieving officer and the medical officer.

7719. In the cases where they are boarded out outside the union, can you say whether it is the view of the guardians that the boarding-out should be as near the union as possible, or do they sometimes go a long way?—They go long distances, I think. The difficulty is really to get homes. There are not enough homes and not enough committees. If I were to give an opinion on the facts as stated to me, I would say there seems to have been a sort of pause in the enthusiasm for the boarding-out system. You do not find the number of people coming forward and saying: We are interested in this thing, and we will form a committee. There is a difficulty in getting committees formed.

7720. Have you ever heard that that may be due to some extent to over-inspection?—I have not heard that stated, but I heard a great deal said as to that in a debate in Edinburgh at a Poor Law conference where the subject was discussed.

Detention for necessary period of paupers after surgical operation.

7721. You have spoken I think about the detention of the ins-and-outs in the workhouse; has this matter come under your notice: in the event of cases requiring very prolonged medical or surgical attention going into the infirmaries, do you find that sometimes these cases are apt to remove themselves—of course they may discharge themselves when they please—before the medical officer would certify them fit for removal?—No, I have not.

7722. That has not been brought under your notice?—No.

7723. It may be, may it not, and possibly you may have had cases—one knows of them—where a pauper requiring a surgical operation is removed for that purpose and taken into the infirmary and treated, and then he occasionally desires to leave before the medical officer will certify him fit for removal?—I do not think he can discharge himself; the master would not allow him to go out unless he has got a doctor's certificate.

7724. Has he any power to prevent his going out?—In the sick wards I think he has.

Apportionment of time of general inspector.

7725. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) I think you said you had to give a great deal of time to the inspection of workhouses, and that you could give but very little time to your more important duties, such as attending meetings of boards of guardians?—More particularly the superintendence of the great bulk of the out-relief.

7726. Might it not be said that the inspector has a very great deal of responsibility with respect to the management of the workhouse, and perhaps not quite so much responsibility in regard to the manner in which the guardians exercise their discretion?—That may be said, but I should like to know why that should be. The rate pays for all.

7727. Has the inspector any responsibility in regard to the exercise of their discretion by the board of guardians?—No, not as to their discretion in giving either outdoor relief or indoor relief. We do not interfere at all as to how the relief is given or in what method it is given.

7728. So that you have no responsibility as regards that?—That is so.

7729. But with regard to the management of the workhouse, you have a certain responsibility?—Yes, we are bound to inspect the workhouse by order.

7730. Might that not be the reason why you have to spend so much more time in visiting the workhouse than in attending the board of guardians: I only want to know whether that is not one of the reasons?—I do not know. I am not sure that the question of the responsibility that the inspector has over outdoor relief has ever been raised, but it has occurred to me personally. I have always felt it, and I thought it right to put in on my record.

7731. With regard to the inspection of workhouses do you not attach much importance to that?—I attach very much importance to it, according to the condition and state of the workhouse and the officers: but one gets to know one's officers as a rule pretty well.

7732. Your duty with regard to inspection is to see that all the regulations of the Local Government Board are carried out, and that there is a proper system of inspection, and that the officers discharge their duties efficiently?—Yes.

7733. Do you not think that if the inspection is made less frequently, or if the inspector was taken away and less time had to be devoted to them, that these workhouses would not be in the good state in which they are at present?—I think it would be impossible to reduce the number of inspections, which is only supposed to be one in the year.

Proposal to depute inspection of workhouses to assistant inspector.

7734. You would be in favour of deputing the work of inspecting the workhouses to some assistant inspector, I believe?—I think one ought to have a chance of deputing work of that sort.

7735. Might it not be taken then by the officials that the Local Government Board did not perhaps attach the same importance to the inspection of the workhouses and the management of the workhouses as they did to other duties?—I think not. I think so long as the workhouse was inspected regularly once a year, it would be all right.

7736. There is another important thing with regard to workhouse inspections. I suppose one might say that the paupers themselves look upon the visit of the inspector as a sort of link between them and the outside world?—Not so much I fancy as in the past, because so many visitors now go in. The personal visiting by guardians has done a great deal. In this country an individual guardian can go at any time into any part of the workhouse by himself or herself.

7737. Is that done to a great extent?—That is done, and that of course is a great opportunity for any inmate to make a complaint.

7738. Then you would not be in favour of having any less inspection of workhouses than there is at the present time?—No.

Advisability of more frequent attendance of inspectors at meetings of guardians.

7739. If your district was made smaller, or if in any way it was arranged that you could pay greater attention to the meetings of guardians and watch their administration of out-relief, might it not be thought that the Local Government Board was interfering too much in the administration?—I observe you state that there is a good deal of jealousy of external interference?—Yes, there is.

7740. Would it be wise then on the part of the central authority to send their inspectors down very frequently to take part in the administration?—Our inspectors all live in the district, and there is not that same feeling that there would be if they were coming *ad hoc*. I think that they welcome the inspector very much indeed, especially at these relief meetings, because the minority may sometimes appeal to him.

7741. If their attendances at the meetings were doubled or made much more frequent, would they still welcome the inspector?—I think so.

7742. There would be no jealousy of external interference?—I do not think so—not to the extent that I should put it in practice.

Proposed abolition of very small Workhouses.

7743. I observe you state that there were four workhouses in your district with less than fifty inmates; is it necessary to retain workhouses with such a very small number of inmates; could they not be amalgamated with the adjoining unions?—That is one of the questions that has been discussed. Those four are all rather curiously situated. Pateley Bridge and Sedbergh are situate in a large mountainous district with a very few inmates and a very small number of people on out-relief. I do not see that you could very well do without a workhouse there, owing to the acreage. Then Skirlaugh is a purely agricultural district; that is the only one which I would say might be thrown into another union, say Sculcoates. It is a small workhouse with only twenty-four or twenty-five people in it. It is absurd to have a workhouse for that number.

7744. What staff have they for that workhouse with twenty-four inmates?—There is a master, a matron, a general servant and a general handy man. In that case they have the whole house warmed by a boiler, and the man looks after that.

7745. Is there a nurse?—There is no nurse; the matron acts as nurse.

7745. Is there a porter?—No. Perhaps there is an assistant. I think there are four people there altogether.

7747. In your eastern district had you many small unions like that with just a handful of people?—I have shut up two workhouses altogether in my record. One of them was an isolated rural workhouse in Norfolk with about forty or fifty people in it, and of course it created civil war for three years.

7748. Why?—Because they were so anxious to retain it.

7749. The contractors or who?—Everybody wanted it. There was a tremendous row, and we had two public inquiries, I think. But I shut the workhouse up, and we distributed the inmates to the surrounding people. Everyone was delighted when it was done, and no harm happened to the poor.

7750. What was the financial result, do you know, generally on that particular union whose workhouse was shut up?—They first of all lost the staff, which was something; then the clerk was pensioned. The master had died, and it was that which enabled me to do it really.

7751. What became of the house?—The house is shut up; it is to let.

7752. Do you say that you think one of the existing unions might be shut up?—The only union in my present district that I should say might be shut up would be Skirlaugh, which might be thrown into the adjoining union of Beverley or the adjoining union of Sculcoates.

7753. Without hardship to the poor, do you mean?—I do not think there would be very much hardship. They would have to go a greater distance, but they would probably manage somehow.

Nature of workhouse inmates' complaints to inspector.

7754. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You say in paragraph 3 of your memorandum that from time to time when you visit a workhouse you get complaints from the inmates; do you find anything in these complaints?—Very seldom. They generally come from the class who have studied the Poor Law regulations and think they have got the master. They trot them out and say, Now we are going to have the master. There really is nothing in it as a rule. I listen to them most patiently; I always make a note in pencil of everything they say, and they go away perfectly satisfied.

Proposal to depute inspection of workhouses to assistant inspectors.

7755. You do, I suppose, get a good deal of information from the inspection of your workhouses from time to time, do you not? You get to know what the officers are, for instance, and you get a good deal of general information with regard to the administration of the union which you will hardly get from a paper?—Yes, you could not get it in any other way. You get to know all the chief officers, and the board and the officers both look upon the inspector really as a friend and adviser, and they do take one's advice.

7756. Is that not rather an argument against sending an assistant to do it for you?—No. I think they look upon all inspectors as fair men who will listen to their point of view and will do justice between them and the inmates. That is the general rule, I think.

7757. That is to say they would look on the assistant in the same way that they look upon you now?—I think so.

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

7758. Taking it from your own point of view, would you not lose an advantage which you gain now?—I should certainly make a visit. You can go and spend an hour in the workhouse without going into every ward, and still you can learn a great deal about it.

7759. Would you contemplate that you would visit the workhouse, but not make an inspection of the workhouse?—Certainly. You could easily keep touch with a place without going into every corner of it.

7760. You are contemplating two sorts of assistants, as I understand; one sort that would relieve you practically from the inspection of the certified schools of the smaller kind and the scattered homes, and somebody else who would inspect workhouses and have some relation to outdoor relief; have I put it rightly?—That is right.

Proposed inspection of out-relief.

7761. What do you precisely contemplate that he should do with regard to outdoor relief?—I contemplate that I should give him instructions to go and investigate the outdoor relief of a certain union. First of all he would go and interview all the relieving officers, and he would make himself thoroughly acquainted with their rounds of work. He would inspect their books and make notes of the unsatisfactory cases, or what would appear on the face to be unsatisfactory, and would put questions to the relieving officers, and if necessary would visit the homes with them in a friendly way. I think he ought to go with them on their rounds, and visit all their pay stations, and in fact spend a considerabe time, it might be a couple of days or three days, in thoroughly overhauling and superintending the work of that relieving staff. When he had done that, he would either write a report or see me, and I should then be thoroughly acquainted with the character of the relieving officers and with the way they do their business. He would attend the relief committees, and I should be informed fully. Then I could go into any matter before them as the inspector of the district.

7762. Would you contemplate that he should generally supervise the way in which the relieving officers did their work?—He should supervise for the purpose of reporting.

7763. I was rather using the word "supervise" in contra-distinction to an inspection which occurs occasionally with a view to seeing how things are done?—I should leave the routine supervision to whoever was the chief relieving officer—the superintendent.

7764. You would not at all contemplate that the central authority, or the inspector on behalf of the central authority, should undertake in any way the supervision of relief by the guardians or their officers?—No; I do not think that would be practicable.

Appointment of superintendent relieving officers.

7765. With regard to the relieving officers, would you encourage the appointment of superintendent relieving officers when that is practicable?—When that is practicable, and when there is a sufficient number to warrant it.

7766. You have pointed out that sometimes a relieving officer has too much to do and holds too many offices; the reason the guardians are anxious to appoint a man who holds more than one office is, is it not, that they thereby avoid more than one man going over the same ground?—It is to fill up his time, and for the sake of economy.

Reasons for additional duties of relieving officers.

7767. Supposing the man is not fully occupied, you must do something of the kind, must you not?—In that I quite agree; that would give an excuse for it.

7768. So that in the rural parishes where the man's time would not otherwise be fully occupied, something of that sort is essential?—I think it is, and you cannot fairly criticise it there.

7769. In the more urban unions is there not something to be said for having more relieving officers and at the same time allowing them to hold some offices such as that of Registrar; what objection would there be to that?—The appointment of more officers would do away with the objection that they have not the time, but then you would have to put two relieving officers into one district.

7770. Is that not better from some points of view than having a number of officers going over the same ground for different purposes?—I do not know. If they have got to go over the ground in all their businesses, it does not matter whether it is the same ground, does it?

7771. It takes up the man's time. Do they not say this: That if a man has occasion to go over a particular area he may as well go for two purposes as for one?—That is so, and he may get information too—there is that to be said. My main object in making the suggestion about these other offices is because they take away a man's time and energy from the work which he ought to be doing.

7772. Therefore your point is met if the arrangement is such that the man has got time for his relief duties, no matter how it is secured?—That would remove a great deal of my objection.

7773. You have told us that in one or two cases you have got rid of the workhouses?—In two cases.

Unions without workhouses.

7774. You know that in one or two cases in the Eastern district there are unions which have got no workhouses at all; Hoxne and Hartismere, I think is one?—I mention that.

7775. How does that plan work?—I say in my memorandum that I was never satisfied with the administration of that combination.

7776. Do you think that the plan of having a union without a workhouse and boarding-out the paupers, as it were, in another union, is an undesirable one?—I cannot say that that is my view because I recommended them to do that at Woodbridge. I pulled down the workhouse there too.

7777. You have had experience since then?—I wanted to pull down the workhouse, because I knew they would have to build a workhouse afterwards. It was merely to get an alternative policy. Now they have been forced to board-out somewhere else, and they will no doubt build a workhouse themselves, and my object will be accomplished. Boarding-out all depends upon how distant it is; the question of distance comes in there.

Difficulties to enlarging Poor Law areas.

7778. I was going to ask you about that point. It is some times suggested that there should be larger areas for workhouse administration, for instance, that you should take a county. One objection that is made is that the distance at which the indoor paupers would thus be placed from their relatives might be too great; does that not apply to some extent, at all events, to that boarding-out?—Yes, it does. It encourages out-relief to cases which really ought not to be dealt with by out-relief.

7779. In order to avoid that difficulty?—In order to avoid bringing them long distances.

7780. I think that the York case is the only one in which you have got out-relief unions in your district?—That is all.

Objections out-relief unions.

7781. There are certain peculiarities of course with regard to York; but do you feel able to express an opinion as to the principle of out-relief unions?—I must say that the out-relief union system is not one that I desire to see extended.

7782. The object, I take it, of all out-relief unions is not really a poor law one, but is rather a local government one—it is to get unions within county boundaries?—That was the moving argument, I think.

7783. In the case where a union is in two or three counties, as in the case of York, you could not have that portion of it which contained the workhouse as a separate union, because the workhouse would be too large for it, and therefore the areas were combined for indoor administration; that is the principle that was adopted, was it not?—Yes.

7784. But you think it does not work well?—It does not work well in York, because the two bodies are totally antagonistic to each other, or think they are, in interests.

7785. Do you find any disposition to send cases into the workhouse because the indoor relief will be charged upon the whole union, whereas the outdoor relief will only be charged on the out-relief union?—I cannot say that of York, because York has been always an out-relief parish.

Proposal to make out-relief parochial and indoor relief union charge.

7786. Sometimes it is suggested that outdoor relief should be made a parochial charge and indoor relief a union charge; would your experience in relation to York lead you to think that that suggestion would not

have the result which is anticipated from it, namely, the diminution of outdoor relief?—It would be very hard to say what the result would be there. If you look at the map I put in, you will see that the great proportion of money goes into the poorest parish.

7787. That is, the greatest amount of the out-door relief goes into the poorest parish?—Yes; so that the result would be that the property owners in that union would be mulcted in a most enormous proportion.

7788. Do you think that another result of a plan of that kind would be to encourage what you look upon as an evil, namely, that the guardians of particular parishes would look after their particular poor; would that practice be increased, do you think, supposing the charge is a parochial charge?—No, I should think the contrary, because if they have got to pay for it out of their own parish, they would very soon look into the case. It becomes a pocket question then.

7789. Owing to the pressure upon them from the people in their parish to look after their own cases, is that not what happens now?—Yes, but if the payment of that came out of the parish, they would consider whether it was worth while to listen to them.

7790. That is exactly what happens at York: the outdoor relief is a charge on the parish, because York itself is only one parish?—If it is only one parish—I had forgotten it—it would be so. I was thinking of a number of parishes where each has its own representative, and where the parish itself would be charged.

Size of various boards of guardians in Yorkshire.

7791. I think your table H. (East Riding) says that there is only one parish in York out-relief union: they were combined, I believe some years ago. Just look at the number of guardians for the York out-relief union: although it is only one parish they have got forty guardians That, I suppose, arises from the fact that there were a great number of parishes in the city of York, and that when they were combined, they took the total number of guardians in the parishes which were combined, and assigned them to the new parish?—Yes, and made forty wards.

7792. Electing one guardian in each ward?—Yes.

7793. Are they the same wards as the municipal wards?—No. There are only three or four municipal wards. If you look at the returns, you will see how small the ward population is. In Escrick Union there is one ward for a population of fifty-seven with one representative, another ward with a population of eighty-one and one representative, and another ward with a population of 155 and one representative. Then in the Flaxton Union there is one ward with a population of seventy-four and one representative. In the York union there is one ward with a population of only eight and that sends a representative. Old Sarum was nothing to it.

7794. I do not know whether this has come under your notice: Is there not practically a good deal of difficulty in reducing the number of guardians?—There is a case now where I live, in the Knaresborough union. They are always wanting to get more guardians for the urban district, and in Harrogate, which has grown enormously they have had an addition of two or three, and now they want an addition of quite a large number.

7795. Is that in order to balance the rural members?—Yes. There is the antagonism of town and country. Harrogate is a place where they have spent a great deal of money upon various kinds of work, and the rural district councillors are kicking, and then in order to meet that, the guardians of Harrogate want to get more representatives.

Proposal to enlarge electoral unit for guardians.

7796. Therefore, it would be a good thing, would it not, if there were some power of enlarging the area for the election of guardians, although you perhaps would not be in favour of any great extension of the area of administration?—Yes. That is a distinction that I make in my memorandum.

Record of attendance at relief committees.

7797. That must be done, I take it, by a combination of parishes for the purposes of election only?—Yes, thereby reducing the number of the elected.

7798. In paragraph 54 you have told us about relief committees. You say that sometimes the quorum is not maintained. There ought to be three to constitute a quorum, ought there not?—Yes.

7799. Is there any record kept which shows what the attendance is?—Yes.

7800. So that it would be possible to ascertain at the time the particular relief was given whether there was less than the quorum present?—In Sheffield they certainly do keep a record. Speaking generally, my experience is frequent that the attendance is confined to only two or three guardians. On one occasion one man went through a whole list.

Proposed restriction by Local Government Board of period of relief.

7801. Would you see any difficulty in guardians in giving relief being restricted to quite short periods, say a month?—Do you mean by a Local Government Board Regulation?

7802. Yes.—You can generally understand a case in one month, though it very often takes more than one month to do so.

7803. Would you think that too short?—Say either a month or six weeks.

7804. Have you got cases where boards of guardians meet at comparatively long intervals, or do they always meet every fortnight?—They meet every fortnight, sometimes every week. I think that an Order of that sort would automatically cause a great deal of investigation and revision.

7805. It would get rid practically, of cases being treated as permanent would it not?—It would give a great deal more trouble, and would necessitate probably a larger staff.

7806. A larger staff of what?—Of relieving officers and clerks, I think.

Relief stations.

7807. You have got a good many pay stations in your district, have you not?—Yes, there are a great number.

7808. Do you find that they work satisfactorily or otherwise?—That is a question which I have not had the opportunity of testing personally. I have from time to time been at a pay station and seen the pay given. There are reasons in favour of pay stations. They were originally started in obedience to a suggestion of the Local Government Board in 1871, so that the suggestion came originally from the board. Then we found out that abuses crept in.

7809. I was rather wanting to know how they had worked: of course in a good deal of your district you must have very large areas where the people are very much separated?—Yes, and there must be some point of contact and meeting for those people. The only abuse is that they sometimes pay a little trifle to the person who comes for the relief, and sometimes send children. On the other hand, the convenience is very great.

7810. Perhaps you are not in a position to answer this question: do you think they could be abolished in your district?—I think there would be very great opposition to abolishing them. In the Pocklington union, as a matter of fact, I think there are only one or two pay stations, and the relieving officer goes and gives the money at each house. I have been with him and seen him do it. That could be done more, no doubt, but it is a matter which the relieving officers would resist very much where they have not been in the habit of doing it. It is a thing that ought to be introduced as occasion serves, and not by a sweeping regulation.

7811. I take it that your district is one of those in which the difficulty would be greatest on account of the large moorland areas in it?—Yes.

Method of retirement of boards of guardians.

7812. I think you told us that the guardians in your district are all of them elected for a period of three years?—Yes.

7813. That is, they go out all together?—Yes.

7814. Do you find that works well, or do you think it is better to have them retire a third at a time?—I have never had any experience of the other way.

7815. Was it the same when you were in the East Anglian district?—Yes. Except in Ipswich.

7816. Did they not go out one-third annually?—I do not remember any other case; there may have been, but I cannot tax my memory with it.

7817. The argument that is used is that if you have an annual election of a third, you keep up a continuity of policy and of experience among the members of the board of guardians, whereas if they are elected altogether

Mr. Philip Henry Bagenal.

27 Mar. 1906.

there may be an entire change?—As a matter of fact you do get a certain number of experienced men always on the board.

7818. Do you find that practically you secure that result at present—that a certain number of old guardians get returned after the election, so that you do get experienced men?—I think that nearly always some of the old hands stop.

7819. Therefore that difficulty does not appear to you to have much in it?—I should like to see the change made, but I think it is a thing that does not suit the genius of the people in Yorkshire certainly; there they want a general election.

7820. Of course it is rather more expensive, too?—It is more expensive.

Cause of high cost of Sheffield homes for children.

7821. In paragraph 103 you deal with the cost of the Sheffield Homes for Children, which appears to have gone up from 7s. 9d. in 1897 to 9s. 4¾d in 1905; is that on account of reducing the number which they took into each home?—They did reduce the number to a certain extent in each home, and they are reducing them. They originally started with fifteen, and they are now aiming at eleven or ten.

7822. Is fifteen found to be too large?—I think it is.

7823. That number was taken, I presume, in order to diminish expense; was that the reason?—It was to enable the experiment to be floated; that is really what I think it was.

7824. That number has been adopted elsewhere, I think?—I believe it has been laid down generally that there shall be not more than fifteen.

Medical loan relief.

7825. With regard to medical relief, do you find medical relief given on loan in your district?—There is very little relief given on loan; that is my experience.

7826. Whether medical or otherwise?—Yes. They may give it sometimes as a form of test.

7827. When they do give it, do they recover the cost?—I think very seldom.

Out-relief by master of workhouse and consequence.

7828. You told us of a case, I think, where the master of the workhouse had been giving out-door relief?—It was technically outdoor relief.

7829. Because the man was not in the workhouse?—He worked in the workhouse precincts, and I suppose as a matter of convenience he was paid by the workhouse master as the end of each week.

7830. Not paid as wages, but paid as relief?—It was so much a day. It was a system they had in York. I went there one day and found this money being paid by the workhouse master; I asked the meaning of it and he then explained. I said: This is entirely wrong; you have no business to be paying money which is out-relief practically. He said, It has always been done here; I said, it must be stopped, and, what is more, I shall have to call the auditor's attention to it.

7831. What happened when you called the auditor's attention to it?—The auditor surcharged the workhouse master, and as it worked out to about £300 or £400 the master of course wrote to me about it.

7832. Did he appeal against the disallowance?—He appealed against the disallowance.

7833. It was a case in which he could not equitably, I presume, be called upon to pay the money?—No. It was quite obvious that it was one of those cases in which the equitable jurisdiction of the board would be naturally exercised. But it stopped the practice.

7834. That is, the effect of the disallowance was to stop the practice for the future?—Yes.

7835. So that the purpose was really answered by means of the disallowance?—Yes.

7836. With regard to your statistical statement as to the number of outdoor paupers relieved during the half year, you are aware, I presume, that the officers are relieved from the necessity of keeping that statement now?—I was not aware of that. I asked them for the information, and they gave it to me.

Desuetude of half-yearly statement as to number of paupers.

7837. Do they keep that statistical statement now, in fact, do you think?—The relieving officers have shown me in their relief lists a column from which they take these facts.

7838. The statistical part of the relief list no doubt has to be kept still, but there was a statistical statement made up at the end of each half-year under the Order for Accounts, and that was dispensed with some years ago?—That may have been. I have seen these figures on the left-hand side of the relief list, and in another place all the sums for each week.

7839. That was not what I meant; that undoubtedly has to be done, and that would be the foundation for the statistical statement which was formerly kept. The Order for Accounts provided that a half-yearly statistical statement should be made out of all the persons who were relieved, but that was dispensed with some years ago, because it was found that no use was made of it?—I may say that all my clerks and officers in Yorkshire are particularly kind and good in getting me statistics, but they are overdone with statistics, and they are often complaining to me of the enormous amount of returns that they have to make.

Number of returns required of Poor Law officials.

7840. They are called upon to make them for Parliamentary and other purposes, are they not?—Yes; they say they have never done making returns.

7841. (*Chairman.*) Not for their own guardians, but for Parliament?—For Parliament and for the clerk. The clerk has to send a number up to the Local Government Board in order to fill up Parliamentary returns. All the Parliamentary returns practically are prepared by the clerks of unions, and the clerks are fed by the relieving officers and the other officers. Their whole life is passed in getting these things out. Then an inspector, at times of stress like this when he is called upon to give evidence, gets information too. I got the information for these analyses from them. So really they are never done getting information. I pity them sometimes.

7842. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The duty of making that statistical statement that I referred to was imposed on the clerk, and the clerk, I suppose, got it from the relieving officer and the master?—No doubt. I think the basis of it all you will find in the relief list.

Status of clerk and relieving officer.

7843. Something was said about a comparison between the kind of man that a relieving officer is and the kind of man that the clerk is; it would be necessary, would it not, that the clerk should be a man of a good deal higher social status than a relieving officer?—He certainly generally is.

7844. He conducts the correspondence of the guardians?—Yes.

7845. He acts as their legal adviser?—Yes.

7846. And practically does a good deal in the way of administering the general affairs of the guardians, apart from actual relief?—Certainly. He is their adviser generally on many points.

7847. He acts as adviser, and must be a man of good education and some social status if he is to discharge his duties properly?—And I think he generally is.

7848. Would that kind of qualification be necessary in a relieving officer?—That would not be necessary; but I think the higher the standard of education and intelligence and adaptability to circumstances in the relieving officer, the better work he does and the more economically and satisfactorily the work of the union will be done.

7849. You would not contemplate, would you, that a relieving officer should be a man of the same social position that would be necessary for a clerk?—No, I do not think so. He could be a very well informed man without that.

TWENTY-SECOND DAY.

Monday, 2nd April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. JAMES LOWRY, called; and Examined.

Mr. James Lowry.
2 April, 1906.

Extent of district.

7850. (*Chairman.*) You are the Local Government Board Inspector for the district known as the North Eastern District, which comprises the union counties of Northumberland, Durham and the North Riding of Yorkshire, with parts of Cumberland?—I am.

7851. How long have you been inspector in your present district?—Since 1901.

General conditions in the district.

7852. During that period there has been a general increase of pauperism?—That is so.

7853. Both in the rural and urban parts?—It is not so pronounced in the rural as in the industrial centres.

7854. Has the increase been in indoor as well as outdoor relief?—I think on the whole indoor relief has gone down in many of the unions.

7855. Will you give us the figures of the number of persons receiving relief in your district at the present moment?—I cannot.

7856. Have you any idea what percentage of the population the pauperism forms?—I have not.

7857. Has there been any trade disturbance since you have been in your present post?—Nothing very serious. There have been small affairs, but nothing of any considerable moment.

7858. Is there much difference in the methods of administration adopted by the unions as regards poor law outdoor relief?—There is not. There is a very pleasant amount of similarity in all the unions, both large and small

7859. Does the amount of outdoor relief form much the same percentage as indoor relief?—It does.

7860. You state in your memorandum (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVI), that is has varied from 76·6 to 77·6?—That is all.

Methods of dealing with children.

7861. Are there many children in the workhouses?—There are not in my district. There are a few; they have a good number, but a large number are now arranging for cottages and getting them out, but I have no large number of children in a number of unions. At Newcastle, Gateshead, and two or three other places, there are a considerable number, but there is no large number.

7862. The system of cottage homes and scattered homes has worked well?—It is growing very rapidly, I am happy to say.

7863. Is it being generally adopted by boards of guardians in your district?—It is now.

7864. What is the financial result?—On the whole my own experience is that those who opposed it most bitterly are now reconciled to it and in favour of it, and the increase in the expense is very trifling. I have heard of it being lower, but I take that with a grain of salt.

Type of Guardians in colliery districts.

7865. In the colliery districts of what class are the boards of guardians composed?—Some of them are just so-so.

7866. What do you mean by that?—I say in some of them the members forming the boards are more of a so-so position; they are not always the men one would like to see

7867. Are the majority of the members of the boards working colliers?—Oh no, not working colliers, but connected with collieries.

7868. Men employed in the collieries?—In other capacities, not as working miners; they are officials, or call themselves so.

7869. There is no union in which there is, as far as you are aware, a majority of guardians who are working men?—No, not one that I know of.

7870. How does the amount of pauperism in the purely colliery districts contrast with that of the agricultural districts?—They are almost similar one with the other. The only point where we find it is where there is a strike, or where there are slack times; then, of course, the proportion goes up.

7871. Has there been any considerable movement or migration of population in your district?—No, not that I can speak of definitely.

Infrequency of Scattered Homes for children.

7872. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Have you any scattered homes at all in your district?—Yes.

7873. More scattered homes than cottage homes?—If you will excuse me, do you make a difference between scattered homes and cottage homes? If you mean by cottage homes those in groups, they are growing, I am glad to say. Some of the older unions still have the scattered homes.

7874. I mean by scattered homes where a number of cottages are taken by the guardians. It is a scattered arrangement, and not one institution?—Of scattered homes we have not many; cottage homes are growing, I am happy to say.

Poor Law Children educated in Public Elementary Schools.

7875. Are practically all the children in your district sent out to elementary schools where the guardians have not a separate institution for them?—They are sent out to the public elementary schools.

7876. So that they are not educated in the workhouse itself?—That is a point. There are the little ones between three and five. It is a very important matter, I do not pretend to understand it legally, but, as you know, five is the lowest age for the school boards.

7877. They do not send them out before five?—I do not think they do, as far as I know. I have heard of isolated cases, but when I have inquired into them, there have been other explanations.

7878. (*Mr. Lock.*) A question was asked by the chairman about the number of paupers in your district. You have the returns for the counties, have you not, showing what the pauperism is?—Yes.

Mr. James Lowry.

2 April, 1906.

7879. The North Riding is in your district, is not it?—All the North Riding is my district. It is about one-third of Yorkshire.

7880. That stands in the last return of the Local Government Board at 29·8?—At what date is that?

North Riding, high pauperism.

7881. That is on the 1st January, 1905. Cumberland was 24·5, Durham, 24·4. Do you think that the state of things is satisfactory in your district, judging from the rise of pauperism, say, in the last twenty years?—The industrial side is so contingent and dependent on trade disputes. The agricultural side I do consider satisfactory.

Conditions in Middlesbrough.

7882. Take a town like Middlesbrough, for instance. There you have an increase of population, I think I am right in saying, of about 45 per cent. in the last twenty years?—Yes; on account of the steel works.

7883. You have a rise in pauperism much in excess of that percentage. Is there anything to account of that in the character of the incoming population?—They are the working classes to a very large extent, owing to the industry. The steel works have been rapidly developed there, and have employed a much larger amount of labour.

7884. It is a serious state of things there, because as the population is increasing, pauperism is going up, and going up probably at a greater rate?—I have a note of that; it is so.

7885. What is the constitution of the Board at Middlesbrough; is it a strong board?—I consider it such: they are very considerate and deserving, and all that sort of thing, and most careful in administration. It is a comparatively new town, and the industries being founded are not old industries.

Conditions in Newcastle-on-Tyne and elsewhere.

7886. If we take another place in Northumberland, say Newcastle-on-Tyne, which is also a large urban centre, there you have again an increase of pauperism out of proportion to the increase of population. What would specially account for that?—The docks and the shipping are the main complaint in Newcastle.

7887. Latterly the ship-building has been good, has not it?—No; not good as far as the employment of labour is concerned.

7888. Are you, or is anybody, considering what should be done in view of that state of things at an important centre like Newcastle?—I am not aware of any absolute consideration. The Corporation itself has held meetings.

7889. Have they come to any conclusion?—No, they have not. They adjourned last time and said they would wait a bit longer and get some further evidence. I have seen no distinct decision taken of any sort or kind.

7890. With regard to another point which the chairman also referred to, the increase of outdoor relief, is it not the fact that, taking Michaelmas, 1904, and Michaelmas, 1903, there is practically an increase all along the line in both outdoor and indoor relief? For instance, with regard to in-maintenance, at page 467 of the last Local Government Report, the North Riding shows no increase in in-maintenance, but a decrease of 2·7, but it shows an increase of 2·2 in outdoor relief; Durham shows an increase of 2·2 in in-maintenance and 9·3 in outdoor relief, which is marked; and Northumberland, which is, of course, to a certain extent controlled by a few large towns, shows an increase of 7·3 in in-maintenance and 6·4 in out-maintenance, showing, apparently, that in both in and out there has been an increase in relief?—That is so as far as Northumberland is concerned.

7891. Durham stands very much in the same boat?—That would be much more agricultural than industrial.

7892. The increase in indoor relief is 2·2 and the outdoor relief 9·3, so that it would seem on the face of the figures that the larger towns are certainly in a worse position from the point of view of pauperism than they were 20 years ago?—That is so. That has been my own experience for years past.

7893. Have the local authorities in Poor Law Conference considered these faults?—They have considered them by name, but I am not aware of any practical results as the result of their consideration. In Newcastle quite recently they held meetings and appealed for funds, apart altogether from parochial matters, and they obtained considerable sums, but they were gone in two or three weeks.

7894. There is no question of policy arising from those meetings as to the way of administering the Poor Law itself?—No; no question of policy at all.

Infrequency of Cross Visitors.

7895. In Newcastle have they a cross visitor for outdoor relief?—They have not that I am aware of. I am very glad you have mentioned that point; that is a thing I have thought of for a considerable time. Whenever I have mentioned it to boards of guardians I have only been met with a laugh, and I have been told that it would increase the cost. When I was at Liverpool we went into the matter, and I think that the administration there is about as good as it could possibly be. They have not cross visitors in the vast majority of places.

7896. Is it a large board at Newcastle? What is the number of members?—I should think it would be nearly thirty. I do not know the exact number.

7897. Do they act through relief committees?—Yes; the machinery is right enough.

7898. In Middlesbrough have they a cross visitor?—No, not that I know of.

Economical results of Cross Visitors.

7899. Generally speaking, in these towns that are in your district have they cross visitors?—They have no. That is the reason I named it. I have been accustomed to it; we did things in Liverpool differently to what they do them elsewhere, for we had not only a cross visitor, but a superintendent registrar in addition, and we found that they more than saved their salaries. I only wish that principle was extended in large places.

Unimportance of Special Act and Orders in District.

7900. When you refer to the special Acts or Orders in Section 12 of your memorandum, do those special Orders refer to anything of great importance?—No nothing at all of any particular leading character.

7901. There is one mentioned, for instance, with regard to Middlesbrough, 1875. What is that? You say that district was under a special Order. I ask the question because Middlesbrough does not come out very well from the point of view of pauperism?—There is a little mistake in that; there are four unions under special Orders, but there are five printed in the list.

Trades employing women.

7902. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Can you tell me whether there is much women's work in your district? Are there any special trades?—No, there is not a great deal in connection with women. At some of the places there is rope and string making, but there is no large industry for women.

7903. Do the women work in the mines at all?—No.

7904. At the pit-mouth?—No; very few. Some work at screening, I think it is termed. I do not pretend to understand it practically, but it is only a comparatively few. They are on the bank at the top, screening.

7905. Is that paid for pretty well?—I do not think it is. It is hard work and dirty work, and I do not think it is as well paid as it might be.

Out-relief to women.

7906. Do you think there is much out-relief given to women?—Yes, in a number of unions there is a good amount of out-relief given to women.

7907. Would that be only to old women?—Principally old women and widows.

7908. Do they give relief to widows in preference to taking their children into the schools?—It has been done, but I would not for a moment say that there is any general likelihood or disposition to do so. They try to deal with each case on its merits.

7909. On the whole you think they generally take hildren in preference to giving relief?—I would not like o express an opinion on that; I would say the reverse.

7910. Is there any scale of relief in any of your unions?—Yes.

Scale of relief for children.

7911. What would be the scale of relief?—1s. 6d., 2s., and 2s. 6d.

7912. For each child?—Yes. 1s. 6d. usually. There is 2s. and 2s. 6d. occasionally when there are any special circumstances.

7913. I suppose there are very few textile industries in your district ?—Very few, if any at all.

Mine officials as Guardians.

7914. I should like to press the question a little about the guardians in connection with the mines. You say that many of them call themselves connected with the mines. Would they be superintendents ?—They are officers and different officials, superintendents and gangers who have certain numbers of men under them in different capacities. They are officers, they are not miners, and they would resent it at once if you thought so or said so.

7915. They sit on the boards of guardians ?—Some do on some of the boards. They are practical men who understand mining, so that when a question arises they can discuss it and debate it.

7916. They would be useful members ?—Very useful. In fact, when we want particular information on a particular matter we ask them specially. They are not miners in the ordinary sense of working for so much a shift or so much per hour.

7917. Do the mine owners take any interest in the Poor Law administration ?—Not by any means, I am sorry to say; I wish it was the reverse.

Voluntary cottage-homes for the aged at Durham, and their effect on out-relief.

7918. I believe that round Durham the miners have established a system of cottage homes for their own aged poor. Can you tell us anything about that ?—I am aware of the fact that they do so, but my experience is that for some reason or other it is difficult to get information as to what they are doing. They do not like us; I admit that, though they give us left-handed compliments. They have those homes, I am glad to say, and I see them frequently. Those homes are let, on some conditions, to miners. They seem to be well kept and paid for and to be in good condition; but get particulars from them of absolute prices and so on you cannot.

7919. Do you think that provision for their own old people is likely to grow ?—I sincerely hope it will grow; I see no reason why it should not grow. The wages are good while the men are at work, and they ought to grow most certainly. The miners have taken this up, perhaps most fully, and there ought to be many homes of that nature.

7920. Do you think where these homes exist that the out-relief is less considerable ?—In some places it is. When the good man is taken away, the sooner the house is empty the better; that is the pleasantest way of putting it. I am sorry to say that, but it is so, it is no use disguising it; they want the homes for the used up miners.

7921. You mean that his widow, for instance, would come on the Poor Law ?—That is the end of it; she gets to know sooner or later. It is uncomfortable, and a removal, either temporary or permanent, would be acceptable, and the plain English of it is that she is got out by some means or other and the house is given to a man who is still living and who may have his wife and perhaps one or two children with him, but the families by that time are generally grown up and doing for themselves and are away.

Absence of case-paper system.

7922. Are there any unions in your district where case papers are used ?—I do not think there is a single union.

Relief Stations and payment of relief to deputies.

7923. In the country districts do you work by pay-stations ?—They do in some, but there is no regular work. I have asked that very question several times over, and the relieving officers represent that they march the whole place, which I doubt sometimes very much.

7924. Some of these country districts would be very large ?—Very large and very extended. I would rather see them go to the house myself, or see them come out to pay-stations; then I could believe it; but there is one most objectionable practice, and I do wish some means could be taken to stop it; that is, where a relieving officer will pay a number. It is a great mistake, in my judgment. No. 1 lives so and so, No. 2 lives so and so, and rather than walk three or four miles up a mountain or up a hill or out of his way from his next work, he will give one person several reliefs, which is a very great mistake.

7925. You think it does not always get to the right people ?—I am perfectly certain it does not always and, when it does get to the right people, I have frequently heard of a commission being charged.

7926. Have you sufficient provision for outdoor nursing for outdoor paupers ?—Are we talking about the same thing ? Do you mean compulsory or voluntary ?

Nursing of out-door poor

7927. Have you your own nurses, or do you use voluntary agencies to supply them ?—The large houses, I am happy to say, have their own nurses, and are having them in increasing numbers, but the small houses have not. They engage a nurse sometimes, one that resides in the district, and send her out to different places.

7928. Does that not work well, do you think ?—I have no great objection to it; I would rather see that the smallest houses should have one nurse. The difficulty is, if you send that nurse out.

7929. You mean that the large houses have their resident nurses ?—They have.

7930. Do they send them to the outdoor cases ?—They do sometimes.

7931. In country districts, is there any means of nursing the outdoor poor ?—Very, very little. Very frequently, if they can manage it, they have a matron who has been a nurse in her earlier days, which is an excellent plan, because she knows exactly what to do, and how to go about it.

7932. She would go into the district ?—I have known them do that; or she would let the nurse go, and take the nurse's place, a most thoughtful and kindly act; but, of course, they know that is not their duty, and they do not care for it.

Subscriptions by Guardians to nursing associations.

7933. (*Dr. Downes.*) Do not the guardians subscribe to nursing associations ?—They do extensively.

7934. Do the country guardians do so ?—It is not so pronounced as in the case of the town guardians.

7935. Are there district nurses in the country villages ?—There is a district nurse in almost every village, and the question is: who is she kept up by; is she kept up by the guardians, or is she kept up by the church or the religious bodies ? The best I can answer is that she is kept up by both.

7936. The guardians subscribe ?—They do.

Subscriptions to, and use of, voluntary hospitals by Guardians.

7937. Do they subscribe to the hospitals in your district ?—Yes, extensively.

7938. How are cases of operative surgery dealt with ?—They are dealt with on much the same lines; they will subscribe to hospitals that deal with both medical and surgical cases. I wish there was a hard and fast proportion. Some will have many more applicants than another, and then they will write and say they propose paying £10; £5 may have been the previous amount, and they will increase it to £10. Why ? Because there have been two or three surgical cases, which is just the point you are at. As a means of guiding the guardians I would very much like to see a fixed sum voted as a subscription, either according to the number of inmates or the different kinds of treatment.

7939. Has there been difficulty in removing cases for operative treatment ?—Very, very seldom. We are very fortunate; there are no great distances in the whole of my district, and we are particularly fortunate, because there are trains everywhere.

7940. You spoke of the homes for aged that the miners had provided. Have they done anything in the direction of providing for their sick ?—They have not; neither for the sick, nor children. Children, of course, are out of the question altogether.

Separation of children and adults in workhouse.

7941. Are children of school age sufficiently separated from the adults in your workhouses ?—Do you mean children under five or from five onwards ?

7942. I mean of school age, over five ?—That is just the very point. School age is three from the workhouse point of view, but school age is five outside.

7943. We will say children over three ?—As far as I could find, they are separated and put in smaller rooms now, but there are no proper teachers, that is what I object to.

7944. Have you many complaints made to you by the people as you go round the workhouses ?—I am happy to say I have not. Being from Liverpool, I made it my business on that very point to try over and over again.

7945. You were Chairman of the Liverpool guardians ?—I was, till I had the honour of being appointed inspector.

Mr. James Lowry.

2 April, 1906.

Classification in Workhouses.

7946. Do you get any complaints as to classification ?—No, they would be more inclined to ask you the meaning of the word than anything else. Classification means a lot, and a lot that will never be carried out until half the workhouses in the country are re-built and re-arranged. I am perfectly certain of it. It could not be done, that is if you were to take to classification as you put it here, plain and distinct.

7947. Have you any difficulty in the classification of imbeciles ?—That is a semi-medical question. There are some they keep in workhouses for months and months and others they scarcely keep for hours before they get them out.

7948. You draw a distinction between one imbecile and another ?—Yes.

7949. Some would not be objectionable to the people ?—Sometimes I have got to ask, when they say : " that is so-and-so," but others I have not to ask, because they soon let you know.

Treatment of lunatics.

7950. Is there any difficulty with regard to lunatics waiting for certification in your workhouses ?—I do not know of any real difficulty. You come across cases, of course, and I do ask the question whether he is waiting but I do not know of any particular harm arising from that at all.

7951. Do you know of cases where they have been unduly retained in the workhouses ?—Not a solitary case. I have known others where the masters have been begging and praying for the hour to come to get them out, when they have no proper accommodation for them.

The problem of diminutive Unions.

7952. (*Miss Hill.*) Am I right in saying there is one workhouse in your district where there are only seven in-door paupers, and two were there are only nine ?—I hope that is so.

7953. What is done in those cases ? Is there a master and matron and a whole establishment ?—There is a master and matron and an entire parochial staff.

7954. Has any attempt been made to diminish the cost by boarding those paupers in other unions, or amalgamating them ?—I do not know of any. It is a question of average, whether they are large or small. You have got the house, and whether you have ten inmates or twenty is a pure question of average.

7955. It cannot be necessary to have a separate institution for them ?—No, certainly not ; I would have grouped them years ago, if I had had my way, but then there is the question of walking and getting to them.

7956. Attempts have been made and failed ?—I would not like to say attempts have been made, but with regard to my own part of the matter, I saw that very clearly, and in the largest place I ever had to do with I would have altered it years ago, but the alteration of the one creates a grievance in the other that they could not visit and see each other.

Type of Guardians.

7957. (*Professor Smart.*) You spoke of some boards of guardians being so-so. Might I ask : do you mean that they were interested parties, or merely inefficient ?—They are not interested parties—I would not say that for a moment ; but they do not all take the same view of the Poor Law that a trained mind does.

7958. I was afraid you meant they were interested parties ?—No, I do not make that suggestion for a moment.

7959. You find practical uniformity of policy amongst your various unions ?—I have in my own district very great uniformity.

7960. We are told that the Poor Law is very elastic, that it gives the guardians great latitude of administration ?—I would not like to say it is very elastic. There is a little stretch about it, but you have to try it very hard before you see much of it.

Uniformity of practice produced by scales of relief.

7961. If it is elastic, how do you account for the uniformity of administration in your district ? Is there any means of communication between the districts ?—There is the means of communication of letters between the different clerks ; that is the principal way. The scales, as you know, are fixed. They are followed by routine. That applies in my own district, I am happy to say, very particularly. A departure from that would be a very serious matter, without reason given as regards the rates of relief. That always has been, in my own knowledge, and I presume will be to the end of the chapter, a thing on which you will get no two boards of guardians to agree.

7962. Then a certain amount of uniformity would be due to your own influence as inspector ?—To a large extent.

Sufficiency existing discretion of Guardians.

7963. I see from the list of suggestions received from boards in your district that some boards consider that they have not power enough. I see Sunderland asks that the discretion of the guardians may be increased. Scarborough asks that relief should be not given to persons refusing the offer of the workhouse. Carlisle suggests that relief should be given to other than the destitute. South Shields says that out-relief should be further extended. Hartlepool suggests that it should be further restricted or altogether abolished. Stokesley seeks power to offer work for wages to the unemployed. In view of such recommendations, do you think it would be wise to give guardians more discretionary power ?—I do not think it would. You have raised a lot of important questions that have agitated us for years and years, and it would be, I am afraid, on the whole, dangerous to give an isolated body of guardians power to do as they liked without proper and sufficient and absolute control.

Treatment aged couple at South Shields.

7964. You mentioned one interesting thing, that in South Shields an experiment has been made in lodging aged couples together in cottages in the workhouse grounds. Has that been a success ?—I should think it was a success, but it is very plain, as plain as it can be, and the old people live together ; but beyond that I see no advantage.

Disinclination of aged couples to live together.

7965. We are very often told that the majority of such aged couples do not wish to live together ?—I am sorry to say I have heard that myself. I could not reconcile it for a moment.

7966. You could not reconcile it ?—I could not. I argued it with them and talked it over many times.

7967. You find them rather irreconcilable ?—Yes, I am sorry to say, notwithstanding they are man and wife.

7968. Is it incompatibility of temper ?—I presume that it is a good deal, but another matter is : the men, from social habits and instincts, and all the rest of it, would be rather associated with their own class and their own numbers, and they leave their good ladies to do the same thing, I presume. There is no use in attempting to hide or disguise it. I have asked the question time out of memory, for the matter of that, and the answer is ' No," is it practically one and universal, that they would rather be with them all.

7969. You know that the separation of old couples is made a grievance outside ?—Yes.

7970. As if it were a cruel thing ?—It is a grievance, but that ceases the moment they get accustomed to the size and arrangement of a ward. That is my experience of them.

Conditions Alston, Belford, Brampton, and Rothbury Union.

7971. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I notice that of the three unions in your district which are highest in pauperism, two are rural ; one is Brampton and the other is Alston ; while two of the lowest, Belford and Rothbury, are rural. How do you account for that very great difference between the rates of pauperism in unions which are similar ?—That raises several other questions. For instance, Brampton is called a rural union, but it is the centre of a very large industry, and has quite a number of small towns in it. The people there are not farmers at all ; and to the Brampton centre they find their way ultimately. That is as far as Brampton is concerned. Alston, the northern one, is a purely agricultural place. It is miles and miles away in the country, and there is no crowd or number of people live near there. I should think it is purely agricultural. And then there is the season. I have talked to the labourers many times to see if I could get an intelligent answer of any kind to the question you are putting to me, and the first thing they go for is the machinery ; they denounce that up-hill and down-dale. Modern agricultural machinery does the work in a third of the time and takes two-thirds out of their hands. That is the only thing like an intelligent answer I have got.

7972. Do you think the large number of aged people has anything to do with it ?—If you went into minute

particulars, it has to do with it; it is a growing factor, a constantly growing factor; they will not die to please the authorities, and they have to be kept and maintained in the meantime.

7973. All the four are very nearly alike in that respect. Rothbury, the lowest, has 103 per thousand over sixty years of age?—That is so.

7974. Brampton has 108?—Yes, that is so.

7975. Apparently old-age does not account for the difference in pauperism, they are really alike in that respect?—Rothbury will be worth studying for a while, because they have just moved from the old tumble-down hole into a brand new workhouse.

Conditions in Middlesbrough.

7976. Middlesbrough has the highest number, I think?—It has, unfortunately.

7977. Is there anything peculiar in Middlesbrough with regard to the climate? Is not it built on a swamp, or something of that kind?—It is said to have been, at some time or other. As regards the population of Middlesbrough, there are no very well-to-do people there. I asked that very question myself. I am astounded with the number of paupers and the cost of them. I have gone into the question of the population, and there are none of the so-called aristocracy who live in Middlesbrough. Their money is there, their business and influence is there, so far as the work of the day is concerned, but they do not live there, they live outside the boundary.

7978. Is there not a large amount of sickness in Middlesborough?—That may come from the building of the town on the swamp, as you say.

7979. What is the prevailing illness there?—I do not know that there is any one prevailing illness, but throat and chest complaints—they will be more liable to them.

7980. Is not disease of the chest very prevalent at Middlesbrough?—I believe it is, but I am not a medical man. I have noticed it, and I hear enough of it, and I ask the ordinary questions; but, of course, I offer no opinion.

7981. I wondered if that had anything to do with it, if that is not an explanation, have you any?—No, except the ordinary vicissitudes of trade. There are two or three very large places yonder, and when they are in good employ they will keep the population, but when there is a large number of people who are in receipt of relief. If change takes place—there is one just now, but I hope it is over—it is bound to have an effect. When you throw 1,000 or 2,000 people idle, unfortunately those people have nothing to fall back on. If they saved when work was good, they would have something to fall back on, but they do not, and at the end of the first week they are on their beam-ends.

7982. Is the trade union or friendly society movement very strong in Middlesbrough?—It is said to be, and I quite believe it.

7983. Is there any more disturbance in trade between employer and employed in Middlesbrough than there is in Morpeth or Sunderland?—Not that I know of. If I may diverge for a moment, these are questions I have argued with these people till I am tired. In the very place where most of them are, they say there is not a pound to the good, but if they want any trade or business they can find it in hundreds, and more than that at times; but when you come to discussing what we are talking of now, the keeping of these poor people, they say: "No, they must go to the workhouse." I have told them pretty plainly what I thought of it, many a time.

Disinclination of relatives to maintain relatives.

7984. Do you think the family ties are very weak?—I should not like to say that, but they are not so strong as in some other departments.

7985. You are giving that really as a reason, are you not, that people very readily allow their relations to accept relief, rather than maintain them themselves?—If you take it in that light, they do not provide the funds which they ought to do and could well afford to do if they were properly managed. They do not do that—no; it is the Poor Law. The Poor Law is too ready.

7986. They rely on the Poor Law to help them out of their difficulties?—In my own time I have noticed that. Many years ago it would have been taken as an insult, but to-day the insult has gone.

7987. (*Mrs. Webb.*) What is the nature of the provisions of these special orders? I see you refer to five unions which are under special orders; how do the provisions of those special orders differ from the ordinary?—If you notice, the dates of those unions are all fairly recent, I think 1847 or 1850 is the oldest.

Nature and origin of Special Orders in the District.

7988. That is the date of the order?—Yes.

7989. That is not the date of the union?—That is the date when the order came into force in the union.

7990. What sort of orders are they? Take the first, what does it relate to?—There are orders for different things, but the meaning of them I have never yet been able to understand, and I cannot grasp what they were granted for. If you have a special order for a special place you would naturally think there were special circumstances, but when I have gone into them to get to know what the circumstances were I have failed up to date.

7991. It is not because there was some local Act?—There has been some local bother and one or two things have got confused, and the different authorities would insist on their own way of working, so an order was given apparently.

7992. That was to permit it?—Yes, that is the only intelligent reason I can find.

7993. It was to permit some divergence?—Yes, from the strict lines.

7994. How did you find out there were special orders?—I have been Chairman of the Liverpool Select Vestry, which I suppose has the largest workhouse in existence, and one ought to know these things now and again.

7995. Middlesbrough is a union which could not have had a local Act, because it is a recently formed union, more or less?—Yes, comparatively recent.

7996. Do you happen to know the provisions of that special order of 1875?—No, I do not; I know the order, and I know that is the proper date, but I do not know what the provisions of the particular order were for.

7997. How do you know there are not special orders in other unions in your district; have you enquired?—Yes, I have asked the question.

7998. You say you were Chairman of the Select Vestry?—I have had that honour, and resigned the chairmanship to take the inspectorship.

7999. For how long were you chairman?—Only for twelve months; that is our rule.

8000. Were you a member of the Liverpool Board of Guardians?—For some years.

8001. How many years?—Either four or five, and I was chairman the last one.

8002. Did you give up the whole of your time to the work of the Select Vestry?—No.

8003. You were in business?—I was a member of the board of guardians and as such I was elected to be chairman.

8004. The rest of your time was engaged in your own private business?—Yes.

8005. Could you tell me anything about the administration of relief in Newcastle. When I was there about six years ago it was asserted that there was a considerable amount of outdoor relief given before elections for political purposes, does that still obtain?—I do not think anything of that sort exists in fact.

Administration of relief in Newcastle.

8006. Not there?—No.

8007. Have you heard it did exist?—I have heard talk, but talk and facts are different things, especially in connection with politics.

8008. You do not think as a matter of fact that is so?—I do not. I never heard of a case. I have never known of one. If I knew of a case I would take steps to know the meaning of it.

8009. Can you tell me what is the procedure with regard to giving contracts in the various unions? Do they, for instance, open the tenders in full board and decide straight away as to whether a contract should be given to one person or another?—Different unions differ. Sometimes we elected three or four men whom we could trust, and when all the contracts were given to them they made the selections, and re-submitted them to the board;

Diversity of Guardians' practice in dealing with contracts.

Mr. James Lowry.

2 April, 1906.

but it was open to any member of the board to ask for any particular contract and to ask the reason why that was not included—absolute freedom, but do not mistake me, the procedure of the different unions differed. Some do that, some open them in full meeting and there you know on the spot; others do not. In large unions my experience has been that they do as I told you.

8010. They refer them?—Either to a committee or to four or five well-known members in whom they have absolute confidence.

8011. Have you come across the system which is practised in some unions of not giving the names or any particulars of the different tenders which would enable the members of the board of guardians to know who was tendering?—Yes, where they did that on purpose, giving them a letter or a number, certainly; a very wise provision it is sometimes.

8012. Is that usual?—It is not usual, but if you have one or two smart business men who know what they are about on the board they will suggest that and it will be adopted. We did it for years.

8013. You did it at Liverpool?—Yes, many times.

8014. Do you on the whole think that is a good procedure?—I am perfectly certain, I have no doubt whatever.

8015. You are quite sure?—Yes, every tenderer is bound to have one or more friends on the board; they may tell you they do not know this, that, or the other, but they do. As a matter of fact the amount is called out, and unless a person is sitting there and has a note of the amount or knows it and says: "That is so-and-so's amount," they cannot know who is tendering. That is one of the best matters about it, I have seen it done many times and thoroughly agree with it. When there are ten or twelve contracts being submitted that way it is only right and fair they should not know.

8016. You think, human nature being as it is, that there is collusion?—I do.

8017. Unless you take some means of preventing the guardians knowing who actually is tendering?—Yes; you get them all out, and then the chairman will announce which is the lowest; that is a different matter altogether.

8018. Have you known a case in which even the price is withheld so that they should not be able to recognise the tender?—I have, I have frequently taken part in it, and would do it to-morrow if the necessity arose for it.

8019. The name and the price is withheld?—Yes, both withheld, and only the total comprising so many items read out; a very wise and sensible provision where you have business men who are dealing with them; but I do not say that would do in every union, because in some of the smaller places in the country they would not understand it—there would be a row in no time.

8020. It is in the small places in the country where you are more likely to have jobbery?—Yes, but unfortunately my experience has been as I say, and the larger the union the more open and honourable the dealings. That is my undivided opinion.

8021. In order to keep the thing honourable and straight you must disguise the name of the tenderer, you must withhold the particulars?—I believe they either have the name, or the chairman and the clerk together number them, if they like, but it would not be wise to divulge the name of the person when you are reading out the amount.

8022. The long and the short of it is that you do not quite trust the guardians to be quite honest in giving contracts if they actually know who are tendering?—In all these boards, I am sorry to say I must agree with you, they all have their friends, and the friend reports by telegraph or something quicker outisde where the contracts are, and where they have gone, and we do not think it always wise.

8023. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is it not likely to be the case in the smaller unions that there is a friend at court?—I have heard that argument, and I must say it is not my experience; I have seen the biggest sets, on the very ground that we are talking of, in the largest unions.

8024. (*Mr. Webb.*) On the whole, as you suggested just now, the smaller unions are fairer in this respect?—There is more talking together amongst themselves outside; for that reason we withhold the names altogether and put numbers or signs, and we found that to be by far the best rule in the largest unions, in my experience, and we have had some very big things to deal with.

8025. In your experience has an auditor of the Local Government Board ever reported to you that in his opinion there is something suspicious about contracts for you to look into?—I cannot recall a case where such has occurred. Infrequency of communication between Auditors and Inspectors.

8026. You do not have much communication with the auditors?—We have not—we have very little; we should have to go and say who we are, and who they are before there would be any communication.

8027. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) When you were installed as inspector, did you have any instructions as to your duties?—No. I was chairman of the largest union in the world, and I suppose the friends in London thought I would know the ordinary routine, but I received no definite instructions of any sort or kind. Inspectors' instructions and qualification

8028. You had five years' experience as a guardian, I understand?—I think it is five years.

8029. You were appointed to do just what you thought best in the way of inspecting?—I had the experience of the men who came yonder in the first place. I saw them at Brownlow Hill. If you read up what you are going to do, you can get plenty of instruction from the published books, and there is your general knowledge of the Poor Law as a guardian—you are supposed to know what you are to ask, and to get the information that you require; but there is no examination that I know of—at least, I went through none.

8030. And there were no instructions given you as to what your duties were?—No written or printed instructions.

8031. What is the type of guardian in your district? You told us they were so-so. Are they manufacturers?—I do not know that the word "so-so" would apply in the case of numbers of guardians; there are some so-so guardians amongst them, I admit readily. Type of Guardians.

8032. Do you mind telling us what is the composition of the boards? What are they made up of—workmen?—Retired farmers; here and there a retired tradesman—there is such a thing even yet—and the majority of them are business men.

8033. The majority are business men?—Yes, business men and men who were engaged in business, as far as I know.

8034. It is these business men and retired people that you would not trust to go through the contracts?—No, I do not say that; those are the men who ought to be trusted more, who have no interest in the matter, good, bad, or indifferent. Guardians' procedure as to contracts.

8035. Nobody has any interest in it which is a corrupt interest. I understood just now the boards of guardians ought not to be trusted with opening the tenders, because some would be doing something they ought not to do with regard to them?—If you took that impression from what I said, that is wrong. We take the tenders as tenders, and we hand them all over to a sub-committee of three or four practical, experienced men. Then I purposely stated that any individual member of the guardians has a perfect right to ask any question bearing on them.

8036. In the case of the committee that you would hand these tenders to, would they know who the people were who were tendering?—Certainly they would, and that is the reason why they are careful to appoint men who they think not only know their business, but know how to handle it in every particular.

8037. The answer you gave just now to Mrs. Webb conveyed to me, at any rate, the impression that, in your judgment, boards of guardians were not to be trusted to open tenders and accept them or reject them if they knew the names of the people tendering?—I did not mean to convey any element of suspicion of any sort or kind. In a large board of guardians you may have four or five men—one is a grocer, another is a provision dealer, and so forth—practical men, who are going to deal with these particular contracts, and you take and hand those

matters over to those men, and they go through them with business eyes, and a knowledge of what they are dealing in, and the articles they want, and they recommend so and so. All the tenders are there, and any member of the vestry or board of guardians can ask any question he likes and see any person's tender.

8038. That is simply to ensure efficiency ?—Yes.

8039. Not to prevent jobbery ?—We think we have secured efficiency by getting both the right men and the right stuff.

8040. The things you have been recommending here with reference to tenders, you only recommend because you think by those means you get better stuff ? —More reliable goods.

8041. Do you advocate it to prevent jobbery on the part of the guardians ?—I do not think it will prevent jobbery on the part of the guardians.

8042. Do you think there is jobbery amongst the guardians ?—No, my experience with reference to that is practically *nil* ; the orders were straightforward and right in every particular.

8043. It is because they are such a fine body of men, tradespeople and retired tradespeople, that they are above suspicion: they were selected from trade ?—The electors had the good sense to return them, and they represent the particular trade they belong to.

Absence of corruption among Guardians.

8044. You are speaking of the general body of guardians in your district. I am not bothering my head about Liverpool. What I want to get from you is, whether, in your judgment, those guardians are guardians who, if they have got something to give away, would be liable to look after their pals ?—The general body of guardians in the district I have the honour to be inspector over are, I believe, upright, honourable men, the vast majority of them, undoubtedly.

8045. Are there any public charities in Newcastle or Middlesbrough, that you know of ?—Yes, there are a number of public charities in Newcastle, of course. I presume there are in Middlesbrough as well.

8046. You could not tell us anything about them, I suppose ?—There are the hospitals in Newcastle, apart from the parochial one. There are some other excellent institutions which bear a more general name which are not attached to any one particular thing.

The pauperism of Middlesbrough.

8047. Middlesbrough stands at the head of your list as having the highest percentage of pauperism, does not it ?—It does ; it is 3·4, I see here.

8048. It is true that part of it is built on a swamp ?—Yes.

8049. Have you seen the medical officer's figures with regard to the death-rate amongst children there ?—I cannot say that I have. *Mr. James Lowry.* 2 April, 1906.

8050. Have you looked at these figures as all—that there are only forty-nine persons per 1000 of the population who are over sixty years of age ; it is very low on the table indeed ; and also that only 33 per cent. of the people who are getting relief are over sixty years of age. Have you noticed that ?—I had not until you drew my attention to it.

8051. That means that 67 per cent. of the relief must go to people who are able-bodied or children. I want to ask you whether the reason for the high percentage is the fact that a good lot of that would be for illness and for widows and their children, and also for accidents ?—Yes.

8052. Have you any return of accidents in that district ? —None.

8053. Have you made inquiries about it at all ?—No, only general conversation. You referred just now to widows ; they are widows of those who unfortunately have suffered from local fatalities, whether it is weather, climate, or what not ; they are left, while the relief had been given for a longer or shorter period to their late husbands.

8054. Have you been through Middlesbrough workhouse lately ?—Many times.

8055. Were you struck with the number of cripples there are there ?—I cannot say I have been.

8056. You have not taken any special notice of it ?—No.

Nature of Special Orders in the district.

8057. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the special orders in force in Middlesbrough, have you had occasion to look at them ?—No.

8058. Are you aware that they are, in fact, the ordinary orders, and they only happen to be issued at different dates to those particular places ?—I have thought that several times, but I could not get an intelligent answer like you have given me this moment.

8059. Do you remember when the Middlesbrough Union was formed ?—I think so.

8060. Can you remember the date ?—I do not remember the date.

8061. Was not it a modern union ?—I look upon it as the most modern union I have got in point of time.

8062. Consequently the orders which were issued generally were not in force there, and had to be put in force from the formation of the union ?—By special order.

8063. There is no peculiarity about them except that ? —I have never been able to find out that there is.

Mr. Nicholas Herbert, called ; and Examined.

8064. (*Chairman.*) You are now Local Government Board Inspector for the No. 3 district ?—I am. *Mr. Nicholas Herbert.* 2 April, 1903.

Extent of district.

8065. Which is No. 3 district ?—It comprises the union counties of Warwickshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, part of Surrey, and part of Worcestershire.

8066. Previous to your appointment to that district, you were inspector of district No, 10, the North Midland district ?—Yes.

8067. You had five years experience there ?—Yes.

Effect of Mr. Chaplin's Circular.

8068. We will accept your memorandum as your evidence in chief. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVII. (A).) There are one or two questions I should like to put to you upon it. In paragraph 7 you refer to the circular letter of August 4th, 1900, and you think that that letter had some effect as regards an increase of outdoor relief. Did the number of recipients of outdoor relief increase, or was it merely that the amount was increased ?—I think the number increased.

8069. The guardians interpreted the order as regards numbers as well as adequacy ?—Yes, they mistook the order. They did not read it carefully. I have heard several guardians say the Local Government Board have now come to the conclusion that outdoor relief should be given more freely.

Increased death-rate in Workhouses and causes.

8070. In paragraph 10 you refer to the percentages of deaths in the workhouses which show a considerable increase, and in paragraph 87 there is a similar table which also shows a considerable increase in the percentage of deaths. To what do you attribute this ? Is it that a larger number of persons who are seriously ill now go to infirmaries ; if so, do they include a class that previously had not recourse to infirmaries ?—I think so ; they are now looking upon Poor Law infirmaries as State hospitals rather than workhouses; therefore they are now more ready to come into the infirmaries than formerly, and that practice is growing, I think.

Increased numbers of aged and sick paupers in Workhouses.

8071. The proportion of old people in the workhouses has increased, I think, of recent years ?—Yes, but it is principally amongst the aged sick and the sick that require skilled nursing, the bedridden, that the numbers coming into the workhouse are increasing.

8072. The inducement of better treatment and better accommodation has increased the number of occupants ?—That is so.

Pauperism in Lincolnshire and Leicester.

8073. In paragraph 70 you point out that in Lincolnshire there has been a slight decrease in pauperism, but I see in paragraph 25, notwithstanding the decrease, it is still the highest with the exception of Leicester ?—That is so.

8074. The improvement is really rather a reduction in an abnormally high rate ?—That is so.

Nottingham system of relief and its results.

8075. I will come to some very interesting facts which you record in connection with the administration of relief in Nottingham. In paragraph 46 you say that in October 1901 the Poor Law guardians eventually adopted the new system which is contained in the resolutions you there

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

enumerate. The operation of the scheme under those resolutions seems to have been very satisfactory?—I think it has been very satisfactory.

8076. It has succeeded in its objects; it has obtained more uniformity of treatment, it has secured to the deserving poor the consideration and relief that their interests require, and it has detected impostors?—That is so.

8077. I notice that the guardians work in co-operation with the Town Council and the Charity Organisation Society?—That was when there was some distress during the winter of 1904 and 1905 caused by the lack of employment in the town through no special works being carried out.

8078. Is the accord which exists in Nottingham among these three bodies exceptional, or does it exist in every town?—It is exceptional.

8079. It has been very satisfactory?—Very satisfactory indeed.

Effect of Workhouse test.

8080. Coming to paragraph 56, you there give the figures of those who were refused outdoor relief and were given workhouse orders. Out of 557 only sixteen accepted indoor relief?—That is so.

8081. And then it appears further on that, of the seven men who accepted, two remained in the workhouse only two days, two remained a week, one remained twelve days and one a month?—That is so.

8082. Was the result of this analysis a great surprise to you?—No. I had always been under that impression, and I was very pleased to see that the superintendent relieving officer, who takes an extreme interest in his work, was able to give such figures as to prove what is generally considered to be the case by most of those who have studied poor law questions.

8083. Simultaneously with the adoption of these rules, did the guardians increase the number of relieving officers?—No, but they appointed a superintendent relieving officer.

8084. On the other side, according to paragraph 61, the guardians were enabled to increase the amount of outdoor relief in certain deserving cases?—That is so; they took off a great number of those who were receiving 2s. a week, which had been given more as pocket money than as relief, and increased the amount of relief in other cases.

8085. There then follows a number of interesting cases reported upon by the relieving officer where persons in possession of means, or making an improper use of their means, were detected?—That is so.

8086. The change has been satisfactory, and is continuing to bear good fruit?—I think so.

Out-relief policy at Leicester.

8087. We will now come to Leicester. In Leicester there was an election in 1901, and a good many new members were appointed who were in favour of giving outdoor relief more generously than before. Has there been a subsequent election?—There was one in 1904.

8088. Did the same idea prevail at that election?—I think so.

8089. There has been a considerable increase in the amount of relief, both indoor and outdoor?—That is so, but I may say that Mr. Walsh has promised to give all evidence with regard to Leicester, so I have not looked up the papers before coming here.

8090. In paragraph 19 you will observe that you state: "As a large proportion of the inhabitants are employed in these trades in this county, it would be expected that pauperism would be less than in counties where the heads of the families are, as a rule, the only wage earners." There have been considerable alterations and changes, have there not, in the boot-making trade?—That is so; quicker moving machinery has been introduced; but that was several years ago.

8091. You do not think this rise in pauperism was due to any particular movement in the boot trade?—A certain amount of it was, but not the whole of the great rise which has taken place since 1901.

8092. It is rather outside your province; but could you tell us whether the introduction of machinery has increased or diminished the amount of employment in Leicester?—That I cannot give, but probably Mr. Kemp, the late chairman of the board of guardians, would be able to give you more definite information with regard to those points than I could.

8093. How long has the movement been going on?—It was there before I was appointed as Inspector to the district.

8094. I suppose it has continued during the whole of your period of office?—It has.

Alleged causes of pauperism.

8095. Going back for a moment to paragraph 53, you state there the alleged causes of applications. I rather want to know what some of the items mean. "Immorality:" does that mean a woman who was about to be confined?—No, those cases should be under the heading "effects of immorality," but these are taken from the superintendent relieving officers' report. These cases ought to be really put up under the first heading.

8096. Of "sickness"?—Yes.

8097. Then "criminality" is the next one?—With regard to criminality, I was speaking to the superintendent relieving officer and asked him what he meant by this term. It is principally the wives who apply for relief for themselves and their children while their husbands are in prison, or men who have just come out of prison, and require relief for a fortnight or so before they get work.

8098. It is rather misleading apparently, or at least it is not very intelligible?—I have put down the figures from the superintendent relieving officer's report.

8099. "Illegitimacy," I assume, means illegitimate children who have no parents to whom they can legally appeal for support?—That is so.

8100. In paragraph 84 you show the percentage of increase of population, and in the next column the increase or decrease of pauperism. There is a very remarkable increase of pauperism in Grimsby?—That is so.

Conditions in Grimsby Union.

8101. How do you account for that?—Grimsby is practically a new union. Formerly it was part of the Caistor Union, and we have a new set of guardians there, who have given relief rather generously; certainly more generously than the old Caistor Board of Guardians did.

8102. What is the character of the district which has been added to Grimsby. Is it agricultural?—Grimsby has been taken out of the Caistor Union. Formerly the Caistor Union included Grimsby, and they have taken out the urban part, and a small part of the rural and made it into a separate union.

8103. There is a large increase in population, you see?—Yes, there is a very large increase in population.

8104. There is also a large increase in the population of Mansfield. The evidence we have had before us goes to show that where there is a large increase of population it is generally attended by a temporary reduction in the percentage of pauperism, but these figures go in the other direction?—Only in the case of Grimsby.

8105. Grimsby is, I suppose, a one trade place; it is only fish?—It is also a holiday resort, because Cleethorpes is part of Grimsby.

8106. What is Cleethorpes?—It is a seaside town adjoining Grimsby. No doubt part of the increase at Grimsby was caused by the dock strike which took place some four years back, when great sympathy was shown for the poor and they have not made the reduction again. The increase is also due to relieving officers having some 700 cases on their lists and therefore they cannot go into them thoroughly, and are unable to give the care and attention which is necessary.

Results of appointment of Superintendent Relieving Officer and rota Relief Committees at Nottingham.

8107. I see you revert to Nottingham as a union which might be taken as a specimen of Poor Law administration?—They practically carry out my ideal of what the administration of a Poor Law union should be.

8108. You attribute a very large amount of the success of the new administration to the appointment of the superintendent relieving officer?—That is the first thing; there is also the difference in the administration by relief committees.

8109. Which are rotatory?—Yes.

Increase of male paupers and causes.

8110. In your 102nd paragraph you notice the change during the last thirty years in the various proportions of the men, women and children who are receiving Poor Law relief. The number of men has considerably increased, the number of children has decreased, and the percentage

of women has remained almost stationary. To what do you attribute the large increase in the number of men. You state they cannot obtain employment. Are mne turned adrift now at an earlier age than they were a few years back?—I think so. They come upon the Poor Law at a much earlier age than formerly.

8111. Are you satisfied they do come on earlier?—I am fully satisfied there is a much younger class of men getting into the workhouses than formerly.

8112. Have you any figures to show that?—I have no figures to show that.

8113. That is the result of your personal observation?—Yes.

Effect of Workmen's Compensation Act.

8114. Following that up a little, it has been alleged that the Workmen's Compensation Act has acted in that direction. Have you ever heard that allegation?—I have frequently heard it, but I have not come across cases to prove it.

8115. Individual cases?—No individual cases to prove such was the case. I have only heard it stated that such is the case.

8116. When you have asked men who are in the workhouse, they have not alleged that as a reason of their inability to get work?—No, I know of no case, but the men have frequently told me that it is useless for men over 50 to apply for work. With regard to the condition of those men in the workhouse, the superintendent relieving officer got out some figures showing the condition of 100 unselected cases, and he found that 63 per cent. of those men were single, only four were married and living with their wives, thirty-three were widowers or separated, so that a very large proportion of them are single—about two-thirds.

Condition as to marriage of workhouse inmates in Nottingham.

8117. What union was this?—In Nottingham workhouse. Two-thirds of them were single and only four were living with their wives. It appears to me that if these men had had some encouragement to seek work, someone to encourage them to go on, probably they would not have come upon the Poor Law, but having only themselves to look after, they simply drift down into the workhouse and make no effort to get out of it, and in a loosely administered workhouse, or a workhouse where the work is not sufficient, or not so irksome or tedious as it is outside, there is a tendency for such cases to remain in the workhouses.

Former occupations of paupers at Nottingham.

8118. What were these men: mostly unskilled labourers?—The occupation of those were not noted, but I can give you the occupations of the 2493 new applications during 1903 in Nottingham. 600 were labourers, 214 called themselves hawkers, 152 building trades, 117 lace, 108 hosiery, 59 were miners, 37 porters, 37 engineering trades, 22 metal workers, 21 clerks, 18 clothing workers, 18 wood workers, 17 carters and cabmen, 14 leather trades, 9 dyeing trade, beer 8, warehousemen 8, cycle 2, miscellaneous 76, professionals: singers, musicians, etc., 19. That is the men. Of the women 318 were lace workers, 181 charwomen, 264 domestic servants, 46 hosiery workers, 36 clothing, 43 hawkers, 11 were laundry workers, no trade 6, tobacco workers 5, cycle 1, French polishers 3, miscellaneous 14, singers, musicians, etc., 9. So that more than one-third of the men were general labourers at Nottingham.

8119. These were the men who applied for outdoor relief?—The men who applied for relief. The total number of applications was 2,493: there were 1,556 men and 937 women.

8120. (*Mr. Booth.*) Where do the wives come in?—These are the applications, and I have only the applications. If a man applied for himself only, or if he applied for his wife as well, in both cases it would count as one application.

8121. If he applied for the wife as well, would she be counted in the number?—No.

8122. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) If she got relief she would?—These are only applications. If I go into the number of persons, then I get different figures altogether.

8123. (*Chairman.*) How many of those applications were acceded to? How many were granted outdoor relief, and how many were given the option of coming into the workhouse?—557 I think it was. I have given those figures.

8124. The total number was 2,493?—That was the number of applicants.

8125. Were only 557 granted relief?—557 were refused out-relief and workhouse orders given instead.

8126. And the remainder got relief?—Yes.

8127. So that practically three-fourths of the applications after careful investigation were acceded to?—Yes, some of those would be medical orders.

Qualifications and experience of Inspector.

8128. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) How long have you been appointed?—I was appointed assistant inspector in 1888.

8129. Had you any previous experience?—None, except in the Local Government Board.

8130. What were you in the Local Government Board?—I was private secretary to Mr. Ritchie.

8131. For how many years?—I was his private secretary for two years.

8132. So that you have been connected with the Poor Law now about twenty years, is that it?—Yes.

8133. Did you have any instructions when you were appointed?—As far as I can remember, no; but then I was appointed an assistant inspector.

8134. So that you worked with another inspector; whom did you work with?—Mr. Hedley was then metropolitan inspector, and Dr. Bridges was the inspector for medical purposes.

8135. Did you work with Mr. Lockwood at all?—Yes.

Poor Law administration at Nottingham.

8136. About Nottingham, it seems to me that you look on that as a well-administered union, do you not?—I look upon it as a well-administered union, but the guardians are somewhat generous.

8137. In what way are they generous?—They are ready to grant relief rather freely.

8138. Do you think they grant it to undeserving cases?—No.

8139. Do you think that they make sufficient inquiries into the cases?—Yes, they make full inquiries.

8140. Do they give relief in aid of destitution, or in aid of poverty?—Take the case of a widow with one child and three lodgers, with 27s. a week coming into the house; the guardians would probably give 1s. 6d. or 2s., as they say, to save the woman from any temptation to go wrong.

8141. They have a large proportion of outdoor relief there, have they not?—It is not large, is it?

8142. It is 3,551 against 1,828 is it not?—Those are the figures.

8143. Do you think the guardians there are able to discriminate between deserving and undeserving?—I think so.

8144. Do you think that the work is carried out fairly well there?—Very well indeed.

8145. Does the fact that outdoor relief is given to that extent, increase the total pauperism in the place? What I mean is, do you think it would be possible to abolish all that outdoor relief?—Not all.

Value of strengthening idea of maintenance of parents by children.

8146. You know there are some people who say you ought not to give outdoor relief at all; now, this is a board of guardians which you consider administers the poor law properly, and yet it gives a good deal of outdoor relief; would you consider that that union would be properly administered if the out-relief was abolished, and do you think that it would be to the good of Nottingham if, instead of giving any outdoor relief, they gave it all indoor?—That raises the whole question with regard to outdoor relief. My view with regard to outdoor relief is, that the State should do all it can to make the children support their aged parents. It is good for the old people and it is good for the young people. Take the case of the young people. If a father knows that he can look to his children in his old age to support him, that is an encouragement for a father to do his best for the child. To do his best for the child may cost him money; and I do not see why he should not look upon that as an asset for his old age, as, for instance, if he spent money upon an apprenticeship for his child or upon a few extra years' schooling, so that the child might become a teacher and thus have a very much better chance of getting on in the world. Surely it must be some encouragement to the father, if he knows that the boy is not only morally but legally bound to support him in his old age. Therefore I think you would get more children apprenticed or given extra education.

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

If the father wishes to turn the boy out and make him into a self-supporting person as quickly as possible, he can do it by making the boy an errand-boy and afterwards becoming a general labourer—which I believe many of them do; but that is the class from which we get pauperism. Again, with the old people, it is very much better, rather than give them 3s. or 4s. a week and letting them live their lonely lives to encourage a daughter or daughter-in-law to take charge of the old people and for the sons to assist. In a well-administered union, cases frequently come before the Poor Law which, upon investigation, prove that the families can support them, that is, they have got sufficient means to support their parents. The old people living with a daughter or a daughter-in-law have a very much better life than if they lived the lonely life which they would do upon this 3s. or 4s. a week. Not only that, but the 3s. or 4s. a week is very often supplemented by contributions in the shape of charity from strangers—not from their own children. Therefore, I think that the State should encourage the children to do the best for their parents. But there are some hard cases—and they say hard cases make bad laws—such cases as old people who have not got any sons to support them, but where such cases apply they want very thorough investigation by the guardians, and the guardians should ascertain what is the best means of relieving them.

8147. You rather put Nottingham, out as a sample?—Only in the forms and method of administration.

8148. Do you think that at Nottingham the guardians do make all these inquiries as to the ability of the children to maintain their parents?—The relieving officers and the superintendent relieving officer do.

8149. If that is carried out, you still have a large number outside?—You have a large number at Nottingham.

Analysis of out-relief at Nottingham.

8150. I want to point out that only 52 per cent. of the relief was given to old people there, and all the remaining 48 per cent. went to people under sixty, according to Mr. Booth's table. You must remember that a considerable number of children and widows would be getting relief at Nottingham?—Yes, a good deal of out-relief is given there to widows and children.

8151. And then there is the relief given in cases of sickness?—Yes.

8152. Do you consider that giving outdoor relief in that union is a good or a bad thing? Does it tend to increase pauperism or to decrease it, or does it tend to keep it normal?—In Nottingham they go medium; they are neither very lavish nor very strict.

8153. It is your type of what a good union ought to be, is it not?—The method of administration is.

8154. That is, they are as careful as they can be?—The method is as good as it can be.

8155. And yet you have this amount of pauperism?—Yes. You have a very large number on that board who are very fond of giving outdoor relief.

Necessity of out-relief owing to absence of charities.

8156. But if it is only given to deserving people, then that is, of course, what they are there for, granting that you should give outdoor relief. According to your experience, would you advocate no outdoor relief?—As I have mentioned, there are some hard cases which are relieved by charity in St. George's-in-the-East, where they have such charities, it need not be necessary to give outdoor relief; but in other unions where you have not got charities to help hard cases, I am afraid the Poor Law must come in.

8157. Take Nottingham. Do you think it is all right there?—There the guardians themselves are rather generous.

8158. Then they are not good administrators, are they?—The method of administration is good.

8159. (*Mrs. Webb.*) The machinery, you mean, is good?—Yes.

8160. But the policy may be bad, although the machinery is good?—Yes.

8161. (*Chairman.*) You would not admit that the policy is bad, would you?—No, I should not say the policy is bad—I say they are rather generous.

8162. You say that the machinery is good, but, as I understand you, there is in your judgment a tendency on the part of the individuals that form the machinery occasionally to be somewhat lax; is that it?—Yes.

8163. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) To which classes do you think that refers at Nottingham; do you think they are too generous to the widows, for instance?—To the widows and the children, I should say. I have attended their relief committees, and I have noticed that particularly with regard to the widows. I have given you an example—there are many such examples—and in that respect I thought they were rather lax.

Effect of abolition of out-relief.

8164. Still you believe that if you were to abolish outdoor relief all over your district pauperism would come down?—Pauperism would certainly come down.

8165. And it would be possible to do it, would it?—I think public opinion would be against it.

8166. I want to ask you whether you think we ought to give all indoor relief and no outdoor relief?—I have said that in some few cases it would be a hardship not to give outdoor relief.

8167. You do not know what percentage that would be?—If you wish me to give the union which I should say was a model union with regard to the guardians, I would take Stamford or Bingham or Spilsby.

8168. You have a good lot of outdoor relief there, have you not?—Yes.

Out-relief to aged in rural districts.

8169. That is accounted for, is it not, by the fact that you have got 130 per 1,000 over sixty years of age?—That is so. It is a rural union.

8170. That would mean that there would be more old people getting outdoor relief?—Yes. In rural unions you will find the people live to a much older age than they do in urban districts.

Attitude of poor towards out-relief.

8171. They get the outdoor relief in the shape of a pension, really, do they not?—That is it.

8172. Do you find that guardians and the people generally are coming to look upon outdoor relief as a pension?—No, I cannot say that.

8173. I mean, it is thought that they have a right to it?—No, not in most unions.

8174. Do you think they still look on it as something a little disgraceful to be getting outdoor relief?—In some unions, yes, in other unions, no.

Effectiveness of the stigma of out-relief.

8175. In which unions would you say no?—Nottingham, for instance, is an urban district where the population is lost, and where nobody knows that a person is getting relief: in Nottingham I should say no, but in a country place like Spilsby I should say yes.

8176. You do believe that people are ashamed of having to get outdoor relief?—I think so.

8177. Do you think that applies generally to the country districts?—It applies to many country districts, but not to all, for instance, it does not apply in Caistor or in Horncastle.

Increased attractiveness of Workhouse Infirmaries.

8178. You say in your memorandum that the increase in the number of indoor poor is partly due to the improvements that have taken place in workhouses, etc., and that many who formerly would not have applied for relief have now no hesitation in asking for an order for admission to the infirmary; is that merely because the infirmary is better conducted?—Yes; the infirmaries are better conducted and the inmates are better nursed and better fed; then the wards are brighter and are not so over-crowded.

Aged persuaded into Workhouse Infirmaries by relatives.

8179. Do you think that the people there have any notion that they have a right to provide hospitals and that sort of thing out of the rates, and that the people who go in go in because they feel that they have a right to provide these places, and therefore they have a right to go and use them?—The inmates of the infirmaries are mostly very sick and very old people, and they want rest and quietness, which they cannot get at home, and they also want attention. I do not think that it is they themselves that care to go in; it is generally their relations who tell them how comfortable it is there, and that the nurses can do more for them there and that kind of thing, and so they become willing to go inside.

8180. It is, of course, the infirm, as apart from the sick, that you are speaking of now?—I am speaking of both the sick and the infirm.

8181. Surely a large number of people who are not old but who are temporarily disabled go in ?—The temporarily disabled do not form such a very large number.

8182. So that the inmates of these infirmaries would be mainly old people ?—Yes. They will be the class which requires skilled nursing which, if you do not have a trained nurse to attend to, would soon get bed sores.

8183. What about the cases in a town like Nottingham ; would you not have a considerable number of people under sixty there who get relief in infirmaries ?—Yes, you would have more in a town.

Centripetal effect on pauperism of Poor Law Infirmaries, *e.g.*, Birmingham.

8184. Would not one of the reasons why there are more of this kind of people of that age going in now because they think they have a right to do it ?—No, I do not think so. I think a very large number of those which you get, say, in Nottingham, come from the country districts and do not belong to Nottingham ; these cases go to the large towns where the infirmaries are looked upon with favour by the poor. They come into the town and go to a common lodging-house, and apply for an order for the workhouse, in order to get the benefit of the very high nursing and medical skill which they can get in a large infirmary. For instance, take Birmingham, which is a favourite infirmary. The proportion of deaths which take place in the Birmingham infirmary is 15·7 of the total number of deaths that take place in that town, that is, one out of every seven who dies in Birmingham dies in the workhouse, and I fear that a very large number of those do not belong to the town.

8185. They are tramps, really, then ?—No, they are people who come from the neighbouring unions and go into common lodging-houses or into lodgings in order to take advantage of the Poor Law in that way.

8186. They are people who do not belong to Birmingham ? —That is so. In Birmingham there are 2,012 beds in the registered common lodging houses. In No. 2 Relief District two-thirds of the applications come from the common lodging houses and from lodgings.

8187. In paragraph 63 of your memorandum you refer to people whom the superintendent relieving officer speaks of as being very drunk ?—That is an extract from the superintendent relieving officer's report.

8188. Could you tell us what percentage of the people are very drunk ?—No ; but the superintendent relieving officer, if you have him in front of you, would probably be able to give you a lot of information on such points.

8189. I want to know whether a case like that would be struck off at once ; I suppose it would at Nottingham ?—Yes, it would there.

Maintenance of aged by relatives as a remedy for out-relief.

8190. (*Mr. Nunn.*) With regard to the question which Mr. Lansbury raised about outdoor relief, it would be impossible at a stroke to abolish outdoor relief in a series of unions, whereas it would be possible to do it gradually if one were at the same time promoting habits of providence amongst people, and stimulating people who were prepared to help them to give them charitable assistance ?—I think that relations should be encouraged to look after their old people. I think, in the first instance, we should get that reform thoroughly considered and carried out, so that the old people should look to their families rather than to the State. There is a tendency I think, to look to the State too much, now.

8191. That is quite obvious in the case of the old men and old women who have children who ought to look after them, but Mr. Lansbury was instancing the case where you have an old person who has not anyone to look after her ; that is a case, I take it, in which you would consider charitable intervention would be most suitably employed ?—I consider charitable intervention would be most suitable there, and then, if you cannot get it, the Poor Law must step in.

8192. The special case which I would like to ask your opinion upon is that of the old persons whose children are quite capable of looking after them but who decline to do so when approached by charitable bodies. When the guardians are prepared to force an allowance from them by taking legal measures, do you think they should leave them alone to support their parents, or do you think they ought to use the machinery of their union to collect the money ?—What is sometimes done is that, rather than give 2s. or 3s. per week as outdoor relief, they ask the old woman to come in, and then charge the 7s. to the relatives.

8193. Supposing that it was a case of real hardship for a person to enter the house—such a case as one often comes across where, for instance, an old lady had brought up several sons and done it well, and they had refused to assist her—would you think it justifiable to use the collecting machinery of the union in order to collect the relief which the sons ought to give the old lady ?—If it cannot be done otherwise, yes ; but very often, if you have got a good superintendent relieving officer, he will point out to the sons that it will become very much more expensive to them if they cannot arrange it. Under such a superintendent relieving officer as Mr. Johnstone, say—unfortunately he is no longer Superintendent Relieving Officer at Nottingham—very many of those cases came to a satisfactory arrangement without the old people having to be classed as paupers under the Poor Law.

8194. With regard to the table in paragraph 102, I think you have said that the proportion of single men in the workhouse is about two-thirds of the total number of men ?—Yes.

Condition as to marriage and previous careers of paupers at Nottingham.

8195. Was the inquiry pushed in order to ascertain whether those men really were single, that is to say, were any individual instances taken up and their statements checked ?—I will read you what the superintendent relieving officer says : "From inquiries made in 100 unselected cases as to the cause leading to loss of work by men who became chargeable in the workhouse, it appeared that 62 left or were dismissed owing to drink ; 27 were dismissed because of laziness ; 5 for insubordination, and 6 for general unfitness for their work. It also appeared that the wages and the conditions of these 100 men were as follows : At 15s. to £1 a week, 13 single ; 1 married, and 8 widowed or separated ; at 21s. to 25s. a week, 11 single, 1 married, and 5 widowed or separated ; at 26s. to 30s. a week, 7 single, 1 married, and 7 widowed or separated ; at 31s. to 35s. a week, 5 single, 1 married, and two widowed or separated ; at 36s. to 40s. a week, 1 single and 1 widowed or separated ; for those at from 41s. to 45s. a week there are no figures ; and for those of uncertain wages 26 single and 10 widowed or separated." There were therefore 63 men single, 4 married, and 33 widowed or separated.

8196. Were those applications originally coming from outside which had been investigated by the relieving officer ?—Those were 100 men who were in the workhouse.

8197. So that their statements were accepted, and there was not an investigation made by the relieving officer at the place of origin ?—This is the result of investigations made by the superintendent relieving officer, not only at the workhouse but he also made very close inquiries as to their mode of living previous to coming upon the Poor Law.

8198. Did he push the investigation back to their present and previous addresses ; that is what I want to know ?—He made further inquiries. This information depends not only on the *ex parte* statements of the paupers themselves, but also upon the inquiries which he would get the relieving officer to make.

8199. May I ask whether, in the course of those inquiries, he ascertained whether any men who said they were single were really married ?—I cannot say. You must get Mr. Johnstone to tell you that.

8200. In paragraph 62 you cite several cases of deception ; those were all obtained from the superintendent relieving officer, I think ?—From the report of the superintendent relieving officer.

Functions of Superintendent Relieving Officer.

8201. Can you describe now what the functions of a superintendent relieving officer are ? Does he undertake cases himself or does he merely look after the cases dont by the relieving officers under him ?—There are special orders issued by the Local Government Board as to his duties. He is a most important officer. When you get four or five relieving officers there is practically no supervision unless you have a superintendent relieving officer. Again, a superintendent relieving officer helps towards uniformity of administration. A guardian may go up to a single relieving officer, and say, "You will have to give relief to such a case. And you need not mention such and such facts." What is the relieving officer to do ? If there is a check put upon him by the superintendent relieving officer, he says, "I cannot do so," and then you get the full facts of the case stated when it is brought before the board of guardians.

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

Explanation of certain tables in statement of evidence.

8202. Does he inspect the relieving officer's work in the office and cross-visit the cases also; is that what he does?—Not only that, but he takes the relieving officer's books when the relieving officer goes on leave, which is a very good check.

8203. Then in paragraph 58 you give a table setting out a certain number of cases in which out-door relief was refused; I see that there is a division made between those who have entered the workhouse and those whose allowances were stopped on various grounds. Did none of those whose allowances were stopped on various grounds enter the workhouse?—They did not apply for relief, and they did not come into the workhouse.

8204. "Entered workhouse" would include a good number of those other categories, I take it?—Yes, it would.

8205. Then there is a table in paragraph 55; does "Not deserted" in that table mean that a statement had been made that they had been deserted and it was afterwards discovered that they had not?—These cases ought to come under the heading "Deception;" they are cases where the husband goes into the next street until his wife goes into the workhouse, and then go back again.

8206. She said she had been deserted, and it was not so?—That is it.

8207. In paragraph 54 you give a table showing the residences of applicants for relief, and one line is "Applications from Institutions;" that would be from charitable institutions chiefly, I suppose?—From hospitals, private asylums, etc.

8208. Did shelters figure largely amongst those?—No. The people from those would apply direct to the relieving officer; they would be able-bodied. "From institutions" would really mean the sick.

8209. I think you have said the classification in the table in paragraph 53 was a classification made by a superintendent relieving officer?—Yes.

8210. There is a good deal of cross-classification in it, is there not?—Yes. If I had done it myself, I do not think I should have used exactly the same terms.

8211. The antecedent conditions are so very complex that it suggests a certain crudity to put down causes in that way, does it not?—Yes. I have only given you the figures because I thought they might be useful to the Commission; the officer went into it very thoroughly himself.

8212. But he has got his theory behind him, which does not appear?—Yes.

Favourable discrimination for thrifty applicants for relief.

8213. Of course guardians inquire into the question of whether a man has belonged to a provident club of any kind, but is that ever made a condition in deciding whether he shall receive outdoor or indoor relief?—That information is always given in the application and report book.

8214. Would different treatment be given to a man according to whether he belonged to a club or not?—Yes, and also as to whether he was thrifty or not.

8215. If he had not been thrifty, would an attempt be made to recover by loan, or would they give him indoor instead of outdoor relief?—In very few cases do they attempt to recover by loan.

8216. What are the attempts that are made to discriminate between the man who has tried to provide for himself and the man who has not?—The guardians are much more generous towards the first man. But really each case has to be judged upon its merits; cases cannot be treated wholesale.

Co-operation between Guardians, Municipality, and Charity at Nottingham.

8217. Turning to Nottingham, there you say there is a good deal of co-operation between the guardians, the municipal authorities and the Charity Organisation Society; what specific form does that co-operation take?—When the guardians found that there was a certain amount of distress likely to be caused through want of employment during the winter of 1904-05, the guardians approached the town council in order to see if they could give extra work, or what they were prepared to do. It was decided between the town council and the board of guardians to work with the Charity Organisation Society. It was arranged that all those who had not been in Nottingham for twelve months, or who were well-known bad characters, or who had received relief before, should be referred to the Poor Law; and that all the other cases should be taken by the Charity Organisation Society, who relieved them, and I believe with very satisfactory results indeed.

8218. Where did the municipality come in—did it provide work?—I forgot to mention that they gave £400 out of their funds to the Charity Organisation Society, on condition that the Charity Organisation Society took over these cases; and more was to be given if necessary. They also started certain sewage works in the winter. The three authorities worked in conjunction, and whilst pauperism in other towns increased largely, in Nottingham it only increased 10 per cent. in that year.

8219. What sort of division was made amongst the various classes of applicants? I suppose some received work at the hands of the municipality?—Some did.

8220. And some received an allowance from the Charity Organisation Society?—Yes.

8221. And others were referred to the Poor Law?—Yes.

8222. What classes of men received the allowance from the Charity Organisation Society?—The deserving cases, for whom work could not be found.

8223. That is, the most provident?—Yes.

8224. And those which were unsuitable for the work which the municipality offered?—Yes. There was only a certain number of places vacant, and therefore they could only employ a certain number.

Report of Charity Organisation Society on work at Nottingham.

8225. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) The Charity Organisation Society of Nottingham have issued a report on this work; might that be put in evidence?—If you can get that report, which is an excellent report, it will give you the whole facts of the case. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVII. (B).)

8226. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Has that led to any further co-operation between the board of guardians and the Charity Organisation Society?—I have left Nottingham now, and I do not know what has taken place since.

8227. But you do not know of any other form of co-operation between them?—No; but I may mention that the clerk to the guardians, who is a very able officer, is also the clerk to the Distress Committee.

8228. There they are only dealing with the unemployed?—That is so.

8229. Does the co-operation between the board of guardians and the Charity Organisation Society subsist with regard to any other class of cases except the unemployed?—Not that I am aware of.

System of Rota Relief Committees at Nottingham and its advantages.

8230. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the Nottingham committees, do I understand that the same guardians always deal with the same cases, or is the arrangement that you mention in your memorandum devised for the express purpose of making different guardians deal with the same cases?—There are forty-eight members of the Nottingham Board of Guardians, and they are formed into four committees of twelve each, the first twelve names on the list alphabetically forming the first committee, and so on.

8231. So that they become permanent committees?—Yes. The first committee will take relief district A for three months, then relief district B for three months, then relief district C for three months, and relief district D for three months; and then they will go back again to A.

8232. Then they take different districts for three months?—Yes.

8233. So that you do have a different set of guardians dealing with the same cases?—That is so.

8234. Is that the object of the system?—That is the object of the system. At the same time the system permits of any guardian belonging to other districts attending any relief committee. No two committees are allowed to sit at the same time, so if there is a case which a guardian is interested in, he can go and make his statement with regard to that case to the committee that is dealing with it.

8235. Then practically, bearing in mind that qualification, the object is that the same guardians shall not deal with the same cases for more than three months?—The object is to attain uniformity of treatment.

8236. Surely that does not attain uniformity of treatment, because if different guardians deal with the same cases that would presumably mean different treatment? —You may get different treatment in each district every three months, but you get uniform treatment throughout the union.

8237. But still if you have a different set of guardians dealing with the same case every three months, you may have a difference of opinion as regards policy?—Yes, but then you have got the superintendent relieving officer to fall back upon.

8238. I was coming to him later on?—I would point out that having a superintendent relieving officer, he is able to tell them all that took place at the other committee.

8239. We will leave the superintendent for the moment. The whole object of this system is really, as I understand it, to prevent favouritism?—That is so.

8240. That is to say, if you do not have this system there is favouritism?—There is a likelihood of favouritism.

8241. And such a strong likelihood that you must manufacture this rather artificial system in order to prevent it? —That is so.

Position of Superintendent Relieving Officer.

8242. As regards the superintendent, he becomes practically the dispenser of the uniformity, that is, he is responsible for the uniformity?—He is not responsible at all. He makes his statement, and he answers any question put to him.

8243. But you rely on him to keep the relief uniform? —I rely upon him to give the information as to what takes place in the other committees, or as to the general policy which has been pursued by the board.

8244. And therefore he more or less directs the policy of the board?—I do not think so.

8245. But if he does not direct the policy how do you secure uniformity?—He is only able to give information as to what has been done in a particular case; for instance, you have a case which has been before one committee, and then he is able, when the next committee comes on, to tell them what the other committee have said, and he can also put in his case paper with all the remarks of the previous chairman on it.

8246. I understand that legally the guardians are supreme, but as a matter of fact this man, having all the expert knowledge, must actually direct their policy, must he not?—They rely upon him to a certain extent for information, but the Nottingham guardians intend to have their own way always as a committee.

8247. Of course they may intend it, but surely as a matter of fact the superintendent does to a very large extent determine the policy?—I would not go so far as that.

Amount of "sickness" pauperism and causes thereof.

8248. I notice that in the returns of "Alleged cause," sickness comes out at 41 per cent.?—Yes.

8249. Do you think that is at all typical of other unions?—I think that is so in unions with a large urban population.

8250. That is to say, that nearly half the pauperism is caused by sickness?—Yes, that is true in the case of half the applications. A good many of those are for medical relief only.

8251. Then any conditions which produce sickness must be potent causes of pauperism?—That is so.

8252. You would therefore say, would you not, that bad housing would be a large cause?—Yes.

8253. And bad conditions of employment, long hours or insanitary workshops also, would be a cause of sickness?—They would.

8254. And therefore a cause of poverty?—Yes.

Centrifugal effect on pauperism of Poor Law Infirmaries.

8255. So if we were inquiring into the causes of pauperism, the causes of sickness would in that case be one of the principal causes of pauperism?—Yes; but you must remember, as I pointed out before, that in Nottingham a very large number of these applications do not come from persons who belong to Nottingham, but come from persons who come into Nottingham in order to get the extra special care which they know they will get in the Nottingham workhouse.

8256. Do they come and lodge with Nottingham friends?—Yes, or they get into some lodging-house. They are able to understand what kind of inquiries will be made, and if they do not tell the truth, they probably can get into the infirmary that they wish to get into.

8257. Is this closely inquired into?—Very closely, but how are you going to inquire into the circumstances of a person in a common lodging-house? If they say they have lived in Nottingham for fifteen years, it is difficult to find out that they have not.

Difficulty of applying law of settlement to inmates of common lodging-houses and to sick people.

8258. Do you suggest that in the case of people who live in common lodging-houses, their settlements cannot really be ascertained?—That is my idea. I have given a table showing that 51 per cent. of the applicants come from their own homes or are living with relatives. You can easily find out everything about them; but when they come from lodgings, or from common lodging-houses, you have to take their *ex parte* statement; and if they will not give you any information, or give you any hint as to their settlement, how are you to find out?

8259. I suppose you could inquire of the head of the common lodging-house how long that man had stayed there, and he would be obliged to report it to the police? —And even suppose he does so, you cannot find out where the man's settlement is.

8260. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) If the person is ill you must attend to him, must you not?—Yes, certainly.

8261. And you have to inquire into his settlement afterwards?—Certainly.

Effect on character of people of hospital provision for infectious diseases.

8262. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the use of the infirmaries, which you say is becoming more frequent, do you think that it all arises from the fact that people have become accustomed to use the fever hospitals?—I cannot think so. No doubt if they accept relief, so to speak, from the town council (the sanitary authority) rather than from the Poor Law, probably that would have an effect; but I should not think it would have a very large effect upon them. If I got ill, I should probably have a nurse and the doctor would see me now and then, but if a poor person gets ill he goes into the infirmary and then he gets a nurse by day and a nurse by night and a resident medical officer to come and look at him whenever the nurse considers it necessary, for instance, if his temperature goes up the medical officer would be sent for. I think that is probably what causes the increasing number in the infirmaries.

8263. The whole plan of notifying diseases, with a view to their removal from their homes, must surely make the man feel that he is doing the State a service by going to the hospital, rather than remaining at home and contaminating his friends and relations?—That must be so.

8264. To a large extent the State is engaged now in persuading the ordinary citizen that he ought not to remain in his home if he is ill?—If he is suffering from a disease from which other people will be likely to suffer.

8265. And practically all diseases are now considered contaminating to some extent, are they not?—Not old age.

8266. But almost everything else?—Yes, many diseases are.

Procedure and difficulties in connection with Poor Law contracts.

8267. Would you kindly tell us your experience with regard to boards of guardians giving contracts; where are the weak points in the procedure?—I think the weak point is not with regard to the contracts themselves, but as to whether the class of goods which are delivered is in accordance with the contract. Take for instance the meat contract. If the contract says "prime English wether mutton" you generally find it is Deptford killed that is delivered; if the contract says "Deptford killed," you will find it is New Zealand mutton, and if the contract says "New Zealand mutton," described as Canterbury brand—but there is no such brand—Australian mutton is delivered. I found out this when I was making inquiries into the matter in London a few years back. The price in the contract which they get for prime English mutton was in most cases such that the contractors could not possibly have it delivered except at a loss, although there must have been a pretty good profit if the Deptford killed mutton was delivered—not an extravagant profit, but a large profit. After I had made many inquiries, I decided to attack this question so as to get real contracts, as I found that the same contractors always got the contracts. I went for the biggest authority in

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

London, the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and there was a correspondence with the Local Government Board which might be of use to the Commission, respecting the contracts for meat. With regard to the boards of guardians, as a rule I think you can trust them—indeed, I am sure you can—and that you have only got to give them a hint that something is wrong, and then they will soon put it right. Take the case of Baxter *v.* Musto at Mile End. I gave the Mile End Guardians a hint that the contract for drapery required looking into; it cost me three days in the court of King's Bench, but at any rate I think it was fully proved right up to the hilt that there was collusion between the contractor and somebody on the Board of guardians. Everything there I fancy has been put right. Taking boards of guardians as a whole, I am sure there are only a few black sheep, and as a rule they are entirely governed by the desire to do the best they can for the poor.

8268. Would you say that about the London unions ?—I know so very little about the guardians in London; I have very seldom met them, although I was in London for twelve years.

8269. Did you come across the Lambeth union, for instance ?—I met a committee once, but only once.

Inspector's functions as to contracts.

8270. Do you consider it is the duty of an inspector to attend meetings of boards of guardians when they are giving out the contracts ?—I attend meetings of boards of guardians, but not on any special day. You cannot attend every board of guardians when it is giving out contracts; they all come on about one time, *i.e.*, at the end of the half-year.

8271. Do you think it is part of the functions of an inspector to find out what is the exact procedure with regard to the giving of contracts ?—I think that might be one of the special points which he should look into.

8272. But it is not at present, is it; he would not consider himself specially responsible for that, would he ?—If I saw that the procedure was wrong, I should point it out.

8273. But you can hardly see it unless you find it out. Do you consider it would be the duty of an inspector to find out what the procedure is on every board of guardians in his district ?—Yes; but in taking up the appointment I should not make that one of the special points to be dealt with at once, though after an inspector has been in the district a certain number of years, it should be. There are many other points which are more important.

8274. According to your experience, is it usual to withhold the names of tenderers or not ?—I should think it goes half and half.

8275. You do not know what is the practice in London particularly, do you ?—No; I know nothing about the procedure as regards London contracts.

8276. Do you know at all what the procedure is in Nottingham ?—I could not trust to my memory.

The rationale of out-relief to widows with children.

8277. I did not quite understand your answers to Mr. Lansbury with regard to out poor relief, and I am not certain whether you approve of giving out door relief, say, to a widow with children ?—It all depends upon the case. I think every case wants deciding upon its merits, and wants to be gone into very thoroughly by the relief committees of the boards of guardians.

8278. Then you do not quite believe in poor law principles ?—Are you referring to the very strict ones ?

8279. I mean such a poor law principle as it is undesirable to give out-door relief to a woman with children ?—Speaking generally, it is very undesirable, but I think there are probably some hard cases which might with advantage be inquired into by the guardians.

Inspectors' methods of influencing Guardians

8280. In dealing with boards of guardians, do you ever instruct them as to poor law principles, or would they consider that an impertinence ?—I do not think they would consider it an impertinence. I think it is our duty to place before the boards of guardians the general principles, but not to go into too many matters at one time.

8281. You may have read some of the letters and circulars which the first assistant-commissioners under the Poor Law Commissioners wrote in 1835, 1836 and 1837 to their boards of guardians, in which they lay down definitely the principles of the new Poor Law; you would not do that with your board of guardians ?—No, I do not think so.

8282. That you would take to be outside the duty of an inspector now ?—I think that an inspector should try to get the confidence of his boards of guardians; and then he can begin to preach.

8283. But you would not lay down theoretically what they ought to do at all ?—No.

8284. When you have to send them a circular, for instance, like the one advocating better and more luxurious treatment in the workhouse for old people, would you take it upon you to make any remarks on that circular and to advise them not to extend the same sort of treatment to the able-bodied; and would you try to prevent the ill-effects of what you would consider an ill-advised circular ?—At the present time I am just introduced into my new district, and I am trying my best to get the dietary put right; that is, I am suggesting that a distinction should be made between those who are in the workhouse and should be there, and those who are in the workhouse and should not be there—the able-bodied who ought to be outside. The late inspector was, as you know, very ill for a year or so, and he had not evidently gone into the matter. I found, for instance, at Wantage that the able-bodied, the sick, the infirm—all classes in fact—were getting six plain meat dinners a week. The Order says not fewer than two plain meat dinners a week should be given to the able-bodied, so that the guardians might not be too harsh upon them, and with regard to the other classes the guardians are bound to give three; but in this case they were giving the able-bodied six plain meat dinners a week, the same as for the infirm. That is what those fellows rather like; they do not care for soups or for bread and cheese; they would sooner have a plain meat dinner. In this respect I am going round trying to instruct my boards of guardians as to the principles laid down in the dietary order.

Irregularities of workhouse dietary.

8285. Would you look into the question of the amount of food given to the out door cases ?—As to the amount of out-relief in kind, do you mean ?

Lavish out-relief in kind.

8286. In watching the relieving committees of certain boards of guardians it has occurred to me that they give far too much food per person to their out door cases—they give an excessive amount of bread, for instance; have you found that ?—I cannot say that that is so. Very few boards of guardians in my late district gave relief in kind, except the temporary relief which is given by the relieving officers.

8287. Sometimes they will give it to widows and deserted wives, will they not ?—I do not think you get much of that in the Midlands. They do not care to relieve in bread; it is nearly all in money.

8288. Then this has not occurred to you as an evil ?—No; I have not seen an undue amount of bread issued.

Respective effect on administration of Outdoor Relief Regulation and Prohibitory Orders.

8289. (*Mr. Bentham.*) May I ask if all the unions in your district are under the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order ?—I think so.

8290. Do you find any difference in your experience, either in this district or the other, between the administration so far as outdoor relief is concerned in a union under the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order and in a union which is under the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order ?—I really can give you very little information as to that, as I have not gone into it.

8291. There are unions of both kinds, I suppose, in your present district and in the other one ?—Yes.

8292. And you have not noticed any difference whatever ?—I have not noticed any.

8293. I take it from your memorandum that you think the excessive amount of pauperism in Leicestershire is due rather to bad administration than to any other cause ?—Yes, and also to the relief being given by the guardian of the parish. That is not done in Leicester itself, but at Barrow-on-Soar it was left entirely to the guardians of the parish to decide.

Method of administering out-relief at Barrow-on-Soar.

8294. Is that relief given there by the guardians themselves then ?—It used to be, but an improvement has now taken place there. I believe there has been some correspondence between the Local Government Board and the guardians, or, at any rate, between the auditor and the guardians, as to the relief that has been given in certain cases.

8295. Will you describe the method that obtained there?—The method that obtained at Barrow-upon-Soar was that both relieving committees sat in the same room, the chairman would read out the case—just the name and the age, etc.—and then call for the guardian of the parish, and the guardian of the parish would say, "A most deserving case; 3s. 6d., gentlemen."

8296. Would he name the sum?—He would name the sum.

8297. Would the relieving officer have anything to say?—Very little.

8298. He would not be asked, would he?—No; it would be left to the guardian of the parish. For instance, the relieving officer would put on his book: "Three sons, each earning 17s. a week, living with their mother and father; mother and father looking after the house." Yet the 3s. 6d. a week would be given as relief.

8299. Do you say that has been remedied now?—I think so. There has been correspondence between the Local Government Board and the guardians about it.

Guardians' disregard of women and children's earnings in Leicestershire.

8300. I understand there is a large amount of labour for women and children in Leicestershire in connection with the boot-making and hosiery trades?—Yes, there is.

8301. That ought to reduce the amount of relief granted by the Poor Law, ought it not?—Yes. A great many of the cases that are relieved in some of the Leicestershire unions do not require relief.

8302. Are they relieving cases where there are earnings from other members of the family, but the head of the family is not earning anything?—In many cases where the amount of money coming into the house is quite sufficient to support the entire family, the guardians give relief because the head of the family is not earning any money.

8303. They do not take the income of the family, and if it is sufficient to maintain all its members, hold that they are not eligible for relief?—No.

Number of Guardians at Lincoln and Louth.

8304. In paragraph 27 you give us a list of unions and the number of elected guardians, from which I see that Lincoln has 104 elected guardians?—That is so.

8305. How many parishes are there in Lincoln?—104, I suppose.

8306. So that it is one guardian for each parish?—Yes.

8307. Does that apply in the same way to Louth, which has 101 guardians?—Yes.

Objections to parish as electoral unit for Guardians.

8308. Do you think any improvement will be made by amalgamating some of those parishes and so reducing the number of guardians?—I should get rid of the parish system altogether in connection with the elections.

8309. Would you adopt that principle everywhere of getting rid of the parish system of elections?—I would adopt the principle everywhere of getting rid of the guardians being appointed for a particular parish. When a guardian is appointed for a particular parish he really becomes patronage secretary for that parish, and is considered a good guardian or otherwise, according to the amount of money that he can get out of the board for that parish, because the money does not come out of the parish, but out of the union. If you could get statistics showing where guardians are appointed by parishes and where they are appointed by wards, I think you will find that in the latter case there is generally less pauperism.

8310. Have you any instance in your area where there are few guardians and they are elected by wards and not by parishes?—Yes, Nottingham.

8311. Do they follow the municipal wards at Nottingham?—I cannot say.

8312. Are the Poor Law wards there not rather larger than the municipal wards?—I cannot say.

System of election of Guardians by wards and its effects.

8313. (*Mrs. Webb.*) What is the difference between being elected by a ward and being elected by a parish? In both cases the man represents the locality and the locality only, does he not?—No; in the case of ward elections there may be twelve elected for one ward.

8314. There is one unit of representation, and all the people are elected for that unit?—Yes.

8315. That is not the case with most ward elections, is it?—Even with regard to wards generally, each ward in the South of England is represented by one person, I think?—Yes.

8316. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Nottingham is all one parish, is it not?—Yes.

8317. But it has been divided into wards for the purpose of the election of guardians?—Yes.

8318. Therefore a number of guardians are elected for each ward?—Yes, twelve, I think, for each ward.

8319. (*Chairman.*) Then has each voter twelve votes?—Yes, he votes for twelve persons.

8320. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) It seems to me that in this case you only get the evil enlarged, for you have got twelve patronage secretaries in each ward instead of one?—But you cannot get twelve men to agree on such a point.

8321. (*Mr. Loch.*) In the one case a man gets a definite sum of money paid in the parish out of the union funds?—Yes.

8322. And that tends to keep the parish element strong, whilst, as it does not operate to the same extent in the wards, the ward element is weak?—Yes. In the case of a parish election you generally get a man from the parish elected, and he is probably regarded as a friend or a neighbour, and the old people look to him to get them relief, and he generally obtains it for them.

8323. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I take it that Nottingham arranged its wards according to its own ideas, both as to the size of the ward and the number of representatives?—I forget the mode of procedure that was adopted; Sir Samuel Provis could tell you more about that.

Advantages of few Guardians and large areas of representation.

8324. Do you agree in principle that the larger the area of representation the less likely is there to be any parochial ideas in the mind of the representative?—Yes.

8325. And do you believe that the fewer guardians there are the more efficient usually they will be in doing their work?—I am sure of that.

Effect of appointment of Superintendent Relieving Officer and other reforms at Nottingham

8326. With regard to Nottingham, you have given us a description of the methods adopted there, which commenced, I think, by the appointment of a superintendent relieving officer?—Yes.

8327. Then resolutions were passed in October, 1901, regulating the procedure of relief committees?—Yes.

8328. Has there been any marked change in the figures from, say, 1st January, 1902, to 1st January, 1906, in consequence of this policy?—In paragraph 48 I give the statistics for 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905.

8329. Are those the figures for 1st January?—Yes.

8330. Apparently there has been a steady increase in the total numbers?—No. I say in my memorandum, "From the above it will be seen that out-door pauperism decreased after the appointment of a superintendent relieving officer, and the reforms that took place in the administration, until 1903, but has since increased," and then I give the reasons. That is, that there were no public works being carried out in Nottingham during the winter of 1904–5, and that there was a certain amount of distress caused thereby and money was tight.

8331. Do you think the statistics would have been more favourable but for these local circumstances?—I am sure they would.

System adopted by Guardians for granting relief at Nottingham and its operation.

8332. In regard to the system that they have adopted, have they passed any by-laws or regulations for the guidance of the guardians?—No.

8333. Then they have none?—They have none.

8334. Therefore they are in the hands of the superintendent relieving officer, more or less, at each of the relief committee meetings?—How?

8335. With regard to the way in which they may deal with a particular case and the amount of relief that they would give in a particular case?—No; that is left entirely to the discretion of the committee. The guardians meet and sit for two or three hours a day, and sometimes longer, hearing these applications, and they rather treat a case as they would a chess problem.

8336. One set of guardians keep together all the time and then move on to the next section when the three months is up?—Yes.

8337. That set of guardians is all along getting accustomed to a certain scale of relief which is in their minds for a certain class of case, and that scale might differ

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

somewhat from the scale that is in the minds of another set of guardians who are on another committee?—That is so.

8338. When the one set of guardians is moved on to the next section, they will carry their ideas with them, and consequently will deal with the cases in that section in the same way as they dealt with the cases in their previous section?—There is no scale at Nottingham; I mean to say, no hard and fast scale, but each case is decided upon its merits. There is no such scale as 3s., 4s., or 5s. for such-and-such a case.

8339. As you know, a number of men sitting together usually get a common idea of what amount they would give under a certain set of circumstances?—Yes.

8340. Each of these separate committees might get its own ideas, and they then would be at variance with each other?—They might.

8341. Therefore you would not get uniformity in each committee, but you would get uniformity over the whole area by changing the amount that would be given in each district?—That is so. I have noticed that one committee is somewhat more generous than another.

8342. And it carries its generosity with it when it goes to the next section?—Yes.

8343. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) When a more parsimonious committee succeeds a more generous committee, is the relief cut down?—No; for that they have to wait till the next revision.

System of revision of chronic cases at Nottingham.

8344. (*Mr. Bentham.*) How is the revision done? Does a committee revise its own cases at the end of three months?—Whichever particular section they would be on, they would revise those cases. I think it is done every six months, is it not?

8345. Every quarter, I think. But what does the revision mean?—Every case is read out and gone into.

8346. In the presence of the applicant?—If there is any change in the circumstances the applicant is asked by the relieving officer to attend the revision; but even otherwise a case is read out and gone into just in the same manner as it would be if it were a new application.

8347. Then really the cases are heard?—That is so.

8348. By the same committee which has granted the relief?—That might not be the case; it might be another committee.

8349. I thought that each committee revised its own cases prior to changing?—The revision might come on the very first sitting after they had changed, and then it would be another committee which would revise their cases.

8350. I thought the system was that each committee revised its own cases prior to moving on to the next district?—No. They have a special date when the revisions all come forward. That is fixed as near the quarter day as possible.

8351. Is there any cross visitor's report made in these cases, except that which is made by the superintendent relieving officer?—No.

8352. Have they no cross visiting?—No, except that made by the superintendent relieving officer.

8353. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is there any real investigation into these cases?—Yes. The superintendent relieving officer visits most of these cases.

8354. You mean the revised cases, do you?—Yes, the revised cases as well.

8355. (*Mr. Booth.*) I thought you said that not all cases were revised in this way, but only those in which change was contemplated?—All are gone through, but where a change is contemplated, or where the relieving officer has thought any change has taken place, the superintendent relieving officer would make further inquiries, and so you would get the results of the double inquiry—that by the relieving officer and that by the superintendent relieving officer.

8356. So that unless the superintendent relieving officer has, so to say, marked the cases as being really in need of revision, they are not revised at all?—They are gone through in a more or less perfunctory manner; but the superintendent relieving officer would know every case where the circumstances had altered.

8357. And that does tend to throw, I will not say responsibility, but influence into his hands?—It would.

8358. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would he go through the cases before the committee met and select such as he thought required revision?—When the case comes before the committee the case is read out just the same as it would be if it were a new application, and the relieving officer—not the superintendent relieving officer—would say, "The same," and the case would then be finished with. But if there is any alteration, you will hear the superintendent relieving officer and the relieving officer giving their tale, and it is gone into as a new case entirely.

8359. That is to say, if the relieving officer recommends an alteration?—If the relieving officer states that there is any change in the circumstances.

8360. Supposing he thinks there is a change in the circumstances?—He reports the change.

8361. Would he have the applicant there?—If he thought necessary he would have the applicant there.

8362. (*Mr. Booth.*) I thought we were discussing, not cases in which there was a change in the circumstances, but cases which might be looked at differently by the next committee, which is quite a different point. Does that revision which comes from another committee, with perhaps other views, depend upon the word of either the relieving officer or the superintendent relieving officer?—They would accept the decision of the previous committee, I should imagine.

8363. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Would one committee upset the decision of another committee?—No, I do not think so.

8364. The tendency would be, would it not, if they had any doubt, to refer it to the committee that had decided the case, and ask them to reconsider it, as one committee would not revise the work of another?—I do not think they would interfere with the work of another committee, unless some alteration had taken place.

8365. Assuming that a case might have been in receipt of relief for a considerable time, and that that case might have been considered, say, by the four committees, would there be at any time a variation in the treatment according to the individual views of the separate committees?—No, the treatment would remain the same as though it had been decided upon by the committee who put the case on the books. Of course, we are dealing now with permanent cases; when you get the temporary cases lasting a fortnight or a month only, there you would probably get a certain amount of difference of treatment.

Extent of Superintendent Relieving Officer's work at Nottingham

8366. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I see there were 3,551 persons on the books on January 1st, 1905, as being in receipt of outdoor relief in Nottingham?—Yes.

8367. It would be impossible, would it not, for the superintendent relieving officer to superintend or supervise the work of the relieving officers under him, and also to make many cross visits in the course of the year when the numbers run so high as that?—Mr. Johnstone, speaking of his year's work, says: "During the period I have visited 643 applicants for, and recipients of, out-relief and reported the results to the various committees. I have also inquired separately and specially noted 709 other cases." That makes altogether 1,352; that would be practically the whole of the cases in Nottingham, as you will see if you multiply that by three or two and a half. There would be on an average two and a half persons per case.

8368. Then the cases are really revised during the running of an order for relief?—Yes.

8369. When one committee is revising its cases, will it go through all the cases, both the permanent cases and the new cases?—Yes, and the temporary ones.

Period of relief orders at Nottingham.

8370. What length of order do they give as a rule in Nottingham?—I think in Nottingham the order runs for thirteen weeks, but in some unions they give twenty-six weeks.

8371. Would they give thirteen weeks in all cases in Nottingham?—No, not in the temporary cases. There are some cases which are always described as temporary and which are put on for a fortnight. For instance, a man has had an accident to his finger; they will probably give 15s. out-relief to that man whilst he is getting his finger well, and whilst he cannot work; but directly he can handle his tools and get back to work the relief is stopped.

8372. What length of order will they give in the case of a widow with children?—Thirteen weeks.

8373. Would that be the usual thing?—Yes.

8374. (*Mr. Loch.*) What would be the length of order in the case of the aged?—For the aged it would be thirteen weeks also.

8375. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you not think a better system would be for the whole board to revise all the cases of its committees on the report of an independent investigator?—That is a pretty tall order—1,300 cases to be gone through by a whole board.

8376. They would not remain 1,300 or 1,400 long if the whole board did go through them, would they?—Probably not.

estion of fficiency of pplication d Report ok as a ord.

8377. In the table in paragraph 53 you give a classification of the alleged causes in the case of 2,493 new applications for relief; how was that information obtained; are all these particulars to be found in the application and report book?—No. At Nottingham they have the case paper system, and Mr. Johnstone, the superintendent relieving officer, has got this table out from the case papers.

8378. It would not be possible to get out such a table where they had not the case paper system, would it?—I should think not, unless the relieving officers did their work properly and filled in the column "Observations" properly, and gave the names of the relatives liable to maintain, distinguishing those who were capable of doing so from those who were not.

8379. And stating the causes of pauperism?—Or the causes of pauperism. If the relieving officers did their work well the application and report book should give this information.

8380. Do you find in your experience that the column "Cause of Application" is not filled in?—They fill it in, but the cause of application is generally put down as "Destitution" merely.

8381. "Or "poverty"?—Yes. I cannot get many of the relieving officers to fill these columns up properly.

plicants for lief residing common dging-uses.

8382. In paragraph 54 you state where the applications come from, and I notice there are 620 applications from persons who reside in common lodging-houses. Have they any fixed rule as to dealing with cases from common lodging-houses; do they ever give out-door relief to such cases?—No.

8383. Do they always give an order for the house, then?—Mostly, or they are refused altogether.

fusal of re- f at Nott- gham in es where rnings are fficient to aintain mily.

8384. In Nottingham do they give relief to persons who are living with relatives in cases where the united income is sufficient for all, as you state they do in Leicester?—No, I do not think so.

8385. Not to the same extent, at any rate?—No; it is gone into very much more carefully. They certainly would not give it at Nottingham.

8386. In paragraph 71 you described the task work that was given to able-bodied men at Leicester, and I should like to ask you some questions upon that?—Would you kindly ask Mr. Walsh when he comes? You will find that he has got everything with regard to Leicester, and I should have to trust to my memory entirely with regard to it.

nnection tween uperism d local ans.

8387. (*Professor Smart.*) You suggest a very interesting connection between local borrowing and pauperism; you say that out-door relief in the North Midland district has increased since 1901, and one of the reasons you give for that is that the local authorities have had to call a halt in the carrying out of public works by means of loans?—That is so.

8388. I suppose you mean there has been a rise in the rate of interest since 1901, and that the local authorities could not face the higher rate?—I should say so; money got tight and a general spirit of economy came over people, and they were rather afraid of going in for loans. It was the same with railway companies as with local authorities.

8389. Then you do not mean so much a rise in the rates as a fit of economy?—I think it was a fit of economy mostly; and of course a rise in the rates leads to this. Money was also tight.

8390. It might not mean the same motive exactly though. Then you say many people have become dependent on the continued activity of these local bodies?—I am sure that is so as regards local authorities, railway companies and other bodies, but principally as regards local authorities.

Medical relief an inducement to pauperism.

8391. Then you suggest that one cause of the increase in the number of indoor poor is the better sick-relief that is afforded in the workhouse?—That is so.

8392. I gather you would say that an increase in poor law expense, and even an increase in the number of paupers, may not be a sign of growing distress?—Certainly not.

Fallibility of statistics.

8393. Therefore statistics of pauperism when they are quoted *simpliciter* as proving a decline in national prosperity, are quite untrustworthy?—I should imagine that is so.

Attractiveness of Poor Law Infirmaries.

8394. I understand you to say that there is now less reluctance to accept poor relief, especially when it takes the shape of medical relief?—There is less reluctance.

8395. You used a very striking expression; you spoke of workhouse infirmaries as state hospitals; is that your own, may I ask, or is that a common phrase?—I think it is my own. I have not heard anyone else use the expression.

8396. You do not know if the idea has become common among the poor that they have a right to it as a sort of State institution?—I do not think it has.

Number of deaths in Birmingham voluntary hospitals.

8397. Do you think it is a good thing or a bad thing, on the whole?—I think it is a very good thing that the old people and the sick people are well looked after, and that there is a better tendency to good administration in the Poor Law. Public opinion is in favour of giving to the sick. Look at your hospitals; one out of every five who die in Birmingham dies in a hospital or asylum which is supported by voluntary subscriptions or is provided by the Town Council. That shows that public opinion is rather in favour of giving this treatment to the sick.

8398. There is a distinct loss of independence apparently connected with that, is there not?—Yes, there is.

8399. And, as has been suggested here several times, it may be a stepping-stone to taking Poor Law relief in other forms than medical?—It is, probably.

Connection between pauperism and employment of women.

8400. You make another interesting suggestion that I have not seen before, and that is that in Leicestershire, where there is abundant employment for women and children as well as for men, the pauperism is high in comparison with districts where the head of the family is the only bread winner?—That is so.

8401. May that not have some connection with the reflex effect of factory work on the family, namely, that the father keeps his independence and self-respect better where the burden is thrown altogether upon him, and that the home is better looked after and there is more thrift where the wife does not go out to work?—That is probably so, but I have not looked at it in that way.

8402. It is rather a striking statement of yours that where there is employment for women and children pauperism is high?—I think in Leicestershire pauperism used to be very low.

8403. Indeed—under similar conditions?—Yes.

Fluctuation in poor law policy at Leicester.

8404. With women and children employed?—Yes. If I remember rightly, in reading over the Appendix to the Report of the Poor Law Commissioners, you will see that Leicester was always going first very strict and then very lax; it is still the same.

8405. Do you mean long ago?—That was in 1834. If you compare what was reported in 1834 with the present time you will frequently find that those unions which were very strict then are very strict now, and *vice versa*.

8406. (*Mr. Booth.*) There is the Southwell case?—Southwell is keeping moderately good. Then there is Bingham, where Sir George Nicholls learnt his experience.

Removal of factories from London and its causes.

8407. (*Professor Smart.*) Then you say that two large engineering firms have removed their factories from the South of London to Newark; did you ever hear any reason alleged for the removal?—Yes, high rates and the high rateable value; for instance at Newark they are probably paying on a much less rateable value than when the works were in London. Then there is the cost of labour; labour is very much less expensive there than it is in London. Then, also, being close to the coalfields, coal

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

is cheaper. Competition is now so great in regard to manufacturers that they have to be content with smaller profits, and in order to get rid of higher rates and to lessen their cost for labour and coal they have been obliged to go into the country.

8408. You have heard high rates given as one of the reasons, have you?—Yes.

8409. I think you do not give the proportion between outdoor relief and in-door relief over your district as a whole?—I have not done so. I have only given the cost on in-maintenance and out-relief per head of population.

Proportion of out-relief to in-relief and its causes.

8410. Have you any rough idea what it may amount to; would it be 75 per cent. or anything like that?—I have not gone into it except with regard to the cost.

8411. At any rate, it would be very much above the half?—It would.

8412. I am going to ask you a general question; I am afraid you will think it a very ignorant question, but I want to get the answer put on record. I come from a country where the system is different; but the traditional system of England is of course the workhouse system, namely, that only the destitute should be relieved and that they should be relieved only in the workhouse, and yet I find that the large proportion of poor relief with you is outdoor?—That is so.

8413. In fact you come very close to the proportion we have in Scotland, where our system is avowedly an outdoor system?—But then you must remember that in Scotland not only do the families keep one another and help one another, but the members of the clans also help one another. Then you have thrift in Scotland, and often the reverse down in the south of England.

8414. Has it anything to do with expense; that is to say, would you put more into the poor house if you were willing to spend more money on workhouse buildings?—If you ask me whether any one of these in the sick wards or infirmaries or in the infirm part of workhouses could be removed therefrom, I say I do not think so. You have got the experience of Poplar and you have got the experience of Nottingham, where the guardians made enquiries whether there were any old people in the workhouses who could be relieved by means of out-relief, but they found that there was nobody to take charge of them or to give them a home, and that these people, if they went out, would become neglected, and would probably cause a great deal of sympathy because they would get into a neglected state; so that more harm than good would be done by giving them outdoor relief. I forget the exact number. I think there were only about eight or ten cases which they could send out from the Nottingham workhouse.

Result of offering out-relief to Workhouse inmates at Nottingham.

8415. It is sometimes given as an excuse for outdoor relief that there is not enough accommodation in the workhouse, and that a new workhouse would cost too much to build?—I have never seen that argument used.

8416. You have not any experience of that at all?—No.

Adaptability of Workhouses as Infirmaries.

8417. (*Dr. Downes.*) Have you found any difficulty in respect of the adaptation of the wards of workhouses that were originally built for other classes to the purposes of the infirm or of the sick?—Of course the wards which were built for other classes would be narrow wards, but then one could have one row of beds in them, though that would mean that it would be very expensive because you would then require more nursing in proportion.

8418. So that you have to look at it from more points of view than the mere building point of view?—That is so.

8419. Have you had any special cases where they have been able to adapt an old workhouse to the modern requirements of the sick?—There is the case of Lincoln, where the old workhouse wards were made into an infirmary; but then the building rather lent itself to it, as it was sufficiently large to enable them to get a sufficient unit for nursing purposes.

Various forms of administration for Poor Law Infirmaries.

8420. You have had experience of various forms of infirmaries in London and your other districts; can you tell us what are the different forms of administration in the case of Poor Law infirmaries?—You have the administration that holds in London, where the medical superintendent is the head; then you have an infirmary such as the Leicester one (which is an experiment), where the matron is the head of the establishment.

8421. Is there a special order for Leicester?—Yes; all the separate infirmaries have special orders. Then you have the administration which is in force at Birmingham, where there is a house governor, a matron, and a staff of visiting surgeons.

8422. There are three very different systems which you have mentioned to us?—Yes.

8423. At Leicester are the medical staff resident or are they visitors?—There is one resident and one non-resident.

8424. I think at Birmingham the assistant medical officers are resident?—Yes; there are four assistant medical officers resident and four medical officers.

8425. How many separate infirmaries had you in your last district?—Newark, Worksop, and Leicester.

8426. Some of those are comparatively small, I take it?—Yes. The Newark Infirmary is going to be converted into a workhouse. I mean to say, the workhouse is going there. The Worksop Infirmary is a small one with ninety beds, the only male officer on the premises being the porter.

8427. Who is in charge of Worksop?—The matron.

8428. Is that an entirely separate institution?—Yes.

8429. Is there any resident medical officer?—No, they have only ninety beds.

8430. I do not know whether you have any information as to the relative cost of any of these infirmaries?—No, I have not.

8431. Nor of the maintenance cost?—No, I have not taken those details out.

Provision for special classes of sickness.

8432. In your present district and in your last district have you had any special difficulty with regard to providing for special forms of sickness?—Take first the infectious sick; how do the guardians generally deal with those cases?—As a rule they enter into a contract with the sanitary authority with regard to typhoid, small-pox, scarlet fever and diphtheria; and with regard to measles and other such complaints either a separate building is put aside for them or they have separate wards. Nottingham has a little isolated hospital for about three or four cases, and if the number of the cases of measles gets too large they can set aside a large ward in the main building for the purpose.

(Infectious cases).

8433. In the early days of the administration of infectious hospitals by the sanitary authorities, used there to be occasional difficulty and friction?—Yes.

8434. I do not know whether you find so much of that now?—There is, especially at Holbeach, great friction.

8435. In what regard would it be—as to payment or as to the reception of the patients?—As to who should provide the accommodation for such cases.

8436. Have you any other cases of difficulty of that class?—No.

(Phthisis).

8437. I notice that your guardians are in some cases paying special attention to phthisis; you mention that in your last Report?—There is no doubt that the question of phthisis and the isolation of phthisis is receiving a great deal of attention from guardians, and they wish something to be done. At Nottingham they have a sanatorium. The doctor at Nottingham says that he gets very good results, but it is very difficult to maintain discipline amongst these phthisical cases.

8438. Are any of your guardians considering whether it is well to give out-relief in phthisical cases?—No, I do not think so.

8439. Do you wish out-relief given to that class?—I think they should give out-relief to that class if they would go into a sanatorium and the relatives pay part of the cost.

8440. The point which I had in view in my question is that it may be undesirable for advanced cases of phthisis to be living with other people in the same house?—That is so.

(Tuberculous children).

8441. Then with regard to tuberculous children, is any provision made for them?—Both at Nottingham and at Mansfield they have separate wards for them.

8442. Do you think the guardians use voluntary convalescent homes to any extent?—Where possible, but the cost is rather heavy.

ingworm).

8443. What do they do for children suffering from ringworm and diseases of that sort?—Unfortunately we have no special provision for those. In my new district at Kingston Union we have got twenty cases, and I have suggested that they should apply to the Metropolitan Asylums Board and see if they can get that board to take them.

8444. What are they doing for those twenty cases now?—They are giving them no schooling.

8445. That, of course, is a serious thing?—It is very serious. I have called the medical officer's attention to it in order to see if schooling can be given to them.

umber of rials of orkhouse mates paid r at expense relatives.

8446. I think some time back, when you were in London, and possibly since you may have continued it, you prepared some statistics as to the proportion of people dying in Poor Law infirmaries who were buried by their friends; have you any recollection what the result of those statistics was?—Thirty years ago very few (if any) paupers were buried except at the expense of the State, but at the present time I think in most places about two-thirds of the people who die in the workhouses are buried at the expense of their friends.

8447. What do you deduce from that?—That a great many of those who die in our infirmaries are not entirely destitute. There are a certain number who insure themselves so that they can have a burial of their own, but a good many of them are buried by friends. I have seen a hearse and four come out of Paddington Workhouse.

rial surance paupers.

8448. Have you any evidence on that point of insurance that you can give us?—I am sorry to say no.

8449. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Is it not common for the friends outside to keep up the insurance payments for those who go into the infirmary, for the sake of avoiding a pauper funeral?—Yes, that is so in a certain number of cases. As I have said, I have seen very good funerals come out of these infirmaries.

8450. Provided by friends?—Provided by relatives.

8451. (*Dr. Downes.*) Are you aware that it is also alleged that the friends occasionally take the money and do not bury the person?—I have never heard of that.

fect of ngevity on mbers plying for lief.

8452. One cause, perhaps, of the greater number who come into infirmaries now may be that there is a greater proportion of aged people in the population, the lower death-rate having led to an accumulation of old people?—That may be so.

uality of Contract" ovisions.

8453. On the question of contracts, do you find the quality of provisions generally is good in the workhouses that you visit?—In the country districts the general quality is very good.

8454. Can you say the same of the London districts?—There was an improvement before I left.

ifficulties in nnection th Poor w Contracts.

8455. Could you suggest any alteration in the form of tender which may tend to prevent the contractors from obtaining an unfair advantage by a knowledge of the stocks in hand?—The form of tender appears to me to be all right, and I do not see how you could alter the form of tender. In contracting for meat, if you contract, say, for thick and thin flanks, one being worth 7d. a lb. and the other 5d. a lb., then you give an opportunity for the master to say to the contractor, "If I am going to have thin flanks I must count for something in this, and if you do not do it, I shall have all thick flanks," in which case the contractor would lose his profit.

8456. That is the case where the quality of the article is not sufficiently clearly set out in the form of tender, is it not?—Yes.

8457. That is not quite what I had in my mind; in fact, I was going away from provisions then. Supposing, we will say, a board of guardians are contracting for the supply of boots, and the tenderer tenders for boots of different sizes and different kinds; if by any means he has got knowledge that the guardians are overstocked with a particular kind of boot he may put down a very nominal price for that boot and a higher price for those that he would think would be required?—Yes, he may do that.

8458. Such things have been done, have they not?—That is so, but as a matter of fact I think in the case you are referring to, when he had got the contract, he had got it with a very high price for one class of boot, and that class of boot only was delivered, a much larger quantity than the estimated quantity being ordered. But the guardians can easily protect themselves if, following the Whitechapel or Reading procedure, they make the estimated quantity the order for the goods; then no harm can be done.

8459. That is to say, the estimated quantity on the tender becomes the actual order?—That is so.

8460. Have you gone at all into the question of the drug contracts?—No.

8461. Or of the different methods of contracting for drugs in your district?—No; it is such a very technical business.

8462. In fact, the whole of this contracting question and the delivery of the goods is extremely technical, is it not?—It is very technical. You want to take up one branch at a time in order to learn it.

Mansfield soup-kitchen experiment.

8463. In your report you speak of the failure of the soup kitchen at Mansfield; speaking of the relief of distress at Mansfield, you say the soup kitchen was opened, but it is considered an unsatisfactory method of relieving the distress and was therefore soon closed; can you give us any details of it?—It was found that the casual labourer not settled in Mansfield and that class of people were getting the soup, and not the people for whom it was intended. As far as I could ascertain there was really no distress at Mansfield. The population of this Union increases at the rate of nearly 5 per cent. per annum.

8464. Was that soup kitchen opened by a voluntary agency?—Yes.

Removal of factories from London,

8465. In your memorandum, paragraph 30, you speak of the removal of two firms from the south of London; do you know in what unions in London their factories originally were?—Messrs. Ransome & Sons came from Battersea.

8466. And Simpson & Co.?—They came from the south of the Thames.

Effect of trade depression on pauperism.

8467. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) About women's work—I think Professor Smart has already referred to it—you say in paragraph 19 that the total pauperism is greater although the women are also working as well as the men. I know that in your report, published in the 34th Annual Report of the board, you say: "It must be remembered that as there is much female labour employed in the factories of the large towns in this district, depression in trade is not so serious a fact as in those towns where men only are employed." That is what we have heard also about Yorkshire, and it is interesting to find that your experience now rather goes the other way?—I rather wanted to point out in my memorandum that in Leicestershire there is a lax administration, that there ought to be less pauperism in Leicestershire than in other districts, but that owing to this lax administration, especially in Leicester and Barrow there is more pauperism.

8468. It is even worse than it looks, because it ought to be better with the women at work?—Yes.

8469. Do you not think that where the men and women are working together at the same trade, you might say that if that trade is bad it strikes the whole family?—Yes; but then what does bad trade mean? Take, for instance, a cotton factory; supposing you are usually manufacturing 100,000 lbs., then it is bad trade if you are only manufacturing 95,000 lbs.; and good trade means 105,000 lbs. If you are only selling 95,000 lbs. instead of 100,000 lbs. you will go on at that for a month or two and increase your stock, and then afterwards you will go on working five days a week or four days a week until the stock in hand has diminished. There is really not very much difference between bad trade and good trade, and I do not think the state of trade affects pauperism to the extent it is generally supposed to do.

8470. Then the depression has not been such as to throw whole families out of work?—No.

Lavish relief at Leicester.

8471. Would the laxity of administration take the form of giving out-relief possibly in supplementation of the woman's earnings?—This is in Leicester, and is a point which Mr. Walsh will be examined upon. In Leicester, although the women and children are probably earning 30s. or more a week, the guardians have relieved men on the outdoor labour test, that is, the man can get on a test and receive relief at the rate of 10s. to 14s. a week; he takes home to his wife the half which is given

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

him in kind, and he has got the other half to spend on himself. He is probably quite content with that, and therefore you cannot get him to seek for work.

8472. Do you think there is any tendency, by cheapening the women's labour, to decrease the men's earnings, or are they all paid at the same rates?—You must get a manufacturer to give you an answer to that.

Abundance of employment for women.

8473. In paragraph 103 you say, "It appears to me that whilst there is no lack of employment for women, there are, especially during the winter months, many men who cannot obtain employment"; does that refer to your district especially?—I think you will find that, generally speaking—I might say that even at Market Bosworth, and other rural unions—they are obliged to get charwomen to do the necessary household work in the workhouses, and they find a difficulty in getting them at 2s. a day.

8474. Would it be the domestic service demand for women that always keeps them going?—And type-writing. A woman can start in domestic service at 2s. 6d. a week, and can go up to £100 a year as lady's maid. Every one of them can find employment right away from the half-crown up to the £100, whereas the scale of pay for male work is so much a day, and the price is generally a fixed one.

8475. In paragraph 97 you give us an interesting case of a man staying in the house and being paid to do the work of the house in Boston union?—Yes; I put that paragraph in to show that a lax indoor administration is almost as bad as a lax outdoor administration.

8476. Would that be quite an exceptional case, or could it be paralleled?—In many unions in London it used to be the same, but I think most of that lax indoor administration has gone now.

8477. In paragraph 101 you say, "Owing to there being so few able-bodied women in the workhouses at the present time most of the necessary household work has to be done by paid labour"; if there is a large number of men in the house, is there any reason why they should not do the household work?—On the male side I have tried my best to get the masters to make them to do it, and in nearly all the unions they do the work; but you cannot have the men going on the female side to do the household work.

8478. But they do it on the male side?—Yes.

Cause of preponderance of women on out-relief.

8479. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the explanation you gave of the fact of there being more women receiving outdoor than indoor relief, I think you attribute that to female employment being more easily obtained now than it was at one time?—That is it.

8480. Is there not a large number of single men and widowers who avail themselves of the indoor relief who having no satisfactory homes have no option of outdoor relief, whereas it is not the case to the same extent with women?—Of course, daughters will look after their mothers very often, rather than they will look after their fathers. They will take the mother into their house sometimes, but the father they consider is rather a nuisance. The mother will help them with their babies and that kind of thing.

8481. A man, when sick, is more helpless than a woman?—Yes, but it is not that class of very infirm men who are getting into the workhouse; there are a good many who are far from being past work.

8482. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Would it not be the case that the guardians grant out-relief much more easily to women than to men?—I do not think the out-relief makes much difference in this respect.

8483. Would it be true to say that there would be a very much larger female pauperism on out-relief than there would be of male pauperism?—Generally there is much more out-relief given to females.

Methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

8484. Passing on now to the children, what is done for them in your district; are they sent to schools or are they kept in the workhouse, or are they boarded out?—Ten unions have got homes or separate schools away from the workhouse, and the other unions keep them in the workhouse.

8485. So the majority keep them in the workhouse?—Yes, but a very large number are boarded out, and a very large number are sent to certified schools. As many as possible go to the certified schools, but the certified schools are now overcrowded and it is very difficult to get children in them.

8486. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Do they keep any record of the comparative results in their future careers as between the children who are sent to the certified homes and the others?—I am afraid not.

8487. Practically they are not kept in any union, are they?—No.

After employment of Poor Law children.

8488. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is there any difficulty in placing the children from the schools when they go out to work?—None whatever; at least I have not heard of any difficulty. In the case of the girls there are more applications for them than there are girls.

8489. Is it always a very satisfactory service that they go to, or is it not very often a rough place where there are no prospects?—I think that the guardians, and especially the lady guardians, take a great interest in those girls, and I think you will find that a good many who are sent from the certified homes get very good situations. For instance, the certified home at Lincoln will not place out a girl unless there are two servants.

8490. Do the boys mostly go into the army or the navy, or do they go into the local trades?—They go into the local trades. I am trying to get the guardians to send as many as are fit for sea service to the "Exmouth" but there is the difficulty that the farmers want them in the rural unions.

8491. And they go to the farmers, do they?—Yes.

8492. How do they manage in the towns when they go out to trades there, but when they are too young to earn enough for themselves to live upon; are there working boys' homes to which they send them?—They really board them out and give them relief, with the sanction of the Local Government Board. That has been done for the first year of their apprenticeship, when they are unable to earn sufficient to maintain themselves.

8493. Have you ever considered whether the children in the schools do more of the housework than is desirable for them?—Where that is so, I should call attention to it.

8494. Do you think that it is not so as a rule, and that they are not overdone with that work?—Yes. They have plenty of time for play.

Pauperism and administration at Bingham, Stamford and Spilsby.

8495. (*Mr. Loch.*) You have referred to Bingham, which of course is a historically notable union; there the outdoor relief compared with the indoor relief is really considerable—39 in the house and 227 out, according to the 1st July return. Do they check it by the carefulness of their scrutiny?—Yes; but you see they have only got 2 per cent. of pauperism.

8496. Would you say that the scrutiny is extremely careful?—Very.

8497. Would you say the same of Stamford, which is different, in so far as there is much more in-relief?—The Marquis of Exeter takes a great deal of interest there.

8498. There again intelligence is brought into the work?—Yes.

8499. With regard to Spilsby, there is a small indoor and a large outdoor pauperism; what does that really show?—Spilsby has gone down from 111 indoor poor on 1st January, 1895, to 83 on 1st January, 1905. When you come to Stamford it has got exactly the same number, 135 or 134, and their out-relief has gone down from 258 to 146. Stamford is following a new policy rather, but the policy at Spilsby is older and at Bingham it is older still, and therefore the number of indoor poor remains down very low.

Reduction in pauperism without use of workhouse test.

8500. What is clear is this, is it not, that granted those distinctions that you refer to, if there is a real scrutiny into the cases you can get your pauperism down?—That is so.

8501. And that to a certain extent without the workhouse test being continuously used?—That is so.

Suitability of Application and report book.

8502. Then I would ask you whether the form that we now have for the Application and Report Book is really suitable for investigation?—Very few Application and Report Books are properly kept. The form itself is a very good form. The case-paper system of course

supplements it and makes it larger, but the column headed "Observations" covers a lot, and if they would put the information in properly and keep the Application and Report Book as Mr. Dicken, the relieving officer at Belper does, you would have very good administration.

8503. But then the word "Cause" and the word "Observations" are so very general, and so far as I know, the form itself is really not properly used?—Very few relieving officers properly fill in the form.

Conditions in Chesterfield Union.

8504. Going to Chesterfield, the pauperism there is very high, and you have a very large number of not able-bodied adults and wives receiving relief; is there anything special about Chesterfield?—I have spoken to the guardians several times and urged them to look into the cases themselves instead of leaving the cases to the guardian of the parish, but they will not. In most instances it is left to the guardian of the parish to decide as to the relief.

8505. That is the radical change next to investigation?—That is so.

Effect of scales of relief.

8506. You have referred to the question of scales, and I think you said that at Nottingham they had none?—They had no regular scale there.

8507. Do you not think that the scale system leads to always adopting an allowance system?—I do not think so.

8508. When you get a case which, at any rate in co-operation with charity, might be dealt with thoroughly, an allowance is given and the thoroughness of the relief is forgotten; do you think anything can be done to promote a real examination of cases from that point of view rather than adopting a scale system with out-door relief and a policy of allowances?—I do not know how you would get the Derby guardians to do that. They have their scale, and directly a person has to be relieved they look at the scale and say he is entitled to this.

8509. Supposing you could abolish scales?—If you could abolish them, I think it would do a great deal of good.

8510. Then you would have to use intelligence more?—Yes, that is, every case should be treated upon its merits.

Meaning of "deserving."

8511. You have used the word "deserving," in evidence, and I suppose that is the word that is commonly used in making some distinction as to the mode of relief given, or something of that kind, that is to say, it really implies rather a favouritism than a useful distinction?—Yes.

8512. So if we could get rid of it in the "aged deserving poor" and such phrases it would be all to the good?—That is so.

8513. In any of your towns is there any suggestion that you should follow the example of Bradford or some other towns that have a system of visiting, or any kind of supplementary organisation by way of charitable relief?—No, I do not think they have gone into that yet.

Charity and pauperism at Boston and Louth.

8514. In Boston is there a good deal of endowed charitable relief?—I cannot remember, but I think there is.

8515. Is there at Louth?—At Louth there is.

8516. Does not the pauperism of Louth stand rather close to the question of charity; the pauperism of Louth is very remarkable, is it not, for a town of that kind?—It is; but then, it has got 101 guardians, and each guardian acts for his parish.

Effect of size of Boards of Guardians in Lincolnshire.

8517. Is not the pauperism of Lincolnshire rather remarkably large?—It is, and so is the number of guardians.

8518. Is that cause and effect?—I think so. If the number of guardians were reduced, and they were not appointed for special parishes, I think you would get Lincolnshire down to the other counties.

8519. Do the guardians adopt any standard in the appointment of their relieving officers, or is it a question of their being known to members of the board?—I think in most cases they are known to members of the board, and are not appointed specially for their fitness.

Possibility of prescribing qualifications for Relieving Officer.

8520. Would you be of opinion that a standard might be adopted, and that an instruction might be given that relieving officers should fulfil certain qualifications as a preliminary?—Yes, if you put down a good standard for those qualifications.

8521. Have you found that the relieving officers are set aside by the guardians, who cross-question the applicant and then come to their own decision independently of his evidence?—In some unions—yes, and in some—no.

8522. In several important unions is it done so?—In such a union, for instance, as Leicester, the guardians will not always look at his evidence; but in Nottingham everything the relieving officer says is thoroughly weighed and gone into.

The prestige of Relieving Officers with their Guardians.

8523. That is, where the administration is bad, the relieving officer is set aside?—That is so.

Effect of Out-door Relief School Children Order at Birmingham.

8524. With regard to the Underfed Children Order, are you in favour of having an order like that in force side by side with the normal administration of the Poor Law, by which the child is dealt with and then the father, if possible, is dealt with by way of loan or prosecution?—That question of the Feeding of School Children Order is rather an important one in my new district. At Birmingham they had 6,000 children who were fed daily during the winter months, but since the Feeding of School Children Order the number has dropped to about 2,000.

8525. To what is that due?—The Birmingham Free Dinner Society, which had been feeding children daily for the past 30 years, ceased to exist after the Order came into force. The other voluntary source for feeding children (which was instituted by Mr. Hookham) is now confined by him to orphan and deserted children. Mr. Hookham is still feeding 1,600 daily and the Birmingham Guardians 400, so that the number is reduced to about 2,000.

8526. Then the process was this, that the charitable agencies were relieving, and when the order came in they referred their cases to the Poor Law, and when the Poor Law came in they made investigation, and the result was an enormous reduction in the number of children?—Yes. One of the parents of those children was getting nearly £4 a week, and many of them were receiving between £2 and 30s. a week.

8527. Would you say that the charities will again start their feeding, and so the evil circle will again be performed?—I cannot say.

8528. Taking the principle of the Act, which is to punish a neglecting parent, have not boards of guardians ample authority to punish parents if the children are neglected?—Yes, through the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

8529. You could do it yourselves direct, could you not through the guardians?—Yes, but the 400 who are at present on the books of Birmingham are the children of casual labourers; sometimes their parents can give them a good breakfast and sometimes they cannot. In regard to that 400, I think the Birmingham Guardians have asked in most instances for the board's sanction, so as not to have to prosecute in these cases, because they could not recover the money, seeing that they are nearly all casual labourers.

8530. They could prosecute and so bring justice, as it were, into the field?—Yes.

8531. But they prefer not to do so?—They think it is not advisable to do so.

8532. These destitute children who are, I presume, in receipt of outdoor relief, how much do they get, 1s. a week, or anything of that kind?—I am not sure. I think the Birmingham Guardians have come to an arrangement with Mr. Hookham to supply the meals, the gentleman who still feeds some of the children.

8533. Still this would be a standing supplement to the wage of the casual worker, equivalent to the number of his children?—Yes, it would.

Child pauperism at Chesterfield and elsewhere.

8534. One is rather struck with the number of children who are being relieved by, for instance, the Chesterfield Board. I see there are 906 children of able-bodied parents, and then there are 204 of the not able-bodied, besides the children, which is a smaller number, who are in the workhouse. Do you find that there is an increase in child pauperism?—I have only gone into the question of in-door child pauperism. That has gone down, as you know, and was going down for some years until the Act of 1899.

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

8535. To which Act do you refer?—There are two really—the Local Government Acts of 1889 and 1894.

8536. Are the guardians using their power of guardianship to a larger extent than before?—Much.

8537. Has that had any effect?—I think so.

8538. Do you attribute the increase of child pauperism to the bad conditions of the last few years?—No. I think much more interest has been taken in the matter, owing to so much being spoken about the children in the newspapers.

8539. That is to say, the sentiment of the moment is creating the pauperism of the time?—It is doing a certain amount in that direction. For instance, there was a case at Guildford where a foster-father and foster-mother took a child out of the lying-in ward and had it till it was about three or four. Then the woman, whilst the husband was away, took it to the workhouse, hoping to be able to find the parents thereby. The foster-father was greatly incensed and he tried to get that child back, but the guardians will not give it up.

8540. Do you find that the Bastardy Acts are enforced strictly?—I do not know; I have not followed that.

8541. Are you in favour of a policy of creating concurrent institutions for relief, such as the distress committees of the unemployed fund?—That is rather a matter of politics is it not?

Type of applicants for work under the Unemployed Workmen Act.

8542. It is a matter that depends very closely on poor relief, because you have in any of those places where there is a Distress Committee two authorities: one, the Poor Law authority, for dealing with distress under the title of destitution, and the other the authority for dealing with it under Distress Committee conditions. Have you made any investigations in those places where this method is going on?—Yes. A very large number of those who have applied to get work get their applications acceded to, but some do not accept it when offered.

8543. Are they the same type of applicants as would come to the guardians in other years?—I am trying to obtain statistics showing how many have been paupers before, and as to the class applying. Some—probably many of those who apply to the distress committees are known to the relieving officers as belonging to the casual or pauper class.

8544. Might those statistics be put in?—Yes, I will send them on. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XV. (C).)

Possibility of co-operation between Guardians and Charities at Louth.

8545. With regard to Louth, where there is a good deal of charity, do you think that a policy would be of service by which the charities of the district might be brought into some sort of cohesion and recognised as a body parallel to the poor law, and enabled to deal with cases which, under normal conditions and orders, the Poor Law cannot deal with?—Do you mean to set up a separate authority?

8546. To set up a kind of assistant authority?—If you could let a committee of the board of guardians deal with those cases from the charitable funds—that is, if there were any charitable funds—I think that would be very handy.

8547. The cases which have struck me most at times are cases of widows; of course a considerable expenditure of money relatively might enable them to provide for themselves, but as a rule these cases, as you know, hang on the board of guardians, they get an allowance and they go on keeping it. Taking Louth again, where there is a good deal of charitable money, could not those cases be dealt with and kept altogether away from the poor law?—It would be a very good thing, and it would save expense, if you could keep those cases away from the Poor Law but the authority investigating should be careful to give to only proper persons and after full inquiry.

8548. Suppose there was one competent inquiry agency in the place, and there being no scale, the cases were discriminated, so that those that could be dealt with only by a continuation of an allowance were set apart from the others, then could we not, wherever there are funds, bring a new force to the aid of the Poor Law, by which we could keep down the pauperism by the force of charitable interest?—If that could be done, if charity could work in conjunction with the Poor Law, it is no doubt that it would be good for the poor and that it would relieve the rates.

8549. Do you see any way of giving charity that united feeling of action which the Poor Law has got, unless it be in some way organised and officially recognised?—If you get the Charity Organisation Society officially recognised, do you mean? As you probably know, the Charity Organisation Society in some districts is thought to be too strict in its measures, and I do not think therefore, that it would have a good effect, so to speak, in those districts.

8550. Suppose the Charity Organisation Society were altogether put aside for the moment, the problem taken in hand *de novo*, and all the charities of the place were organised, for that purpose a subsidiary organisation to these ends being created, would that not lead to the old feeling being more or less set aside and a responsible body being created?—You would have to get an authority that is in accord with public opinion. Who is to put up that authority? If there was an authority which could be put up in accordance with public opinion, I think it would be very handy indeed; but how to make it in accordance with public opinion without election I do not see.

8551. Would you be in favour of a statutory arrangement like that in Denmark, by which the aged have a right to outdoor relief or other relief?—There you come to the question of Old Age Pensions.

8552. I do?—That is a point which I have hardly gone into thoroughly. I think I should have to give many month's study to it before replying.

8553. With regard to the ins-and-outs, do you find that in large towns like Nottingham and Leicester there are a good many ins-and-outs?—There is no doubt about that.

Adequacy of existing treatment of "ins and outs."

8554. Are you satisfied with the method of dealing with them by way of the present detention in the workhouse?—Where there is a well administered workhouse they will not go to it; but at a place like Leicester, where there is easy administration, they will.

8555. That is to say, the more stringent or careful the administration in the workhouse, the fewer will be the ins-and-outs?—That is so.

8556. But even so, supposing there are a good many, even without that condition of stringent administration, would you be prepared to say that a certain number of admissions should *ipso facto* bring them under the Vagrancy Act or some such Act?—Most of those ins-and-outs, I think, belong to the vagrant class, and so you could bring in the question of labour colonies.

8557. They practically do belong to a class that might be so dealt with as a class, do they not?—Yes.

Non-Poor Law expenditure paid out of poor-rate.

8558. With regard to the poor rate, would you be of opinion that it would be well to separate the poor rate absolutely from the rates which are usually now collected under the term "poor rate?"—I think it would be as well to have it separately stated.

8559. When you deal with large areas like London, do you think that a system of the local relief authority estimating the expenditure of the year and receiving a grant for the purpose from a superior authority could ever be enforced as a good method of holding expenditure in check?—I do not quite follow.

8560. Suppose in London, for instance, for any particular purpose, as we now have the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund we had a central authority, not making grants out of a common fund, but requiring an estimate from the local authority and making grants according to that estimate—which is the system adopted in many cases abroad—do you think that would lead to a greater economy of administration?—I cannot exactly see the working of it. I have not gone into it.

Adequacy of existing Poor Law areas.

8561. With regard to poor relief institutions, do you think it would be as well to have a county centre for certain groups of institutions?—Certainly not. I sincerely hope that the present Poor Law area will be allowed to remain. It has on the whole worked well.

8562. Suppose we take the afflicted classes?—Suppose we take the sick. You cannot treat the sick wholesale. Go into a country workhouse, and see the guardians there when they go amongst the sick whom everybody sympathises with. One guardian will go up to one man and another guardian to another, and you will find a penny packet of sweets coming out to an old man

who is a really good character and who has had to be relieved owing to sickness. By keeping the union as it is, you have got an area from which everybody who is elected can easily come. You have your fortnightly meeting or your weekly meetings—many of them have weekly meetings; but if you have a county authority you would have probably less than twelve meetings a year.

8563. You yourself have mentioned one group of cases—ringworm cases; why should there not be a local provision by the county for all such cases?—With regard to cases of ringworm, you have only got them in large towns, and the number of cases is very few.

8564. Even so, there is no provision for them?—That is so, but Kingston I think is the only place where they have got ringworm as an epidemic.

Need for larger area for dealing with epileptics and defective children.

8565. With regard to defectives, is it not desirable to have a common place reserved for defective people?—I should like to see the epileptics and defective children removed from the workhouses. I think I have said that in my Report.

8566. For those purposes you may use the county?—You want in some instances a larger area for such cases.

8567. And that would be the group of counties?—Yes.

8568. How would you support those groups; would you have a rate for them?—I suppose it would have to come from the rates.

8569. The local rates, do you mean?—Yes.

Effect of "Officers'" Grant.

8570. With regard to the salaries and other sums which are not so very large, which are paid for by the Exchequer in the case of workhouses, do you think it desirable to go on with that system?—It is giving some dissatisfaction at the present time. In 1888 it was given according to the salaries then paid, and in unions where the population is increasing the salaries have greatly gone up and they are getting nothing extra; but in other unions where the population has gone down, they have probably fewer officers and yet they are getting the same amount of money. However, it has had one good effect; where you have a small rural union, and there is a question of reducing the staff of nurses, the argument that the salaries of the nurses are paid out of the contribution has some effect.

8571. That system might be revised, you think?—I think it requires revision.

8572. Also, is it not true that the rateable value of these places has gone up immensely?—It has.

8573. Could not we therefore throw the whole of this administration on to the local rates?—I have not seen how it would work, so I cannot say. I have not thought about it.

8574. It is all part and parcel of normal administration?—Yes.

8575. So that under a common principle it would lie upon them?—Yes.

Means of dealing with unemployment at Nottingham, Leicester and elsewhere.

8576. With regard to Nottingham and the other towns, in the bad years which we must all expect, are you satisfied with the appliances which we now use, if I may so call them, for dealing with the unemployed?—Are you referring to the Unemployed Workmen's Act?

8577. Not merely to that, but you have got the labour yard and the workhouse, you have got the borough council relief, and you have got the distress committees dealing practically with the destitute, be they considered unemployed or be it a Poor Law matter. Would you propose to adopt the Poor Law as the central system for dealing with Nottingham, or what would you say—because the returns of pauperism in some of these towns are not satisfactory, are they?—No; they are not.

8578. They suggest that the thing requires consideration so far as it is connected with the unemployed?—Which towns are you talking of now?

8579. I was thinking of Nottingham and of Leicester, particularly of Leicester?—Nottingham has got 2 per cent. of pauperism, against 2·67 for the rest of England; therefore it has got less pauperism than the average.

8580. They keep down the Poor Law relief by dealing with charitable people and by dealing with the unemployed through a connection which was used for relief purposes and not necessarily for work in connection with the municipality?—Yes; and then you have also got to remember that Nottingham is the centre to which all those people from the outside come in order to get the medical relief and in order to get into the Nottingham workhouse.

Mr. Nicholas Herbert. 2 April, 1906.

8581. My point is that in Nottingham the system is adopted of co-operating with charitable people, and the result has been that the pauperism did not rise there as it rose, for instance, in Leicestershire?—That is so.

8582. Does that not suggest means of getting out of our difficulty? The Whitechapel Order, as you know, dealt with the able-bodied by admitting the head of the family into the house, and letting the charitable keep the family while the man went into the house. Could not that system be adopted, it being clearly thrown upon the charitable people to keep the family if the house is accepted?—Yes.

8583. Otherwise, do you not fear that these last twenty years, which give a very bad result in some places, will create a permanent pauperism?—Has it given very bad results in many large towns?

8584. A good many of these towns show a distinct rise. If you take the last twenty years Nottingham is just keeping abreast with its increasing population; Leicester shows very badly up; the pauperism and the population of Mansfield seem to run almost side by side; and then you know what has happened in Chesterfield. This problem therefore seems a very serious one, unless the crisis is temporary?—You cannot compare the winter of 1904–5 with other winters. There is no doubt that then very little was spent on public works. In former years millions were being spent by local authorities and by railway companies upon works which employed a very large number of men, but during the winter 1904–5 there was very little work being carried out in my district out of loans, except the Derwent Valley water scheme.

Lack of employment in winter of 1904–5.

8585. That argument of course carries us to a certain extent, but it leaves us in this position, that unless great public works are undertaken, and that out of public money, you have as an alternative public pauperism?—That is it.

8586. Which is a very serious alternative to leave us in?—Yes.

Working of Out-Relief Unions.

8587. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) You have, I think, in your district one case of out-relief unions, have you not?—Yes.

8588. Only one?—Yes.

8589. How has it worked?—It is such a small out-relief union that it works quite smoothly.

8590. Is it Grantham?—Yes, Belvoir in the Grantham Union.

8591. Do you find that there is any difficulty in working the system; is there friction between the boards of guardians?—No; and I do not see how there should be any friction.

8592. You do not find any, in fact?—No; there is the same relieving officer.

8593. Is there the same clerk?—No.

8594. Is there any tendency to send the paupers to the workhouse, because the indoor relief will be charged on the whole of the union, whereas the outdoor relief is only charged on the out-relief union?—I do not think so.

Necessity for indicating the proportion of the poor rate spent on Poor Law purposes.

8595. I am not sure that I quite understood an answer you gave just now with regard to the poor rate: do you say that you would have a separate rate for Poor Law purposes?—I would have the rate shown. The statistics of the Local Taxation Returns show us the amount which was raised for Poor Law purposes only; that is a very handy thing to show the guardians, and I think it would be just as handy if the ratepayers knew of it.

8596. But you do not contemplate a separate rate, do you?—No, not a separate rate.

Origin of "Officers'" Grant.

8597. With regard to salaries, there is a certain amount paid to boards of guardians by county councils calculated on the amount which they paid for salaries in a particular year?—Yes; in the year, 1888.

Mr. Nicholas Herbert.

2 April, 1906.

8598. Is that not misunderstood? Do not the guardians think that the intention of that was that the salaries should be paid out of the separate fund contributed in that way?—I think so.

8599. Whereas it was only a means, was it not, of making a contribution from a larger area towards the cost of Poor Law administration?—That was the intention of Parliament, I believe.

8600. But that is not fully realised, is it?—No, it is not.

8601. It would not be possible now to abolish that grant unless you substitute something else for it, would it?—You must substitute something else, otherwise there would be great discontent.

Effect of Out-door Relief School Children Order.

8602. With regard to the Underfed Children Order, is it realised that that Order did not make it the duty of the guardians to give relief to anybody whom it was not their duty to relieve before?—They considered they could not give outdoor relief to able-bodied men, and most of those children are the children of able-bodied men.

8603. But still if the child is destitute, and it is a case of sudden and urgent necessity, they are obliged to relieve it?—Yes. As I have said, the general opinion now amongst boards of guardians is that they cannot relieve such cases, because they are then relieving the father, and they can only relieve the father by taking him into the workhouse. That is the general opinion.

8604. Therefore, the point was not that they issued relief to a new class, but that the mode of relief might be different?—Yes.

Scales of relief: their operation and effect.

8605. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the point that was raised by Mr. Loch as to the scale, it seemed as though you meant to say that the adoption of a scale of relief for outdoor able-bodied men was equivalent to an allowance system?—Mr. Loch was referring to a scale of outdoor relief not for men only, but generally. Most boards of guardians have a scale of relief something like 1s. 6d. for a child, and 3s. for a widow, and 4s. for over seventy, etc.

8606. You stated that you thought it would be a good thing if it could be abolished?—I think so.

8607. If it were abolished, would it not result in giving an amount that would cover all the members of the family, and so the relief then would vary according to the relief given to the members of the family?—I do not think so.

8608. Would you give the same amount of relief to a family of two or three that you would give to a family of nine?—No; certainly not.

8609. Then on what basis would you vary it?—The guardians would have to consider what was necessary in each case. They would naturally come to some conclusion.

8610. Would it be necessary to count heads in order to ascertain what amount could be given?—They must count heads.

8611. Therefore, in whatever form you give relief, it would come to the same?—They would have first of all to take into account what was going into the house.

8612. So they do when they adopt the scale; they take off the earnings, in order to bring the total income of the family to the scale?—That is not the usual plan.

8613. Surely any board of guardians would never give the full scale where there might be a reasonable amount of earnings, and yet give the same scale where there are none?—They only take off a shilling when there is a lodger in the house, or something of that kind.

8614. That is if the lodger pays a shilling?—No, the lodger would probably pay 9s. a week for his board and lodging.

TWENTY-THIRD DAY.

Tuesday, 3rd April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.S.C.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

The Hon. GERALD WALSH, called; and Examined

The Hon. Gerald Walsh.

3 April, 1906.

8615. (*Chairman.*) I understand you have only recently been appointed Local Government Board Inspector for the North-Midland District?—That is so.

8616. You felt that your experience was hardly sufficient to enable you to give a general description of your district; and therefore you have, for the last few months, been concentrating your attention, so far as this Commission is concerned, upon the administration of the poor law in Leicester?—Yes.

Figures as to pauperism and expenditure at Leicester.

8617. According to the memorandum you have handed in (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVIII. (A—E.)) there has been a very remarkable rise in the amount of poor relief given in Leicester, both indoor and outdoor. Let us first deal with the facts, taking the decennial period; the number of indoor poor has risen from 1,169 to 1,730?—Yes.

8618. And the outdoor from 2,830 to 6,179?—Yes.

8619. And there has been a very large increase in the number of vagrants?—Yes.

8620. A rise from 6,674 to 17,173?—Yes, that is in five years.

8621. In a table* which you have put in (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVIII. (E.)) you give the increase in the amount of the Precept, which has risen, taking the Michaelmas periods, from £26,470 at Michaelmas 1895 to £52,380 at Michaelmas 1906?—Yes.

8622. I think you wish to make an explanation on the table. I understand that the guardian's financial year ends at Lady-day, and that the precept that is issued at Lady-day is for the Michaelmas half-year following?—Yes.

8623. Therefore these figures would have to be corrected in this way, that the year in each instance beginning with 1895 would have to commence with Michaelmas and not with Lady-day?—That is so.

8624. With that slight alteration this table hold good?—Yes.*

8625. Therefore for the present year, that is the year 1906, the expenditure for the half year would be £52,380?—Yes, that is the amount required up to September 29th next.

* Table subsequently amended.

8626. If the amount of the precept is the same for the remaining half of the year the expenditure for that year will be heavy—it will be £104,000, will it not ?—Yes.

Effect of Machinery on unemployment.

8627. There being, therefore, no dispute as regards the facts of the rise in pauperism in Leicester Union, which are further illustrated by your chart (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVIII.(B)) let us investigate for a moment or two what are the alleged causes. It is stated that there was a considerable contraction of work in the shoe factories; have you been able to look into that matter at all ?—Not very much, but I have met two or three of the guardians who know the shoe trade, and they are agreed that there has been a considerable dislocation of trade owing to the introduction of machinery.

8628. Will this be a permanent contraction in their judgment, or will the introduction of machinery in a short time increase the amount of employment ?—They think that a great number of these men who have been displaced will not find work in the factories again.

8629. That is to say, that the younger men will be taken on ?—Yes.

8630. Has there been a contraction in any other great branch of labour in Leicester ?—The same sort of thing is taking place in the hosiery trade.

8631. There has been the introduction of new machinery ?—Yes.

8632. So that practically there is a certain displacement of the old labour conditions ?—Yes. Framework knitters have been displaced.

Instances and causes of lax administration of relief at Leicester.

8633. That would be one of the causes contributing to this increase of pauperism ?—Yes, I think certainly it would.

8634. It is alleged that almost simultaneously with this contraction of work there was a change in the administration, and that relief was then given upon easier conditions than before ?—Yes.

8635. According to paragraph 15 of your memorandum the rule as regards outdoor relief that previously was in existence was altered; do you consider that alteration was a very material one ?—I certainly think it was.

8636. It struck out the words, "whether such relatives are liable by law," I understand ?—Yes.

8637. And it substituted the words, "where the united income of those liable ?"—Yes.

8638. Can you explain what is the difference between the two ?—If a man was living with his sister-in-law she would not be liable by law to maintain him, but under rule 2, as it stood in 1893, it was taken into consideration that he was living with his sister-in-law, who might have been in good circumstances; as amended in 1902, her income would not have been taken into consideration.

8639. It limited the liability to support to those only who were legally liable ?—Yes.

8640. The task of work was also modified ?—Yes.

8641. And the amount that was required as a task was diminished ?—Yes.

8642. At the same time the scale of pay was revised and increased ?—That is so.

8643. These alterations were the result, I understand, of two elections in which the question of outdoor relief was given a prominent place ?—Yes.

8644. Coincident with these alterations there was a great increase in outdoor relief, was there not ?—Yes.

8645. And there was an increase in the indoor relief too ?—Yes.

8646. And the workhouse premises were insufficient to enable the guardians to apply the workhouse test ?—That is so.

8647. Side by side with this great increase in outdoor relief, there was no corresponding increase in the number of relieving officers ?—No.

8648. The result, apparently, was that there was a good deal of deception, and certain persons, according to the statements in your memorandum who ought not to have had relief obtained it ?—Yes, in 1901.

8649. Did the auditor call attention to the great increase of expenditure in outdoor relief ?—Yes.

8650. Do you know if that has had any effect on the guardians ?—No, not at present.

8651. Is there any inclination on the part of the guardians to revert to the older methods ?—Within the last ten days they have re-introduced tasks of work at the workhouse, namely, oakum picking and wood-chopping, which had been completely in disuse for some time.

8652. There are signs then that they are screwing the standard up ?—There are signs that they think the thing has gone far enough now, and they will try and pull it together again, I think. They are revising the dietary for the able-bodied.

Centripetal effect on pauperism of lax administration.

8653. 1902 is the date at which these changes were made. In paragraph 34 you give an analysis of the Leicester Distress Committee's statistics, showing the length of residence in Leicester of the various applicants; that shows that 42 per cent. of these applicants had been in the borough less than five years, does it not ?—Yes.

8654. So that notwithstanding the assumed bad conditions of trade, and the lack of employment, there was apparently an influx into Leicester of people seeking employment, or seeking relief, after 1902 ?—Yes.

8655. Are these figures endorsed by public opinion or private investigation in Leicester ?—They are the official figures of the Leicester Distress Committee.

8656. It is considered that this system of relief has attracted to Leicester undesirable persons ?—Yes.

8657. Who have come there not to get work, but to obtain relief under the conditions which now exists ?—That is so.

Rules adopted by Leicester Guardians for granting relief.

8658. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Have you regular rules for the administration of relief at Leicester ?—They have for certain classes.

8659. You refer to a rule in one of the paragraphs of your memorandum. Is that one of a series of rules they have got ?—Yes, one of a series of rules.

8660. Was there any alteration except in the one to which you have drawn attention ? Perhaps you have not had occasion to look into that to see whether they differ in other respects from the old rules ?—I think they did in some respects.

8661. Perhaps you would put in the two sets of rules showing the extent of the alterations ?—I will do so. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XVIII. (F).)

8662. Do you know generally what was the nature of the changes; was it in the direction of laxity ?—Yes, it was in that direction.

System of Relief Committees at Leicester.

8663. Have they relief committees at Leicester ?—Yes, Six Relief Committees.

8664. How do they work them; is there a fixed committee dealing with a specific district ?—They deal with them according to wards, a committee to each relief district.

8665. Do the same guardians always act on a particular committee ?—Always.

8666. Do the relieving officers' districts correspond with the wards ?—They do, but a relieving officer may take more than one ward.

8667. There are forty-eight guardians, I think ?—Yes.

8668. It is all one parish ?—Yes.

8669. The parish is sub-divided into wards ?—Yes.

8670. Do you happen to remember whether there are many wards ?—I am afraid I could not tell you.

8671. (*Chairman.*) Do you know how they are elected; does a ward elect more than one member ?—I am afraid I could not tell you.

System of election of Guardians at Leicester.

8672. The reason I ask is that in Nottingham apparently there are four wards, and each ward elects twelve guardians ?—I find there are sixteen wards in Leicester.

8673. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Therefore there would be three guardians to a ward ?—Three guardians to a ward.

8674. Do they all retire together ?—They do.

8675. Do you know how the relief committees are composed; are the guardians who represent particular wards selected by the board to sit on the relief committee which sits for that ward ?—Yes, principally.

8676-7. (*Chairman.*) To put the point bluntly: assuming that four wards were to elect twelve guardians, would

The Hon. Gerald Walsh.

3 April, 1906.

those twelve guardians administer out-relief to the people who had elected them ?—Yes, to a great degree they would.

8678. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Have you had occasion to attend any relief committees since you have been inspector in that district ?—I have not attended a relief committee.

8679. I think I understood you to say they were now proposing to re-open the stone yard ?—To re-impose the tasks of work in the workhouse.

8680. Do you mean as a labour test ?—No, for the able-bodied men in the workhouse.

8681. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Is that because the spring is coming on ?—I do not think so.

8682. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) They have always had a task of work for the outdoor able-bodied men, have not they ?—Yes.

Out-relief to single able-bodied men.

8683. Did they ever give outdoor relief to able-bodied single men ?—A resolution was passed on 3rd October, 1905, permitting out relief on the labour test to be given to single able-bodied men under certain conditions. Many applied but failed to carry out the conditions.

8684. I see the scale of pay does not mention the class of a single man ?—In the altered rules which I shall hand in you will find that the scale of pay for able-bodied men is at the rate of 1s. 3d. per day, half in pay and half in kind.

8685. With regard to the task outside the workhouse for the able-bodied outdoor paupers, have they got a stone yard now ?—There is no stone yard at all.

Workhouse Farm at Leicester and its administration.

8686. What is the work they put them upon now ?—Wood-chopping and wood-bundling, or farm work on the land.

8687. What do they do exactly on the land, is it digging ?—It is digging, etc.

8688. It is only used for the purpose of a labour test, I suppose ? There is no building on it, is there ?—On the Gilroes Estate there is no building for housing the men ; on the North Evington Estate there is the infirmary building.

8689. (*Mr. Loch.*) How do they settle the tasks to put to the men who are on the farm ? How do they fix what their extent is to be ?—There is a superintendent and he tells the men off for what they are to do, and it rests with him as to whether he is satisfied with the amount of work they have done at the end of the day or not.

8690. How many men are there to that superintendent ?—They would average about 120 to 140 on the North Evington Estate and about the same on the Gilroes Estate. There is a superintendent and his assistant at North Evington and two men at Gilroes too.

8691. Are these men employed in squads ?—No, they are not employed in squads.

8692. They are all employed together ?—They are dotted about the place.

8693. Is it possible to supervise them ?—Not properly.

8694. Is there any instruction which is available for you officially to prevent an insufficient number of supervisers of the men being used in such a way that it is very difficult to see how much they do ?—As an inspector there is none ; you can only advise the guardians to appoint more people.

8695. That is to say, they are really breaking new ground by taking this new farm, and at the same time they are not utilising the experience which there is available on the question ?—No, so far as I know.

8696. Have you yourself seen other farms attached to workhouses in other parts of your district ?—I have whilst I was in London seen Laindon, but no other.

8697. Practically the attraction to a man, wife and five children, to take that as a test, is that they get 13s. a week now as against 10s. in the old days ?—It would be 14s.

8698. What was that based on ; was it based on an idea of a minimum wage, or what was the idea that led to this change ?—I think that in paragraph 33, which sets out the guardians' reply to the auditor's report, you will see it is stated the average set by the Board is 3s. per week per person. Under the head of E. M. it goes on to say, "In this case it was 18s. received from three of the children, and on this basis in no single week did the income plus the relief given exceed the average set by the board, viz., 3s. per week." That is 3s. per head.

8699. They practically were fixing a minimum income ?—Yes.

8700. And if a man dropped work he could apply and be pretty certain of getting up to a minimum income ?—Yes, that is so.

8701. Was not that one of the great attractions ?—I think it was, undoubtedly.

8702. I should like to ask you about this sentence in italics which immediately follows :—"In the absence of any official ruling on the report of the Local Government Board as to the basis upon which relief should be granted, whether gross earning or net income of the parents, the Committee will act upon the assumption that the latter is the best basis upon which to work." It says net income or gross earning. How do they find their net income ? Was the enquiry of the relieving officers sufficiently exact to get at the net income ?—The idea was that, whatever the child was earning, part of it had to go towards its food and towards its clothing and maintenance, and that that should not be taken into account.

Meaning of "net income" as standard for amount of relief.

8703. That is to say they made deductions for each member of the family ?—Yes.

8704. They treated each member of the family as a separate entity providing for itself ?—Yes.

8705. Then they said after providing for itself on their scale the balance might be carried to the common account of the family ?—Yes.

8706. Their scale was, of course, whatever scale they chose ?—Yes.

8707. So you had no real standard at all in the settlement of relief, because the scale of the expenditure which the guardians might expect the child to have to incur would very likely be different to the actual expenditure which the child did incur in maintenance, clothing, etc. ?—Yes, that would be so.

8708. Do you think that it would be possible by any official ruling of any kind to prevent a recurrence of such a method which, on the face of it, has been provocative of applications ?—I think the Board has never particularly suggested to the guardians what scale of relief they should adopt.

8709. Would the Poor Law Orders for, instance, cover an issue like this ?—I think not.

8710. Are you of opinion that it is desirable that the local board of guardians should work on a scale, or, to put the alternative, that they might take the case as it stands and see what should be done for it, instead of relying at once on that scale that is put forward as soon as the inquiring officer has made his investigation ?—I am not in favour of a scale.

Appointment of Cross Visitors.

8711. Your paragraph 36 refers to the appointment of a relieving officer to supervise and cross visit. Would you be in favour of making it compulsory for a board to have a cross visitor if the number of cases amounted to a certain total, or some other similar condition ?—I think it is most necessary they should cross visit.

8712. Then you would be in favour of compulsion ?—Yes.

Functions of Auditor and Inspector as regards case relief.

8713. In paragraph 32 you refer to the auditor ; the auditor there has clearly taken into account the investigation, as I understand, from the statements made. Do you think a system could be adopted by which the books could be audited from the point of view not only of finance, but from the point of view of the case work, if I may so call it, and a report be submitted as to whether or not the relieving officers' application and report books are properly filled up ?—I do not quite follow you.

8714. I am referring to the case you mention of H. A., No. 2 District. The district auditor points out first of all that the out-relief is extremely large. Then he says, here is a case in point, "In this case the wife earned 2s. 6d. to 6s. per week. The man is a bricklayer, and has been on the labour test for about eighteen months. He is a good workman, but cannot obtain employment owing

to his drunken habits. Some years ago he assaulted his wife, and was sentenced to three months' hard labour. He appears to consider the labour test a permanent situation. I suggest that in this case the man should have been sent into the workhouse and the wife and children relieved outside." The auditor there is auditing not merely the accounts but the work of the board ?—That is so.

8715. That being so, it suggests that if every auditor audited both the accounts and the work in other places than in Leicester, cases of this kind might be brought to light ?—That is so.

8716. Would that be desirable ?—I think it would be for the inspector to bring those cases to the notice of the guardians as a body, seeing that relief is administered by separate courts.

8717. As a matter of fact, do these cases come before the inspector ?—Yes; he ought to look at the application and report books and see these cases. It is on these cases he would advise the guardians with regard to the administration of their out-relief.

8718. When the auditor brings it forward, there is a possible question of surcharge, is there not ?—Yes, there is a possible question.

8719. When the inspector brings it forward there is no such question ?—No.

Need for more supervision of cases on relief lists.

8720. I am simply dealing with the question from the point of view of better administration; is it not desirable that there should be some continuous survey of the application and report books of the relieving officers, with a view to bringing to light work like this, wherever it may occur ?—I think there should be.

8721. Has an inspector really time to do such a thing as that, judging even from your short experience in your present district. You have many unions under you: is it a possibility for you to do that ?—I do not think you could go through them all.

8722. Therefore, unless you have special help for it or someone does it and brings the matter before the board, or in some way gives publicity to it, this work may go on and not come to light in its detail ?—It might not.

Difficulty of imposing adequate "test" of work.

8723. With regard to the problem of Leicester and its pauperism, can you make any suggestions ? The problem I presume is not unlike the problem of other towns, where there has been a re-action in favour of the rather relaxed method of relief. Suppose we stand at the parting of the ways between a lax system and a stricter system, have you any suggestions to make about it ?—I think the tasks of work certainly ought to be imposed, and I think the proper supervision of the work whilst the men are at work should be enforced.

8724. Take this question of the tasks of work, the tasks of work are tasks which are actually asked of all men that apply, but the strength and ability of the men is different, so that what is a task for one is not a task for another, as you find in these cases ?—That is so.

8725. Does it not follow, if you are to use the task system, you must apply it personally, or it fails ?—That is so.

8726. Do we do that at all ?—It is not done in Leicester.

8727. Again, if you have a labour yard, what is the number that you would allow in a labour yard under one superintendent ?—That is rather a difficult question.

8728. Are not those questions really, from the point of view of the deterrent effect of poor relief, almost essential to the problem ?—Yes.

Futility of "farm" at Leicester.

8729. Would you say the utilising of this land for digging has been of real service in preventing pauperism in Leicester ?—No.

Possible co-operation between Guardians and Charities.

8730. With regard to the charities of Leicester, have you ever thought whether the Whitechapel Order for giving relief to the family outside if the head of the family comes into the workhouse, might be applied, and in suitable cases that the Charitable Societies of Leicester should help those who were left outside, namely, the rest of the family ?—I am afraid I have not thought of that yet.

8731. Do you think the charities of Leicester could assist in any other way; I would suggest one way, that they should assist in cases which are unsuitable for poor relief, where the rent has to be paid, or persons have to be set up, and so on, those cases might be relieved by the Charitable Societies ?—I think so certainly.

8732. Is there any inclination on the Board to do that ?—I think not so far as I know.

8733. Is it a question which could be brought before the board of guardians, or would it be outside the province of your work as Inspector ?—I certainly think I could bring it before them.

8734. That might be of some assistance possibly ?—Yes; and emigration might be of assistance.

8735. There was an Emigration Society started last autumn in Leicester ?—Yes.

8736. Do you know whether it has been taken up actively ?—I was making inquiries about it, but I was called here earlier than I anticipated.

8737. Have you found that the Distress Committee is emigrating people ?—I wrote also about that, but I have not had the return which I asked for.

Possibility of Borough Councils checking Guardians' expenditure.

8738. Can you suggest any way of checking this large expenditure. The guardians make their own precepts practically ?—Yes.

8739. There is no control over them as to the amount of money they may spend, except the public opinion of the district when it is thoroughly roused ?—That is all.

8740. Supposing they had to send in an estimate to a borough council, and the borough council, we will say, had the control over the expenditure in the sense that they pass a grant by a special poor rate, do you think that that would mend matters at all, or would the borough council be as much in favour of expenditure as the Board of guardians ?—I really do not know.

8741. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would not there be great friction between the two bodies ?—I think so.

8742. Do you think it would be practicable to avoid that ?—I do not.

8743. (*Mr. Loch.*) It comes to this almost, that in the fulness of the reaction almost any amount of money can be spent by the board of guardians and that without any control whatever ?—Yes.

Effect of introduction of machinery on unemployment.

8744. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Could you tell me this with reference to the effects of the introduction of machinery on trade: It sometimes happens where the quick-going machinery is introduced, it turns out so much more work that more people are employed in the subsidiary parts of the work than are really turned off. Do you know if there is any tendency of that sort in the boot trade ?—I think there is a tendency towards it now.

8745. So that it might recover in that way. I do not know if it is so, but possibly more finishers might be needed, because of the greater amount of work that is turned out by the machinery ?—There might be, but it is not anticipated.

8746. Do you know what part the women take in the boot trade more especially ?—Fitting of uppers and flowering and embroidery work.

8747. You do not know whether they are also thrown out by this machinery ?—The rivetters were the first to suffer.

8748. So the finishers and lasters have not suffered so much ?—Machinery has now been introduced into every department, including the finishing and lasting.

8749. It would make more work for them if they are turning out more ?—It might do so. There are, I think, an increasing proportion of women employed in consequence of the machinery.

8750. That is what I want to get at. Do you know if the number of women has actually increased, or is it only that the number of men has decreased ?—I could not say.

8751. At any rate the proportion of women is greater ?—I think so. In one of the largest factories which I visited one-third of the hands employed are women.

Earnings of women.

8752. Do you know if they are fairly well paid ? Do you know at all what their earnings are ?—It is very difficult to get it. I asked for that. It would vary from 16s. to 20s. a week for women in the boot trade.

8753. That is very good, of course ?—Yes.

8754. You said the frame knitting had also suffered in the same way. Would that be women or men who were thrown out ?—Women and men. There are men and women frame knitters.

The Hon. Gerald Walsh.

3 April, 1906.

8755. Do you think there is any chance that the women who are thrown out of the frame knitting will be absorbed in the shoe trade, or probably they could not adapt themselves?—No.

High rates a cause of migration of industries.

8756. You tell us that the high rates have emptied houses in Leicester to some extent. Have they driven any of the industries out into the country?—Some industries have, I understand, moved to Melton and other places, but it is difficult really to find out whether it is the high rates or whether it is the union rate of wages which has driven them out.

8757. Do they take their hands with them when they go, do you know, or do they leave them behind?—I have not been able to ascertain that.

8758. If it was a question of union rates, I am afraid they would leave them behind?—That is so.

Partial adoption of case-paper system at Leicester.

8759. Do the Leicester Board of Guardians use case papers?—They use case papers with regard to inmates coming into the house; not with regard to applicants for outdoor relief.

8760. They have two systems. Case papers for the inmates, but not for the outdoor applicants?—That is so.

Policy of different parties in Leicester Board of Guardians.

8761. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Have you been able to get any information as to the policy which was advocated at the election—was it a purely out door relief policy, or relief for the unemployed, or what? What platform did they stand on? As I understand, the present guardians swept the board, did they not?—No.

8762. They got a preponderant majority; is it that out of the forty-eight, forty are in favour of the out-relief, or relief for the unemployed, or something of that kind?—I think there are about one-fourth of the new guardians who came on with this liberal programme of relief, and the other three-quarters are old guardians who have been there for some time, but they have been swayed by the one-fourth.

8763. Then thirty-six of them could not stand up against twelve; they did not really realise the principle underlying Poor Law administration?—That is so.

"Destitution" as the condition of relief.

8764. The Poor Law, as framed in 1834, was framed for the relief of destitution, was not it?—Yes.

8765. Does the average guardian remember that, or does he think the Poor Law exists for the sake of assisting poverty?—I think he expects it to assist poverty.

8766. That is to say he cares solely for the individual and not for the community?—That is so.

8767. Would you say that is a kind of cleavage, I cannot say between the old guardians and the new, because they all apparently row in the same boat, but as far as theory goes, have the old guardians, the thirty-six, any idea of the welfare of the community?—I think perhaps they have now.

8768. Any little alterations that have been made lately, thanks to you, have been due to the thirty-six recovering their bearings a little?—Yes.

8769. And the approach of the spring weather?—No, I think the last high precept had something to do with it.

8770. You do not mean to say that in next October you will get the same sort of thing beginning again?—It may, but I hope not.

Borough Council work for the unemployed.

8771. Does the borough council deal at all with the question of providing work for the unemployed, or does the borough council leave the poor relief to the guardians solely. They have taken on some of the unemployed men.

8772. At the request of the guardians?—Yes, and some through private requests of individual guardians have been taken on.

8773. That is to say, the guardian would know the borough surveyor and he would know a deserving man of good character was coming up, so that he would say, Give this poor chap the employment?—Yes.

8774. That little favouritism is exercised in his behalf?—One of the guardians, Mr. Kemp, to whom I have alluded here, has lately got the borough council to take twelve men on for some of their drainage work.

8775. The guardians are now beginning to differentiate into classes these able-bodied men; to put the best, say, on to borough council work, and those of an inferior grade on to stone breaking?—I do not think they have got so far as that. An individual guardian has, but not the board as a whole.

8776. I understand the bulk of these unemployed men are boot rivetters, except the vagrants who have drifted into the town. You told us they put a good many on to digging work; and I wondered how far boot rivetters were qualified to dig. On your last page you have 516 of the boot trades. That means 516 of these men, I understand?—These are not employed by the guardians.

8777. I suppose the same kind of figures apply to both the Distress Committee and the guardians, do they not? If the distress committee could not give them work, then they must go to the Poor Law, if they are destitute or approaching destitution?—Yes.

8778. Therefore, some of these 516 men did find their way eventually to the Poor Law guardians for digging or stone breaking?—They have not all, I think, yet.

8779. You do not think that any of these men on this list of the total register of 1837 have come to the guardians at present? (*Mr. Booth.*) Your previous statistics say 284 have been or are now on labour test?—That is so, 284 have come to the guardians.

8780. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Some of them must have been men who, as a matter of fact, were quite unused to digging?—Yes.

8781. If I understand what a boot rivetter has to do, he is not likely, under any circumstances, to be a digger or a stone breaker?—A great many of those have been out of work some time and have done it.

8782. What has happened to the Boot Trade Society in Leicester? Has that practically ceased to be powerful, owing to the introduction of this machinery? It used to be a very strong Society years ago?—Yes, I have heard so.

8783. Now practically it has lost all its power because of the machinery, and the employment of female labour has practically destroyed the Society?—I really could not tell you that.

8784. I do not know whether it is a fair question, but have you happened to come across in your late investigation any figures about the progress of that Leicester Branch of the Boot & Shoe Makers' Society for the period mentioned here?—I think you would probably get that better from the Society itself.

Revision of "able-bodied" dietary at Leicester.

8785. (*Dr. Downes.*) You mentioned that the able-bodied dietary was being revised; do you know the reason of its revision?—It was said that it was so good a dietary that the workhouse was in consequence no deterrent to men.

8786. Have you a copy of the dietary?—It is here.

8787. Did they give many of them lunch?—Yes, they gave some of them lunch.

8788. Were they doing any very extraordinarily hard work?—There was no work in the workhouse at all, with the exception of some six men who would be employed on corn grinding: the others did nothing but cleaning in the workhouse.

Nature of paupers' work at Leicester.

8789. There was no very heavy work. You are aware, no doubt, that lunch was introduced into the dietary order for the purpose of men who were really on exceptionally heavy work?—I have the list of 13th February, and out of 90 able-bodied men there were 24 employed in scrubbing, 12 as wardsmen, 9 on the land, 8 painting, 6 in the corn mills, 6 [window-cleaning, 4 in the bakehouse, 2 in the kitchen, 2 in the laundry, 2 stoking, 2 in the carpenters' shop, 2 in [the engineers' shop, 2 in the wood shop: there was no work at all of a heavy nature.

8790. Even work on the land, according to your statement, amounts only to 42½ hours a week: 7½ hours daily and Saturday 5 hours, I think makes a total of 42½?—That is so.

8791. You do not call that very hard, I take it?—No.

8792. What do they do on the land?—They cultivate the vegetables for the house and the infirmary, and attend to the stock.

8793. Are the workhouse inmates sent up to work at North Evington?—Some twenty go up to North Evington from the workhouse, and the others are labour test men.

8794. The infirmary is on that site, is it not ?—Yes.

8795. Are they working in the infirmary premises ?—Yes.

Leave of absence from Workhouse at Leicester.

8796. What leave to go out do the able-bodied men get in Leicester Workhouse ? Is leave freely given to the inmates of the workhouse ?—Yes, it is freely given.

8797. Do they wear a distinctive dress ?—The able-bodied do in the workhouse ?

8798. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Indoor and out, or only indoor ? When they go out on leave, do they have ordinary clothes ? —They can wear their own clothes if they wish.

Inadequacy of Workhouse accommodation at Leicester.

8799. (*Dr. Downes.*) You say the workhouse is very overcrowded. Have the guardians considered the possibility of taking any temporary premises, any disused factory or other building ?—I did suggest it to one of them the other day.

8800. Had not they considered it before ?—No. North Evington Infirmary was opened only in September last and that provides 512 beds. Previous to that they had 360 sick inmates in the workhouse and they were in hope, when this new infirmary was opened, that would relieve the pressure on the workhouse.

8801. Has that hope been realised ?—No, it has not.

8802. How did they take your suggestion that some premises should be hired ?—At the present moment they are asking the Local Government Board to sanction the removal of their imbeciles and epileptics to North Evington to further reduce the numbers in the House, and the numbers in the house at the present moment are going down, owing to the time of the year.

8803. Where do they put the imbeciles at North Evington : in the infirmary ?—In the infirmary.

8804. Has the outdoor medical relief gone up at all ? —Yes.

Increase in out-door medical relief at Leicester.

8805. Have you any figures on the point ?—In one district, No. 5, I found that the relieving officer in five months had issued 1,052 medical orders, in addition to 931 cases for outdoor relief and labour test cases, and 423 cases for the House.

8806. That number of medical relief orders I gather from you was a large increase on the previous practice ?—Yes.

8807. Do they get medical comforts freely ? Perhaps you would not have had time to go into that ?—They do get medical comforts freely.

8808. Was alcohol given at all in the workhouse to any of these people employed on work ?—Alcohol is not given.

8809. Have you any sick in the workhouse now, or have they cleared them all out ?—They have all gone to North Evington.

8810. Do you find the infirmary filling up from the outside at all ; that is to say, are cases which did not previously seek workhouse relief beginning to come into the infirmary ?—I do not know that that has been very noticeable at present.

8811. Can you account for the very large increase in vagrants at all ?—No, I do not know that I can account for it, except that they are attracted to the places where out-relief is given very liberally.

Increase of vagrants and its cause.

8812. But these are vagrants : they would not be relieved by the guardians with out-relief, would they ?—In addition to laxity of administration probably another reason which may account for it is that the Derwent Water scheme passes close to Leicester, and vagrants always follow those works.

8813. Following what they call the pipe track ?—Yes.

8814. When did that scheme commence ?—I could not tell exactly when it commenced, but it is going on in full swim now.

8815. Are there any shelters or soup kitchens or agencies of that sort which have been started lately ?—Not that I know of.

8816. It strikes one as somewhat remarkable that in a town which is presumably in such distress through want of employment there should be an influx of this particular class ?—It does.

8817. Is it the fact that the vaccination question is a prominent question in the election of these guardians ? —It is.

Attitude of ratepayers at Leicester.

8818. (*Miss Hill.*) Do you see any organised movement on the part of the ratepayers to resist this state of things ? Is there any strong ratepayers' association, or are meetings held in the town at all ?—There was a meeting of the overseers with regard to the last precept to see whether the amount could not be curtailed, and there have been several letters in the newspapers lately with regard to the enormous expenditure.

8819. What is this Derwent Water scheme on which you say these men work ?—It is a water supply for a town which I forget : it is bringing water from the River Derwent.

8820. You say few of the men that were sent were satisfactory, and they returned. What was the action of the guardians with regard to these men who returned ? Did they put them immediately on these relief works or on this outdoor relief, did that make any impression on them ? —One man applied for relief and had an order for the House.

8821. You said you thought that there seemed, within the last ten days, some slight desire to pull the reins a little bit tighter. Did that come from outside pressure, i.e., pressure from the ratepayers, or do you think the guardians themselves are beginning to see what they are doing ?—I think it is a little of both.

8822. You are not aware of any widely spread or any very pronounced movement on the part of the people to resist this thing ?—There is nothing organised at present that I know of.

8823. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I have only one question, but it is rather comprehensive ; I do not know whether you will care to answer it. Supposing you had a board of guardians prepared to put themselves under your direction, who would recognise that the rates were very high and pauperism was very great, what kind of suggestions would you make to them for dealing with the present pauperism ? How do you think they might get out of the present mess that they have got into ? I think the way out suggests the way in rather. Do you think they might classify their able-bodied paupers and deal with them in a different manner. I suppose that would be the beginning really, to enter into a very careful inquiry as to the able-bodied poor and attempt to classify them and deal with them in different ways ?—Yes.

8824. Do you think emigration would be a possible solution in some directions for some of them ?—I think emigration would certainly be a good thing.

8825. Then a very much stricter administration, I suppose, and offering the House to a considerable number of them ?—Yes.

8826. Do you think that any of the able-bodied poor that have been assisted belong to friendly societies ?—I do not think so.

8827. Supposing you had an opportunity of advising on the subject, would you advise them to abolish the outdoor test work either gradually or immediately ?—Yes.

8828. And to offer the House only ?—Yes.

Effect of strict administration.

8829. What do you think would happen to the present population that depends upon it ?—I do not think the majority would go into the House.

8830. How do you think they would deal with themselves ? Do you think they would leave Leicester and find more suitable openings elsewhere ? There is no possible opening for them, I suppose, in Leicester, or do you think that there is ?—I cannot say.

8831. Do you think as pauperism increases there, the work that has to be done for Leicester and in Leicester is supplied by workmen who come in for it from the outside ?—No.

8832 You think there is a continuous demand for labour there, but these are men who are so inveterately lazy they will not take it up, and their places are really taken by men from the outside ?—I think certainly they are lazy and the labour test affords them permanent employment.

The Hon. Gerald Walsh.
3 April, 1906.

8833. You think there is work going which they might take up, but which other men come into the town and get instead of them. Do you think that is the case?—No, I do not think that I would go so far as that.

8834. You have not any facts to go upon with regard to that?—No.

8835. Have your guardians taken up the question of under-fed children under Mr. Balfour's circular?—Do you mean throughout the district?

8836. No, I am speaking of Leicester?—They have inquired into about 300 cases, but have not given relief to a single case under the Order.

Respective merits of "Boarding-out" and "Scattered Homes."

8837. I think before you went to this district you did a good deal of inspecting institutions for children and Poor Law schools, did you not?—Yes.

8838. Have you any preference for scattered homes or boarding-out?—No, I have not preference for either.

8839. You think they both serve their purpose?—I think it very much depends on the Committees who look after them.

8840. A scattered home is just as good as a boarding-out cottage provided that the Committee that administers is a good one?—Yes.

8841. (*Chairman.*) Can you give us any information as regards the age of the people who were thrown out of employment in the boot trade? Have you any information as to whether they are old men?—The men who would be on the labour test?

8842. Owing to the changes in the boot trade, a certain number of people have been thrown out of employment. That is admitted. I assume that they would probably be the old men. Do you know?—I have not got that information absolutely, but what I was told would lead one to suppose that they were mostly men of middle age.

8843. If they were men over middle age there would be greater difficulty in getting other employment. Perhaps you did not go into that particular point?—I did not.

Effect of introduction machinery employmer

8844. (*Dr. Downes.*) On that point, on page 1 of your memorandum you say it was found that the rapidly moving machinery was detrimental to those who were past middle age. In what way was it detrimental? Do you mean to their health or from an industrial point of view?—The men were too old to take up the machinery. They could not watch machinery as if they had been accustomed to it from childhood. It was really in that way that I meant it.

8845. That industrially it was detrimental to them?—Yes.

TWENTY-FOURTH DAY.

Monday, 9th April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. BALDWYN FLEMING, called; and Examined.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.
9 April, 1906.

8846. (*Chairman.*) You are the General Inspector of the Local Government Board for the District comprising Dorset, Hampshire, most of Wiltshire and the Farnham Union in Surrey?—I am.

Extent of District.

8847. You have been connected, as an Inspector, with the Poor Law since 1868?—I have.

8848. You were transferred to your present district in 1876?—Yes.

8849. Therefore you have had thirty years' experience of that district?—Yes.

8850. We will take your written memorandum as your evidence in chief. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIX (A-E).) In the earlier paragraphs of that memorandum you call attention to satisfactory features in the results of the administration in the rural unions, and two of the most satisfactory features are, a decrease in the number of able-bodied paupers, and in child pauperism?—That is so.

Decrease in in able-bodied and child paupers.

Old age pauperism and prospect of its diminution.

8851. Therefore the proportion of old paupers in the rural unions must be steadily increasing?—It is; but then there are very special reasons for that, and I doubt whether they are really appreciated as they should be. From my point of view old age pauperism ought not to continue. We are living through a stratum of pauperism now which was a necessity of former years, but which ought not to continue in the future for this reason, that the people who are now the old paupers never had the opportunity of providing for themselves. Those who survived their wage earning period, and the relations and others who were able to help them, had no alternative but to come upon the rates, because in the days when they were younger friendly societies were not sound, they had not the opportunities of thrift which the present generation have; and, from my point of view, I believe that old-age pauperism, unless it is perpetuated by unwise legislation, should become a thing of the past. I do not think that the present generation will have any excuse for being paupers in their old age, unless they have special inducements to rely on public support instead of their own independent exertions.

8852. Do you apply that general observation to the urban districts as well as to the rural districts?—Yes.

8853. The large towns in your constituency are Southampton and Portsmouth?—They are the only two really large towns. I have besides the cities of Salisbury and Winchester, and some towns of moderate size; but the only two really large towns in my district are

Southampton and Portsmouth. They are both extremely important towns, because Portsmouth is the great Naval Dockyard, practically the key to the heart of England, and Southampton is the great commercial port of the South of England.

Effect on pauperism of the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Trades Unions.

8854. As regards your observation that old-age pauperism should become a thing of the past, we have had a good deal of evidence from the North of England and elsewhere; and certain of the witnesses have expressed their opinion that they think a certain class of employee loses his employment from various causes earlier now than he did some time back, and that one of the causes contributing to this reduction in the age at which people cease to be independent is the Workmen's Compensation Act. Has the working of that Act come at all within your experience?—I have no doubt the effect of that Act is to drive people out of employment at a younger age than before the Act was in operation, and the trades unions bear in the same direction. The trades unions, so far as my experience goes, do not care to have anybody who is not thoroughly able to do a full day's work for the standard wage which they decide ought to be paid, and the result is that the workers who are somewhat past their best get elbowed out.

Potentiality of thrift among the working classes.

8855. Although the workmen of the present day may, through friendly societies and other kindred agencies, have a better chance of making provision for themselves in their old age, still have they, in your judgment, so availed themselves of those chances as to make it likely that there will in the future be fewer old paupers than in the past?—I think the competition of outdoor relief, and the various unsettling influences which have been at work during the last ten years, the promise of old-age pensions and the various political promises, if one may so describe them, which have been made prior to general elections, have so unsettled the working classes that they are waiting to see what happens rather than provide for themselves, as they really ought to do if these other influences had not been at work. The marvel to me is how the friendly societies have held their own in face of the competition of outdoor relief. I think that the fact that the friendly societies go on increasing in their membership and in their funds, and the enormous efforts that are being made in the direction of thrift by the working classes, are the strongest possible evidence that they are sound at heart, and unless their sense of independence is artificially discouraged by Parliament, or by other means, it will exert itself, and the people will provide for themselves. In the very early days of the Poor Law Commissioners it was noted that the working classes always rise to the necessities of the situation; if they do not find what they wanted provided for them, they manage to provide it for themselves. I think that will be so with regard to old-age pensions. I have no doubt myself that the old-age pension difficulty ought to be solved through the agency of the friendly societies. If other and more undesirable agencies, from my point of view, are not brought into operation it will be so solved. But outdoor relief as it is given now, and inducements held out to apply for outdoor relief by such legislation as the 5s. Friendly Society Bill, appear to me to be entirely mischievous, and to work against what should be the great object of legislation; that is, to make the people independent instead of dependent.

Value of "unsound" or "dividing out" societies.

8856. You have something to say as regards the village clubs, the sharing-out clubs and similar institutions which are very often described as unsound, or even rotten. I understand you to contend that there is a certain class of life that would not be taken by the great societies?—That is so. For bad lives which cannot get into sound permanent societies, I know of no other chance that they have than by going into these dividing-out societies. By that means they have some opportunity of doing, at all events, that much for themselves. If you look back into the past history of friendly societies, and their effect upon pauperism, you will find that friendly societies have been working out their own security. It is only now that they have ascertained a sound basis on which to found their tables, and their practice; and many of the friendly societies which have failed in the past have failed not through vice but ignorance. Many people have paid into friendly societies for years, I have known cases of twenty, thirty and forty years even, and the friendly society has failed just before the man ought to have had the benefit of it. Then there is a further great difficulty which friendly societies have found themselves in; that is, that they are paying off liabilities they never undertook and never intended to undertake. They are practically paying for old-age pensions for senile decay, whereas they only undertook to pay for sickness. Senile decay is not really sickness, and consequently a very heavy expense has been put on friendly societies which, in their inception, they never intended to take.

Difficulties of pioneer Friendly Societies.

8857. Has any attempt been made to rectify that by raising the annual contribution or premium?—I can hardly answer that. I know that in some of the smaller societies, some of the county societies, the attempt has been made; and I think there are some of the societies now which will not admit members unless they pay in for old-age benefits as well as for sick benefits. Many of the great societies have a separate branch for old age, but the original payment was merely for sickness. Where people have lived to extreme old age, and are incapacitated from permanent senile decay, the societies are undoubtedly paying old-age pensions in the guise of sick pay, which was never intended when the original tables were drawn up.

Suitability of existing Poor Law areas and difficulty of amalgamating Unions.

8858. Passing on to the question of boundaries, have you any suggestions to make as regards boundaries. Would you increase the unit of administration and make it larger than the existing unions?—No, not when the union is of a sufficient size. There are a good many small unions which, from my point of view, might with great advantage be amalgamated with the surrounding unions, but the question is one of extreme difficulty, because directly you try to dissolve a union, you practically have the whole neighbourhood up in arms against you. I had a most striking case in my own district. Th Fordingbridge Union had a shockingly bad workhouse The union was about half in Hampshire and half in Wiltshire. I was anxious to dissolve it, and to put the Wiltshire parishes to the Alderbury Union, which is now the Salisbury Union, and the Hampshire Parishes into the Ringwood Union. By that means the Ringwood Union would have had to build a new workhouse which was very much wanted: the Ringwood Workhouse is the worst remaining in my district. The Fordingbridge Union refused to accede, and the Local Government Board directed me to hold an inquiry with a view to the dissolution of the union. When the guardians at Fordingbridge found that the Local Government Board had power to dissolve the union, and would exercise that power, rather than be dissolved they decided to build a new workhouse. I was very unwilling that the board should accept that decision, because I thought, and I still think, it would have been much better that the union should be dissolved and apportioned between the Wiltshire and the Hampshire unions adjoining. However, the influence brought to bear upon the Board was so strong, and the local feeling was so strong, that the Board could not resist it, and had to consent to the continuance of the Fordingbridge Union: the Fordingbridge Union built a new workhouse. The boundaries, I am happy to say, have since been adjusted, because, after the Boundary Commission and the passing of the Local Government Act, Wiltshire gave up the Wiltshire parishes and they were put into Hampshire. The Wiltshire parishes were attached to the Hampshire portion of the Fordingbridge Union, so it is now a Hampshire union. The boundaries were made coterminous by the transfer of the Wiltshire parishes to Hampshire, but the Ringwood bad workhouse still remains.

Difficulties in country districts of classifying paupers by Workhouses.

8859. Speaking generally, are not the areas now too small to permit of the development of, or a thorough, classification?—Then you get to the question of distance, which is a question upon which I hesitate very much indeed. I think it is extremely cruel to remove the old people a long way away from their surroundings and from their own homes. The unions were formed from 1836 downwards with very little regard to considerations which we should take into account now-a-days, but they were, to a very great extent, formed to be convenient for the people comprised within the unions. It is astonishing how much communication does now go on between the workhouses and the homes and relations of the people who are in the workhouses. The suggestion of increasing areas very largely, and having separate workhouses for classification

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

within one large area, to my mind would be very cruel in its working, because it would practically remove all the inmates of these institutions from their own surroundings. It would, I think, raise a very legitimate grievance against the application of what is popularly known as the workhouse test.

8860. It would make the workhouse test in your judgment more difficult of imposition?—Certainly; it would cut the people entirely off from their own surroundings and associations. If you look at the present position, you have a workhouse more or less in the centre of the district it serves: you have the guardians of each parish coming constantly to the workhouse: you have the chaplain of the workhouse, who is probably a clergyman, serving one of the parishes in the district, coming to the workhouse: you have the medical officers from the different districts brought from time to time to the workhouse; you have the carriers from all the parishes coming to the centre; you have the clergy from the different parishes coming to the centre upon various occasions; you have the farmers coming into market; you have all sorts of communication from almost every area within the union constantly brought into the immediate proximity of the workhouse, and by that means the inmates are kept intimately acquainted with everything that is going on in their own homes and their own surroundings, and they are constantly visited by the people they know. That is possible by the present ordinary arrangement of the unions. If you make your area a very large one and remove the people so many miles from their own homes all that is put an end to at once; and you cut the people off from their own associations, their own friends, and their own homes, and from all that they have been accustomed to and which makes life dear to them. I think that would be a real hardship.

8861. Have any of your rural unions combined for one particular purpose, such, for instance, as an institution for imbeciles?—No.

Imbeciles in Workhouses.

8862. You would not have the same objection to a combination of that kind?—That again is not an easy question to answer off-hand. There are a great many imbeciles who are classed as imbeciles, who are not epileptics, who are perfectly harmless and extremely useful in the workhouse. When Mr. Long was President of the Local Government Board, I drew up a memorandum of the imbeciles in the Warminster Union which showed that the imbeciles in the workhouse were almost all of them perfectly harmless, extremely useful, and very happy. I went into the history of each one, and it seemed to me that to remove them from their surroundings there would have been very undesirable. One of them was very keen about hunting, and was allowed out whenever the hounds were near. It was astonishing how he could keep up with them across country. One of the others used to run messages and errands. They were quite trustworthy and perfectly harmless, but as they were defective in intellect they were counted as imbeciles and could be detained in the workhouse. I think it very hard on those people to take them out of their surroundings and put them in an institution where they would have no companions but people who were similarly afflicted with themselves. With reference to the question of boundaries, I am anxious that they should be made coterminous where various authorities have the exercise of powers. I think it is most important that unions and counties should be made coterminous, and indeed in my own district it has very nearly been accomplished. Farnham Union is an exception. It has one parish, Aldershot, in Hampshire. There is now a proposal before the Local Government for the removal of Aldershot from the Farnham Union. In Dorsetshire, where Lyme Regis is situated, I was very anxious to get the county boundaries altered, because it would be difficult to bring Lyme Regis into a Dorsetshire Union. However, the Lyme Regis people wished to remain in the County of Dorset and in the Axminster Union in Devonshire. It did not interfere with my unions, because my chief object was that none of my unions should overlap county boundaries. I should have been glad to have got the union and county boundaries coterminous there, but I was not able to do it. The Lyme Regis Union was not in my district. On the Wiltshire and Berkshire side there is the Hungerford Union, which also is not in my district, it ranks as a Berkshire union—that has some parishes in Wiltshire that we were not able to deal with as regards Poor Law, although they were dealt with as regards the rural district council. The Wiltshire parishes were made one council and the Berkshire parishes another. The only other union where I was unable to do it was the Malmesbury Union; and when I say I, I am only saying it in order to describe what was being done, the credit is not due to me, it was really due to the Wiltshire authorities and to the way in which the Local Government Board worked the powers which were given to them. I happened to be the agent who carried the matter out, or rather, held the inquiries on which it was carried out. In that part of Wiltshire there are one or two parishes which are not in the Malmesbury Union; if I could have got those into the Malmesbury Union as I was anxious to do last year the union and the county boundaries there would have been coterminous. Except those places, the only real difficulty I have is with the borough of Southampton and the Poor Law Incorporation of Southampton. Southampton is under a local Act, and therefore the Local Government Board have not a free hand to deal with it as they could if it were under the ordinary Poor Law. The borough of Southampton and the Southampton Incorporation used to be very nearly coterminous, and indeed when I first had to do with Southampton the Mayor was *ex officio* Chairman of the Incorporation as well as of the Corporation of Southampton. The Corporation area was afterwards extended, but the Incorporation area, that is the Poor Law area, was not extended at the time the Borough area was extended, and there being a local Act in force, the Local Government Board have not power to deal with it satisfactorily until the local Act is repealed. In the last session of Parliament the Local Government Board issued a Provisional Order for the repeal of the local Act. It was opposed in Parliament, and the House of Commons Committee, to which it was referred, put in a clause which the Local Government Board was unable to accept, therefore it was not carried through, but at the present moment the state of affairs in Southampton is, I think, most detrimental to the Poor Law service and indeed to the public interests altogether, because Southampton has by far the highest poor rate in my district. The poor rate is 3s. in the £ in Southampton. Under present conditions Southampton, as far as Poor Law matters are concerned, has no possibility of relief, because, for the present, there can be no increase of rateable value. The whole area is already built over, and the tendency will be rather to decrease than to increase in value, because the higher class of inhabitants is gradually leaving Southampton for the suburbs, and their houses are being divided into small tenements. Unless there be power to deal with that and the adjoining area by the extension of the Poor Law area of Southampton to that of the borough, it is extremely difficult to see how anything like an equitable result can be arrived at. That matter is now before the Local Government Board and how it will be settled, of course I am not prepared, at this moment, to say. It is a very striking instance of the inconvenience of having authorities without coterminous boundaries. If those boundaries were coterminous you could consolidate the collection of the poor rate immediately. Now you cannot. It was done at Portsmouth where all the authorities worked in harmony. The borough was extended, the Poor Law area was extended with the borough, and the consolidation of the rates has been effected. The whole has been put into one civil parish and all the rates are collected at the same time. That is a great convenience and saving.

Advisability of a Union being entirely in one county or borough.

Boundary difficulties of Southampton.

8863. The position at Southampton has been that the poor population are moving into the old town and the better-to-do are moving outside?—Yes, and the outside, although it is in the Borough, is not within the Poor Law area. There is the additional hardship that the guardians have built a most excellent infirmary in what is called the added area, which is in the Borough, but not in their own Poor Law area, and they have to pay rates to another union for their own building, and although their building is there, it cannot serve the population which surrounds it and which has to go to the South Stoneham workhouse five or six miles off. Then there is the further difficulty, that whilst this matter is pending both the Southampton and South Stoneham workhouse accommodation is quite inadequate, and, until it is decided in

Conditions in Southampton.

what jurisdiction the area is to be, of course the question of building must remain over.

Encouragement of able-bodied pauperism under present administration.

8864. Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of your memorandum refer to the changes which have taken place in pauperism since 1834, and to the trend of more recent legislation. You point out that the Report of 1834 had to deal with the aggressive able-bodied pauper, and now the normal problem is how best to provide for the helpless sick and the aged. Further on, you point out that destitution has now ceased to be the only ground of claim. From these paragraphs I rather infer that you are afraid, unless care is taken, that the able-bodied pauper may be reinstated. Am I right in that?—Yes; to a certain extent I am certainly afraid of it.

Possibility of reducing pauperism by expert administration.

8865. The trend of recent legislation and the pressure brought on the Local Government Board has encouraged or induced boards of guardians to depart from the stricter methods of administration which in the earlier part of your experience prevailed?—Certainly. I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that an enormous amount of the pauperism and the expenditure is absolutely unnecessary, and ought not to be. I would say without hesitation that if the Local Government Board and a staff of its experts could administer the Poor Law, within three years you would have the pauperism reduced by one half, and in twenty years you would have it almost wiped out of the country. It has been done in many unions in almost every conceivable variety of position. When I was first attached to the Poor Law Board, Atcham was in my district. I was in Shropshire at that time and at Atcham Sir Baldwyn Leighton practically reduced pauperism to *nil*, and that was put to the terrible test of having Shrewsbury attached to it. Shrewsbury was one of the worst administered unions in that part of the country, and they said Shrewsbury would drag down Atcham to the Shrewsbury level. Not a bit. Atcham dragged up Shrewsbury, and the result of the union, after a few years, was that the Atcham policy prevailed. Then take other unions. Take what Mr. Pell did at Brixworth and what Mr. Bland Garland did at Bradfield. Take Bradford, take Manchester, take Whitechapel, take Fulham, and you see practically the same results everywhere. If that policy were universally applied, you would gradually get the same result universally. I am confident, myself, after a very careful and a very long study of the subject that an enormous amount of the pauperism which now exists is absolutely unnecessary and thoroughly mischievous, and if you could only get a uniform administration on sound lines, the majority of the pauperism of the country would disappear. See what foreign writers say. You will find much the same idea if you read Aschrott's book. Monsieur Thiers, I remember, described pauperism as "*la plaie la plus dévorante de l'Angleterre*," the eating ulcer of England. Monsieur Chevalier in his book shows how the Poor Law practically leaves matters as it finds them; simply keeps things going and does not apply a remedy, because the good theory of the Poor Law is defeated by the bad administration. If you could get an even and steady administration over the country, there is no reason whatever why England should be as largely pauperised as it is. It is only fair to say that the pauperism and the expenditure are enormously exaggerated in the public mind. The average pauperism for my district is under 3 per cent., and the average cost of the poor for the whole of the district is only 1s. 5d. in the £ for the year. Nobody can say that less than 3 per cent. on the population is a terrible percentage of pauperism, or that an expenditure of 1s. 5d. in the £ on the rateable value (and that includes lunatics in asylums and every item of Poor Law expenditure) is a very onerous burden; but the fact is that all sorts of rates are called poor rates which are not poor rates at all. All the other items are levied as poor rates so there is a popular fallacy that the burden of the Poor Law is very excessive. In my district that is not so. At the same time it is terrible that you should have such a heavy item as the aggregate comes to, but the largest item of all is the item of outdoor relief. The out relief in my district during the year ended Lady Day, 1905, cost more than £150,000.

Examples of Atcham, Brixworth, Bradfield, &c.

Average pauperism and its cost in the district.

Disadvantages of other than Poor Law expenditure being defrayed out of Poor Rate.

Difficulty of ascertaining the irreducible minimum of pauperism.

8866. Do you hold the theory that there is an irreducible minimum of helpless population entirely impotent to maintain themselves. If you hold that view, have you ever made a calculation of what percentage of the population is the irreducible minimum?—It is extremely difficult, because you have no data to go upon. My point of view assumes that a large proportion of the paupers who are now paupers ought not to be paupers, and would not be paupers if the law was properly administered.

Inadequate relief and methods of supplementing it.

8867. Although unable to maintain themselves, their friends or relatives would come forward and assist them?—Yes, but many would maintain themselves, and there are endless means which we know nothing about which the people have. As the law is at present administered, the guardians are on the horns of a dilemma, either the relief is not wanted, or it is utterly inadequate. They give 2s. 6d., and I contend that nobody can live on 2s. 6d. in anything like ordinary comfort, yet you see these people come in dozens, get 2s. 6d., and take it gladly: very often it is 1s. 6d., and sometimes as low as 1s. a week. Either it is not wanted, or it is utterly inadequate. If it is not wanted, they ought not to have it, if it is wanted they ought to have a great deal more, and the fact that they come and take it gladly, shows that they have means which people know nothing about. You there come to the great difference between wages and income. The popular idea is that the income of the working man is his wage. As a matter of fact it is not. There are endless means by which the wages are added to, and which form sources of income quite independent of wages. I dare say some of you may remember Richard Jeffries' famous letter to *The Times*, in November, 1872. He wrote about the agricultural labourer, and he quoted a case there in which the rent of the cottage was paid by one fruit tree. There are endless means by which a thrifty housewife can help to provide for herself and her family, or by which members of the family, and the children, can add to the income, such as keeping poultry, bee-keeping, goat-keeping, fruit, vegetables, salads; there are endless things. It all depends on the place and the particular cottage. All the cottagers round a place like Bournemouth can make money in that sort of way. Merely hot water for tea will bring in a considerable income in a neighbourhood like Margate and Pegwell Bay. Those are things that people do not think of. They are too apt to take wages as income, and they unfortunately often take the standard wage for that instead of the average wage. I do not want to mention names in this case; but when Joseph Arch went into Dorsetshire and told the labourers they were down-trodden hinds, and that they were working for 8s. a week, two employers of labour, within my own knowledge, offered the men 14s. a week if they would give up their perquisites. In Dorsetshire a great deal is given in perquisites, in addition to part payment in money. The cottage is given, and almost every employer of labour has his own particular perquisites. In those cases 14s. was offered. In one case they took it and in a month they applied to go back to the old system; in the other case it was refused.

Wages no true criterion of affluence.

8868. (*Mr. Booth.*) Do you mean 14s. instead of the wage?—Instead of the 8s., which was stated to be the wage, they were offered 14s. a week. In one case they took it and within a month they asked to go back to the old system, and in the other case they refused. That was a great many years ago now, I suppose it is twenty years ago. I only mention that to show the difference between the nominal standing wage and the income.

Low scales of relief in District.

8869. (*Chairman.*) Where boards of guardians give small sums of weekly relief, such as 2s. 6d. which you mentioned, have they not generally some scale of what they consider a minimum on which people can live, and do they not give them 2s. 6d. to bring the income, from every available source, of the person so helped up to this minimum?—I constantly ask the question of the relieving officers, "What income has this man got?" when he has had the 2s. 6d., and the answer frequently is, "Nothing that I know of," and yet they give the 2s. 6d. Some few years ago I got out the scale of relief for every union in my district; they all had scales more or less; some were written scales; some were a sort of agreed upon scale; but I do not think in any case a single man under ordinary conditions was higher than 2s. 6d.

Dangers of inadequate out-relief.

8870. Are you in favour of scales?—No, certainly not. Every case ought to be treated on its own merits; the whole of the facts in the case ought to be thoroughly ascertained. Then, if relief be given, it should be adequate;

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

if it is not needed it should be refused. As a matter of fact, these half-crowns, eighteenpences and shillings are given because the facts are not ascertained. They make orders, in some cases, for as much as thirteen weeks at a time. If I had my way, no order should go for more than a fortnight, and at the end of the fortnight it should be thoroughly re-investigated. If you had a staff of relieving officers who would do it, and a board of guardians who would do it, you would get the relief in hand, and you would know what the necessities were, and those necessities would be adequately relieved.

Relief given to prevent the dispersal of labour.

8871. Under the system you describe, these small payments are mere doles ?—That is so, and you never know what is the motive of them. I remember very well, when I was in Lancashire, in some time of difficulty, I had no doubt, although I could not prove it, that a great deal of relief was given simply to keep the hands together so that they should not be dispersed—hands belonging to certain factories.

8872. Do you mean to say they were supplementing the wages ?—No, it was when they were on strike or not working, or there was a lock-out, as the case might be. They did not wish them to be dispersed, because, when the strike or lock-out was over, they wanted to have them there ready to start work again, but in the meantime they were on the rates.

8873. (*Mrs. Webb.*) That was through the employers' influence ?—Yes.

Out-relief a form of old-age pension.

8874. (*Chairman.*) The guardians were the employers, as I understand ? — Yes. They did not want these people to be dispersed, and they gave them relief to keep them together. You will find in the agricultural districts that every old servant of everybody in the neighbourhood is practically on out-door relief at anything from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. Of course, they ought to be pensioned as old servants, not as paupers. You cannot get at the motive ; you never know why the out-door relief is given. You see a most improper case come up, and you suggest that there is something wrong in the family, either there is drink or immorality, or something or another, and it is very undesirable that out-door relief should be given ; nevertheless it is given.

8875. In the case of old people, this payment is given, and, I suppose, almost admitted to be given, as a sort of old-age pension ?—Yes, outdoor relief has become a habit of the country in the rural districts, and if you could only get the administrators and the recipients out of that habit, you would do a very great deal to restore proper administration. I have heard cases where the Chairman will say : " Oh, what have you come for ? " and the man will say : " I have come for my allowance." It is a matter of course.

Scale of relief stationary.

8876. Under this system in the rural districts, has the tendency been for the amount of outdoor relief to rise of recent years ?—I do not think so. I think it stands at very much the same level as it did when I first had to do with attending boards of guardians. I do not think any of them have increased their scale, except perhaps in the large towns.

8877. The evidence you have given is specially important, because you have had a very long experience. The witnesses who have come before us have been examined on this question of the rise and fall of pauperism, and there are two contending theories ; one is that it is very largely regulated by administration, and the other is that it is the conditions existing, the changed conditions in a neighbourhood which cause this change in the amount of necessity and the change in the amount of relief given. I wish to put a concrete case before you. Take Southampton. At page 6 of your figures you deal with Southampton, and there are some further figures relating to Southampton in the detailed statement which is attached to your memorandum. I see, by the second table on page 6, the population of Southampton has increased from 48,000 to 61,000 ; the rate of pauperism is now, notwithstanding the increase of population, higher than it was in 1876, and it is almost the highest, with the exception of one union, in the whole of your district. I assume that the increase in the shipping facilities and the development of the docks has brought a large population into Southampton and a population which has an aptitude for the casual work that dockyards give. I want to test your theory about strict administration. Assuming you had strict administration, what would be the effect in Southampton ?—If the Southampton workhouse accommodation had been equal to the requirements of the Poor Law area, the pauperism would be very much lower than it is now. The pauperism stands at its present figure simply because the workhouse is full, and they are obliged to give outdoor relief.

Conditions in Southampton Union.

8878. They cannot apply the test ?—They cannot apply the test at all, and the South Stoneham union is in the same position, for the reason I have already stated.

8879. Then the administration, according to your idea, is good in Southampton ?—I should be very sorry that my Southampton friends should think that I did not speak well of their administration, but, from my point of view, their administration leaves a great deal to be desired. It is only fair to say that they are so handicapped by their position that they cannot administer strictly. They cannot put people in the workhouse, because they have no room.

8880. Would the knowledge of that draw people from outside, so that people would come to Southampton because they knew that out-door relief was more easily obtained ?—I doubt that, because they could be removed if they had been there under a year. Southampton stands in an extremely peculiar position. There is an enormous amount of casual labour at Southampton, and the people who form that section of labour are most improvident. Nobody can tell at Southampton what labour will be required. Three or four ships may come into the docks, some of them huge ships, and for a few hours' work will be at fever heat ; every hand that they can get will be employed in discharging the cargo and in putting in the goods that are to be taken on. If a good many ships are in docks at the same time, every hand will have work, and they will be well paid. The work may go on not only during the day but also during the night. Then those ships go out, and you may have a lull ; you may have a day or two when there is hardly anything to do. The people who have earned this money during the time of pressure do not keep that money for the time when they will have nothing to do, they go and enjoy it at once, and then during the slack time they have nothing, and very likely they will have to go to the vagrant ward for their night's lodging.

8881. I do not want to put to you any matter outside your personal knowledge ; but do you know if, when Southampton is working at full swing, it can employ all the people who apply at the docks, or is there some surplus of casual labour ?—They would not employ an incompetent man. Lots of people might go to the dock to apply for labour who are unfit for it, but when it is in full swing I think it would employ all the men who are fit to be employed.

Comparison of Southampton and Portsmouth.

8882. Contrasting Southampton with Portsmouth, which is your other big town, the population there has very largely increased in the last twenty years, and the percentage of pauperism has diminished by more than half. I assume that the great difference between the two areas is that at Portsmouth the dockyard are the main employers, and the employment there is continuous ?—Yes. Of course, the Admiralty will not permit Portsmouth to become a commercial port except on a very limited scale. Portsmouth Harbour is, practically speaking, entirely in the hands of the naval authorities. But then at Portsmouth they have got their union and their municipal and other boundaries in thoroughly satisfactory order, and the guardians at Portsmouth are able to administer upon proper lines. They have got workhouse accommodation which is generally sufficient. There has been pressure this last winter, and the guardians are now considering what they ought to do to increase their accommodation. They have not had to give up applying the labour test at Portsmouth at any time, as they have practically had to do at Southampton. In Portsmouth the good classes of society are also resident in the union ; they are not like Southampton, where many of the better class have gone outside the poor law area.

8883. If Southampton had the same administrative advantages that Portsmouth has, by the extension of the area, you think there would be a decrease of the pauperism ?—Certainly.

8884. Going on with your Memorandum, there are two suggestions you make, one in paragraph 17, and one in

Suggestion that Guardians should have greater freedom as to details.

paragraph 18. Let us take the first. You suggest that boards of guardians are rather unnecessarily hampered as regards small details?—I think so.

8885. Have they to apply through you, or do they apply direct to the Local Government Board?—Direct to the Local Government Board.

8886. That entails some correspondence, I suppose?—A considerable amount of correspondence. For instance, if an anæsthetic has to be administered in the workhouse, they have to apply to the Local Government Board for permission to pay the fee of the anæsthetist. It is given as an extra gratuity to the medical officer. That seems a very roundabout way and is very unnecessary

8887. Has an application to be made every time?—Yes, every time an anæsthetic is administered.

8888. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It does not often happen?—I think there are a good many applications in the course of a year for gratuities to the medical officers.

8889. In a particular union?—It is in the towns that it would happen, not in the country.

8890. (*Chairman.*) You would be disposed rather to relax the restrictions?—Yes, on all those small points, subscriptions to hospitals, and matters of that kind. There is a little difficulty, perhaps, about subscriptions. I am quite in favour of subscriptions to County Hospitals. There are, however, some philanthropic societies, no doubt doing admirable work, which are endeavouring, all over the country, to get subscriptions from boards of guardians, and I do not think it is advisable that any philanthropic society should be subsidised at the expense of the rates, so possibly the Local Government Board ought to contain a controlling influence upon that point.

8891. I see amongst other items there is: "Addresses to distinguished persons"?—There have been two or three very irritating instances of that. I have known one or two in my own experience in which Royal people have paid visits to localities, and illuminated addresses have been presented to them, and then it has gone before the auditor, and the auditor has surcharged. It takes all the grace out of a thing, when an incident of that sort happens. It is a very small matter, and is really a very unimportant detail, but it is a very irritating one.

Insufficient power of Local Government Board, *e.g.*, Dental attendance on Poor Law children.

8892. Going to the next paragraph, you would like the Board to have more power in enforcing work which in their opinion is indispensable?—Yes, there are two points have been very present to my mind within the last two or three years. One is as to children's teeth, and the other is escape in case of fire. It is astonishing how difficult it is, in country districts, to get guardians to realise how important it is to have children's teeth attended to. I was at a meeting of a board of guardians a few months ago, in which there was a very animated debate which lasted half an hour, whether one poor boy, who had a swollen face, whom the doctor recommended should be sent to the dentist, should be allowed to go, and after this long debate it was decided, on the casting vote of the Chairman, that he should not be allowed to go to the dentist.

8893. And he had toothache all the time?—The poor boy was there with a swollen face. A thing of that kind is, to my mind, monstrous. But the teeth question is a very large question, and the future of the children depends very largely upon both their first teeth and their second teeth. People do not realise how important it is that the teeth should be properly attended to. I have over and over again asked guardians to let a dentist come and examine the children's teeth and see what required doing, and they have declined to do it. Farmer Giles will get up and say: "Lor, I have never been to a dentist in my life; why should pauper children go to a dentist?" In the little matter of tooth brushes they say they do not want petting up with tooth brushes.

8894. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is it your idea that there should be a dentist appointed to each workhouse; that he should be one of the members of the staff?—I should like to see that. I do not say in every rural district you ought to appoint a dentist, but there ought to be provision for children who require a dentist's attention being sent to the dentist. If the guardians would do it, the thing could be done, but some guardians will not do it. Another question is as to escape in case of fire. In one of the workhouses of my district there are four wards at least which, from my point of view, are in considerable danger. They are the end wards, on the first and second floors, of the two opposite wings of the workhouse. Those wards are approached by staircases with no alternative exists at the other end. If those staircases get blocked by smoke, which would be inevitable if the house caught fire, the inmates of the end wards could have no escape. I wanted the guardians to put up an external staircase, and the Local Government Board sent down the architect with me to see whether my suggestion was a proper one, and our report went to the guardians afterwards, saying that it could be done at a very moderate cost—I think £60 was all the cost—but still the guardians declined to do it. Those wards remain unprotected. It would be absurd for the Local Government Board to apply to the Court for a mandamus to compel the guardians to open a window and put up a staircase.

Provision of fire escapes in workhouses.

8895. (*Chairman.*) You think if the Local Government Board had power to order such things to be done, such a power would not be unpopular, because the fact that it existed would induce the guardians to do what was necessary without compulsion?—I think so.

Multiplicity of Workhouse books and returns.

8896. Then you come to a matter of some little importance, and that is the workhouse book-keeping. Are there great complaints about the number of figures and details?—Yes, there are. To my mind it is extremely involved, and a great deal of it is unnecessary. I object to it strongly, because it really does not produce the result which you desire. It is impossible, in administering a House, to work down your results to a quarter of an ounce. Nobody could do it in his own establishment. These books do it, but it is mere paper work.

8897. Are the accounts obliged to be kept in the same form always?—They are obliged to be kept in the same form. The order of accounts states the different books that are to be kept by the officers in charge of them. In a large workhouse I admit it would be very difficult not to have a comparatively close system of book-keeping, but in the smaller country workhouses I think that it would be comparatively easy to work them more as a private establishment is worked, just with sufficient vouchers to show what was brought in and what was consumed, but without requiring the endless repetitions and entries which the officers now have to make in the different books which they are obliged to keep and present to the auditor.

8898. There are a great many returns they have to make in order to comply with Acts of Parliament?—Yes, but those chiefly come upon the clerks. I do not think those are so onerous. It is the day by day work which the workhouse master has to perform which takes him off from work which he might be much more usefully doing. As a matter of fact, the medical officers do not keep their books. It is a standing grievance that you cannot get the medical men to do it. They have not time to do it, and they do not do it.

Possibility of repealing Law of Settlement.

8899. Now we come to the question of settlement and removal. Your opinion inclines to the repeal of settlement, but it would be impossible to attempt to repeal settlement unless you had something like a uniform system of administration all over, would it not?—I think that the repeal of settlement would, to a very great extent, bring about uniformity of administration. If a house were too good, and they all flocked there, it might have to lower its standard.

8900. It seems to me there would be a difficulty in a big place if you once lowered the standard?—It would not have the effect of lowering the standard. But what do you do now? A person has only to remain one year in a place and settlement is at an end for all practical purposes. You have reduced it to one year, and then irremovability. What is the good of keeping that? It gives all the trouble and all the annoyance and all the expense of working the law of settlement and removal, without any corresponding advantage.

8901. Take a seaport town, like Southampton. Would you not have a considerable number of people belonging to other parishes chargeable on the parish if you abolished the law of settlement?—If the principle of a thing is right, I do not think it ought to be questioned because it may be worked inconveniently in one place. The great

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

question with regard to the abolition of the law of settlement or removal—or it used to be the great difficulty when I was in the North—was what was known as the Irish question. It was said that in times of difficulty you would have Irish paupers shipped over in thousands to Liverpool and Glasgow. I know when I had Liverpool in my district it was not an uncommon thing that people applied for relief the very day after they had been there a year ; but I would unhesitatingly abolish the whole law of settlement and removal. It is quite an anomaly and quite out of date. It is a very small residum of feudal times, which is not wanted now. I do not see what harm would be done ; it would save a great deal of expense and a great deal of friction and a great deal of trouble. I think where persons fall destitute, there they ought to be relieved.

8902. Let me put a case which I was going to suggest where the administration, for various reasons (I need not go into them) becomes lax in a populous district, and people flock there and the place becomes pauperised, or at any rate the proportion of pauperism largely increases ; you say it would remedy itself, but it is not very easy, if the place has once become pauperised ?—I do not think the effect will be to pauperise them. They have only to stay there a year now, and they cannot be removed.

8903. You think that the check of a year does not compensate for all the disadvantages which ensues ?—No, I do not see any advantage in it. I see great disadvantages, and I do not see any advantage. They say it may be the right of a person to be sent back to his own parish. If he wants to go back to his own parish, he can go back, and when he gets there he will have the right to relief there.

8904. I pass on now to paragraph 23. You are inclined to suggest that there should be greater power given of compulsory removal to the workhouse ?—Yes.

8905. That applies to more than one class of case, does it not ?—Yes, there are very few cases, I think, in which it would be necessary to exercise it, but you do nowadays come across old sick cases, bed-ridden cases, which cannot possibly be properly looked after in their own homes. Even if you had put an expensive nurse in charge of them and given them all the appliances, owing to the construction of the cottage, the family living in the cottage, and other details, a case that really requires constant skilled nursing cannot have it under the conditions existing ; and it would be much better for everybody that there should be power to remove that case to the workhouse infirmary, where it can be properly attended to, than that it should run on in misery on outdoor relief.

Proposed power to compulsorily remove certain classes to Workhouse.

8906. There is also the case of old people living under most insanitary conditions ?—Certainly.

8907. There is no power to remove them ?—No, there is no power to remove anybody against their will now, unless they are certified imbeciles or insane. There is a further difficulty with regard to those old bed-ridden cases : that you never know that the relief ordered for them reaches them. You see a medical order for 2 lbs. of beef, which is supposed to make beef tea for a week. I have known cases in which those tickets have been collected and presented to a butcher when they come 7 or 8 lbs., in order that a joint may be obtained. I remember a butcher sending to a board of guardians to know whether he was bound to receive three or four 2 lbs. tickets as an order for a leg of mutton. And even when you put the 2 lbs. of beef into the house, what is the result ? If they make beef tea of it, which not one cottager in a thousand knows how to do—it is most difficult to get good beef tea, and after all it is only a stimulant and not a food when you do make it—but supposing you do make it, or get it made, it will not last for a week ; it is bad long before the end of the week. It means, with regard to many of those 2 lbs. of meat, that the family have one meat dinner.

Proposed power to detain certain classes in Workhouse.

8908. You would also wish to increase the power of detention in workhouses ?—Yes, with regard to certain classes of cases—young girls who are sure to come to grief if they go outside. I think it is a pity there is no power to detain them without classing them as insane.

8909. Your opinion rather corroborates the evidence which has been given by some other inspectors, that a considerable portion of the illegitimate children are children of girls who are feeble-minded ?—Even without being feeble-minded, there are certain girls who are deficient, and also those who have instincts which it is not desirable they should be allowed to indulge. It is very much better, if the doctor or the guardians think they should be kept there, that there should be power of detention. I do not say I would give it absolutely ; I would give power to appeal to the magistrate, so as to protect the liberty of the subject, but I think the guardians ought to have power of compulsory detention in cases which clearly ought not to go outside. Venereal cases is another instance. I believe it was always intended that the guardians should have the power with regard to venereal cases, but the law officer advised the Poor Law board many years ago that it did not apply to those cases. My own belief is that when Lord Devon's clause was passed, that was one of the very cases it was intended to apply to.

Attitude of Midwives Board towards Poor Law Infirmary training schools.

8910. With regard to nursing and midwifery, you note the great improvement that has taken place in the training and in the class of nurse now at work in the infirmaries and workhouses ; but they are not, I see, recognised as midwives by the Central Midwives Board ?—Since I wrote that paragraph the position has been somewhat modified, because a deputation from the Central Midwives Board has been received at Whitehall, and they say that where the medical officer is one of their approved teachers. candidates can be presented. I did not know that, and I do not think the Local Government Board knew it, at the time I wrote that paragraph ; but the position is practically as stated in that paragraph. Before the Midwives Act was passed, any Poor Law nurse who had attended the requisite number of cases, and could pass the examination, could obtain her qualification in midwifery from the London Obstetrical Society, but the Midwives Board has passed a resolution, which was not approved by the Privy Council—it did not go before the Privy Council ; it is a resolution of their own—that they will not accept candidates from Poor Law institutions unless they have seventy-five cases a year, and then not unless they are recognised by them as training schools. The result of that is that it prevents a large proportion of the Poor Law nurses from being able to go up and present themselves for examination. I am quite unable to see what the advantage of the resolution can be. I may say I have been in correspondence about it with Miss Wilson, who is a member of the Midwives Board, and I can see no reason whatever for such a resolution. If the nurse has attended the number of cases which they prescribe, and has a certificate to that effect from a qualified authority, and if she be able to pass the examination, one does not see how it can matter whether the cases she attended happened in a house which had seventy-five cases in the course of the year or twenty-five cases in the course of the year. She only has to be present at twenty. If she has been present at twenty, what can it matter that there were fifty others in the establishment during the year ? If she has had the experience which is required, and can pass the examination, so far as she is concerned, one cannot see why any difficulty should be created. There is the further reason why Poor Law nurses should be admitted, that they are generally better trained than a candidate who has only gone through a midwifery course. The Central Midwives Board admit candidates who only go through a three months' midwifery course. The Poor Law nurses have generally gone through three years full training as nurses, so that they are very much more valuable as midwives than a midwife who has merely gone through a three months' midwifery course. I mention that matter in my *précis* as an instance in which a great detriment has been done to the Poor Law service without the Poor Law authorities having any opportunity of objecting before-hand. Many of the probationers have undertaken to remain three years for their training with the idea that they would be able to go up for their midwifery course ; but, by the resolution of the Central Midwives Board, they are prevented from doing so. It is a very serious hardship looking at the fact that they say, on one hand, there will be a very great dearth of midwives, and that they are sending lecturers about the country endeavouring to persuade everyone they can to get midwives into good training, and on the other hand they refuse a supply of admirable midwives and will not allow them to present themselves for examination.

8911. Is the board entirely composed of medical men ?—I cannot remember off-hand what the composition of

the board is. There are two ladies, and there are some representatives of the College of Physicians. I think Dr. Downes would be able to give you that information.

8912. The Local Government Board is not medically or administratively represented?—No.

Effect of improved nursing in increasing Poor Law expenditure.

8913. Coming to the concluding paragraphs of your memorandum, in paragraphs 28, 29 and 30 you point out that the cost of in-relief must necessarily rise as the provision for the sick and the aged is more costly than the maintenance of the class of people who previously were in workhouses. Does not that rather point to the fact that more of the sick and aged come to the workhouse now, when ill, or when becoming decrepit from old-age, than before?—I think it shows very much the great improvement in the nursing. Now that the nursing is really efficient, the doctors can do things in the Poor Law institutions which they could not do before, and, therefore, they try to get the cases in so that they can be properly looked to. When there were not the means of properly attending to them in the Poor Law establishments, there was no use getting them there, but now that they have skilled nurses and all the necessary appliances, they do get them there.

8914. Therefore, that is a cost the growth of which one must contemplate?—To some extent. That has the further influence that the poor people themselves learn how well they are done by in the infirmaries, and, therefore, they have much less reluctance to go there.

8915. They perhaps draw in a class which previously did not go to the workhouse?—The class who previously received outdoor relief and who were miserable. But there is no doubt that in the old days, the days of pauper nurses, there was a thing which was most extremely difficult to catch hold of or prove—there used to be a great deal of bribery. If a patient wanted to be well looked after by pauper nurses, if he or she had a friend who could go in and just slip 1s. or 6d. into the pauper nurse's hand, the case received attention. If there was nobody to do any good office of that kind for a case, the case was not looked after as it should have been looked after. No doubt there was a good deal of that done. Now that we have got skilled trained nurses, the thing is out of the question. There is nothing of the sort, and the very poorest and the most desolate of the patients are just as well looked after as the ones who have relatives or people interested in them.

Efficiency of Workhouse officers.

8916. You have a good opinion of the workhouse officers. In your judgment, they do their work well?—I think admirably.

8917. The part of the Poor Law administration which you think wants strengthening is the relieving officer?—Yes.

Extra duties of Relieving Officers and objections thereto.

8918. Do relieving officers, as a rule, discharge other work besides that of relieving officers?—Not to the same extent that they used to do. At one time a great many of the relieving officers were holding the post of inspector of nuisances. That has, almost everywhere, I think, been stopped. I do not think at the present moment there is a single case in my district. There were many of those cases, and that interfered very much with their doing their duties. They have a great many duties now which I should be very glad to see taken away from them. For instance, with regard to lunatics, relieving officers are constantly called upon to remove lunatics to asylums, perhaps a considerable distance from their own districts. It is quite open to guardians to make other arrangements, but the duty is, under the Lunacy Acts, upon the relieving officer to see that the thing is done. Another matter on which relieving officers are constantly sent out of their district is to look after settlement and removal cases.

8919. They also have to deal with vaccination?—Some of them are vaccination officers. That again I object to. I should like to see vaccination taken away from the guardians altogether. It is not a relief business, it ought to be put under the sanitary work and not under the guardians' work.

Relieving Officers' salaries and their adequacy.

8920. Is the remuneration that relieving officers get sufficient to attract desirable and efficient men?—That is a difficult question to answer. In some cases it is fairly good; in some cases I think it is very inadequate. With regard to relieving officers, as with regard to medical officers, the difficulty is that, whenever there is a vacancy you get any amount of qualified candidates who come forward, and when I tell guardians that their relieving officers and medical officers are not adequately paid, they say: "Well, at all events, we have only to advertise it, and we shall get any amount of candidates who are perfectly ready to come forward and do the work on the terms we offer. In the face of that, can we, in the proper performance of our duty to the ratepayers, offer more than what we can get what we want for?" I think a great many of the medical officers are very much underpaid, and a great many of the relieving officers are too.

Return as to size, etc., of Relieving Officers' districts.

I have got a Return here of the relieving officers' districts in my union, which I shall be very happy to put in if you care to have it. It gives the acreage, the population, the number of relieving officers, the number of acres to each of the population. Some of them are very scattered indeed. In Beaminster there is only one inhabitant to every six acres—the acreage of each relieving officer's district, and the population of each relieving officer's district.

8921. Have you put in the salaries?—I have not the salaries here, but they could be very easily added, if you would care to have them.

8922. We shall be obliged if you will do that?—I certainly will. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIX (F).)

Need for more Relieving Officers and more frequent visitation of cases.

8923. I see you attach very great importance to sufficient and efficient relieving officers. You look upon it as the keystone of effectual outdoor administration?—Certainly. It stands to reason that a relieving officer cannot do the work, under present conditions, as I should like it done. The relieving officer, as a rule, goes round his district once a week. It is known exactly where he will be at every hour; he goes at such an hour to such a place and at another hour to such another place. And then they have what I think is a most objectionable system of pay-stations; that is, they have not time to go to the homes of all the paupers and see them in their own surroundings, and the paupers have to come to the pay-stations, and at the pay-stations they pay them. A pauper may not go to the pay-station, he may send a child to get his relief, and the relieving officer does not see him at all. More unexpected visitation, which, to my mind, is absolutely necessary to ascertain the real conditions of paupers, the relieving officers have no time to do. When you look to the areas they have to cover and the number of cases they go to, they simply cannot do it. It takes them just their days in the week to get round to the various villages they have to go to. I am confident myself it would be a most economical thing to appoint many more relieving officers, at good salaries, and to keep them constantly at work paying unexpected visits. It is the only way in which you can ascertain the real necessities of the patients, on the one hand, and adequately relieve them, and, on the other hand, in which you can protect the ratepayers from fraud.

Pros and cons of Relief Stations.

8924. It has been represented to us that pay stations under certain conditions are almost a necessity where the population is very sparse?—I do not agree there at all. I think the relieving officer ought to be made, especially where there are sparse populations, to go to the homes of the recipients of relief and administer the relief in person. The only pay stations which appear to me to be at all excusable are in the very large towns, where the people live very close to the pay station, and it is no hardship for them to go. In the sparse districts it is often a very grave hardship that the recipients should be required to go to the pay stations. They either have to do it at very great personal inconvenience, if not personal suffering, or if they are personally unable they have to send someone else, and then the relieving officer knows still less about the case.

8925. You would assume, I gather, that even if pay stations were abolished, even if it entailed generally all over the country an increase of relieving officers, pecuniarily it would ultimately benefit the ratepayers?—I think so certainly, not only the ratepayers, but the poor people themselves, because they would be adequately relieved. Of course the relieving officers, as I admit, and as I said in my evidence, are in a very difficult position. The ideal relieving officer would be a man who had not a pauper in his district. If a man did his work thoroughly well, he would prevent anybody from becoming a pauper. A

Proper function of Poor Law officers to prevent or reduce pauperism.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

relieving officer's work is much more, in my opinion, in prevention than in the relief of destitution. Directly his number diminishes very largely, the guardians say, this man has nothing to do, he is getting too much pay.

8926. They look upon it as a matter to be decided not by results, not by the reduction, but by the actual number he has to deal with ?—Yes, just as in the case of workhouses, I constantly hear guardians say, "There is nobody in this workhouse ; what has this great staff of officers got to do ? " As a matter of fact when there are no able-bodied people in the workhouse, the work on the officers is very much greater than when there are able-bodied people, because the able-bodied people can do it ; but when you have nothing but aged and infirm and decrepit people in the house, the officers have to do all the work.

Superintendent Relieving Officers and their effect.

8927. In your district are there any superintendent relieving officers now ?—At Portsmouth, and to a certain extent at Southampton, but not anywhere else.

8928. Does the system work well in those two districts ? —At Southampton I think each relieving officer keeps to his own district, but at Portsmouth they have a superintendent relieving officer. I do not know that he is called by that name, but he is an extra relieving officer who goes about the other districts and sees that the work is properly done, and of course it works admirably.

Deterrence of workhouse test.

8929. (*Mr. Booth.*) We have been told that the test of offering the house does not necessarily or permanently increase the number of people who require to be relieved in that way. Do you agree with that view ?—Entirely, it diminishes it, because the people then learn that they must provide for themselves, and they do it.

8930. Yet it is impossible to offer it unless there is room in the house ?—Quite so.

Necessary margin of surplus Workhouse accommodation.

8931. What margin of workhouse accommodation is needed in order to make the offer of the house successful ? —I am sorry to say I cannot answer that question, because the workhouse is divided into so many departments. I got out a return a short time ago of the spare accommodation in the different departments in Wiltshire and Dorsetshire, and although the aggregate number of beds was very large, when you came to divide them among the different departments it was very small. For instance, in every workhouse you must have a considerable number of beds that you hope never will be occupied. The receiving ward must have a certain number of beds ; you must have separation wards for cases of skin diseases, and other ailments, which you hope will never be occupied ; you must have a certain amount of maternity accommodation, which you hope will very seldom be occupied ; and in other departments, you must have means for classification, which also you hope will never want to be occupied, for cancer and offensive or septic cases ; so you must have a very considerable reserve in every workhouse in the different departments, but as to saying what the average percentage would be, I could not venture to express an opinion.

8932. In the aggregate it would be considerable ?—It must be considerable.

8933. Could that necessary margin possibly be arranged by a combination of unions. Would the difficulty that you put forward as to distance apply equally, where it was really that all that was required was a marginal matter. Would it not be possible by a combination amongst a number of unions to supply that margin more economically than if each union supplied it ?—I think not. I think you must have your margin available in the place where the accommodation is required for the union itself.

8934. It would not do to offer the house, knowing you might have to transplant to a neighbouring union some of those who accepted the house, rather than relief ?—To begin with, under the present law you cannot do that without their consent.

8935. I am not thinking of the present law, but what may be possible with regard to a form of extension of area ?—I really doubt whether it could be done in that way. I think it would prove inconvenient in practice. It is a curious thing, that there is a fallacy among the people who receive relief that out-door relief is less disgraceful than in-door relief. Of course that is completely wrong, and it is very advisable, if possible, that the people should be taught that. To my mind in-door relief is more honourable than outdoor relief, because the indoor relief man says, "I accept your relief, but in return for it I give you the best work I can. You put me to work in return for the relief I get, and I give you the best work I am capable of giving in return for what you give me." The outdoor relief man does nothing of the kind, but takes all he can get and does nothing whatever in return. Looking at it as a matter of disgrace, the outdoor man is in a more disgraceful position than the indoor man.

Comparative stigma of out-door relief and indoor relief.

8936. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) You said just now that when there were vacancies for relieving officers or medical officers there were plenty of qualified applicants ? —That referred mainly to medical officers.

Qualifications of Relieving Officers and possibility of prescribing the same.

8937 I thought it must do. I want to gather from you what you consider the qualifications of a relieving officer . -That is an extremely difficult question to answer, but as a matter of fact men are appointed relieving officers very often who know absolutely nothing about it. A relieving officer, as a rule, has to learn his work after he is appointed. It is very difficult to get at the motives which move individuals to appoint other individuals to certain Poor Law offices, but you will sometimes see a man appointed as a relieving officer simply because he has failed in everything else—I will not say very often—but not infrequently. He may have failed as a farmer ; he may have failed as a contractor ; he may have failed as a road surveyor ; he may have failed in any sort of line of business to which he has devoted himself, but if he be well known and have a quantity of friends, they will find something for him.

8938. He might even have failed as a guardian ? —Or he may have succeeded as a guardian. I know one relieving officer who was a very successful guardian and has made an admirable relieving officer.

8939. It does occur to you it is almost impossible to expect to get, under present conditions, the kind of relieving officer that you think is a necessity for that position ?—It is very difficult.

8940. Have you any suggestion to make as to how that could be got over ?—The Poor Law Officers Union have an idea that examinations should be held for the purpose.

8941. What is your view of that ?—I know of one union in which the officers themselves, I will not say as a pastime, but for their own improvement and information, do answer examination papers from time to time, which are put to them by people who are interested in their work, and they learn a good deal thereby, but whether it would be possible to impose an examination for the relieving officership is, I should think, a very open question indeed. It is difficult to test a man's capacity for the work by any examination you could put him to ; certainly a paper examination would not do it. A man might be an admirable paper administrator, but he might be lazy and self-indulgent, and not get over the ground to do his work at all.

8942. Would you suggest anything like having a central station where you might have a certain number of probationers ?—I have no doubt if the Local Government Board had the administration of the relief for the whole of the country and the appointment of the officers who were to administer it, that very excellent results would be obtained, but that is not a practical solution of the difficulty.

8943. Could there be any system devised by means of which certain people who are not qualified, and who understood that they were not qualified, could be qualified. At present there is no qualification at all ?— You might impose an age limit, you might do some good by that ; you might impose a certain amount of reading, writing and general information as a qualification, but I do not know that that would help you very much. It is very difficult to suggest a qualification which would ensure your having the men you want for the Poor Law work.

Difficulty in removing unsatisfactory Poor Law Officers.

8944. Yet it is a necessity of the position to have the right man ?—Yes, I should be very glad if there were an easier mode of removing people from office, who are not satisfactory. It is very difficult now. If you get a man not doing his work well, it is practically impossible to remove him.

8945. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Is that from the point of view of the guardians or the Local government Board ?—From the point of view of the Local Government Board and from the point of view of the guardians also.

8946. There is no duty on the Local Government Board or the local guardians to get rid of an incompetent officer ?—The Local Government Board find it very difficult at present to get rid of an officer, unless charges can be brought against him which can be proved. General incompetence is a thing for which it is most difficult to get rid of anybody. I should be glad if there were power to do it; I do not say the power does not exist, but in practice it cannot be exercised. If a board of guardians passed a resolution that they had lost confidence in an officer, I should think it a very good thing that that officer should be removable by the Local Government Board without an official inquiry. Up to the present time it is almost invariably held that the Local Government Board will not remove an officer without an official inquiry. There is nothing so difficult of proof at the official inquiry as general incompetence.

Inadequacy of Law of Settlement as a check on migration of paupers.

8947. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) With regard to the matter of settlement which you rather wished to see dealt with, you say: here is no check except for one year, because there is no removability after a year ?—I do not say it is no check, but it is a very slight one.

8948. One's experience rather shows the same thing. Is not it the fact that people come in generally to urban districts when work is plentiful, or something special is going on, and they get into work, sometimes for six months or a year, then they become irremovable, then the work slackens off for some reason or another and they become practically paupers very soon ?—Yes, they cannot be removed if they have been there a year.

8949. As a rule they do move in where there is work, when they are told there is work in a particular locality ?—Probably that would be so.

8950. Then they just carry on for a year, and after the year they are irremovable ?—Yes.

8951. You lay a good deal of stress on the subject of teeth with regard to children and the dentists. As to the subject of eyes we have found in London that that is a very grave matter ?—In the country districts we do not get very much of that. There has been a certain amount of trouble in years gone by at Portsmouth and Southampton, but in the Poor Laws Children's Homes both at Southampton and Portsmouth they have most excellent medical superintendents who are very keen about their work and do it very well, and practically there is very little eye trouble there. It is a thing that wants constantly watching, and if it were not constantly watched no doubt there would be eye trouble, but those two are the only two large centres that I have now. At the Hartley Wintney School, which is the only district school I have, at which I suppose there are about 200 children, of recent years they have had very little trouble with the eyes.

Eye troubles among Poor Law children.

Labour conditions at Southampton

8952. Do you know the wages paid at the Southampton Dock in these times of pressure ?—They are paid by the hour. I am afraid I cannot tell you that because it depends on the men; some classes are paid more than others.

8953. There is a great deal of overtime ?—Yes, as I say, in times of pressure they work day and night.

8954. That kind of spasmodic casual labour is invariably improvident, is not it ?—Yes, that is so. At Southampton now they have nothing to induce them to be provident; they are improvident. If they find they have nothing in their pockets, they apply for an Order for the workhouse. They cannot take them into the the workhouse, so they give them an Order for the casual wards. They get shelter of a kind, and food and drink of a kind, which enables them to keep on until more ships come in and they can go out and get more work.

8955. I suppose in your district if you got rid of that improvidence on the part of the casual spasmodic labourer you would have got rid of most of your difficulties ?—I think you would have got rid of a good deal of it if you treated it properly, but where the workhouse accommodation is insufficient, and where the administration allows it to be used simply for the convenience of that class of person, of course the present condition of affairs goes on.

8956. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think you said that the experience of certain unions in various parts of England, even rural unions, showed that pauperism might be stamped out if sufficiently energetic measures were taken to secure that ?—In the course of fifteen or twenty years, I should think it might be very nearly stamped out. You have a residuum of the absolutely helpless and of the incompetent, who never could provide for themselves owing to their physical incapacity, and who may not have relations who are able to provide for them. That would be a sort of remanet which, I suppose, would always exist to a certain extent, but so far as people who could provide for themselves and fail to do so are concerned, I think within twenty years time if you had a uniform and sound administration you would have no paupers left, they would all have provided for themselves by means of friendly societies, or by other means which are open to them. Of course friendly societies are only one form of thrift.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

Extent to which pauperism could be eradicated by good administration.

8957. During the past seventy years the Local Government Board has had very large powers, has not it, in regard to what the guardians shall do, and its definite policy has been on the whole to abolish outdoor relief or to minimise it ?—No doubt the aim of the Commissioners in 1834 was gradually to abolish outdoor relief altogether. The special problem they had to deal with at the moment was outdoor relief of the able-bodied, but if the principles which they laid down had been steadily adhered to, the abolition of the outdoor relief to the able-bodied would have long ago brought about the practical abolition of all outdoor relief, and much of the indoor relief.

Difficult position of Local Government Board in relation to the Poor Law.

8958. Do you think the Local Government Board has failed in not having a sufficient staff to propagate its views ?—No, I do not think the Local Government Board (perhaps I ought not to say so) have failed in any way. I look upon the work of the Local Government Board rather as an outsider, because my work to a great extent is away from Whitehall, and to me it is perfectly wonderful how the Local Government Board do their work. I think the administration of the Local Government Board has been admirably successful considering the way in which it is handicapped by the division of authority between the board and the local authorities, and by the action of Parliament.

8959. At the end of seventy years it leaves us with a great mass of outdoor relief, which we all feel is still demoralising to the poor ?—That is because the Local Government Board are not the administrators. The Local Government Board do not administer. I have the instructions here which were given to me when I was appointed as an assistant inspector to the Poor Law Commissioners.

Instructions to Assistant Commissioners.

8960. Will that be put in ?—I have not the least objection. When I was appointed an assistant inspector in 1868, the instructions to the assistant commissioners were given to me and here they are. (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XIX (G).)

8961. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Those relate to the assistant commissioners appointed under the Poor Law Commissioners of 1836 ?—Yes, they are published in the official circular.

8962. Have you had any further instructions ?—Only verbally. There have been a great many instructions sent to the inspectors from time to time on different points, and the circulars sent to boards of guardians go also to the general inspectors, but in these instructions to the assistant commissioners, I do not know whether I am at liberty to put them in ?

8963. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think there can be no objection ?—These are what were given me when I was appointed, and in them it says the assistant commissioners are not the administrators.

8964. (*Dr. Downes.*) What is the date of those instructions ?—These are the 13th January, 1847.

8965. There were instructions prior to those ?—Yes. Those are in the official circular.

8966. (*Chairman.*) Will you read the particular clause ?—These are the instructions to the Assistant Commissioners in 1841. They were modified afterwards, because at that time the Assistant Commissioners had to take what were known as the averages. They were practically keeping the accounts and giving the averages of expenditure and pauperism in the different unions. That was

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

afterwards done by other means. I do not know when the earliest instructions were issued to Assistant Commissioners. I remember when I was first appointed I received very definite instructions, partly printed and partly by word of mouth. The passage I want to refer to was this: "Before they close these instructions, the Commissioners will remark, that the ordinary and detailed management of the workhouse, and the superintendence of the union officers, is vested in the guardians, and, therefore, that the guardians are primarily responsible for any abuse or irregularities in the administration of the law which may occur within their union, with respect either to the state or management of the workhouse, the administration of outdoor relief, the keeping of the union books or the conduct of paid officers, which ought not to escape the observation of the assistant, commissioner, who will not fail to report it, without delay to the Commissioner." That states clearly that assistant commissioners were not administrators: they were only, if one may so describe it, supervisors. The Local Government Board inspectors are not administrators, they simply supervise, at least that is my view of their duty.

The political element in the Local Government Board.

8967. (*Mr. Nunn.*) My point was that the Local Government Board, and the Poor Law Board before it, had a definite policy in view, and had a great many means in their hands to produce a certain impression on the minds of the public and the guardians, yet the impression has not been produced?—Because it has been constantly hampered by the interference of Parliament.

8968. I suppose that is some times an assistance. I suppose the President of the Local Government Board, having a seat in the Cabinet, is able to initiate legislation where interference is necessary?—On the other hand the interference may take the form of the political side which he happens to represent in the House. I think the great advantage in the supervision by the Commissioners was that there were very little politics indeed about it. In those days they had a free hand; in the very early days of the Commission.

8969. Do you think the policy of the Local Government Board would be freer if the president did not have a seat in the Cabinet?—No, I think it is necessary that he should have a seat in the Cabinet; at least I do not say absolutely necessary, because several Presidents in my time have not been in the Cabinet, but they have been able to put their views before their colleagues in the Government; they have all been in the Government if not in the Cabinet.

8970. You would not be in favour of removing the sphere of the Local Government Board outside party legislation by placing a permanent head at the Local Government Board?—I am afraid it would be practically impossible.

Control of Local Government Board over Boards of Guardians.

8971. Apart from legislation, the Local Government Board has power to pull up a board of guardians, partly by way of a mandamus, partly by way of its auditors, and partly by issuing orders which come under the various Poor Law Acts, I suppose?—That is so.

8972. Is there any other conclusive way in which the Local Government Board can give expression to its wishes besides those I have mentioned?—I think there should be; for instance in such details as I have mentioned, the fire escape, and the dentists, it would be a very good thing if the Local Government Board could say, "We will do it and charge you with the cost."

8973. Is this within their power now?—Not practically. The Local Government Board have not power to do it and charge it to the guardians. They may in theory have power to require the guardians to do it, but they could only enforce that by mandamus.

8974. Those are the only four means by which they could enforce their opinion?—That is a legal question, but I think you are right.

8975. They could do it by breaking up a union, of course?—As a matter of fact how many unions have been broken up since the Poor Law Board and the Local Government Board have been in existence? I think you could tell them on the fingers of one hand. It is a theoretical power, but as a matter of fact it is not a practical one.

Duties of Inspectors in relation to the Local Government Board.

8976. I suppose inspectors are not only supposed to supervise the work of the board of guardians, but they are supposed to give a certain voice to the policy of the Local Government Board in regard to any matters that come before them?—I think it is the duty of the inspectors to inform their boards of guardians what the wishes of the Local Government Board are upon all matters which are within the control of the Local Government Board.

8977. When a board of guardians quite fails to respond to that, does his duty cease, or does he report it to the Local Government Board again?—He would report it to the Local Government Board undoubtedly, and his duty would not cease. He would go on trying. I have gone on trying for very many years and have succeeded.

Local Government Board's procedure by mandamus.

8978. I think you used the expression that it would be absurd to move by way of a mandamus in order to produce a £60 structural alteration which might involve the loss of a number of lives. Is it a very difficult process?—I suppose it would be a difficult process, but it is not only in that one way, but the whole process of having to proceed by mandamus when you want a slight alteration like that made; and after all the responsibility is on the guardians. The guardians say they have sufficient means of escape. I think they have not.

8979. Yet, on the other hand, if a means like that were used on a few occasions, it would have a great moral effect in asserting the power of the Local Government Board, I suppose?—I do not know. I think it is absurd that there should be any necessity to have recourse to such a means.

8980. I was thinking of what power the Local Government Board had now?—I think it would be absurd to apply to the Court for a mandamus to compel guardians to erect an external staircase

8981. (*Mr. Loch.*) You would suggest a more summary process?—Yes. It is bringing the law into ridicule to go through a process like that; you have to instruct counsel and there is a great deal of delay and expense.

8982. (*Mr. Nunn.*) At present there are no other means?—Not for practical purposes.

8983. A certain exercise by the Local Government Board of even such means as that would have a moral effect on boards of guardians by increasing the power which the Local Government Board would be able to exercise?—I can quite imagine a case big enough to warrant the exercise of the power, but in everyday occurrences of the character I have referred to, I think it would be rather absurd to have to go to the Court for a mandamus to compel it.

8984. It might have a cumulative effect?—It would have an effect that way no doubt.

Necessity for and methods of, elevating the status of Guardians.

8985. Another way by which the policy of the Local Government Board can be secured is by what you call levelling the *status* of the guardians?—That is a point on which I feel very strongly, as I venture to state in my *précis.*

8986. You regret that the ratepayers' qualification has been so lowered?—I do very much. I regret also that the *ex officio* guardians have been eliminated. I regret very much that the district councillor is made the guardian, and not the guardian the district councillor. I regret very much the chairman of the district council is the magistrate, and not the chairman of the board of guardians. I would rather neither were magistrates, because I do not approve of *ex officio* magistrates, but that is not the question. If there were to be an *ex officio* magistrate I am for the magistrate being the guardian instead of the district councillor.

8987. Another of your suggestions, which I suppose would give extra power to the guardians, would be the extension of their powers in the direction you suggest later on in your memorandum; the power of acting without applying to the Local Government Board?—Yes, those are small matters which now cause unnecessary irritation, correspondence and delay.

8988. Do you think it would level the *status* of the guardians if their electorates were enlarged? In some cases at present they are drawn from very small wards, with very little public opinion in them?—In the rural parishes there is very little interest taken in it, and you generally find that the largest farmer in the parish, or something of that kind, is put in almost as a matter of course. You do not often get contests. You really seldom get contests in the purely rural unions.

8989. I suppose you would get better men to come forward if you used the larger areas, in towns at any rate?—That may be.

8990. Would it assist to level the *status* of guardians if it were more generally recognised that the guardians could do a great deal in the way of prevention of pauperism by co-operating with provident societies and charitable agencies and philanthropic agencies, do you think?—I think so, very much indeed. But of course you know how difficult it is to organise charities especially in country districts, and especially with church and chapel charities. That is where the crux comes in in the country parishes. It is very much the case, in a smaller degree, of the instance given by Louis Paulian in "*Paris qui mendie*," where a woman succeeded in getting her child baptised twenty-six times in one winter. The child was baptised fourteen times by the Catholics and twelve times by the Protestants, and she got a franc and a christening robe each time. She was twitted with doing it, and the answer she gave was "*L'hiver a été si rude, Monsieur.*"

8991. It would come quite within the sphere of an inspector's work within the district to encourage the guardians to take that wider view of their work?—Quite so, but an inspector would have unfortunately very little opportunity of working that vein, I am afraid.

8992. It was the way it was worked in those unions you have mentioned very largely?—Yes; and when the Charity Organisation branch was founded in Portsmouth about three years ago, I had the honour of doing what little I could to encourage it. That has worked very satisfactorily in Portsmouth. They were good enough to ask me to go to their first meeting and some of their subsequent meetings, and I was very happy to attend.

8993. Inspectors can do a great deal in persuading guardians that their work does lie outside in that way, in preventing pauperism?—Yes, I think more in towns than in the country districts now.

Subscriptions by Guardians to Institutions and proposed extension of powers.

8994. Turning to some special points which you have raised: first with regard to the principle of charitable subscriptions, I think you said it was undesirable that the guardians should subscribe generally to the charities. What principle would you take as to subscribing?—If you have such institutions as a county hospital the subscription is a very legitimate one, because their area is the area of the unions contained in the county, and they undoubtedly take a good many cases the guardians of the rural districts, at all events, are not able to deal with, and which would have to be dealt with at the cost of the rates, if the hospitals did not take them. The county hospitals are doing a very great work from that point of view. They are extremely hampered for want of funds, but they do relieve the rates to a very considerable extent. Therefore I think it is right the guardians should subscribe towards them, and I think it is fair to the ratepayers that they should do so, because the ratepayers gain a very distinct advantage; and the same with cottage hospitals, although in a lesser degree. But when you come to subscriptions to philanthropic institutions, such as private homes for poor children, it appears to me that it is very difficult to justify the subsidising of private efforts at the cost of the rates. There have been a good many applications made to the Local Government Board at one time or another by private philanthropic efforts to get subscriptions of a general character, so much a year, towards their funds, and I do not think, so far as my knowledge goes, that the board have ever encouraged that; but where they have had schools which were sufficiently good to warrant the Local Government Board in certifying them, the board have certified those schools, and then guardians can pay for the children they send to those schools.

8995. You think that in revising their list of subscriptions the guardians ought to consider whether the ratepayers have had a *quid pro quo*?—I do certainly.

8996. I think at present the law only allows the guardians to subscribe to institutions and not to societies?—Yes, I think that clause might with great advantage be modified. There is a very excellent institution at Southampton, and I was very anxious that the guardians should subscribe to it. That is the Society for Distressed Sailors and Mariners; they do a very good work at Southampton indeed, and it can hardly be said they come within the terms of the section which authorises guardians to subscribe to institutions and hospitals, but the difficulty has been got over at Southampton by the guardians making a donation, not in the form of a subscription but in the form of a gift, which the board sanctioned under the power they have, I think under the Local Authorities Expenses Act. The board sanctioned it once, but very properly they will not sanction a recurring expenditure under the Local Authorities Expenses Act, so a subscription would not come under that.

8997. You think that an alteration might very well be made with regard to that?—I think so, when it is clear that the ratepayers get value for their money.

Possibility of training for Relieving Officers.

8998. Would it not be better, if there were a certain number of selected unions, really good unions where good work was being done in outdoor administration, where all relieving officers might be regularly trained?—I should hail something of that kind with the greatest satisfaction. I think it is quite possible, in the large towns, where relieving officers of standing and knowledge are doing their work well, that they should have assistant relieving officers in their districts, who, as assistant relieving officers, might be trained in the work and might be rendering them very valuable assistance, and they might eventually come on as full relieving officers in other places and be well qualified for the post. Anything of that kind would be practicable and, I think, very desirable.

The supervision of outrelief.

8999. Under the present system, are you in favour of a cross-visitor or a superintendent relieving officer?—I would rather that he did both; I think the cross-visitor is extremely important, but a superintendent relieving officer, as a rule, really does do the cross-visiting, I think.

9000. I think it has been suggested that, better than either of those, there might be the appointment of an inspector of relieving officers for a district. Do you think that would be really better than having a superintendent relieving officer for the union?—Whose officer would he be?

9001. Apparently he would be the officer of the inspector of the district?—Then he would be appointed by the Local Government Board.

Need for assistants to Inspectors.

9002. Appointed by the Local Government Board, and a man of somewhat higher social *status*?—That is quite a new point to me. I would rather think that over before giving a definite answer. I should think it has possibilities in it which might work very well. I think it would be a very good thing if the general inspectors in the districts had assistance in their work. I very often regret extremely that I am obliged to, I will not say waste, but devote two or three days to going to outlying parts of my district to one little union, when my time might be much more advantageously spent in other work which is pressing me.

9003. Have you no assistant at all?—No.

9004. You have a clerk, I suppose?—I have my clerk, but he only does the clerical work.

Question of detention of consumptive paupers.

9005. With regard to the powers of admission and detention, especially with regard to very poor and ignorant persons, diseased persons who are suffering from such a disease as consumption, which is communicable, you spoke of extending it to one or two other diseases to which it does not apply now Would you extend so as to cover consumptive persons who are quite ignorant of the means of spreading the disease, and are practically destitute, the power of detaining them in the workhouse when you have them there, or compelling them to come in when they are outside?—That would depend on whether you had the requisite accommodation for the purpose.

9006. I am assuming that?—In most of the county workhouses they do not have the accommodation. Of course, to a great extent, it is a medical question which I am quite incompetent to answer, but my own idea of the treatment of consumption, speaking merely as a layman, is that it is extremely unwise to aggregate cases. Personally, I do not at all approve of the sanatorium as the best means of dealing with consumption. I think that directly you aggregate them you may get an

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

aggravation of the mischief. It is better, as far as possible, that they should be dealt with as isolated cases, and collected together. That is a medical question on which I dare say my opinion is worth very little.

Comparison of *ad hoc* and *ex officio* Guardians.

9007. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Have you noticed any difference in the character of the men who are rural guardians and, therefore, rural district councillors, and the character of those who are *ad hoc* guardians and not rural district councillors ?—I do not know that one can draw much distinction between the classes. The only thing is, that among the guardians who represent the towns you more often find lady guardians—for whom I am always grateful. There seems to be an idea, which may have some grounds for it, that, although a lady makes a most excellent guardian, she does not know much about road-making and that kind of business, and, therefore, is not an equally good district councillor. Consequently, as the person who is elected a district councillor is *ex officio* guardian, ladies get ousted in favour of men, because men know more of district council work than ladies do. In the towns they are elected merely for the guardianship, and then ladies get in more frequently than in the country districts.

9008. Apart from the women, would you say that amongst the men on the whole those guardians who are also district councillors are better administrators than those who are elected *ad hoc* ?—I do not think so.

Comparison of Rural and Urban Poor Law administration.

9009. Do you think that on the whole the rural boards of guardians are better administered than the town boards ?—No.

9010. Would you say they are worse administered ? —No. I do not think you can answer the question generally ; some towns administer admirably, and some towns administer very badly.

9011. Then you do not see really any practical difference between the two ?—I do not think so. When I was up in the north, Bradford was administered excellently and Leeds was administered very badly ; and they are two towns within ten miles of each other.

Value of *ex officio* Guardians.

9012. Are there any conditions which you could suggest to us which tend to produce a good type of guardian or a bad type of guardian ?—I do not think so, as guardians are at present elected or brought into office. Of course I should like to see the *ex officio* guardians brought back.

9013. You think they were a good influence on the whole ?—Certainly they were. They were an educated influence, they were a class with a certain amount of leisure ; they were people with a position in the county ; and they knew a great deal, because many of them were landlords and knew intimately the people on their own estates.

9014. Do you remember that in the first years of the Poor Law Commission, 1835, 1836, 1837 and 1838, the assistant commissioners were dead against the *ex officio* element—the justice of the peace ? For instance Sir Francis Head always said it was a curse to a board of guardians if they had *ex officio* guardians sitting with them ? —That was before I had anything to do with the Poor Law, and, perhaps the position had somewhat modified before I had the honour of receiving my appointment under the board. I agree with most things that Sir Francis Head said, but I should not agree on that point.

9015. You think the justices were a very valuable element, you do ?—I do certainly, but not because they were justices. They were appointed because they were justices as it was a convenient way of getting the country gentlemen in. I think the country gentlemen formed a most valuable element in the boards of guardians. I know that it was said that they never came unless a bit of jobbery was to be done or an appointment was to be made to some place into which they wanted to put somebody or other. In some places that was so, but in many others it was not true, for they attended regularly and well.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, on character of Boards of Guardians.

9016. As regards he character of boards of guardians, you are distinctly under the impression that it has deteriorated since 1894 ?—I think so, clearly ; but I should not like my boards of guardians perhaps to know that my opinion is that they are not so good as the boards of guardians used to be who preceded them. Still I think most certainly that the removal of all qualification was a very great pity.

9017. It was suggested to us by Mr. Davy that though the guardians after the Act of 1894 began by being rather reckless and extravagant, yet with experience they have turned out to be as good guardians as the guardians were before them ; is that not your view ?—That may be so as regards the elected guardians, nevertheless, I regret the non-elected element, and I do not think the power of co-option, which exists to a very limited extent—only two or three guardians in each union—by any means makes up for the removal of the *ex officio* guardian.

9018. Is that power of co-option exercised ?—In a great many unions it is. It is especially exercised with regard to lady guardians, I think.

Lady Guardians.

9019. With regard to lady guardians, do you think that on the whole you get a better stamp of women co-opted than elected ?—I have very few elected lady guardians, indeed I have very few lady guardians in my district at all, I am sorry to say. That is a difficult question to answer, and I am afraid I hardly know who were elected and who were co-opted. I know one or two very good ones who were co-opted.

Possibility prescribing qualificati and trainir for Relievi Officers.

9020. Now with regard to the relieving officers, I gather that, on the whole, you would be in favour of some sort of qualification ?—Certainly, if it would be practicable to get it.

9021. As you know, within recent years there has been a qualification for sanitary inspectors ?—Yes, but that is a very different type of work. That is definite work, and a relieving officer's work is not definite. For a relieving officer you want not only a man of good personal character, but you want a man of great sympathy and at the same time great firmness, you want a man who can be very gentle and at the same time very strong, you want a man who has the fullest sympathy with distress and at the same time who is determined to protect the ratepayers from fraud—a man who will find out imposition on the one hand and be very stern with it, and who, on the other hand, will be most sympathetic with real suffering.

9022. Could not you have a system, somewhat similar to that for pupil teachers say, by which a person would have to be an assistant to a relieving officer *plus* obtaining knowledge of a certain amount of theory and facts ?—I think it is quite possible that you might train your relieving officers by making them first of all assistants of relieving officers ; but then you would have to find your good relieving officers to make them assistants too.

9023. In many professions nowadays you have what is practicaly an apprenticeship insisted on ; as regards solicitors or nurses, for instance. Would it not be possible to apply that system of apprenticeship to the relieving officers ?—I am not prepared to say whether it would be possible or not, but I am afraid it would be very difficult, because I do not think there are the means available now. You might find a few very good relieving officers in the big towns who would be fitted to train assistants to take independent positions afterwards ; but the large majority of the country relieving officers, although they do their work with most admirable devotion and with great self-sacrifice in many instances, are not, I am afraid, the class of men who are well qualified to train assistants to be what I should like relieving officers to be.

9024. Would it not be worth while, at any rate in order to prevent jobbery, to have either an age limit or a certain modicum of knowledge to be tested by examination ?—That would be most desirable, if it could be done. The age limit could be obtained.

9025. You could have a certain modicum of knowledge tested by examination ; that is to say, it would not be necessary to make the examination very high. At present there is an absence of any kind of examination ? —I do not know that I should attach much weight to such an examination as appears to be in your mind.

9026. I am thinking of the sort of examination that you have for a sanitary inspector or a factory inspector ? —I do not think the two things are to be compared. You want the sanitary inspector to do certain definite work, but the relieving officer has not definite work. You cannot define a relieving officer's work. True, the regulations in the Consolidated Order lay down the duties of relieving officers, but then you may have a man who will carry out these regulations to the letter, and yet he may be absolutely incompetent.

9027. But you are less likely to get a hopelessly incompetent man if you have some sort of examination test, are you not?—Certainly, any test has a certain advantage.

9028. The factory inspectors pass through a certain examination as to the factory law, do they not?—Yes; but that again is a different class of work. An inspector of factories and an inspector of nuisances, and other work of that kind—take, say, the sanitary inspectors generally—have certain definite duties to perform, for the performance of which you can ascertain their competency to a great extent by examination; but with regard to relieving officers, you cannot do that.

9029. A relieving officer ought to know a certain amount of Poor Law, at any rate?—He ought to know what he can do, and what he cannot do; but further than that, I think it depends very much more upon the personal character and competency of the man than upon any knowledge of the law.

Question of putting Workhouse fire-escapes under jurisdiction of County Councils.

9030. With regard to the fire escapes at workhouses would it not be possible to put them under the county council, as are the fire escapes in factories and workshops and other buildings?—I would much rather not bring the county authority into the workhouses at all.

9031. Why?—Because I want the guardians to do everything. I think the guardians are by far the most important local authority there is in existence. I regard the guardians as infinitely more important than the county council in the effect of their work upon the people.

9032. But they cannot inspect their own work? You could not leave it to the guardians to inspect the fire escapes at their own workhouses, could you?—No; but I think the inspection of the Local Government Board would be quite sufficient, if the board only had practical power to compel these things to be done. If I could go to a workhouse and say to the guardians, "If you do not do this, the Local Government Board will do it and make you pay"; that would be quite sufficient power to get the thing done. It would be just the same as regards the appointment of dentists, and other details of that kind.

Power of Local Government Board to deal with insufficient expenditure on Poor Relief byGuardians.

9033. As regards the provision of adequate workhouse accommodation, so far as we have had evidence, it seems to be a very serious drawback to the powers of the Local Government Board that whereas you can surcharge expenditure in excess, you can do nothing to prevent an absence of expenditure?—That is so.

9034. An absence of expenditure may lead, as it does, to the absence of provision in a workhouse, and, therefore, to positive extravagance?—Very likely.

9035. What do you suggest as an analogue to the power of surcharge which you have as regards too much expenditure, so that you could deal with the absence of expenditure?—I should like the Local Government Board to have the power to direct a thing to be done, and then if it were not done, to have power to do it and to charge it to the locality. Supposing I found that there are not nurses enough, I should like very much to have simply to recommend it to the board, and then for the board to write down to the guardians saying, "We think there ought to be another nurse appointed, and you must appoint one." It is perfectly true, I suppose, to say that the board could do it now by Order; but supposing the guardians did not comply with the Order, then their only means of enforcing the Order is by mandamus.

9036. And that is practically impossible, you say?—Yes, for ordinary purposes.

Circulation to ratepayers of reports on local Poor Law administration.

9037. Do you think there would be any advantage if, in a case of bad administration, it were the custom for the auditor or for the inspector to prepare a careful report on the administration of the guardians and to circulate that to every ratepayer?—I think it would be a very difficult position to put an inspector into. I think you would do more harm than good by that, for probably if he said of a board of guardians that he found fault with them, that would go against him with them, and thereby would injure his influence. We cannot drive—we have not the power to drive; and so we must persuade.

9038. You might give it to an inspector who was not the inspector for the district; I mean to say, it would not be necessary to involve the inspector of the district in it? Then that would be bringing in somebody else over the head of the inspector of the district, and nothing would impair his influence more than that would.

9039. You have occasionally made special inquiries, but generally I assume the reports of those inquiries are not circulated to the ratepayers?—No; and I think it is very undesirable that they should be.

9040. You think it would be undesirable?—Yes, I do. I think if you knew that your reports on inquiries were going to be published, you would have to leave out very much. You would practically have to edit them for publication.

9041. But you could write two reports: one confidential for the office, and one for the ratepayers?—Yes, you could; and the one for the ratepayers would be very valueless, I think. It would have all the heart taken out of it.

Effect of casual employment and failure to use Workhouse Test.

9042. As regards the pauperism of Southampton, I gather that you attribute it largely to the irregular employment there?—I attribute the excessive pauperism in Southampton to the fact that they cannot apply the workhouse test.

9043. But there are other places where they cannot apply the workhouse test, are there not?—Southampton and South Stoneham are the only two in my district, at the present moment.

9044. You have mentioned the fact that owing to the irregular employment, you get a thriftlessness on the part of the people?—Yes; I am afraid you do find that in all casual dock labour.

9045. If persons are kept working night and day, as you suggest, and then have a time of complete unemployment, that develops the kind of character which is thriftless, does it not?—Yes; and then, you see, at Southampton things actually accommodate themselves to that style of character. If the guardians had ample workhouse accommodation, and these people applied, they could then say, "Very well, we will give you an order for the workhouse." These people would then have to go in through the receiving ward, they would have to be bathed, they would have their clothes taken from them, and they would be passed into their proper classification in the workhouse, where they would have to remain until they gave their notice to discharge themselves; then they would have to remain twelve hours, and if it happened two or three times in the month, they might have to remain up to seventy-two hours after they gave their notice of discharge. That would be a very different style of thing to simply going, as they now do, into the vagrant ward for a night, whenever they feel inclined for it, and getting enough bread and cheese and water to keep them going. Of course Southampton is immensely handicapped in its administration, and it is not fair to blame Southampton for these bad statistical results, simply for that reason.

Position of Southampton Guardians under their Local Act and its connection with the rate of pauperism.

9046. Because it has not got workhouse accommodation?—Yes. We cannot control the situation. You see, we were beaten by a Parliamentary Committee last year, when the Local Government Board actually issued a Provisional Order to repeal the local Act.

9047. It is the effect of a local Act then, is it?—Yes.

9048. Would you explain that, as I did not know of it?—The Southampton Incorporation, as it is called—it is not a union, it is an incorporation—is under a local Act. That local Act was passed in the time of George III., something over 100 years ago. It has been modified to a very great extent since, but still under that local Act the property is in the hands of the guardians under the Act. The Local Government Board could, no doubt, dissolve the board of guardians under the local Act, and they could create a new board of guardians and could annex parishes to the union they thus formed; but they could not repeal the local Act, and consequently the property would remain in the hands of the authorities under the local Act, and, although the Local Government Board could constitute a new board of guardians, they could not transfer to them the property of the present board of guardians.

9049. But the new board of guardians could build a new workhouse out of the rates?—Yes; but it is all there, and it would be absurd for you to put upon the locality a new expenditure when you have got it all there. It is

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

complicated further by the fact that a charity is also in question under the Local Act and would have to be dealt with. It would be rather a long story if I were to go into the whole history of it, and I do not know that I can tell you more than I have done. There are certain areas within the added area under the corporation which are not in the Poor Law area, and when the Local Government Board endeavoured last year to get the local Act repealed, these outside parishes had a *locus standi* to oppose it in Parliament. They did oppose it, and the Parliamentary Committee refused to confirm the Provisional Order of the Local Government Board, without putting in a clause which the board were unable to accept. The Parliamentary Committee wished to insert a clause which would have practically overridden the statutory powers of the Local Government Board; the Local Government Board could not accept that, and so it fell through, and the matter remains in *statu quo*.

9050. What did the Parliamentary Committee want to do ?—They wanted to put in a clause that the board should not act without giving these outside parishes the opportunity of being heard before Parliament.

9051. Then practically the Southampton Guardians cannot improve their workhouse ?—They will have to provide further accommodation. The poor rate is 3s. in the £. and it is very much higher than in any other union in my district. They endeavoured to increase their rating power by raising the rate on the docks. That was appealed against, and the Southampton Board were defeated, and had to pay very heavy expenses in addition to losing their increase of rateable value. They are practically at the end of their tether; there can be no further building as the whole area is built over, and the better class is going outside that area to live, and is leaving the poor behind.

9052. What would you suggest ? Would you suggest an equalisation of the rates ?—No. Later on, no doubt the areas will have to be dealt with, but for the moment there is a deadlock, and that is the reason of the excessive rate of pauperism and cost in Southampton. The excessive rate really does not depend on the casual labour question, so much as on the inability to apply the proper tests.

The deterrence of Medical Relief.

9053. I see you attach great importance to the old poor law theory that the position of dependents on the rates should be less advantageous than the position of the independent labourer ?—Certainly.

9054. But you do not apply that to the sick, do you ?—Yes.

9055. Surely not; you recommend specially excellent nursing and excellent appliances and an excellent medical staff for paupers, who could not obtain those advantages outside ?—It is impossible to level down the care of the sick poor to the lowest standard of outside life in sickness. True economy with regard to the sick poor is to treat them with the best possible available means, in order that you can get them well as soon as possible, and send them back to their work.

9056. Therefore you do not apply that principle of the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834 that the condition of the pauper should be worse than that of the outside independent labourer ?—Pardon me, I do; because the sick only get properly cared for in the institution.

9057. Then you do not apply the principle to anyone in the workhouse ?—Certainly I do; the mere fact of giving up their liberty is in itself a restriction.

9058. Then is it only with regard to outdoor relief that you apply it ?—I apply it as regards outdoor relief and as regards indoor relief. I think a sick person in a workhouse, however good it may be, is in an inferior position to a sick person who can get what he wants outside the workhouse and who remains his own master.

9059. Surely that is not so, because the sick person comes in on his own volition to a state of things which is better ? —But they do not come in on their own volition; they only come in when the guardians given them an order, that is, when they cannot provide what they want outside.

9060. The guardians give them an order, whenever it is to their advantage to come into the house ?—Only when they are destitute.

9061. But they do get first-rate nursing, then ?—Certainly, but only as destitute people.

9062. Still a destitute person coming into an infirmary gets better provision made for him than the ordinary independent labourer outside the infirmary can provide for himself ?—That is a necessity of the situation.

9063. I quite agree ?—But then he has to sacrifice his liberty, and he has to sacrifice his control over his own movements and his own actions. He is in a totally different position from the independent person who can do what he likes outside.

9064. Surely the question of liberty—apart from mere words—does not apply to sick people, because sick people cannot get out of their beds ?—The large majority of sick people are not bed-ridden; it is a small proportion of the sick who are bed-ridden, and even they in their own homes can have friends and see them whenver they like; they can send for what they want and get what they want, they can gossip, they can be amused, they can have all sorts of home love and home attentions and home attractions, which it is impossible to give in a public institution.

9065. Do you not think that the mere fact that people are making more and more use of these infirmaries rather shows that they do not consider this absence of liberty of much importance when they are sick ?—No, I do not think so at all.

9066. You still think they feel the restriction ?—Yes, I do certainly. They know that they are paupers, and I think the fact that they are paupers is in itself, I may say, a great disgrace and a great disgrace which is very much felt.

9067. Then you do not think there is any practical danger in our improving the accommodation for the sick every year, and making it more and more superior; you do not think that by that means we may not all come to use the infirmaries more or less ?—Not the least danger in the world, if it is kept within reasonable limits. Of course it may be overdone.

9068. If the accommodation is always to be such that you are cured in the shortest possible time what else can you desire ?—You might have all sorts of extravagant appliances and extravagant feeding and extravagant odds and ends, which I should deprecate very much.

9069. Surely when you are sick the only feeding that is of any good for you is the best conceivable diet for the complaint, and that you would advocate ?—Certainly; but that is very different from extravagance.

9070. Extravagance might be bad for you ?—For instance, you might get a most excellent nutritive jelly which answers all sorts of purposes as regards the patients, but which is totally different from the jelly which would be sent up to you in your own house and made by your own skilled cook.

9071. If it were made by your own skilled cook it would probably not be so good ?—It ought to be; at any rate it may be perfectly good, and yet a very different thing from a jelly which is turned out in a workhouse infirmary, but the matter is one of principle rather than of such details as this.

9072. To go from the question of the sick to that of the children, would you also say that the pauper child should be less well-off than the child of the independent labourer ? —That is a more difficult question to answer. The child stands *per se*. Where he has parents the question is how the position affects them. I do not think that you can apply the principle that the child in a poor law establishment shall be less well-off than the child of the lowest type of independent labourer. A child in any poor law establishment is from many points of view worse off than a child in his own home. To begin with, he is not at home, and nothing can make up to a child for the absence of home. With all that you can do, you can never give a child anything like the home which God gives him in his own family.

The deterrence of rel to children

9073. Of course God may give him a horribly bad home ?—Yes, and then we get him and do the best we can for him; but it is not like a good home, anyhow.

9074. Sometimes you do not get him ?—That is true.

9075. On the whole, then, you would advocate that the child in a poor law establishment should have conditions

which would result in better health and better capacity than the child of the lowest independent labourer. Certainly better than the child of the lowest class of labourer. Notwithstanding all that may be said to the contrary about unwholesome conditions of life your ordinary country child is an extremely healthy child and has a good time. He is harassed by school, and every child has to be harassed by school and has to bear the inconvenience of having to go to school. Still, I think your country village child as a rule has a very good time. You get exceptions, no doubt; you get drunken parents and you get immoral parents who behave badly to their child; still I think the average country village child in England is a very happy child and has a very happy childhood.

9076. Do you think that the guardian who objected to your refinement about having a dentist to look after the children, had nothing to say for himself from the point of view of the theory that the child's position should be worse than that of an independent labourer's child?—Absolutely nothing; because if you have got a child in your care you are bound to do what is reasonably right for him, and it is only of late years that the value of attention to the teeth has been recognised. You know now that if a child has got bad teeth and he gets diphtheria or scarlet fever, he has not the same chance as a child who has got sound teeth. You know if he is a boy and you want to get him into the Service that if he has bad teeth you cannot get him into the Service. You know that he ought to grow up with a wholesome digestion, but that if he has bad teeth he cannot do it, although with sound teeth he will do it.

Dental attendance for Poor Law children.

9077. Therefore a child with sound teeth, who has had all this dentistry, is more likely to get on in the world?—Yes, and I think that parents outside are learning that their children must have their teeth attended to and are doing it.

9078. You would not suggest that the mass of working class parents do really see that their children's teeth are attended to, would you?—I really think they are doing it.

9079. (*Miss Hill.*) I think they are doing so, too?—I think they are attending to their children's teeth very much since it has been brought home to them—that is since school life has been better organised, and since school teachers themselves are more interested in the condition of each individual child. I think a great deal is being done in the way of dentistry among the poorer classes now. If they think their children's teeth ought to be attended to, the poor people see to it, and I cannot understand why the guardians should not do it.

9080. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I quite agree. Do you suggest that the school has increased the responsibility of the parent by drawing his attention to such things as teeth?—Yes; but I do not know for certain who has done it

9081. You spoke of the teachers?—I think it is the teachers. In the village schools now the teachers take a great deal more individual interest in the particular children than they did twenty years ago or twenty-five years ago.

9082. Then you have got the responsibility of the parent positively increased by the child going to school?—I think that the parents are very much taught what they ought to do now by what the children go home and tell them the teacher has told them, and by means of that kind, which they used not to know in days gone by.

The deterrence of child-relief.

9083. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think the principle which Mrs. Webb was alluding to was intended to apply to the independent labourer, and not to the independent labourer's involuntary dependants, such as his children. You cannot be said to be giving a more eligible lot to the dependent labourer when that lot is given to his involuntary child, can you? (*Mrs. Webb.*) I should be glad to hear what you think of this?—I am afraid I hardly followed the point?

9084. (*Mr. Nunn*). It is said that the lot of the dependent labourer must be more ineligible than that of the independent labourer?—Yes.

9085. That principle does not apply to a child involuntarily born into the world and rendered an orphan?—No; I think you are right. I think you must draw a distinction always as to the children. You cannot compare a child who is sent into the workhouse for treatment with a child in his own home outside. You cannot take an average of the outside homes. Some homes are very good, and the children are very happy, with all the love that their parents can give them, and all the self-sacrifice of a lifetime in order to provide for them afterwards. But then some homes are hopelessly bad. You cannot draw an average between the bad home and the very good home, and say that shall be our standard for the workhouse. You have got your children, and you have to do the very best you possibly can by them.

9086. (*Mrs. Webb.*) As a matter of fact, you would altogether neglect to consider, would you not, what was the standard of the outside home, and you would do your very best?—You must, with regard to the children; but at the same time I do not think you thereby abandon the principle that the condition of the dependent child is to be less eligible than the condition of the independent child. I think that with the very best you can do for the children you may have in an institution, no matter how you deal with them, whether you board them out or send them to scattered homes or to school or anywhere you like, they still are not in the same position as a child in his natural home, if that home is a good one—and nothing can put them in that position, in fact nothing can give a child home love except the love he gets at home; you cannot provide that artificially.

Effect of new machinery upon employment.

9087. With regard to the ousting of old men from employment, do you think the general speeding-up of industry, the use of more complicated machinery, and the running of all that machinery at a greater rate ousts old men?—Undoubtedly.

9088. In exactly the same way as factory legislation?—Quite so.

9089. Would you be against the speeding-up of machinery because it ousts old men?—Certainly not.

Relief of Lancashire Cotton Famine.

9090. Then you would not be against factory legislation?—No, certainly not, so far as I understand it. I happened to be in Lancashire shortly after the cotton famine—I was in Lancashire in 1868 or 1869. Arnold's "History of the Cotton Famine" does not come down to that time; I think it ceased in 1864; but it tells the story very well so far as it goes. When I was first in Lancashire as an assistant Poor Law inspector, the results of the cotton famine had practically asserted themselves. I was very much struck, young and inexperienced as I was in administration in those days, with the great demoralisation which the relief of the cotton famine had brought about. The artisan then learnt, for the first time on a large scale, that he could live without work. I believed that the relief could have been conducted on much wiser lines and that if it had been left to the Poor Law, instead of extraneous influences having been brought in, that in the long run the result would have been better for the people. But at all events the funds for the relief of the cotton famine, like the great funds that have been in much more recent times raised in London, did produce an enormous amount of demoralisation, although they may have done a good deal to relieve the necessities of the moment.

Effect of machinery, factory legislation, etc., on employment and pauperism.

9091. With regard to Lancashire, you think that with the speeding-up of the machinery, with factory legislation, and with trade unionism—which I gathered you thought had the same tendency—the old men are being ousted?—Yes.

9092. One would have thought if that were so, that pauperism would have risen, but as a matter of fact pauperism is lower in Lancashire than anywhere else, is it not?—That is so.

9093. So that all those influences which are supposed to oust the old men from employment, including the Workmen's Compensation Act, have, as a matter of fact, not led to an increase of pauperism in Lancashire?—No; probably because they have led to such a considerable increase of income that a man's relations are enabled to prevent his becoming a pauper.

9094. It might be very short-sighted to stop the process of increased efficiency in industry?—It would be abso-

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

Trades Unions and the employment of old men.

lutely fatal ; besides, nothing can do it. If you were to try to do it, you could not do it in the long run.

9095. Therefore if trade unionism can be proved in Lancashire to increase the efficiency of the machinery, you would not object to the partial ousting of the old men ?—I do not say that at all. I do not object to trade unionism. Trade unionism has done most marvellous work, as we all know who have studied the question at all, but I do not approve of some of its methods.

9096. What in trade union rules leads you to suppose that they discourage the membership of old men ?—I am not a sufficient expert in trade unionism to answer. I have never been able to give sufficient study to pretend to be an expert in matters of trade unionism. But my impression at all events is that the trade unions do not care to have a man who has passed his best. I think it stands to reason that it must be so, because they insist upon every man who works under their rules getting the full standard rate of wages ; and when a man has passed his best, he is not worth that. Employers who have to pay the full standard rate of wages refuse to employ a man who is not thoroughly competent, because the man must not work at less than the standard rate.

9097. Probably you know that in all trade unions in which the operatives are paid by time they do make special allowances for old men and permit them to work at lower rates ?—Yes ; to a certain extent that might affect the question, but I think that what I have said holds good generally, that is, that unless a man is at his best, he is not much good in a trade union.

9098. The trade unions never oust their old members, do they ?—Not nominally.

9099. Never practically, either ?—They may not oust them. Perhaps the word "oust" does not best convey my meaning when I say that an old man who is in a trade union does not at all events hold as good a position as an able-bodied man who is in a trade union.

9100. You say you have not studied the question ?—Not sufficiently to be able to speak as an expert.

9101. Are you aware that the majority of the skilled trades which are organised insist on piece-work rates, and therefore the old man gets what he makes—cotton operatives, for instance, would strike against a time-work rate ?—I am afraid I cannot follow you into these details ; I do not know them well enough.

Out-relief prejudicial to Friendly Societies.

9102. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 6 of your memorandum you point out that the facilities which obtain to-day are far more likely to enable a person to provide for his old age than has been the case in the past, and you say that we are living now through a stratum, as it were, of old age which you hope when it dies out will materially diminish the amount of pauperism ?—Yes.

9103. A little lower down you say, "that the proper solution of the old-age pensions question is by means, or adaptation, of the friendly societies, would appear to be certain, and the societies are themselves making provision to that end ; but here the competition of outdoor relief comes in with a most mischievous influence." Are we to gather from that, that outdoor relief is really preventing people from exercising those facilities which they have power to do to-day ?—Undoubtedly, it is wonderful to me is that friendly societies hold their own at all. I think nothing is a greater proof of the independence of the character of the English people than that friendly societies are able to hold their own in face of the competition of outdoor relief.

9104. Do you refer to an unwise administration of outdoor relief ?—Certainly. I think all outdoor relief is unwise, if it is possible to avoid it.

9105. Then you are not of opinion that it is possible to avoid it all ?—It is possible to avoid very nearly all. There are certain cases which you cannot move into the workhouse. When I knew the Bradford union many years ago, they gave very little out-relief, and it was a most striking contrast to Leeds. When I was in that district, I used to wonder how in two towns within ten miles of each other you had such a contrast.

9106. You do not know it to-day, do you ?—No.

9107. I think you would find the contrast is greater than ever ?—I am speaking of thirty years ago. If the Commission will allow me for a minute, I would like to refer to one incident that happened at Leeds, as rather bearing out what I say. At that time in Bradford the children never thought of endeavouring not to support their parents ; they did it as a matter of course, because they knew if they did not, that the guardians would insist upon its being done, and I very seldom at the Bradford Board of Guardians in those days saw the question raised. The children who could support their parents did so as a matter of course, and the parents did not apply to the guardians ; and *vice versa* the parents supported their children when they could. In Leeds it was the exact opposite. No child supported his pauper parents in Leeds unless the guardians made him ; and they all shirked it if they could. When I first went to Leeds, I could not understand the administration of relief. The guardians administered relief in their own wards, and I thought there was very great abuse. I attended the board of guardians several times in order to see and satisfy myself what was going on, and at last I made this suggestion to the board of guardians—I said, "Your relief appears to me to be administered in a very unsatisfactory manner ; I wish you would make a rule that no guardian should sit to administer relief in his own ward." The guardians were furious. They said they had never heard such an insinuation, and "the idea of public officials coming down to talk to them in that fashion," and all the rest of it. I attended several more meetings and at last I said, "Well, you may be right or I may be right, but if I am wrong, why are you afraid of testing it ? Make it a rule that no guardian shall sit in his own ward for three months and see what that leads you to." They consented that they would make the experiment for three months. The very first week there was a saving of £70—they began to save at the rate of over £3,000 a year. At the end of the three months' experiment, I went to the board again and attended their meeting. I showed them the facts, and they said, "Yes, we admit it, but it has been at the cost of extreme hardship to the poor ; this money has been saved, but it is the savings from intense suffering." I said, "Very well, if that be true that completely upsets my argument, but that ought to be tested, that ought not to be accepted merely as a statement. Now will you make inquiries ?" "Yes," they said, "we will make inquiries." Inquiries were made in Leeds from everybody who was in a position to give information. The clergy were sent to, the magistrates were sent to, the district visitors were sent to, employers of labour were sent to—everybody that they could think of who really was in a position to give information. The answers were almost unanimous that not only had there been no suffering, but that the people had never been so well off—that they were much better off under the diminished amount of outdoor relief than when the outdoor relief was given in the lavish manner in which it had been given, and that many who had depended on the rates, so long as they could get the out-door relief, had gone to work when they found they could not get the outdoor relief. That was a most striking instance. I do not say these committees did not give the relief honestly when it was given in their own wards, but they certainly did not give it impartially. When they had to deal with people they did not know personally the relief was given impartially and that was the result.

Parental responsibility at Leeds and Bradford.

Reduction of out-relief by improved administration at Leeds and result to poor.

9108. (*Mr. Nunn.*) That is a most interesting experience ; is it embodied in any document that could be put in ?—There were some references made to the fact in one of the reports of the Local Government Board, but I do not think it ever came out in the annual reports of the Local Government Board.

9109. Is it not in one of your annual reports ?—No, because at that time the inspectors did not make annual reports. That was about 1873 or 1874.

9110. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I think Mr. Davy mentioned it to us ?—I daresay several of my colleagues have mentioned it. It was a well known incident at the time, and it was referred to in more than one printed report, but I do not think it was ever mentioned in the official reports of the Local Government Board.

9111. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you think the tendency, in consequence of the manner in which the Poor Law is administered, is towards people not exercising such thrift as

Lavish out-relief prejudicial to thrift.

they have power to do at the present time?—Just contrast two men: A man becomes a member of a friendly society and he has to pay so much a week; when he comes upon his society, he gets his medical attendance and he gets an allowance of so much a week, and everything else he has to provide for himself. Another man who goes to the board of guardians pays nothing, but he says, "I am destitute," or, "I am sick and I want you to provide for me." The guardians say, "This is a sick person who comes here, and we will not be very liberal with him, but we will give him perhaps 5s. or 6s. a week, and the doctor." For that, he has got to pay nothing, and in addition he gets, through the doctor's recommendation all the extras he wants: wine and beef, no matter what it may be. The marvel is to me that people do join the friendly societies. But when you go back to that question of the independence of the people, it is a most important fact; it is the keystone of the whole structure really. The independence of the people is there, and if it is not discouraged, it will come to the front. I know of many instances, and striking instances too, in my own district. At Warminster in 1898 a gentleman called upon the Chairman and said, "I have come to tell you my name is so-and-so (I do not know the name, the name was kept from me)—when I was a boy I and my family were in the Warminster workhouse; I emigrated to Australia, where I have been very successful; I estimate that we cost the ratepayers £136, and I have brought you the money.' The Chairman said, "We cannot have any possible claim against you, the claim has lapsed long since, and even if it had happened recently we could only claim for twelve months." He said, "It is not that which is influencing me in the least; my family and I were brought up by you in the workhouse; we are most grateful for what was done for us and I should never die happy if I felt we had not, now that we are able, repaid the guardians every farthing that we had cost the union"—and he produced this large sum of £136 which he left with the Chairman, simply asking that his name should not be mentioned. He told the Chairman who he was, but he begged that his name should not be mentioned. A poor old washer-woman went into the Winchester workhouse sick, and she was there for some weeks. Then she went out and resumed her washing, and several months afterwards she sent the guardians a letter enclosing the repayment of what she estimated she had cost, £9. The guardians sent to her and said, "We do not want to take this from you; you are a very poor woman, you were worked hard all your life, you were fully entitled to what we have done for you, and we do not want to take it." She said, "I shall not be happy if you do not take it; I do not want to feel that I have been any charge whatever on the rates. The guardians had her letter framed and hung it up in the entrance hall of the workhouse, where you can see now the letter in which she originally sent back the money. I have know many other such cases. Quite recently a man anonymously sent the Ringwood Guardians 2s. in postage stamps, which he asserted he had cost them. You have that feeling among the people still, and it is that feeling which makes them take less advantage of the Poor Law than they could. There can be no question that outdoor relief is the most bitter opponent of thrift and independence.

Instances of ex-paupers voluntarily repaying cost of their relief.

Effect of the elective principle on Boards of Guardians.

9112. In order to administer the Poor Law in a manner which would not have the effect of diminishing the thrift of the people, what kind of boards of guardians do you think is necessary? Can it be got through a popularly elected body?—Yes, you have had many boards of guardians in England who have done it. You have had the ones I have quoted—you have had Atcham, you have had Bradfield, you have Whitechapel, which is doing it to-day, you have got Fulham which is doing it to-day, and you have many boards of guardians in different parts of the country. They have all done it; every board of guardians that has interested itself in it, if it has only stuck to its principles, has done it.

9113. Are there many boards of guardians who are doing exactly the reverse?—Yes.

9114. And all formed by the same process of election?—Yes.

9115. What safeguard could you suggest that would give you a more uniform selection of members of boards of guardians?—I am afraid that no suggestion that I should be able to make would be likely to be adopted by Parliament.

9116. You really had faith in the *ex officio* guardians as being a steadying element on a board?—Yes. I have no doubt whatever, as I have said already, that if the Poor Law unions can be administered by a central department, you would have uniform administration, and within a comparatively few years you would get rid of pauperism in the country, or of all the pauperism that it is possible to get rid of, for you will always have a certain amount of incompetent people who will have to be provided for by the public.

Possible extent of eradication of pauperism by sound administration.

9117. And you think a board of experts would do that far better than an elective board?—I have no doubt they would.

9118. If county councils had the powers and duties which guardians have to-day, and if they could appoint small district committees for the present Poor Law areas, with powers to deal with all applications for relief, do you think they would be more likely to deal with it uniformly and in the interests of the community than is the case at present?—No. I would not put the Poor Law administration under the county councils so far as I am concerned upon any consideration. I think a board of guardians *ad hoc* is the only authority than can do it, and they ought to be made as important as possible.

County Councils as Poor Law Authorities.

9119. Are there many boards in your district which you consider come up to your ideal of what a Board ought to be?—No.

9120. Is there one?—I think I should say yes, but I would rather not name it. I should not like to compare one board of guardians against another. There are one or two of my boards that are very good indeed.

9121. As your ideas evidently point in the direction of the abolition of out-door relief altogether, do you think that indoor relief would become in that event quite as non-deterrent as outdoor relief is to-day?—Indoor relief would gradually cease to exist. If you once get rid of outdoor relief altogether, indoor relief will follow as a matter of course.

The irreducible minimum of pauperism.

9122. There are always a certain number of persons who are unfortunate or affected, and who must have recourse to the Poor Law unless they are dealt with by charity; these would always be in-door cases?—If you could get rid of the habit of pauperism, the large majority of sick cases would provide for their own necessities and would not require public relief at all. But you would always have a residuum of the incompetent who are naturally, congenitally, physically, or mentally weak, and they would have to be kept at the public expense, unless they had got friends and relatives who were able to maintain them; but except that very small residuum, my belief is that pauperism would gradually disappear altogether.

Deterrence of indoor-relief.

9123. It is said by two chairmen of boards in your district, I think, that in-door relief is no longer deterrent. If in-door relief is no longer deterrent, is it not possible that people might rely upon having a comfortable existence inside an institution, and consequently their ordinary walks of life would continue as they do at present?—You are taking an assumption with which I should not concur. I do not at all concur with the assumption that in-door relief is not deterrent, because I think in-door relief is deterrent.

9124. Which do you think would be the most deterrent to the naturally indolent man who does not like work, provided he had a wife and family—a good test out-door with constant work and small pay, or the indoor existence; would not the indoor comforts naturally appeal to an indolent man more than the severe test out-door?—If I had the management of the workhouse, the indoor test would not at all appeal to the indolent man. The indolent man would have a very bad time of it indeed, and he certainly would not be indolent while he was there. That is a matter of workhouse administration.

9125. He probably would get much better food inside the workhouse than he would out?—I do not know about that. The workhouse dietary is a sufficient dietary, but the workhouse dietary for able-bodied men is not an excessive dietary.

9126. Is it not better than he could provide for himself if he were in receipt of out-door relief?—If he were in receipt of out-door relief, yes, certainly; but then I would not put him in receipt of out-door relief. The

Mr. Baldwin Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

in-door dietary for the able-bodied man I take it is not as pleasant a dietary as the independent working man would provide for himself outside.

9127. Do you think that indoor relief naturally is more deterrent than out-door relief in any form?—Undoubtedly. The great advantage of in-door relief is that you know where you are. In the great majority of cases people do not accept in-door relief unless they are destitute. With regard to out-door relief, a large majority of them do not need it, and those that do need it, do not get enough to meet their necessities.

Local interpretation of Mr. Chaplin's Circular of 1900.

9128–30. In paragraph 13 you refer to the Circular of August 4th, 1900, and you give us the impression that it is "widely interpreted as applying to relief generally"; I suppose you took every opportunity of advising boards of guardians in what way you looked upon this Circular at the time it was issued?—Certainly I have spoken to guardians about that. Many boards of guardians took it as a change of policy on the part of the Local Government Board with regard to outdoor relief. They looked upon it as a general recommendation of outdoor relief as against indoor relief.

9131. How long would it take you to get round the whole of your boards by your method of advising them?—A year, I should think.

9132. Then a good deal of mischief could have happened in the course of that year?—I think a good deal of mischief did happen in the course of that year—mischief which no advice of mine would have prevented, I am sorry to say. At all events my advice would have had but a very limited effect upon them.

9133. You did not issue any circular of your own to the boards of guardians?—No, and I should have gone entirely outside my province if I had taken upon myself to do such a thing. The circular was from the Local Government Board.

9134. If you considered it was being wrongly interpreted and the boards of guardians were acting upon it in a spirit in which it was never intended to be acted upon, would you not look upon it as your duty to draw the attention of the guardians to that fact?—If I happened to be at a board when the question came up, certainly; and I did draw their attention to it on several occasions.

9135. That means that your influence was practically lost over the boards that were interpreting this in a wrong sense?—I would rather put it that my influence had not the opportunity of exercising itself?

9136. And I would rather put it that way, if you do not mind: that is the way in which I intended to put it. Do you think it possible under that circular to so classify the people that it would be a benefit to the Boards if they had taken it in the spirit in which it was intended?—So far as its application to the indoor poor went, the effect of it was rather to give a fillip to what I, and I suppose all my colleagues, had advised over and over again, that is, that the aged poor in the workhouses should be withdrawn from all surrounding circumstances which were unpleasant to them or caused them unhappiness. Classification was one means to the end. You do sometimes find, though not nearly so often as the public believe, that in the workhouses some of the old people are extremely unpleasant to the other old people, and make life a burden to them. Every now and then one comes across a case in which you have a very cranky, ill-conducted, foul-tongued old man or old woman who is unpleasant to the other people in the ward; but it does not often happen. Still there ought no doubt in every workhouse to be means of classifying the aged, so that if they want to be quiet they can have a nice, comfortable room to go to. That has been done in a great many of the workhouses to a certain extent, so far as the accommodation permits.

Classification in the Workhouse.

Adequate out-relief to aged and deserving Poor.

9137. With regard to the outdoor people, to whom I was referring more particularly, and the granting to the aged deserving poor who had led deserving lives, as the circular says, of an additional amount of relief (which you say is always small), you do not think that any harm came of that regulation where it was properly understood, do you?—No. But then, of course, if you are to do it for the aged and deserving poor, you have to arrive at what the aged and deserving poor are. I should be extremely sorry myself to have to classify the poor into the aged and deserving and the aged and undeserving. I do not know what your standard is to be. Personally, I was exceedingly glad that the old folk who had outdoor relief should have more liberal outdoor relief than had previously been given to them, so that I owed the circular no grudge upon that score. I have always been maintaining that the relief given to the aged in the large majority of cases is completely inadequate, and I only wish that guardians would render it adequate; I should be delighted if they would give the poor old people 8s., 9s., or 10s., and in some cases 11s. or 12s. per week. Nothing would so quickly bring home to them the advantage of indoor relief as against outdoor relief.

Effect of Mr. Chaplin Circular as regards adequate out-relief.

9138. The rise in the amount of relief to these aged deserving poor would naturally make the guardians more careful as to the persons to whom they would grant out-door relief, would it not?—I am afraid that has not been the effect. In fact, I think now that that circular as regards the out-door poor has ceased to produce any effect. I do not think to-day that the aged and deserving poor in the immense majority of cases receive 6d. more than they did before the circular was issued. For a time it did have a certain amount of effect; in the case of guardians who wished to give outdoor relief it has enabled them to turn to that circular as a recommendation in favour of outdoor relief; it has had some effect in that direction, an effect which I consider mischievous. With regard to the indoor relief, it has given a certain fillip to the improved classification of the aged indoor poor, and to that extent I am grateful for it.

9139. But you admit at first it had the effect of raising the amount that was given in outdoor relief all round?—I do not think it is so now; it has gone down again. For a time there was a little extra given, but I think you will find that the scale upon which guardians give relief to-day is practically the same as it was fifteen years ago.

Necessity for caution in abolition of out-relief.

9140. Then its effect is lost?—I think so. I should like to say one word more upon out-relief, if you will permit me. Although I should be extremely glad to see outdoor relief brought to the lowest possible proportions, I am sure it could not be done with a stroke of the pen or a wave of the wand; it must be done very gradually. I should be the last to abolish outdoor relief in any fashion which would cause hardship to the poor. It can be done gradually and should be done gradually, and with the fullest sympathy for the cases you have to deal with. I should be extremely sorry to let it go forth that I would issue any mandate that at a certain time all outdoor relief should be abolished. It can only be done by careful administration, which would bring it about really as the result of good work.

9141. I think you advocate the abolition of the Settlement laws altogether?—Yes.

Abolition of Settlement.

9142. I think you consider that all the Settlement laws should practically be swept away, but you do not refer to Scotland and Ireland, do you?—Personally I should, certainly.

9143. Would you abolish settlement with regard to both those countries?—Yes. That would get over the constantly contentious question of non-resident relief. non-resident relief is a most objectionable form of relief from my point of view.

Recoupment of Guardians travelling expenses within the Union.

9144. In paragraph 17 you mention several small matters which might be left to the discretion of boards of guardians; I notice you do not mention amongst those the payment of expenses for visiting institutions within the union; have you had any cause of complaint on that score?—Yes, constantly, and I should be very glad if those expenses were paid. The principle underlying it is this—that guardians should do their work within the union without payment; if they have to go outside the union, that introduces an argument for payment of their expenses, but within the union they ought to do their work free. As a matter of fact, I think the work does involve a considerable amount of hardship, and I should personally be very glad if guardians could be repaid their reasonable travelling expenses. I would not give them expenses for refreshment, but I would give them their travelling expenses; and I would not allow them to have refreshments at the workhouse on board days and that kind of thing at the cost of the rates; I think that would be opening a very wide door. Their actual out-

of-pocket expenses for the performance of their duties I should be very glad to see paid, and as they would always be subject to the audit, if the auditor saw that it was being abused he would be able to put the check on it.

9145. Then you draw the line at reasonable refreshment?—I would not give them refreshments, because a man must have his refreshment; if he has it at home he has to pay for it, and if he has it whilst he is out, he has to pay for it. I would not pay for his refreshments; but I do think it is reasonable that he should have moderate travelling expenses.

Proposed discretion to Guardians to undertake small structural alteration.

9146. You have also left out of the paragraph that boards of guardians might be left to do small structural alterations under a certain amount in value; would you include that?—No, because there you bring in elements of danger. If once you allow that to be done, except under skilled supervision you may have drains interfered with, and then you may get into danger at once. I remember it being said to me once, It is a very hard thing that we cannot alter this bath without going to the Local Government Board for permission. That was perfectly true, but in altering the bath they would have to alter the communications by which the bath water was conveyed from the premises, and I am not sure if they had been allowed to do it in that particular case that they would not have sent the waste pipe straight into the drain.

9147. Do you think that matters of that kind should be left to inspectors rather than there having to be a correspondence with the Local Government Board?—I think the inspectors do save a great deal of correspondence. I think they possibly sometimes exceed their own authority a little bit when they see a thing being done which is evidently the right thing to be done.

9148. Would they allow a board to make a structural alteration without reporting it to the Local Government Board?—I would rather not answer that question. Strictly speaking, they ought not to.

Power of Guardians to subscribe to Institutions and its possible extension.

9149. With regard to subscriptions to hospitals or other institutions and associations which might render service to boards of guardians, can you apply a principle to those, so that one would be able to distinguish between those institutions which do really render a service to the boards of guardians and those which are merely doing work which indirectly might prevent pauperism?—I think the principle is that where you can show that the ratepayers get actual value for the contributions as in the case of county hospitals or local institutions in the district which grant benefits for the subscription conferred, then the subscription is quite justifiable; but when you come to subscriptions to a general establishment which covers the whole country, then different considerations apply.

9150. Take the case of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children; subscription to that society has been recently permitted by the Local Government Board I think?—Yes. I should certainly pay for that, because they do a direct good work, and in many instances they do it in immediate connection with boards of guardians. In many unions now, when children come into the vagrant ward, as a matter of practice the inspector of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children is communicated with, and he sees the children either when they leave the house, or he comes to the house and sees the children whilst they are there, and if he sees anything wrong he puts the society into operation.

9151. But the law can be put into operation without the society, can it not?—No doubt, but there you have an actual agent of the society to do the work, and so I think it is quite fair that the society should have the subscriptions.

9152. But it actually renders no assistance to the board, does it?—I think it renders a great assistance to the board. It is able to watch these children in a way in which the Guardians cannot do it. Directly a vagrant takes his discharge from the workhouse he is free from all supervision as far as the board of guardians is concerned, but the society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children can follow him up.

9153. As far as the board of guardians are concerned, they may never see either the vagrant or those children any more?—Nevertheless, if the children are in a bad state and require looking after, the society looks after them and prosecutes the parents if it is necessary.

9154. I take it that it is in the interests of the public, but that the service rendered to the board is very small and indirect?—I do not agree with you; I think it is doing a direct service to the ratepayers and to the guardians.

9155. Take the Charity Organisation Society, for instance; do you think that renders a service to the Poor Law by, to a certain extent by relieving people who might otherwise come upon the rates?—I think the Charity Organisation Society worked in connection with the boards of guardians renders inestimable service to the ratepayers.

9156. Do you think that would be a suitable agency to subscribe to?—I should certainly think so, so far as I am personally concerned.

9157. But it would be a very wide interpretation of the principle if Guardians were allowed to subscribe to any organisation that might have a tendency to induce the person it assisted not to become a pauper?—Yes; I should think then it would be indefensible, but the Charity Organisation Society does not induce persons to become paupers.

9158. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Might not Charity Organisation Committees point not only to individual cases which might be of that nature, but to some considerable number of such cases?—Possibly, but only as the appropriate relief to destitute persons. On the other hand, they prevent many from becoming destitute.

9159. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Would you agree to subscribe to any organisation of that kind?—I do not know what the practice of the board has been—whether they have sanctioned subscriptions to the Charity Organisation Society or not. I do not remember a case in my district in which the subscription has been sanctioned or asked for.

9160. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It does not come within the section, does it?—It could not be sanctioned under the section, certainly.

9161. (*Mr. Bentham.*) The point of my question is to see if we can draw a line between those organisations that you say do render a service to the community or to boards of guardians, and those that do not?—I am quite with you as to the need for drawing such a line.

9162. But it is very difficult to draw the line, is it not?—Yes, very. I think the test would be whether they really do give the ratepayers value for the subscription given. The power of granting a subscription is very strictly limited, but I forget the Act in which the section is.

9163. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think it is the Poor Law Act of 1879, is it not?—Yes, I think it is. The subscriptions are only to be given to institutions or establishments which would come within the wording of the section, and I think the Charity Organisation Society would not, so far as I understand it (42 and 43 Vict. c. 54, § 10).

Nursing of out-door sick.

9164. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In your last annual report I think you advocate a system of nursing outdoor patients by nurses in the institution; do you hold to that view now?—I should be very glad it it could be done, but I do not know of any union in which it has been done. I have been preparing a return from all my unions as to the means by which they do the outdoor nursing. The return to me is a very painful one. There are a great many unions in which there is practically very little done, not because the guardians are not willing to do it, but because they have not the means of doing it. There are no nurses to do the out-nursing. I should be very glad if, where the circumstances are convenient, it were possible that the workhouse staff of nurses should be sufficient to enable some of them to do outdoor work. I think the influence would be good in many directions. It would relieve the monotony of the workhouse work, it would increase the experience of the nurses, it would give the outdoor sick poor the nursing which they require, it would bring the nurses in contact with other doctors than the workhouse doctor, and altogether both as regards the poor and as regards the nursing service I think the results might be very valuable. But there are not many places where it could

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

be done; it could only be done where the cases lie within a comparatively limited area. You could not do it in a small country workhouse, placed, say, in an area where you have a sparse population, as is the case in some of my unions where there is only an average of one inhabitant to 5 or 6 acres of land. No nurse could cover the distances there.

9165. Still I suppose you would advocate it more particularly with regard to those districts where there is no nursing association that you might subscribe to?—I do not think that was my intention, but I have not got the passage here and I do not quite remember how it reads. Where there are nursing associations, I think it is an excellent arrangement that guardians should subscribe, and I am happy to say that in some places they do, but there are a great many places in the district where there are nursing associations where the guardians do not subscribe.

Attitude of Central Midwives Board towards Poor Law Infirmaries as training schools and its effects on supply of Poor Law Nurses.

9166. In paragraph 27 you refer to the Central Midwives Board, and you mention a resolution that was passed. You say, "The Midwives Act has, in truth, inflicted a very serious wrong upon workhouse nurses, inasmuch as, until the passing of the Act and the consequent issue of regulations by the Central Midwives Board, Poor Law nurses had no difficulty in presenting themselves for the certificate of the London Obstetrical Society." What is the resolution you there refer to?—The rules of the Central Midwives Board have to be approved by the Privy Council, and the rules of the Central Midwives Board were approved by the Privy Council. Before those rules were approved, there was a clause inserted saying that they should not have effect in hospitals and Poor Law nursing institutions: but after that, the Central Midwives Board passed a resolution that they would not recognise as training schools any Poor Law institution which had less than seventy-five cases a year nor accept as candidates any nurse coming from such institutions.

9167. Would that resolution have to be approved by the Privy Council?—It did not go to the Privy Council, and it was never approved by the Privy Council, and yet they are acting upon it. They do not consider it a rule; they consider it a resolution.

9168. Is there not some misapprehension with regard to that resolution?—I have already corrected myself to the effect that where there is an approved teacher they will receive candidates. That has been explained since I wrote that paragraph. We did not know that at Whitehall when I wrote that paragraph, or at all events I did not know it.

9169. I have a letter here from the Secretary of the Central Midwives Board, in which he says no such resolution was ever passed against Poor Law institutions being recognised as training schools and that each case is dealt with on its merits. I wondered whether you had any information to the contrary, of any Poor Law institution that has received any communication to the effect that the line is drawn at seventy-five patients?—The facts are as I have stated them. After the rules had been approved by the Privy Council, the Central Midwives Board passed a resolution, which, in the first instance, was limited to Poor Law institutions, to the effect that they would not recognise any Poor Law institution which had less than seventy-five cases in the course of the year. About a fortnight, I think it was, after they had passed that resolution, they passed another resolution, applying the same rule to all institutions; and now they will not accept candidates from any Poor Law institution unless they, as they term it, recognise it. They have recognised I think now twelve Poor Law institutions; four in London and eight in the provinces. All the other institutions are not recognised by them, and therefore unless they happen to have medical officers who are accepted by them as approved teachers these other institutions cannot send up candidates to qualify. Those are the facts.

9170. In Portsmouth and Southampton the medical officers have now been recognised, I think?—It so happens that they have approved teachers, and therefore, according to the statement made by the deputation form the Central Midwives Board, candidates could be sent up from those two institutions; but, on the other hand, neither of those institutions has seventy-five cases a year on the average, and therefore if they still adhere to the resolution that they will only accept candidates where there are seventy-five cases a year, neither of those institutions could send up any candidates although the teachers are approved teachers.

9171. Have they sent up any yet for examination?—Not since the Central Midwives Board have taken over the examination. When the London Obstetrical Society examined, they did send and they sent considerable numbers, who almost invariably passed, and passed well. It is a fact that of the candidates who were passed by the London Obstetrical Society, a very considerable proportion were candidates from poor law institutions. It is only natural that it should be so, because those candidates, as I have already explained, were nearly always three years' trained nurses in addition to having their midwifery knowledge. By the action of the Central Midwives Board, the nurses who up to that time could go up to qualify are prevented from going up to qualify. Then they made an additional requirement, which it is not for me to question. The London Obstetrical Society were satisfied with the candidate having personally attended five cases, having been present at fifteen more, and then being able to pass the examination; but the Central Midwives Board have raised the number of personal attendances to twenty, that is fifteen more than the London Obstetrical Society required, besides the examination, and in addition they will only accept candidates from institutions which they recognise as training institutions.

9172. Do you not think this will have the effect of interfering with the quality of the persons who apply for training as nurses in Poor Law institutions?—Certainly, I think it will. Some way, I hope, will be found out of the difficulty, but if it be persisted in, it will certainly have a most detrimental effect upon the candidates in our Poor Law institutions, and, as I think, a most uncalled-for effect. When the London Obstetrical Society gave up their work the Workhouse Nursing Association, which included one member of the Central Midwives Board, wrote to the London Obstetrical Society expressing their appreciation of the admirable work which had been done by the London Obstetrical Society; and although the Central Midwives Board have very largely raised the number of cases which they consider necessary for qualification—that I do not question at all; that is entirely within their own competence, and it is not for me to say whether they are right or whether they are wrong—there is no question that some members at all events of the Central Midwives Board are well aware that the London Obstetrical Society's examination was a thorough one, and that the Society did its work very well.

Appointment of Superintendent Relieving Officers.

9173. Then I think you express approval of the appointment of superintendent relieving officers where they can be usefully employed?—Yes.

9174. Do you not agree that a superintendent relieving Officer ought not to be appointed everywhere, but that where there might be only two relieving officers say in a district that the clerk to the guardians ought to have more power over the relieving officer than he has, and might act in the capacity of a superintendent relieving officer?—It would be a very difficult question to answer generally. I do not think you would find many clerks to the Guardians who would be willing to undertake that work; I should think the large majority of the clerks to the Guardians would be very unwilling to undertake it. Besides, I do not know that you would find many clerks to the guardians who are specially qualified to undertake it. You will find a few clerks of course who are very keen about Poor Law work and take a great interest in relief work.

Possible supervision of out-relief by Clerks to Guardians.

9175. But they are generally better qualified than the relieving officers that are employed, are they not?—In the large majority of unions the clerk is not required to devote his whole time to the work, and he only does it as part of his ordinary daily work. Very often the details of the clerk's work are to a great extent done by somebody in his office.

9176. In those cases is it not more necessary that someone should be in closer touch with the relieving officers than is the case at present?—I think it would be an excellent thing that you should have a much

larger staff of relieving officers in every union, and that where you have your larger staff you should have either a superintendent relieving officer or an inspecting relieving officer who should see that they do their work thoroughly. But then comes in the element of expense. That would of course make it a very much more expensive process. I believe in the long run it would be a saving, because I think you would practically exterminate pauperism thereby, and that it would be one of the great means of getting rid of pauperism in the course of a few years' time; but meanwhile it would be very expensive. You very often find with guardians now that you cannot get them to understand what the relieving officer's work really is. You find now that some guardians say a relieving officer has not half enough work to do, and the fewer the number of cases he has the more strongly they say it, although the fewness of his cases may be a proof of the goodness of his work, as I have already tried to explain.

9177. The clerk at the present time has practically no authority over the relieving officer, so long as he attends to his duties according to the orders, has he?—The clerk has no administrative authority of any kind over anybody, outside his own department.

9178. Do you think it inadvisable for him to be appointed superintendent, as it were?—I do not see how you would find that it would work, unless you entirely alter the status of the clerk to the guardians. This is quite a new suggestion to me, and I am speaking on the spur of the moment, but it would not occur to me that that would be a likely solution of the problem at all. It might serve in those unions where the clerk devotes the whole of his time to the work, that is, in the large town unions; but even there I think you would find that the majority of the clerks would not care to have the duty put upon them, and are already fully occupied.

9179. You could not expect that a superintendent relieving officer should be appointed in every union, even in some cases where there are only two relieving officers, and indeed it would not be advisable in cases of that kind, would it?—I do not think the employment of the clerk would work. I am quite with you in regard to your object, but I do not think that would bring it about.

Provision for Poor Law children at Portsmouth and South Stoneham.

9180. The children in connection with the Portsmouth union are all in one home, as I understand it?—Yes.

9181. And there are some 300 to 350 children, I think?—The Portsmouth guardians take the children from Gosport, Fareham, Winchester and Petersfield, and they also take the boys from Steyning.

9182. It is really a district school then, is it not?—No, it is not a school at all it is only a home. They do not get any schooling there, except the infants. The infants under six or seven are taught there in an infant school, but all who are old enough to go out to school go to the public elementary schools. It is only a children's home, but it is an excellent one. I do not know any place where the children are better done by at Portsmouth; to my mind, it is a model of the best means of treating pauper children.

9183. At South Stoneham the children are all inside the workhouse and are educated there, I understand?—South Stoneham is one of the three workhouse schools which still remain in my district—to my regret.

9184. Is it intended to abolish that?—I cannot tell you. That hangs to some extent upon the rectification of the boundaries between South Stoneham and Southampton, which I have already alluded to. If I had my way it would be altered undoubtedly.

9185. How many children are there there?—On the 13th week of the Lady Day quarter this year there were thirty-seven boys and thirty-eight girls.

9186. All belonging to the South Stoneham union?—Yes, I do not think that they take any children from outside.

9187. You have advocated the abolition of this entirely, have you not?—Yes, I have, on principle; but it is only fair to say that those children, especially the boys, are happy and well cared for. There are separate schools and separate teachers and attendants for the boys and for the girls, and they mix a good deal with the outside world. The boys have their cricket team and play out matches. Some of them sing in the village choir at Westend, and they are constantly associating with the outside children—much more than is usually the case with workhouse children. They have had particularly good officers there, and a very good board of guardians, who take great interest in the children; and although I do not approve myself of bringing up children in the workhouse, I think those children have been uncommonly well done by and are happy.

Scales of out-relief and their dangers.

9188. There is another point with regard to out-door relief which I omitted to put to you just now; I noticed from what you said that you are not in favour of a scale of relief?—Certainly not.

9189. Do you mean that you are not in favour of any stipulated scale being drawn up by the guardians for the guidance of the guardians in giving outdoor relief?—I think it mischievous.

9190. How would you distinguish between a family that was to be relieved outside consisting of nine persons, and a family also to be relieved outside consisting of three persons?—I would have the full circumstances of the family of nine investigated and the full circumstances of the family of three investigated, down to their most complete ramifications. I would then make an order if it had to be an order for outdoor relief, for what was necessary to relieve the destitution in the family of nine and for what was necessary to relieve the destitution in the family of three. I would limit that order to one fortnight, and at the end of the fortnight I would have that thorough investigation repeated.

9191. It is merely an arithmetical calculation then?—Not the least in the world. The circumstances may be absolutely different.

9192. That is my point; the circumstances are different?—The family of nine probably would have three or four of the children who are bringing in something.

9193. You say that in one case there might be an income?—I say that the income might be quite different in the two cases.

9194. You do not understand that where there is an income the scale is adhered to exactly, that is, the same amount is given as where there is no income coming into the family, do you?—No; but the necessity of the individual may be quite different. One child may be sick and may require very expensive treatment, and the other children may be well and require hardly anything.

9195. Usually the scale is fixed as a minimum, and is for guidance only?—It is generally used in practice as a maximum scale.

9196. In that case it is an injustice to the recipient and not to the ratepayer?—It is an injustice to the ratepayer or to the recipient; it is either not wanted or it is inadequate, as I have already explained.

Advantages of administration of relief by whole Board of Guardians.

9197. Would you leave it to the individual opinion, as it were, of each committee on the board?—If I had my way I would abolish every relief committee to-morrow. The most important of all the duties of boards of guardians is the relief of destitution, and it is a duty which ought to be performed by the full board and after the fullest deliberation and consideration.

9198. Do you mean that the full board should deal with all the details of every case?—Certainly. You say they cannot afford to give the time; if they do the work, the time must be given, and the work cannot be done unless the time is given. It is because they will not afford to give the time that the work is glossed over and done imperfectly.

9199. Is it not in those cases where the relief is given by the whole board that you have the most lax administration?—Yes; simply because the work is not thoroughly done. But that is no argument against its being done by the whole board. If you have it done by committees, it generally means that the guardian of the parish and the relieving officer decide what the amount is to be, that is, the guardian of the parish is not only the judge but the advocate in the case.

9200. Does that not depend upon whether the guardian who represents the parish is sitting to give the relief in that parish; that need not necessarily be so, need it?—Not necessarily, but as a matter of practice I think

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

every guardian who represents a parish feels very much inclined to think that his parish ought to get something, and he always "sticks up," as it is called, for the cases from his own parish.

9201. Do you find that is exactly the case in a large board of guardians, where all the guardians sit to give relief—that the one who represents the parish advocates a particular applicant from his parish, and the others fall in with his suggestion, in order that they may get his support for their cases meanwhile; and they do not expect each other to interfere in the cases belonging to their own parish?—Yes.

9202. It becomes an understood thing?—Yes, but it is an unfortunate exercise of their discretion What I want boards of guardians to do is to sit and to act impartially. If you have a small committee of which a guardian and the relieving officer are two, you will find that their influence is almost necessarily—as a matter of practice it is—paramount; and they get the relief they ask for. But it you have a full board who are doing their work honestly, they will not decide according to the inclination of the guardian for a particular parish; they will look into the whole merits of the case, and they will decide what the necessities of the applicant may be. There are no two cases which are alike. The exigencies of life vary in a thousand ways between any two cases you like to bring up; you cannot bring up two cases which are exactly alike, and to which a similar scale can apply—in equity, any how.

Adoption by Guardians of regulations as to relief.

9203. Precisely for the same reason that you object to a scale, I take it you would object to regulations for the guidance of the guardians?—No, not at all; I thoroughly approve of regulations if they are sound, and if they will stick to them. I object to regulations being passed and hung up as a dummy on the board-room wall, which is frequently the case, I am sorry to say. I think the Manchester rules, for instance, did excellent work.

9204. The Manchester rules alone, without committee work, would probably be hung upon the wall, would they not?—I do not think so; I do not at all see why.

9205. Have you heard of cases which would be considered among the worst administered practically in the country, yet where they have very strict regulations?—No. A good many of the guardians in my district have at one time or another attended Poor Law Conferences, and have had the advantages of these regulations pressed upon them. When they came home they have adopted and sent round to the members, and one copy has been regulations which have been printed framed and hung up on the wall. I have appealed many a time to the regulations on the wall; but without much result.

9206. Is it not usually the case where the guardians are interested in giving relief to particular applicants from their parish, that the regulations are ignored by the interested administrators?—Certainly.

Apathy of Boards of Guardians as to administration of relief.

9207. But where you get disinterested committees, who are moving round from one district to another, you will get your regulations adhered to?—No; I would much rather have that work done by the full board. I think it is the most important duty of the whole board, and would much rather it were done by the whole board. I know I do not get it done, but I feel most strongly that of all the duties the guardians have to perform the administration of relief is far and away the most important. As a matter of fact, in practice there is comparatively little attention paid to it. Over and over again, you see most of the guardians present during the public business; they discuss any points which may come up on points of public business such as resolutions sent up by other guardians, and any burning questions; but directly the public business ceases and the relieving officer is called in, a proportion of the guardians walk out. You often see that.

Unreliability of statistics as to "able-bodied" paupers.

9208. (*Professor Smart.*) In paragraph 4 you say "The official statistics as to able-bodied pauperism are misleading, inasmuch as, owing to the imperfect mode of classification, large numbers are returned as able-bodied who are not able-bodied"; could you mention some of these cases?—Yes. In a great many unions, if a man is under sixty and is not on any special diet, he is returned as able-bodied, although he may not be able-bodied at all. It is extremely difficult to alter the manner in which the statistics have been kept, because if you do, you alter their value for comparative purposes. That is the great difficulty of the subject. Taking my own unions, you would find a number of people returned as able-bodied, whereas if you were to overhaul those people, you would find that most of them were not. Take, for instance, Wimborne union in Dorsetshire; there you have ninety-five inmates, and of those, ten are returned as able-bodied; if you were to examine those ten, you would probably not find one that could go outside and earn his livelihood; he is simply returned as able-bodied because he happens to be not on any special diet and is under sixty.

9209. Have you any other class of cases?—Yes, I think you might find this: Supposing a man applies for relief, and he himself is temporarily ailing, he and his wife and family are all returned as able-bodied, although he obtains relief on the ground of temporary sickness. Then supposing, on the other hand, a man applies for relief on the ground of the sickness of his wife, he and she would both be returned as sick, although he might be quite able-bodied. There you have what appears on the face of it almost an absurdity—that the man who is really sick is returned as able-bodied because he is only temporarily sick, and the man who is able-bodied is returned as sick because his wife is sick. In many places I think you will find they are so classified.

Paucity of genuinely able-bodied paupers.

9210. These are the ones that occur to you at the moment?—Yes. Going through the whole of the rural unions now—and indeed through many of the town unions—it is safe to say that you will not find an able-bodied man in the house, not a man who can go out and get sufficient employment to earn his daily bread.

9211. But the point is that these people have been returned to the public as able-bodied?—That is what I say: they are returned as able-bodied, although as a matter of fact they are not able-bodied. You will find able-bodied women, no doubt, because you will find women with children, who are in the house because they cannot maintain themselves and the children outside. With regard to in-door relief, there is a very important point which is very much overlooked, and that is that the cost of indoor relief is represented to the public as being much higher than it actually is. I refer to that in my memorandum.

The value of workhouse products as a factor in the cost of indoor relief.

9212. You do, and that is what I was going to question you upon more fully?—Everything that is produced in the workhouse is not taken into account at the cost of its production, but at just under what the market price would be if it had to be bought. Take Portsmouth, for example. I went into the question there with some minuteness three or four years ago. They produce a great deal of pork, and they grow all their vegetables. That pork does not cost them 1d. per lb. and their vegetables do not cost them ½d. per dozen, I suppose; and yet the pork is estimated as costing 6d. or 7d. per lb., just under the market value whatever it is, and their vegetables are estimated also at something under the market value. So you get a return of the cost which really is what the cost would be if it all had to be paid for, though, as matter of fact, it is produced for almost nothing, and the real cost is what the actual cost of production is.

9213. I want to know what accounts you are speaking of; are they accounts that come before the public, and would these appear as goods purchased at the market price?—They are taken into account in the workhouse books, not as being purchased, but at the market price. The pork, instead of being taken at 8d., which might be the market price, would be taken at 7d. or whatever it is, and so entered as the cost of workhouse maintenance. I have given up trying to get at the cost of indoor maintenance for this reason, that the actual cost of indoor maintenance is what the items consumed amount to, minus all repayments towards the in-maintenance of some of the inmates and minus the value of what is produced by the inmates. There, again, I think the public suffer very much, because there is a great prejudice against workhouse inmates doing work. If you start wood-chopping, some outside person objects that it is interfering with the wood-chopping trade. I do not see why it should not be done. I think that any remunerative work that can be done in the workhouse ought to be allowed to be done. The workhouses ought not to

The value of workhouse products as a factor in the cost of indoor-relief.

under-sell the outside market, but they ought to be allowed to make everything they want for their own consumption, and to produce and to sell everything that they are able to produce. It is for the benefit of the ratepayers that they should. The other argument is simply for the benefit of the individual who would otherwise supply the article which is required. I think the benefit of the ratepayers ought to prevail against the interest of any individual.

9214. You are speaking here of a calculation of the cost per head ?—Yes.

9215. (*Mr. Booth.*) If the cost of the article is increased by the work done in the workhouse, to what account does the credit go of the money which has been earnt?——It is purely mythical.

9216. It would not be mythical in the accounts. If you increase the debit side of the account by the value of the labour, the value of that labour must, if the accounts are to balance, be put in somewhere on the other side of the account ?—I do not think it is put in at all.

9217. Then in that case it could not be charged on the other side ?—The pork which is produced at 1d. is charged at the rate of 6d. or whatever it is.

9218. The 5d. must appear on the credit side of the account if the 6d. appears on the debit side of the account, or else the account will not balance ?—The account, to my mind, is an incorrect account. It represents what the cost would be if everything had to be paid for.

9219. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would they not keep a farm account, or whatever they call it, and enter the receipt in that account ?—They keep a farm account, and it is from the farm account that they get the real cost. They were able to give me, when I went into that, what the actual cost of the pork was. The actual cost of the pork really only amounted to the cost of the pigs from which the other pigs were bred, and of some of the food.

9220. But in estimating the cost of in-maintenance as it is given in the published figures, is not the profit that comes from the farm account set off against that account —From my point of view there ought to be no profit from the farm account.

9221. You ought not to exaggerate the cost of the pauper unless you charge that exaggeration to some other account ?—They do. They represent the pork which is given to the pauper in the cost of in-maintenance at 6d. per lb, or whatever the amount may be.

9222. To what account is that increase and aggravation of the expense credited ?—It goes to the cost of indoor maintenance.

9223. In that case the cost of indoor maintenance should be the nett amount, not the gross ?—In that case the cost of indoor maintenance is represented as 5d. or 6d. per lb. higher than the actual cost. The actual cost they have in their farm account, but they do not have it in their indoor maintenance account.

9224. (*Chairman.*) Is this not the case, that the farm sells at a nominal profit certain articles to the workhouse, that is to say, the article which it can produce at 1d. it sells at 6d. but there is no transaction which takes place between the two ?—None.

9225. What is the reason of putting the price up—is it in order to prevent it being said that they were under-selling the outside market ?—No. The guardians have a practice in the case of everything that is consumed on the premises of taking it into account at just under the market price. That is almost invariably the case in workhouses, so instead of showing what the actual cost of indoor maintenance is, the account shows what the cost would be if all those things were bought at the price which they are represented to have cost.

9226. The workhouse account shows cost of maintenance—so much ?—Yes.

9227. Then it shows that there have been certain disbursements in cash, and those disbursements in cash would be less than the cost which is shown ?—No disbursements in cash come into the question here.

9228. There are certain things which are bought outside, are there not ?—But not these things which are produced.

9229. The things which are bought outside are bought at a certain price ?—Yes.

9230. And the price at which they are bought is the price entered in that case, but in the case of those things which are produced inside they are put down at a fictitious price ?—Yes.

The value of workhouse products as a factor in the cost of indoor relief.

9231. Therefore the only transaction in which money passes is as regards the things that are bought outside ?—Yes.

9232. And the amount that would be charged on the rates would only be the actual disbursements ?—The amount that is actually charged on the rates would be as you say ; but the amount which is shown to the public as the cost of indoor maintenance is a fictitious amount, which represents the cost of in-maintenance to be considerably higher than it actually is.

9233. That of course does not affect the amount of the rate, because the rate is only levied to cover the amount actually expended ?—It does not affect the amount of the rate, but it gives the outside public the idea that the indoor expenditure is very much higher than it really is.

9234. (*Mr. Loch.*) There is no correlation between the farm accounts and the indoor relief account, is there ?—No.

9235. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) But the amount would be credited to the farm account in the ledger, would it not ?—Yes. You will find it is a constant thing for the workhouse masters to show the guardians what they are pleased to call their profit on the farm account.

9236. That is their reason for this, is it not ?—Exactly. The farm account shows the actual expenditure, and then when they take the produce into account, they charge it just under the market value to the items which are taken into account, and the difference between the actual expenditure and the price at which they enter it in the account is what they consider their profit.

9237. (*Chairman.*) Therefore the profit on the farm is in reduction of the total expense of maintenance and the difference supplied by the rates ?—Quite so.

9238. (*Mr. Booth.*) But the amount which is given us in our statistics must be the actual amount after allowing for the profit on the farm, surely ?—No.

9239. Then it is incorrect ?—The amount that is levied as poor rate is the actual amount of the expenditure, but the amount which is represented as the cost of in-maintenance is very considerably greater than the actual amount of expenditure.

9240. Then why should the figure in the Blue-book be incorrect ? According to you it is absolutely incorrect ?—Because the guardians and their officers like to show what they are pleased to call their profit on the farm.

9241. They might like to do that, but they ought not to return their statement of what it has cost without allowing credit for this ?—You and I are perfectly at one on that.

9242. (*Chairman.*) I suppose the contention would be this—if we did not sell this to the workhouse we should sell it to the public at a profit ?—Yes.

9243. And that would be an actual profit ?—Yes.

9244. Assuming that they were to deal directly with it, they would sell at a profit, and the workhouse would have to buy other articles in their stead at the price which is charged ?—That is the way they put it.

9245. (*Mr. Booth.*) What is their object, or anybody's object, in exaggerating the statistical statement of the cost of in-maintenance ?—Their object is exactly what the Chairman has stated it to be ; that is, they might say, "We will not use this at all, but we will sell it all outside."

9246. If they did that, what would they do with the profit—they cannot put it into their own pockets ?—They would get the profit, which they would then spend upon buying the things for the workhouse.

9247. And in that way they would reduce to the public the cost of in-maintenance ?—Quite so. To me it is not convincing at all, and that is why I have mentioned the fact. From my point of view the cost is represented as being very much higher than it actually is. In most workhouses there are some inmates for whom payment is made towards the cost of their maintenance, they being

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

9 April, 1906.

either pensioners or people who have relations who pay for them. Those payments I believe are not usually credited to the cost of in-maintenance, but are paid into the common fund. They do not go to reduce the cost of in-maintenance, but they go into the common fund and reduce the general cost.

9248. Possibly it is the same with the profit on the farm, and that goes to the common fund?—The profit on the farm certainly goes to the common fund. There are a great many workhouses where they can produce a great deal, or could produce a great deal, and the inmates are prevented from producing because it is said that it would interfere with outside work. Now that is perfectly wrong. It appears to me that every workhouse ought to be allowed to produce all that it can. It ought not to under-sell other labour, but so long as it keeps up its price, I cannot see any reason whatever why it should not produce, nor can I see any argument in favour of saying that the workhouse should not be a producing establishment and should not sell all that it can produce, for the benefit of the ratepayers. As a matter of practice it is not usually done, and if guardians do it there is almost always opposition excited. One knows what it is with the wood-cutting, and how difficult it is even to get wood-cutting done without opposition from outside. I cannot see in justice why the outside wood-chopper should be bolstered up by refusing to allow the inmates of the workhouse to cut up firewood to be sold from the workhouse. The same with all other industries. I can remember when there was a good deal of mat-making in workhouses, but that is almost entirely given up now, because it was complained that it competed with outside labour.

9249. (*Professor Smart.*) But you agree that they should not under-sell?—They should not under-sell, but everything they want for themselves they ought to be able to provide, whereas they are not allowed to do that, because it is said if they do it prevents outside people from getting the sale of their goods. In many workhouses guardians will not allow mat-making, because they say the ratepayers who sell mats ought to have the advantage of their custom.

9250. Is that so?—It is a common thing. If you want, say, bedsteads for the sick poor, there are certain bedsteads which are specially adapted for the sick poor, made upon Dr. Lawson Tait's pattern. If guardians buy those they almost invariably buy them through some local contractor, so that the ratepayer may get a profit, instead of buying them direct from the particular manufacturer.

9251. Of course the same argument would apply to washing?—Quite so. My argument is that the cost of indoor relief is now represented as being very much higher than it really is, and that it might be reduced very much more if the labour available in the workhouse could be utilised to its fullest extent in producing.

The relief of the incompetent.

9252. In reference to paragraphs 9 and 10, I think we should all agree with you as to the difference between the problem of the Poor Law in 1834 and the problem now. The question then was, how to get rid of the aggressive able-bodied pauper, and now it is, how to provide best for the helpless, the sick and the aged. Do you not think that under modern circumstances there is a class which comes between the two—namely, those who cannot keep up with the demands of modern industry either for want of skilled training or for want of full health, and those who have come to the age of fifty and are thrown out by younger men? Where would you place them in the modern organism?—If they were destitute, I should leave them to the Poor Law. If they were not destitute, I should not relieve them at all.

9253. You say the problem is "How best to provide for the helpless, the sick and the aged;" would you put those under the helpless, the sick, or the aged?—They would come under the helpless, so far as they would require to be dealt with under the Poor Law at all.

9254. Would you hand them over to charity?—If charity can deal with them, certainly. If you can organise charity so as to deal with that class of case, it ought to be done by that means. If I were an autocrat, I would never let anybody come under the Poor Law who might by any possibility be provided for by any other means; I would take the Poor Law absolutely as the last resource.

The relief of the temporarily unemployed.

9255. You must admit the possibility now of men being temporarily unemployed through no fault of their own at all; yet it does not seem to me that you provide any place of relief for them by the problem you put before us?—If I were an autocratic administrator I should take them all into the workhouse whilst they were out of work, and provide for them everything they want under conditions which would force them to resume work as soon as they were able to do so. They would then have a constant inducement not to be destitute when temporarily unemployed.

Legislation tending to laxity of relief.

9256. In paragraph 11 you say, "legislation during recent years has certainly appeared to run counter to the principles laid down by the Commission of 1834"; from what year would you date the new trend of things?—I am afraid I can hardly state that definitely, but there have been a good many Acts of Parliament passed which certainly seem to run counter to the principles which were laid down by the Poor Law Commissioners.

9257. You do not mean the Act of 1894 or of 1900, do you?—At this moment I can hardly go back in detail, but I can work up that point for you. It is quite certain that the principle that destitution should be the sole claim for relief has not been insisted upon.

9258. In paragraph 13 you say, "It is quite conceivable that relief might successfully be claimed by a family with a very considerable income"; have you ever known any case like that in reality?—No, and I think it would be difficult to get hold of an actual case, but it is evident that there may be cases in which there are several members of the family who are temporarily disabled and who are receiving 5s., which might amount between them to a considerable income which the guardians are prohibited from taking into account.

Proportion of out and in-door relief.

9259. Do you give us anywhere in your memorandum figures showing the proportion of outdoor relief and in-door relief in your district as a whole?—In the Table at the end I have given the fullest figures, and there you will find that proportion set out.

9260. Do you give the average for the whole district?—Yes.

9261. Do you remember what it is?—The percentage on outdoor relief for the whole district at Lady Day last year was 76·7, and the percentage of indoor relief 23·93.

9262. With a percentage of 76·7 on outdoor relief, do you not think you are a little sanguine in your hopes of getting rid of the outdoor problem?—Not the least in the world.

9263. Even with 76·7 on outdoor relief just now?—No. I wonder sometimes that it is not higher than it is.

TWENTY-FIFTH DAY.

Tuesday, 10th April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. BALDWYN FLEMING, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming. 10 April, 1906.

Relieving Officers' method of filling up their Application and Report Books.

9264. (*Dr. Downes.*) Do you find that the relieving officers are as careful as you would wish in keeping their application and report books?—Some keep them very well, but some keep them carelessly. The application and report book, as a rule, does not contain by any means the close particulars which one would wish to see recorded there; and in consequence of that, the Case Paper system seems to me to be very superior to mere reliance on the application and report book.

9265. In the earlier instructions of the Commissioners, published in their Seventh Report, to which reference was made yesterday, the Commissioners lay a great deal of stress on the importance of ascertaining the causes of pauperism, and they state that they have specially appropriated columns in the relieving officer's books and in the admission and discharge book to show the cause of the application for relief. Do you think it possible that the relieving officers, if they had more time and were better instructed, could inquire more carefully than perhaps some of them do into the causes of the applications?—Certainly they could.

9266. I believe it is a customary thing for them to fill up that column with simply the word "poverty"?—Very often the column is not filled up at all.

9267. Whereas the Commissioners apparently wanted to know what was the cause of that poverty?—Quite so.

9268. For example, was it sickness or was it intemperance?—Yes. When the cause is sickness or the application is for a midwifery order it very often is entered; but when the cause is somewhat indefinite, or has not been thoroughly ascertained by the relieving officer, often it is not entered at all, or only in a vague and unsatisfactory manner At all events, that information is not usually as closely given as it is very important that it should be.

Extent of Relieving Officers' duty to investigate causes of pauperism.

9269. Would you agree that an intelligent investigation of the causes of pauperism might enable administrators to deal with those causes?—Certainly; but when I have put that to officers and to guardians, I have had the answer that that is rather in excess of the duties of the relieving officer as laid down in the Consolidated Order. The duties of the relieving officer as laid down in the Consolidated Order are by no means very definite. By Article 215 of the Consolidated Order of July, 1847, among his duties it is stated that he has "to receive all applications for relief made to him within his district, or relating to any parish situated within his district, and forthwith to examine into the circumstances of every case by visiting the house of the applicant (if situated within his district), and by making all necessary inquiries into the state of health, the ability to work, the condition and family, and the means of such applicant, and to report the result of such inquiries in the prescribed form to the guardians at their next ordinary meeting, and also to visit from time to time as requisite all paupers receiving relief, and to report concerning the same as the guardians may direct." If that is thoroughly worked out, it would give everything that I should like to see done; but, as a matter of fact, the only column in the application and report book which really gives the opportunity of complying with the instruction I have just read, is the column headed "If partially or wholly disabled, and the description of disability." There is really no sufficient column for recording the reasons of the application. You have columns for the name of the applicant, the residence, how long resident, calling or occupation, whether single or married, widow or widower, etc. Among the other columns, you have one headed, "Present cause of seeking relief or nature of application"; but that is only a very narrow column, with no room, or, at all events, no invitation to fill up the particulars which one would like to see. Relieving officers generally complement this by their own note book. In their own note book they have much fuller information than appears on the application and report book. At the same time, the ordinary relieving officer's information is by no means as close as one would wish it to be.

9270. Should you be in favour of greater importance and prominence being given to that portion of the application and report book?—Certainly. I think the most important part of the whole of a relieving officer's work is thorough investigation on the original application and on its subsequent renewal.

Duty of Workhouse Chaplain to report as to children.

9271. In those same instructions to which I have referred, the Assistant-Commissioner is directed to inquire into the results of the training and education of the chidren; I see from your last annual report that you havle been making some inquiry into these results?—I have endeavoured to go into that subject with considerable care. The position is very much altered since the instructions were issued to the Assistant-Commissioners in 1841, or earlier. In those days there were practically few schools available, and the workhouse school was the place where the workhouse children, I take it, almost universally received their education; whereas, now, they almost universally do not receive their education there, but go outside. It used to be made a specific duty of the chaplain that once a month he was to report upon the general condition and progress of the children. Since the children have been sent out to school, this obligation on the chaplain has been, to a great extent, allowed to lapse, and I believe it is held that the chaplain is not bound to make this report where the children do not receive their schooling in the workhouse. I ask very often for the reports made by the chaplain, but I seldom find them. It is an unusual thing now in the chaplain's book to see the monthly report upon the condition and progress of the children, although in earlier days it was a regular thing that those reports should be made

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

Information as to after-careers of Poor Law children.

9272. What sources of information exist for tracing the future of these children? I take it that for the metropolitan district we have what is known as the M.A.B.Y.S.?—Yes.

9273. What have you for the girls and boys in the country?—I am afraid there is very little information which is regularly obtained upon the future doings of the children who are sent out into situations from the workhouses. Some years ago Mr. Murray Brown and myself—and I am not sure that one or two of our colleagues did not take the same line of investigation—endeavoured to ascertain what had become of a number of children who had been sent out from the workhouse schools, or, at all events, some of the larger of them, during a certain number of years. I got a careful return from the Farnham and Hartley Wintney district school, and as near a return as I could from some of the larger workhouses. I gave some of the results in my annual report of the time.

9274. Would that be printed in the annual report of the Local Government Board?—Yes. The results were very satisfactory, and the percentage of failures was small.

9275. In that case, you got your information, to a great extent, from the superintendents of the schools, did you not?—In the case of the district school, the information was obtained chiefly by the then superintendent of the school and the matron, with the very cordial co-operation of the managers. There was a good deal of trouble taken over it, and they worked out a very fairly complete result. Some of the indications were vaguer than I liked; but still, on the whole, the return was a fairly good one and as I say the results were very satisfactory.

9276. Is it not the fact that a considerable number of these children keep in touch with their teachers after they have left the school?—Yes, a considerable number do. I tested my information in this way: I got a return from all the workhouses in my district, of the number of inmates in the workhouses who had been brought up in Poor Law institutions. If I remember rightly, there was hardly one who was physically and mentally competent. That showed that whatever became of them, they did not come back into the workhouses.

9277. Then you had another way of testing it?—I tested it further by getting information—I forget whether it was through the board or how it was obtained,—as to the proportion of prisoners who had been brought up in workhouse establishments. There again, the proportion was exceedingly small. There had been a statement made by one of the prison chaplains which drew my attention to the subject; I think it was to the effect that some of the worst prisoners he had ever had were people who had been brought up in workhouses; there were some rather alarming and wide statements of that kind which I endeavoured afterwards to verify. The result was that a very small proportion of prisoners had been brought up as pauper children. That, coupled with the fact that very few indeed found there way back to the workhouse, proved two things namely, that they were not sent into the criminal classes and that they were not sent into the pauper class by the education they received at the hands of the guardians.

9278. (*Chairman.*) May I ask what was the date of that inquiry of yours?—I can hardly answer; it was some years ago.

9279. My object in asking was to ascertain what system of education these children were the product of?—That was very varied. Some had been entirely brought up in the workhouse, some had been living in the workhouse and going outside to the public elementary schools, some had been in district schools, and some, no doubt, had been boarded-out.

9280. Was the district school system in full force then?—I have only one district school, and that is a comparatively small one.

9281. Was it in your own district that you made these inquiries?—Yes, the return was confined to my own district. I was anxious to test it for my own district. Mr. Murray Brown did the same and his results confirmed mine.

9282. What was his district?—I think he had the Welsh district at that time.

9283. (*Dr. Downes.*) There is an interesting reference to the results as regards workhouse children in your last report, which perhaps you might like to mention?—Yes. There I have given a very striking instance, which was one of several that came under my observation. Perhaps I may read it: "It must not be supposed for a moment that children brought up in workhouses are failures afterwards. Such is far from being the case. The failures are comparatively few, and some of the children turn out surprisingly well. A boy who was for seven years in the workhouse"—I will not mention the workhouse—"displayed the most conspicuous gallantry in the efforts to save the guns at Colenso. He received the distinguished conduct medal for his splendid courage and was afterwards presented with the freedom of the borough. General S——, who was similarly honoured, referred to him in these terms: 'I should like to add my own congratulations to an old soldier of yours upon the splendid work achieved. I do not think that our Mayor can have known that he had so distinguished a person in front of him as Driver, now Bombardier, H. G., who showed himself one of the bravest soldiers in the field. It was he who, among others, did so much towards the saving of disaster and the retrieving of our guns at Colenso.'" That boy went forward after poor Lieutenant Roberts had been shot down; he and some others volunteered to try to get the guns in, and displayed such distinguished bravery that that was the result. There were, I think, from Portsmouth no less than thirty boys who served in South Africa, some of them with considerable distinction. Some of them lost their lives there.

Training-ships for Poor Law boys: their finance and results.

9284. Do you think the guardians make sufficient use of training ships?—No. I wish they used them more. There is an excellent training ship in my own district, the "Mercury," where there are about forty or fifty vacant berths, but the boards of guardians will not send their children there because they shy at the expense. Captain Hoare, whose private enterprise the "Mercury" is, charges £21 a year for them; they cost him over £30. He will take the guardians' children at £21 a year, but the guardians think that excessive, and are reluctant to send them. As a matter of fact, it is short-sighted policy because his children do astonishingly well. I saw a letter from some of the Admiralty authorities lately to Captain Hoare saying that the boys from the "Mercury," were about the most successful boys that they ever received; that they all did uncommonly well, and that the percentage of the boys who had obtained desirable posts was higher from the "Mercury" than from any other training ship from which they received boys. In the workhouse the boys cost, I suppose, 5s. per week on an average, that is, £13 per year, and Captain Hoare charges £21 per year, which is a difference of £8. He keeps them for two or three years as the case may be, and that makes a difference of £16 on the two years, or £24 on the three years as compared with what they cost in the workhouse. At the end of the second or third year he gets the large majority of them out either into the navy or into the military bands or the naval bands. He has an admirable band of boys there. The boys have everything that they can possibly require; they are most carefully looked after and trained; and to get all that for £21 a year appears to me to be extremely moderate.

9285. Do you know if any capitation grant is given by the Admiralty or the War Office?—Yes; the Admiralty give a grant for each boy that is passed into their service. I cannot tell you what the grant is, but there is a grant for the boys that pass into the service. Captain Hoare manages to pass many of his boys in as first-class boys.

9286. But apart from the capitation grant, the cost is what you have told us?—Yes, £21.

9287. Have you ever heard it suggested by boards of guardians that the Admiralty or the War Office or, at any rate, the Government should bear a larger share of the cost of such boys?—I have often heard guardians say so, but I do not know myself that it would be easy to do it or indeed desirable that it should be done. They do not know until the boy passes whether he will be fit to go into the Navy or in what rank he will go into the Navy. I suppose if the Government were to give a further grant, it would only be given to boys who went into the Navy,

and would be according to the value of the boy when he went into the Navy, that is, according to the class into which he went. I think if such an inducement as that could further one's object in getting boys into the training ships, that it would be very well spent money. It is the best thing you can do with the boys, especially with a certain class of boy who has been brought up perhaps a little bit roughly and whom it is difficult to bring into the discipline of an in-door establishment, but who shapes admirably on a training ship. You can do with a big burly boy on a ship, and he very soon gets knocked into shape and probably turns out an admirable sailor, although if he has been kept in a workhouse school there might have been a failure.

Provision for special classes of sick children.

9288. Have you any difficulty in your district in dealing with special classes of sick children or ailing children: take the tuberculous children for instance?—I do not know any place where that class of children can be properly treated in the country workhouses. Where you have big infirmaries like Southampton and Portsmouth, and in a lesser degree at Farnham, Basingstoke, Salisbury and some others, you may have a sufficient classification, medical attendance, and nursing.

9289. Then cases of ringworm would be troublesome, I take it, in some places?—They are very troublesome Ophthalmia I am little troubled with now, although it used to be very troublesome. I am happy to say it has nearly disappeared: probably the improved dietary has had a good deal to say to that, by raising the general tone and condition of the children. Then I have few children in the district now, except in the big towns and at the district school, as you will see if you will look through the list appended to my memorandum.

9290. Can you suggest any remedy for dealing with the difficulty that there is in connection with these classes of children?—I should like very much indeed to have, one house in a county to which ringworm and skin diseases of different kinds should be sent for treatment. If that could be done, it would be very beneficial. But, on the other hand, the numbers are small, and I doubt whether they would be sufficient to warrant an establishment in each county. Counties might perhaps be grouped for the purpose. That would only cause a temporary separation from the usual surroundings.

9291. Under what authority could you have such a grouping?—It would have to be jointly provided by the Guardians who required it, and it would have to be chiefly administered under medical supervision.

9292. You would contemplate a combination of boards of guardians then?—I think so. If there were any institutions to which guardians could send the cases by paying for so much the better and simpler. There might, for instance, be a branch at a county hospital or some plan of that kind. Combinations, as you know, are not very easy to work, and they are always liable to give rise to friction.

Dental attendance for Poor Law children.

9293. You referred to dental treatment in your evidence-in-chief: I suppose you are aware that the Local Government Board have always favoured the provision of dental attendance on children, and that they have issued a statement of the conditions which they recommend for adoption by guardians, in which prominence is given to what I may call conservative dentistry?—Yes.

9294. Ordinary medical practice is rather given to the extraction of teeth?—The ordinary medical officer is not a dentist, and it is difficult to persuade guardians that a medical officer is not a dentist. Medical officers, as a rule, rather than cause trouble to guardians, or rather than spend the necessary time and effort to obtain the services of a dentist, if a child has got the toothache and a bad tooth, extract the tooth. Most general medical practitioners have a certain amount of dental work among their clients, but they cannot as a rule pretend to dental knowledge, further than the power of extraction. I do not know whether they ever attempt to stop a tooth: I have never heard of one. I have been trying for years past to get guardians to have the children examined systematically, say, once every three months, and then to send such of them as require dental attendance to the dentist, in order that that attendance may be given to them. I may say that some guardians have responded extremely well to the invitation. For instance, at the Cottage Homes at Christchurch, they have a regular appointed dentist, and they have a proper dental chair with the necessary appliances. The dentist comes every month, he examines every child, and does what is necessary. He keeps a proper record with notes of the different operations which he does for the children. At Portsmouth, also the guardians are careful about it. One of the dentists in Portsmouth is good enough to do the work for them: I think he does it as an honorary dentist, but at Christchurch they pay, and they ought to pay.

9295. The guardians at Portsmouth would realise the importance to the boys who are going into the services?—Yes.

9295. I believe they will pass a boy into the service with stopped teeth when they will not pass a boy who has had permanent teeth extracted?—That is so.

Operation of Local Goverment Board's Circular as to administration of anaesthetics.

9297. With regard to the administration of anaesthetics, I think the Local Government Board issued a circular on that point some years back, drawing attention to the fact that they were always ready to sanction payment for anaesthetics?—Yes.

9298. But that still leaves the medical officer in a somewhat awkward position, does it not, occasionally; the payment depends, I think, on the option of the guardians?—Quite so. The medical officer cannot claim the payment, and the guardians have to apply to the Local Government Board to sanction the payment. That is a point which seems to me unnecessary. Where the medical officer considers that an anaesthetic ought to be administered, I think the guardians ought to be able to pay as a matter of course, without having to apply for a gratuity to the medical officer in order that the medical officer may pay the anaesthetist.

9299. But the sanction of the Local Government Board in my experience is never withheld?—Never; I have never known a case in which it has even been questioned.

9300. Is not the point this: that the medical officer may have to perform an operation requiring the administration of an anaesthetic as a matter of urgency, and he is not sure of obtaining payment from the guardians?—Quite so.

9301. So that he has to take the chance of obtaining payment which may not be accorded to him?—Certainly. The guardians might refuse him, and then it would not go before the Local Government Board at all. I think that where, in the medical officer's judgment, he considers it necessary that an anaesthetic should be administered, he ought to be allowed to claim it in the ordinary course amongst his extra fees.

9302. It should be included amongst the prescribed fees?—Yes.

Fees to Medical Officers for operations in Workhouses.

9303. Is it not general knowledge that there has been a great development of operative surgery within this last generation?—Clearly.

9304. And the same might apply to operations which at present do not appear on the scale of fees?—Certainly.

9305. And are not therefore provided for by the existing scale?—Yes. Whilst we are on that point I should like to say that I think it is extremely hard that a medical officer does not get a fee for an operation performed in the workhouse, except for midwifery cases, the specified fees being for outdoor operations, and not for operations in the workhouse. I know that the Board have a revised Order under consideration. In the days when those fees were laid down, the resources of the workhouse were so different from what they are now, that operations were discouraged. I presume that that was the reason why no fee was attached to them. The Poor Law Commissioners and the Poor Law Board, and the early years of the Local Government Board, covered a time in which it was very undesirable that operations should be performed in the workhouses, simply because they had not the appliances and the means of nursing which were available in the general hospitals. Therefore, the policy was to get the cases sent to the general hospitals, and that there should not be any operative surgery in the workhouses because the conditions were not favourable. Hence fees were allowed for the district medical officers, but not for

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

the workhouse medical officers. It may have been judicious—I presume it was then—but of late years it has worked, as I think, very hardly both in the interests of the patients and in the interests of the doctors. Supposing a district medical officer finds a man with a broken leg in a very unhealthy cottage, if he sets the leg and treats the leg there, he will get his fee; if he sends the man into the hospital and is in charge of the case there, he will probably get his fee; but if he sends him to the workhouse he will not get any fee. I have taken a fracture, but a fracture is a bad illustration, because probably a fracture would have to be set immediately. But take an operation for hernia. If he sends the man into the workhouse, where he would have probably every advantage and would be likely to recover under favourable conditions, the doctor will not get the fee; but if he treats him in his own cottage, where every condition is unfavourable, he will get a fee. That is bad for the patient and bad for the doctor. If the doctor consults his own interests he will operate under unfavourable conditions; if he consults his patient's interests he will not get a fee. Of course I am speaking of a case where the doctor happens to be the district medical officer and workhouse medical officer as well. If he were only district medical officer, and he sent the patient into the workhouse, he would not be entitled to a fee.

9306. Speaking of the improvement in workhouse nursing and so on, I think in a number of workhouses now it is possible to perform a certain amount of operative surgery where it was not possible to do so with safety, years ago?—Yes.

Development of Voluntary Hospitals.

9307. Do you find that the voluntary hospitals have extended *pari passu* with the development of the Poor Law?—I am hardly in a position to answer that question.

9308. I mean as regards their accommodation?—I should say probably not, but my information upon that point is not definite. Some of the voluntary hospitals are crowded on their sites, and it is difficult for them to develop satisfactorily. Probably where they have had ground and have had means to extend, they have extended in much the same manner, I should think. But I can only answer that question tentatively, as I have not precise information on the point.

9309. It would also be an affair of funds, would it not?—Quite so. With regard to the workhouse sick wards, there is no doubt now that a great deal can be done which years ago could not be thought of. To begin with, the accommodation in the wards themselves has been much improved.

Supply of dressings, drugs, &c., by Medical Officers out of salary.

9310. Do you find cases where the increased cost of dressings and appliances presses hardly on the doctors who have to supply them under their contract?—Certainly, it presses very hardly on them. I think no doctor ought to be required to supply anything; the guardians ought to supply everything that is required, or at all events ought to pay for it. I know there is a difficulty, because a great proportion of the drugs are perishable, and if the guardians had a store of drugs at the workhouse, the contents might go bad before being wanted; then there are many drugs which are seldom wanted, and which therefore might not be found just when they were wanted. It appears to me that the best solution of the case in the country workhouses is that the guardians should allow the doctor to provide what he considers necessary if he dispenses himself; if not, to obtain what is necessary from whoever does dispense his medicines, and let him send in his bill quarterly to the guardians for what is consumed or for what the doctor uses. Guardians look a little shyly on that, because, they say, he may charge for things which he does not use for us, and we have no means of testing it. I think the only answer to that is that if you have a man in office you must trust him to be honest.

Underpayment of Medical Officers.

9311. It is very important that there should be no excuse on the ground of underpayment for slackness in the performance of his duty, is it not?—Certainly, and that is why I regret so much that in many cases the medical officers are, as I consider, underpaid.

9312. Some of your guardians do provide drugs and appliances, I think?—Yes; that is done in the larger unions; but in the smaller unions, for the reason I have stated, it is really impracticable.

Cost of Medical Appliances.

9313. Have you any cases where the cost of these things has been unreasonably increased of recent years?—I do not think so. It has never been brought to my knowledge that there has been any undue cost charged to the guardians for medical appliances. There is no doubt that the cost ought to be very much higher than it has been in years gone by, and the better you make your nursing and your medical attendance, the higher the cost will be. Take merely the item of cotton-wool. The ignorant nurse might use cotton-wool over and over again, but the nurse who knows what she is doing, when it has once been used would almost necessarily throw it away. It would be the same with bandages.

Waste of Dressings, &c.

9314. I do not know whether it is within your experience that there is a distinction between some hospital-trained nurses at any rate and Poor Law trained nurses with regard to economy in the use of these articles?—Yes. Some Poor Law nurses are extremely extravagant. They may look into that point of economy more closely in the general hospitals than they do in the Poor Law hospitals, but that is a matter of administration pure and simple. In a case not long ago there seemed to me to be an undue amount of cotton wool used. The nurse wanted a little bit to put into somebody's ear, and she would take a big piece out of the package and throw away what she did not use. I mentioned it to the medical officer; he said it was quite contrary to the instructions, and that special care should be given to that point in future.

9315. A medical officer who bestowed a proper amount of time on his work would look into those things, would he not?—Certainly he should attend to these things.

Amount of time devoted by Workhouse Medical Officers to their duties.

9316. Do you have reason sometimes to be dissatisfied with the amount of time that some of the medical officers give to their work?—I will ask the Commission not to ask me to give the names, but I have in several unions within the last three or four years taken from the porter's book the length of time that the medical officer has been in the workhouse. I have found that frequently he has only been in the workhouse for a few minutes, and that he has rarely been in the workhouse for half-an-hour. When you consider that the entry in the porter's book of the time of admission to the workhouse is when the medical officer first goes into the house, that he then has to find his way to the sick wards—very likely saying "How do you do?" to the master and matron, on his way up—and may have other things besides the sick wards to look after—perhaps a child or two, and that his exit from the workhouse is only taken when he is actually leaving the workhouse; then if he has only been in the house for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour time after time, and week after week, it is very evident that he cannot examine the bodily condition of the patients and their surroundings in the way in which I should think it ought to be done.

9317. Do you find that the improvement in nursing tends to stimulate and encourage the medical officer in his work?—Very much indeed. There is no doubt that where a medical officer has got a thoroughly keen and competent nurse, he does the work a great deal more carefully than he was where he only had an ignorant pauper attendant.

Reports of Medical Officers to Guardians.

9318. Do the medical officers in your district as a rule report to the guardians anything that may be required in the sick wards, and any defects?—The medical officers are by regulation ordered to report to the guardians every half-year upon almost every detail of the sick ward administration which it is desirable that they should have special regard to. I can give you the particulars if you care to have them.

9319. They are set out in the Order, I believe?—Yes. I find that in some unions these reports are regularly made; and in some of them they are very valuable, because they are very carefully made. In others it is difficult to get them made at all; and when they are made they are so vague that they give extremely little information. I have spoken to more than one medical officer about those reports, and asked him personally to be good

enough to make them. It has seemed to me that the medical officer who does not want to offend the members of his board of guardians will avoid making those reports if he thinks that the real facts would be distasteful. Besides that, the medical officer has a book which is called the medical officer's report book, and in that book he is supposed to make a report upon any detail which he wishes to bring to the attention of the guardians between the times of his half-yearly reports. So that if the medical officer really availed himself of the facilities which are not only offered to him but which it is ordered that he shall use, he has no excuse whatever for anything in the sick wards of an unsatisfactory character not having been reported to the board of guardians. If he reported the matter to the board of guardians and the guardians refused to alter it, I take it that the responsibility would be to a great extent upon them, and off his shoulders; but clearly, if there is anything unsatisfactory, he has the opportunity of reporting it, and he ought to do so.

Medical Officers' tenure of office, and motives for applying for appointment.

9320. And he is also strengthened in his position, is he not, by the fact that he is not removable except with the consent of the Local Government Board?—Quite so. But then one knows that in the country districts the medical officers are general practitioners, and probably some of their most valuable patients may be either members of the board of guardians or people who have direct connections and interests with members of the board of guardians. It is perfectly natural that a medical officer does not wish to quarrel with his bread and butter. I think this should be taken into consideration. When I have objected to the salaries paid to the medical officers, the guardians give the answer which I mentioned yesterday, "Whenever we have a vacancy we advertise, and we get any amount of fully qualified candidates, who all, until they are in office, profess to be perfectly willing to do the work to our entire satisfaction, and to do everything that is required and desirable for their patients; and it is only when they are actually in office that they suggest that they are not being properly paid. When we get applications in response to our advertisement, is it fair to the ratepayer that we should offer more than we can get the work done for?" Of course to me that answer is not conclusive. One knows that the medical men in a great many instances do not take office for the emolument which they will get from the office, but for various other considerations. Probably one of the chief considerations is to keep somebody else out. There are a certain number of men who have the medical work in a certain area between themselves, and they naturally want to keep another practitioner from coming in. That is one motive. Another motive is that holding Poor Law offices does indirectly bring them practice. The fact that they hold office gives them a certain *status*, a certain position; it brings them in contact with a large number of people, both poor people and well-to-do people, and indirectly therefore it may be of considerable advantage to them. Even taking all that into consideration I do not think that there is any justification for not paying a man a fair value for his work. I think it is very undesirable that medical officers should be able to say, "Well, if they find fault with me, at all events I feel this—that I am giving them more than their money's worth."

Insufficiency of Medical Officers' salaries, and proposed new method of estimating salaries.

9321. Can you suggest a remedy?—Yes. I think that it would be quite possible to fairly estimate the amount of work done by putting a fair value upon each visit, upon each bottle of medicine, and upon the ordinary items of medical practice, and so arriving at a salary which ought to be paid on an average of such considerations. I did try once or twice to work out what the actual remuneration to a medical officer was for the work that he did and if I remember aright in the one or two cases in which I tried to test it, although very imperfectly—it worked out to something under 2d. a visit and 2d. a bottle of medicine.

9322. That is for the indoor work?—Yes; the outdoor work, of course, I had no means of checking at all. But I should not like to give that as a positive statement which would be of general application.

9323. You do not know of any instance where your suggestion has been tried, do you?—No.

Infectious cases in Workhouses.

9324. In the earlier days I think there was a tendency to send infectious cases into the workhouses; I do not know whether you find that continuing in any place?—No. I am happy to say that in the counties under my observation there has been a great deal done in the provision of isolation hospitals by the sanitary authorities, and the guardians have for the most part an arrangement with the sanitary authorities that infectious fevers shall be sent to the isolation hospitals. That does not cover the whole ground. I have had within the last two or three years one or two very unfortunate instances in which smallpox cases were sent to workhouses with fatal results; at all events in one instance to a workhouse inmate—which I think is extremely unsatisfactory. It is utterly indefensible to me that because an inmate happens to be in a workhouse he should be subjected to the risk of anything so terrible as either catching smallpox or dying of it.

9325. So that the practice has entirely ceased?—Not entirely, but it has been reduced to within very narrow limits.

9326. In proportion as the sanitary authorities have made proper provision, I take it?—Yes. In some cases the guardians, before the sanitary authorities were created, built separate isolation blocks as part of the workhouse premises. Most of those, I am happy to say, have now been devoted to other purposes, because it was extremely dangerous to treat infectious fevers on the workhouse premises where the so-called infectious block was fed and worked from the workhouse stores and the workhouse kitchen, and was treated by the workhouse nursing.

Sanitary Authorities and the provision of Isolation Hospitals.

9327. Do you find the guardians and the sanitary authorities work harmoniously?—I think so. In many places the guardians themselves are the sanitary authority. But there has been a considerable difficulty in getting the sanitary authorities in some parts to provide isolation hospitals, and that difficulty has been very much increased within the last few years by the question which is now being agitated as to whether isolation hospitals are satisfactory in their results or not. That is a medical matter; but looking at it as a matter of mere convenience, there is no question of the inestimable benefit of an isolation hospital to a district. A poor man falls sick of scarlet fever or diphtheria or erysipelas or whatever it may be, in his own house, and it means misery during the whole course of his treatment and extreme anxiety as to the fate of his family, if he has to remain there: but if there be a properly equipped isolation hospital to which he can be removed, he will probably recover, and the family will be saved from the danger of taking the disease.

9328. I gathered from your evidence yesterday that you are in favour of utilising the material that the poor law authorities have for teaching nursing?—Certainly.

Poor Law Infirmaries as training schools for Nurses.

9329. Do you find in your experience that that is beneficial in the first place to the poor law; for example, that it attracts a better class of women to the service?—Yes. Where they have favourable conditions such as exist at Portsmouth and at Southampton, and on a smaller scale at Farnham, I do not think they have the smallest difficulty in getting candidates—well-educated girls who are in every way desirable—for training as nurses. They will generally take them for the first month on trial; many a girl thinks she will make an admirable nurse and is well qualified for it, but after a short time in the sick ward finds that she is quite unfit and under this arrangement she can be withdrawn. Before they get them to enter for the three years' training, they satisfy themselves that they are proper candidates and likely to be successful. The results both at Portsmouth and at Southampton, and also at Farnham, have been excellent and their nurses have turned out extremely well. Both at Portsmouth and at Southampton they have annually an independent examination with some recognised, well-known medical man as an examiner. The examination is very thorough, both on paper and by word of mouth. The results have been far beyond any expectation that I could have hoped for when they first started.

Facilities for training Nurses at Farnham.

9330. You have mentioned Farnham as a place which has done well; that is a small workhouse, I think?—Yes, Farnham is a small workhouse, but it is a workhouse where they get more than an average of operative work and acute sickness, because the union contains the greater part of Aldershot.

9331. How many beds have they in the sick wards at Farnham, roughly speaking?—I think they have from 150 to 200 beds.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

9332. So that it is quite possible for the small places to do good work in the way of training nurses?—Yes. The midwifery training at Farnham has been exceptionally good as there is a very keen medical officer who has a very keen assistant (his deputy); and these two between them regularly lecture and demonstrate, and train the nurses. They have also a good superintendent nurse there. I think up to the time when the Central Midwives Board took up the examination, they had sent up ten or eleven for the London Obstetrical Society's qualification, and they had all passed but one.

9333. How many are they able to send up under the new regulations?—They cannot send up any under the new regulations, because they have not seventy-five cases a year. Dr. Tanner is an approved trainer, I believe, but under the new regulations I do not see, notwithstanding what the deputation said at Whitehall the other day, how they can send up their candidates if that resolution as to the seventy-five cases has any force.

Decision of Midwives Board to recognise teachers as apart from training schools.

9334. Have they applied to the Central Midwives Board for recognition?—I do not think so, but I am not sure.

9335. Do you know whether that intimation that the teacher was recognised apart from the training school, was conveyed to the Boards of Guardians who had applied?—I have myself informed the medical superintendents at Portsmouth and Southampton, and I think I have told Dr. Tanner at Farnham. There has been no official intimation that I am aware of to the Poor Law authorities that the fact of the medical officer being an approved teacher will warrant their sending up candidates; and indeed that appears a little inconsistent with the resolution that they will only accept candidates from institutions with seventy-five cases a year. I do not know which is to prevail.

Nursing of out-door paupers.

9336. I think you mentioned in your report that you are not quite satisfied with the nursing of the outdoor poor?—Yes. The nursing of the outdoor poor in many places is most unsatisfactory. It is an extremely difficult problem how nursing can be satisfactorily supplied when you get into the outlying districts. Take, for instance, an outlying cottage in Dorsetshire. I happened to be at the Beaminster Board of Guardians last week, and a case came up of a poor man suffering from cancer, who was living in a cottage by himself—and who declined to come into the workhouse. The guardians had no power to require him to come into the workhouse; there was no district nurse anywhere near, and so all that the guardians could do was to authorise the relieving officer to get two women who were his nearest neighbours and who lived in cottages some little way off to go in from time to time and help the poor man as best they might. I suggested that they could perhaps get a trained nurse from some nursing institution to look after him; but the answer to that was that there was no accommodation for the nurse, as it was only a little cottage in which you could hardly expect a nurse to stay.

Dorset Health Society and Cottage Nurses.

9337. In some parts of your district I think the cottage nurse system is in operation, is it not?—In Dorsetshire the Dorset Health Society have a system of nursing, which it was intended should cover the county, and which, if it is not already doing so, I hope in course of time will do so. Their headquarters are at Dorchester, and they are, I believe, more or less in connection with the county hospital They have certain centres, one at Blandford, and I think in some other portion of the county. At those centres they keep one or two trained nurses who have some knowledge of midwifery. One of them certainly had a midwifery qualification, but I do not know whether she is still in office. Then under them they have what they call cottage nurses, and they are what you want so much in the country districts. They are not trained nurses, but they work under the supervision of a trained nurse. They do not do the trained nursing work, but they do the general work of getting the patient in a condition to benefit by trained nursing,—that is, they clean the cottage, they are willing to live in the cottage, they will do the cooking, they will keep the windows open, they will take the sack of straw out of the chimney and clear out the accumulation from under the bed, they will wash the people, and see that the beds are properly made and properly sheeted, and that the patients are properly dressed, properly washed and kept clean. All these details they are able to do just as well as a trained nurse would do it, and they relieve the trained nurse from that work. They are willing to stay and live in the cottage as long as their presence there is required.

9338. That is to say, they cover ground which really the trained nurse very often cannot cover?—Yes, and do things on which she would be wasting her energy and her knowledge if she had to do them.

9339. You think these cottage nurses render very useful aid?—They are most valuable. I only wish the system could be generally adopted.

Possibility of using Workhouse Nurses for out-door poor.

9340. Do you think the small country workhouses, if they had trained head nurses, might do something in the way of teaching that sort of woman in their locality?—Yes. I think there might be a great deal done in that direction. I feel very strongly myself that a good deal of out-door nursing might be supplied from the workhouse. I do not know whether under the Board's present regulations such an arrangement would be permissible, but it appears to me to be very desirable that in any workhouse which is large enough to carry it out, there should be one or two extra nurses appointed, and those nurses should take a *rota* of out-door work. I think that would be very good for the nurses as well as very good for the out-door sick.

Subscriptions to Nursing Associations.

9341. Do your guardians require the relieving officers to report to them cases which have not been properly nursed, or where the surroundings are such that the case could not be properly cared for?—As a rule I think those matters are reported. The relieving officer, if he finds that he has a case which cannot be properly attended to, informs the guardians to that effect, and then they do the best they can. In a great many of the unions now, I am happy to say they subscribe to district nursing associations. Take the Salisbury union for instance. There are district nurses in a great many of the parishes, although not quite in all, and in every parish in which there is a district nurse the guardians subscribe towards that district nurse. In return for that subscription, the district nurse attends any pauper receiving out-door relief who requires nursing. In the Warminster union they have recently gone one better. There there are one or two district nursing associations and the guardians subscribe to the nursing association and in addition to that they consent to pay the nurses for their attendance, and there is also a system by which a nurse if required may reside in the cottage, and the guardians also have the advantage of that, if they require it.

Nursing arrangements for out-door sick in Warminster Union.

Treatment of sick paupers in special institutions.

9342. Do the district medical officers report to the guardians on cases that they think should be taken into an institution? To some extent they do. One very often sees it, but that is chiefly for special affections. They suggest that the case should be sent to an eye hospital, or to Bath, or one of the other watering places for special courses of treatment.

Attendance of Medical Officers at Relief Committees.

9343. Do the district medical officers ever attend the relief committees?—Sometimes, if they have any case which they wish to bring before the guardians, they will attend and tell the guardians what they think ought to be done. At a board of guardians I have often seen the medical officer come in with regard to a case, or to ask the guardians if they want to see him, or the guardians may send to him and ask him if there is anything he wants to say to them, if he happens to be in the house at the time they are meeting.

9344. Do you think there is an advantage in a medical officer attending relief committees occasionally so that they may see him and personally question him as to his cases?—I should say, certainly. I wish that doctors could be required to attend very much more than they do, but with the present salaries, I do not think it would be reasonable to put that duty upon them: it would take up a good deal of their time

Loan relief Portsmouth

9345. Is much relief given on loan in your district?—Very little, I am afraid. You will see in the statement at the end of my memorandum the amount recovered.

9346. I was going to draw attention to that. Portsmouth appears to stand out rather remarkably?—Yes, Portsmouth administer carefully from that point of view.

9347. They apparently recover a great deal from the paupers' relatives?—Yes. With regard to that column, which comes to a very considerable total, most of it is repayment towards the cost of lunatics in asylums. Under our system of management of lunacy in the country, there is no intermediate establishment between the costly private lunatic asylum and the county asylum. If there were, a great many of these people would not be paupers, and they would be paid for by their own relations. But you cannot get a case into a private asylum under somewhere about £100 or £150 a year, and they cannot afford that; therefore they have to send them to the pauper lunatic asylum. So they pay in some instances the full cost of their maintenance, and in other instances only part of the cost.

Conditions in Portsmouth Union: Government and railway property.

9348. Is a large proportion of the rateable value of Portsmouth represented by Government property?—A considerable proportion is, but I cannot tell you off hand what is the proportion, although I can get you the information, if you care for it.

9349. It is to be had, is it?—Yes, no doubt.

9350. Is the Government in any way represented on the board of guardians?—No, nor are the railways. They are not directly represented on boards of guardians, although they are the largest ratepayers of any, probably.

Effect of administration on pauperism.

9351. Do you find that retired service men come on to the board of guardians at Portsmouth?—To a certain extent, yes.

9352. (*Miss Hill.*) Am I right in thinking that Farnham has a much greater equality between its indoor and outdoor poor than the other districts?—Yes.

9353. Why is that?—Because it is the best administered union in the district.

9354. You spoke yesterday about certain unions, such as Atcham, Bradfield, Whitechapel, and so on, as being specially well administered. I am afraid there are not a very great many of those altogether in the country, and we have been going on for seventy years nearly since the old Poor Law Commissioners. I suppose the great difference in the amount of pauperism is, in your opinion, due to the different administration in the different unions?—Certainly.

Abuses in granting "sudden and urgent necessity" relief, and difficulties in checking same.

9355. I suppose there is a certain amount of elasticity in the law, because the guardians have had very responsible work to do, and it has been felt that they could not be tied down by very hard and fast rules legally with regard to relief, but certainly there is very wide latitude now. Do you yourself see any way in which either the moral courage or the wisdom of the guardians could be strengthened by the law? For instance, take such a thing as the sudden and urgent relief—a good deal is done under that head I imagine, in a great many unions, when the cases are not really those which require sudden and urgent relief. What really touches that—does it come under the auditor?—It does come under the auditor, but unfortunately sudden and urgent relief is very often dealt with in a way which is not legal. Sudden and urgent relief is not infrequently given by the overseer, and then instead of charging it to his parish accounts as he should do—because all relief given by overseers, except orders upon the doctor and to the workhouse is a parish and not a union charge, or should be—he hands it over to the relieving officer, who enters it in his application and report book, and thereby brings it in as a union charge instead of a parish charge. The Local Government Board are expressly prohibited by statute from interfering with any individual case, so that although the rules of the Local Government Board prohibit outdoor relief, there are that series of exceptions with which you are no doubt acquainted which practically oust the rule, and as the Local Government Board are prohibited from interfering in any individual case, their control is practically nil. The auditor can surcharge if he sees a case which is flagrantly either extravagant or dishonest, but short of that, there is practically no check.

9356. I daresay you will have come across cases, for instance, where sudden and urgent relief has been given for weeks?—Yes, for many weeks.

9357. Is there no possibility of dealing with that? It is, as you say, a distinct breach certainly of the spirit of the law?—Yes, it is.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

9358. Do you see any hope of dealing with that?—One has been looking to the general education and wisdom of the people to teach them that such relief does not do the poor any good, but that view is not growing in favour as rapidly as one could wish. Do you see any machinery that could be brought to bear?—I think that there is a certain amount of education going on still.

9359. So do I?—The influence of the Poor Law conferences has undoubtedly been wholesome, and has produced good. The pauperism in my own district is very much lower now than it was thirty years ago. The average pauperism for the district is under 3 per cent.; and the average pauperism for the whole country is under 3 per cent.

9360. I suppose the problem is most acute in the towns?—Yes.

Suggestion to give Local Government Board power to deal with individual cases of relief.

9361. Do you see anything that can deal with that, except the gradual education of the world in general, both inside and outside boards of guardians?—Unless further power were given to the Local Government Board, I think it is very difficult to see how by regulation you can interfere with local administration. Whether such a power could be with advantage given to the Board is extremely open to question, I think. It would create a large amount of ill-feeling among guardians to be over-ridden by the central authority in the actual dealing with individual cases.

9362. Do you think the cure would be worse than the evil?—I think it would. What one really wants is to get a board of guardians who are thoroughly alive to the responsibilities of their position, and who understand the problem which they have to solve. As I ventured to express it yesterday, pauperism has become so much a habit with a certain class that it is accepted almost as a matter of course. But it is by no means as prevalent as it is supposed to be. I have heard it said, and said recently, that the working classes have nothing to look to but either out-door relief or the workhouse when their working days are over. That is a contention which is far too broad. The mere fact that the percentage of pauperism to population in my counties is only 2·8, shows conclusively that the enormous majority of the population do not become paupers. But so far as the influence of the Local Government Board goes, I say with all deference, but I feel it very strongly, that the Board themselves have consistently and loyally acted upon a certain policy, and that if they have failed to succeed, it has not been from any want of effort or principle on their part, but simply because the conditions which they cannot control have over-ridden the view which they would have wished taken of the line which guardians ought to have adopted.

Importance of *ad hoc* guardians.

9363. I gathered from something you said yesterday that you are distinctly of opinion that it is better to have a board of guardians elected for this particular object?—I regard the work of boards of guardians as so extremely important that anything which can be done to enhance and enlarge the position and responsibility of the guardians appears to me to be clearly the right line of action to take. I think the more important and the higher the position which you can assign to boards of guardians the better your results are likely to be.

9364. And you also would feel that they are to a very great extent the body that is dealing with people rather than with things?—Certainly.

9365. Whereas you have one class of men to see to your roads or drains; you would choose another sort of persons to attend to your people; there is, of course, a great deal of business connected with boards of guardians, but after all they deal with a particular locality and with people and families?—Boards of guardians have to deal with the population itself, and in their administration they will create either good or bad principles in guiding the actions of the people. Other experts have to deal with drains, they have to deal with water supplies, they have to deal with gas, they have to deal with this, that, and the other. Those are all items connected with the welfare and the lives of the people. But the great thing to me is to inculcate proper principles as to the action which should guide the life itself; and that is what boards of guardians have to do, and therefore I regard their function as much more important than any other.

9366. And you would be sorry to see it transferred to any body covering a larger area and dealing with a vast

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

number of other things of a very different character; I mean, you would not wish to see it passed to the county councils, for instance?—No, I should be extremely sorry to see what I consider the most important of all public duties transferred to a committee or sub-committee of some body which has endless other things to deal with.

Administrative effect of "expert" board of guardians.

9367. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I understood you to say yesterday that if a Board of experts had to deal with the Poor Law, in course of time pauperism could be abolished?—I think it would gradually get very near to extinction. You would never absolutely abolish it, because there are those who by nature are physically and mentally incompetent, and who have not people able to maintain them; those you would have to deal with. The problem of the unemployed, of course, you might still have with you in every congested area.

9368. If your contention was correct, then a Board of Guardians as you have just described them, elected *ad hoc*, is not the proper body to deal with it, if the object is dispauperisation?—But how so? The very object of having a Board of Guardians *ad hoc* to deal with it would be dispauperisation.

9369. Is that the way you would get a body of experts? Do you ever hope to get a body of experts by the present system of election to Boards of Guardians?—It is to be hoped so. What you want is a body of experts for your Board of Guardians, who really are able to work with knowledge and with discretion and upon proper principles.

9370. You really expect to get that?—I think you are much more likely to get it by a Board of Guardians who are appointed for that special purpose, than by a Committee of another body who have got a large number of other duties thrown upon them.

Nursing of out door sick paupers.

9371. (*Miss Hill.*) With regard to out-door nursing, I suppose that when people require elaborate nursing, you would work rather in the direction of bringing them into the house to that end, than in the direction of establishing a whole Poor Law system of nursing outside in the out of the way parts?—Yes. But I do not suggest the establishment of any Poor Law system; I simply suggest an adaptation of the present system which would cover the need. There is no power now to bring people into the workhouse against their will. As to those who will come in, there is no difficulty in dealing with them; the difficulty is in dealing with those who are not willing to come in.

Power to compulsorily bring infirm into workhouse.

9372. Or who are too ill to be moved?—Yes.

9373. Would you be in favour of some compulsory power of bringing people in, who could not be properly nursed in their own outlying places?—Yes, certainly; but that is a power that would have to be exercised very seldom.

9374. But it is a very important power when it has to be exercised?—I think so. I should be glad to see that power given.

Increasing opportunities for thrift among women and others.

9375. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I think you said yesterday that though the past generation had no opportunity of providing for its old age, the present generation would have no excuse in its old age if it came on the rates?—Yes.

9376. Would you apply that to the women as well as to the men?—To a certain extent women are now obtaining opportunities of getting into friendly societies which did not exist in the past, and I hope that those facilities will be very largely extended. A good many societies already have women's lodges as well as children's lodges, and the children's lodges take both boys and girls I believe.

Savings of agricultural labourers at Exeter in 1834, and of women now.

9377. Dealing with the question of women's earnings, not with the better class, but with the lowest class of women's earnings, do you think they at present admit of savings?—I know it is an unpopular thing to say, but I do think so. You may remember the passage in the report of the Poor Law Commissioners in 1834, in which they said they asked the question, not specially with regard to women, whether it was possible to save out of ordinary wages, and they almost invariably got the answer No. They then looked to the returns from the Savings Banks, and if I remember aright, in Exeter alone they found that £70,000 had been saved almost entirely by agricultural labourers, although everybody to whom they had applied, had told them that it was impossible for the agricultural labourer to save anything.

9378. But where you get women earning, as many thousands of them do, about 5s. a week only, do you think you would still apply that same remark?—That depends entirely upon whether the woman is self-dependent, or whether she is working simply as a member of a family. I do not know that you will find many single women who are living by themselves and are only earning 5s. a week.

Relief in aid of women's wages.

9379. I am afraid there are very many living in that way, but who have their earnings supplemented from some other sources?—Quite so.

9380. Have you any opinion about the question of supplementing women's wages by means of out-relief?—Certainly. It is as bad as anything possibly can be. It is that to a great extent which keeps down the rate of wages.

9381. I see you say there are many more old men than old women in the workhouses?—It is a curious fact, but it is so.

Proportion of male and female in-and out-door paupers.

9382. I have been looking through the returns of female and male pauperism, and I find there are about twice as many female paupers over sixty as there are male paupers over sixty?—I do not know whether that may be attributable to what happens in the towns, but I have got here the last returns from every union in my district, and if you will allow me I will just read two or three. In the little Dorsetshire union of Beaminster there are thirty-six men and seventeen women (not able-bodied) in the workhouse, at Blandford there are forty-four men and twenty-three women, at Bridport there are fifty men and twenty women, at Cerne there are twelve men and seven women; and at Dorchester there are forty-one men and twenty-seven women; and so it goes on, all through the list.

9383. If you take that in connection with the fact that there are about twice as many female paupers, taking it roughly, that means that the guardians give out-relief much more freely to women than to men, does it not?—I think it is so. Women are able to do what men are not. When the ordinary agricultural labourer is past his work, there is very little he can turn to, but a woman can generally get an opportunity of looking after children or helping in a household in one way or another. She knows a little cooking, she knows how to look after children, she knows how to clean a room, she knows how to sew; and she can help her neighbours much more, and can get a certain amount of income from charing and in other ways which men cannot do, or at all events do not do.

9384. Still, is there not a general feeling that the women ought to have out-relief more easily than the men?—No, I do not think there is. Again, when women do get ill, they do not give up in the way that men do. They are accustomed to nursing, and they know what to do. Now a man does not; a man gets ill and he goes off to the workhouse at once, if he has not got a wife to look after him.

Relief in aid of women's wages.

9385. But you will agree with me, will you not, that probably the fact that out-relief is given very freely to women is keeping their wages down?—Undoubtedly.

9386. Is it mostly agricultural work that the women do in your district?—I suppose it would be. I have very little manufacturing in my district. Except just in the towns, there is practically no manufacturing work open to women. There is a certain amount of gloving in the neighbourhood of Sherborne, and the women do that.

9387. Would the guardians actually supplement the women's earnings either in agricultural work or in this gloving work?—Yes, undoubtedly; if they do not earn enough to keep themselves, the guardians would give outdoor relief.

9388. You say that quite as a matter of course?—Yes, and they do it as a matter of course. I think that it is a very great mistake. If I had the administration, I should take those cases into the workhouse. The result would be that the wages would go up until they were sufficient to keep them. Anybody who is in receipt of half-a-crown a week outdoor relief can take work at so much less than a person who has got nothing but the work to depend upon.

Proportion of male and female in-and out-door paupers.

9389. Can you tell us what is the general proportion between men and women as regards indoor and outdoor relief?—I am sorry I have no information on the point.

Loan relief and recovery of maintenance.

9390. In Section 20 of your memorandum you say "Two other important points are relief on loan and maintenance of relatives. Upon both of these much more might be done than is done." Do you mean that much more might be done by local guardians or that much more might be done from the central office?—I mean much more might be done by the guardians. The guardians I think have as much power as under the present condition of the law can be given them under both heads. The law as regards the maintenance by relatives is in an unsatisfactory condition, because the maintenance by relatives cannot be enforced without their first becoming paupers. Under the old law, the 43rd of Elizabeth, it was different. Anybody then who was destitute and had relations capable of maintaining him, could apply to the Justices, and the Justices could make such order as might seem to them good. But the law has now been so altered that, before the maintenance can be enforced, the person must become chargeable to the Union, and the guardians must then apply to the Justices for an order unless the person consents to an order, so that nobody now can enforce maintenance by relatives without first becoming a pauper, and the machinery of the law being put into operation by the guardians.

9391. So that so far you would like to see the law altered?—Certainly I should. I referred to that in one of my annual reports to the Local Government Board some years ago, and I believe a Bill was actually drafted and introduced into Parliament, but it went no further. It was not drafted by the Local Government Board; it was privately introduced.

After-careers of Poor Law children.

9392. You told us a good deal about the children going into the Army and Navy: what about the children who are put out to trades by the guardians; do you find any difficulties there?—No, but that is not nearly so much done as it used to be. Very few children in the country districts are now apprenticed, although that used to be common. I am sorry that has been given up so much as it has.

9393. Do they go into domestic service, or else on to the farms?—Yes.

9394. Is one of the difficulties about putting them out to trades that there is nowhere for the children to live while they are learning a trade?—That is a very old difficulty.

9395. It is met in some places by working boys' Homes, is it not?—Yes.

Relief to Poor Law children earning wages.

9396. Have you anything of that kind?—No, not in my district. The Local Government Board in years gone by have been very much pressed to sanction their living in the workhouse whilst they are working outside, and also to sanction the grant of a certain amount of outdoor relief to pay for their lodging whilst they are not earning sufficient outside to maintain themselves. In some instances I believe the Board have consented, but reluctantly, and it is clearly fraught with considerable danger.

Number of children in Poor Law institutions.

9397. In one of the appendices to your memorandum you give a Table which is headed, "Number of children in the workhouses"; but I take it that is not quite accurate?—It ought to be "In the workhouses and other Poor Law institutions." That table includes children in the district schools, and also the children in the Christchurch Cottage Homes, indeed any children who are in Poor Law institutions. It does not include boarded-out children I think, or at all events not those who are boarded-out outside the union.

9398. (*Dr. Downes.*) Would it include the sick children in the infirmaries or sick wards?—Probably it would.

The question of deterrence of relief to children and of relief in general.

9399. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I think it was suggested yesterday with respect to the children that you were unable to carry out the policy of deterrent conditions, but I suppose you would agree with me that the deterrent conditions should apply to the parents and not to the children?—Certainly.

9400. So that what we do for the children may still be quite consistent with that policy?—Yes; and I do not think I agreed that we were not unable to carry out the deterrent conditions even there, because the very fact of their being in Poor Law institutions is in itself a deterrent condition, from my point of view.

9401. Supposing the good condition of the children did tempt parents to desert their children, you would at once be able to punish the parents? The law provides for it.

Possibility of eradicating pauperism.

9402. Something was said yesterday about stamping out pauperism within a certain number of years, which does not sound a very pleasant process. Do you think it would be as well described, perhaps, as "the encouragement or independence?" I am not afraid of the term "stamping out pauperism." Pauperism is a terrible evil, and it would be an immense benefit to stamp it out. I do not know that I used the term "stamp it out."

9403. I do not think it was used by you?—If I had used it, I should not reproach myself for having used an improper term, I think.

9404. As a matter of fact, a wise board of guardians is very largely constructive in its policy, is it not, and it does not practice any stamping out process? I mean such work as we do with children, and even such work as making careful inquiries and giving adequate relief is a constructive work, is it not?—Certainly. I am quite at one with you.

9405. Even the refusal of outdoor relief is not meant in any way to penalise the people who apply for it?—Not the least in the world.

9406. It is simply carrying out a definite policy for the encouragement of independence?—Yes, and for the good of the people.

Value of consistent policy as to relief and means of ensuring the same.

9407. Do you agree with me that the importance of a definite and consistent policy in a district is so very great that it would be almost better to have a medium sort of policy, consistently carried out, than to be changing about, so that many people would not understand what you were doing?—Clearly that is most important; but I should be very sorry to see any drastic alteration introduced which would create even present hardship. The great thing is that you should teach the proper principles which ought to be followed, and then let them be gradually worked up to.

9408. How is this affected by the constitution of the boards and the fact that the guardians change every three years; does that bring much uncertainty into the policy?—No. In the country districts there are very few changes: there are elections, but the same persons go in time after time in the large majority of cases.

9409. How would it work as between a whole board giving relief and different committees giving relief, from the point of view of a consistent policy?—If the relief were given by the whole board, who have a definite policy and who are working up to it, I think the whole board would do it very much better than if you divided them into three or four sections, each of which might take its own line. The whole board will keep the policy in its hands, and will hold the reins very much tighter than if you allow three or four smaller bodies to do the same work.

9410. But if you get a very large board, does that not mean that sometimes one set of people and sometimes another set of people really influence and control its decisions?—Then your definite policy goes. If you keep to your policy, I think your board will do it very much better than the committees will. You will have the same changes on the committees and the same difference in tendencies as you will have on the board, I think.

9411. Do you think that the whole board is more likely to follow a consistent policy?—Yes. I think the whole board depends very much on the chairman. If you have a chairman who exercises the authority which he ought to exercise, and has a definite policy himself, you will find that he will keep things much more on the line, than will be the case if you divide the responsibility among committees.

Size of boards of guardians.

9412. Have you any boards in your district which are unduly large, do you think?—I do not think so.

9413. How do they run—about forty members?—No. There are a few biggish boards. I have never taken the numbers out, but I should think the average attendance would be somewhere about a dozen or fifteen, taking the whole district.

9414. You suggested yesterday that the ideal relieving officer would have no pauper in his district; could you suggest what would be the lines upon which the ideal

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

relieving officer would carry on his work, and what would be the main difference between his work and that of the un-ideal relieving officer ?—Take the ordinary relieving officer. Somebody goes to him and says, " I am destitute and I want relief ; " he says, " All right, give me your name and address and I will come and see you." He takes the name and address, and he goes and sees him, and he gets the particulars for the application and report book. He makes very perfunctory inquiries in too many cases. He puts down just sufficient in the application and report book to fill up the columns with the particulars there required, and then he presents the case to the guardians, and they say, " Very well, this is a case which must have its 2s. 6d. or 1s. 6d.," whatever it may be. Your ideal relieving officer, when he goes to the home, will find out every possible incident connected with the families—what other resources may be available, whether the applicant can be got into an institution, whether work can be found for any of the children, and a thousand and one incidents by which the inquiry may lead to the solution of the case without its becoming a pauper. He may find that there is a charity applicable. He may find that some of the children may be got into an institution. He may find that the applicant himself may be got into a hospital where he may be cured quickly.

Functions of relieving officer as to inquiry into applications for relief.

9415. So that you would throw a great deal of the constructive work upon a good relieving officer as well ?—Certainly ; and some of them do it.

9416. Do some of them actually do this work ?—Yes, a very few do, so far as time permits.

9417. Do guardians themselves ever do any of this constructive work ?—A great deal : Take Farnham, for instance, which has been referred to by Miss Hill. They have an admirable institution by the side of the board of guardians' work. They call it a benevolent fund. This benevolent fund is subscribed to by people who live within the district, and if any case goes before the board of guardians which they think the application of the Poor Law works hardly upon, and which is evidently a deserving case, but only of temporary distress, and if they want to save the person becoming a pauper—if, for instance, it is the case of a man who can be got to work by purchasing tools for him—they apply to the benevolent fund, and the benevolent fund gives what is necessary, possibly on loan. The man having got his tools and to work, would gradually repay them back. Colonel Fitzroy, who is the treasurer of the Benevolent Fund, told me recently that in no year had they spent more than £20.

Operation of "Benevolent Fund" at Farnham and elsewhere.

9418. If the expenditure is so small, is there any reason why other boards of guardians should not have annexed to them some small fund of that kind ?—It is a question whether it ought to be done at the cost of the rates. That is purely voluntary.

9419. And I mean that the fund should be entirely voluntary ?—It would be a most excellent thing. Mr. Bland Garland told me that when he started the reformed administration in the Bradfield Union he put aside £100 to meet cases of that kind, and that he had only used a small amount of it.

9420. As a matter of fact, it is mostly a little advice and sympathy that is helpful to the people ?—Quite so.

9421. Then there is really no reason why, even in the poorest districts, there should not be some kind of organisation of a voluntary character working side by side with the Poor Law system ?—There is every reason why there should be, if you could only get the people to do it.

9422. There is no reason in the shape of want of funds that need stand in the way, because the funds that would be required are so small that they could always be forthcoming ?—I should think so. There is an enormous amount of charity given away, and if that charity were utilised instead of being wasted, it would much more than do what is required in the direction that we are now considering.

9423. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the giving of relief by the overseers, does that prevail to much extent in your district ?—No.

Relief by overseers, and its proposed abolition.

9424. Supposing the power of the overseers to give relief were abolished, do you think any practical hardship would result ?—I do not think it would. The guardian of the parish, I think, should then have the power given to him.

9425. So that any case of very immediate urgency might be dealt with without having recourse to the relieving officer ?—Quite so.

9426. Would you see a risk in a particular guardian having any power of that kind ?—I should still guard it by what is now the law, namely, that relief so given in sudden and urgent necessity and without the intervention of the relieving officer should be a parish charge and not a union charge. I think that would be sufficient.

9427. Turning to another question, you have suggested that the Local Government Board, if the guardians did not carry out certain minor work, might send down somebody or other to do it ?—Yes.

Proposed increased powers to Local Government Board to deal with guardians' default.

9428. Would that not lead to some friction ?—No doubt it would, but I think the fact of the power being in existence would prevent the necessity for its exercise, except in the rarest of cases.

9429. Take another plan : Supposing there was a grant which might be withheld if certain conditions were not fulfilled, somewhat in the same sort of way that the Education Grant is now : would that answer the object which you have in view ?—Probably it would do as well, except that it would not act so promptly. I should like to be able, if the guardians positively refused to do what clearly ought to be done, to go and do it and to make them pay for it. To threaten to withhold the grant, I think, would very probably, for practical purposes, come to the same results ; but it would not give you the actual power of getting the thing done when you want it.

9430. You have considerable Government property and railway property in your district, you say ?—Yes.

Effect on administration of Government or railway property in a district.

9431. Do you think that the fact that in the case of Government property the Government practically pays the rates, in any way tends to extravagance on the part of the guardians ?—No. I have never found anything to suggest that to me.

9432. Or that the fact that a railway company may be very largely contributors to the rates makes any difference ?—That has not come under my observation. I do think it is a hardship that the railway companies have no direct representation on the boards of guardians where they are very large ratepayers, but that is another question.

Franchise for corporations.

9433. Would you say in a case of that sort they ought to be able to appoint somebody to vote on their behalf at the election of members, or something of that kind ? —Yes.

Provision for old age by friendly societies.

9434. (*Mr. Chandler.*) In paragraph 7 of your memorandum, dealing with the aged poor, you mention the fact that the friendly societies are seeking a solution of this question and are making provisions to that end ; do you know of any definite instance where any friendly society has already done that ?—Yes. The Hampshire Friendly Society makes special provision for an old age pension as well as for sickness. There is a friendly society I know in Suffolk, which has to a considerable extent been influenced by Mr. John Martineau, and which also makes provision for old age pensions as well as for sickness. I think you will find, though I am speaking rather off my book now, that some of the great societies, such as the Hearts of Oak, the Foresters, and that class of society, have lodges which make special provision for old age pensions. The Hampshire Friendly Society certainly do that, and so does the society in Suffolk ; I think the Wiltshire Society also.

9435. That would necessitate, I assume, rather a heavy contribution per week ?—No ; it is something small.

9436. Is that so ?—Yes, if the payment begins early in life, because the number that survive to come upon the fund is comparatively small.

9437. (*Mrs Bosanquet.*) Is it 2½ per week, or something like that ?—I do not think that the separate payment for old age is as much as that. The Hampshire Friendly Society have a very careful arrangement, and you can pay for the pension to begin at the age you choose, according to their tables.

9438. (*Mr. Chandler.*) You say " It is, however, fairly evident that any person of ordinary mental and physical capacity can now provide for his necessities arising from sickness or accident without coming upon the rates." I

assume that you have taken into consideration that that would mean that you must join at the earliest possible age in life in order to insure that?—Yes; everybody ought to join as a child, and then as he gets older he could go into the adult lodges. If one begins as a child, the contribution is very small.

9439. But if he leaves it too late in life, he cannot get into these societies?—No, not over 40. When a man gets to 40, of course the payment is very onerous, and it is much more difficult to get in then, because it is more difficult to prove that you are sound. But for the ordinary population, within a few years, if not now, I take it that the friendly societies will cover the ground. The real difficulty is with those who are physically and mentally afflicted.

9440. Without some system of compulsory insurance there would still be a very large number outside and unprovided for, would there not?—I should be very glad indeed to see a system of compulsory insurance, if it could be introduced into England.

9441. You would favour such a system?—Certainly, but I see the difficulties of it.

9442. In paragraph 12 you speak of the Local Government Act of 1894, and of the changes that were affected under that Act, which in your opinion have not been anything like an improvement in regard to the constitution of boards of guardians. Can you tell me in what way the Act has proved detrimental; has it been in regard to the *personnel* of the boards?—I think so.

9443. Do you think that the boards are not now as good administrators as they were formerly?—Yes.

9444. Yet the opportunity of re-election is still open to those who originally served?—Clearly it is, but at the same time it is not open in the way in which they will take it. A gentleman of high position in a county does not care to go canvassing to his own dependents, his own servants and his own tradespeople and begging them to vote for him. Practically it prevents many gentlemen from coming forward for election where a contest is probable. There are a good many gentlemen on the boards of guardians in my district, but they stand and are elected and have been elected for years to represent their own parishes. But under the ordinary incidents of a contested election a gentleman does not care to stand. Besides, even if he does get in, he probably keeps out somebody who is valuable.

9445. Prior to the passing of that act, of course there were fewer changes, and there was continuity of service?—Yes, you had one section of the board of guardians who could keep the policy going, no matter what changes there might be in the elective element.

9446. Had that not also its disadvantages, inasmuch as there is a danger in security of tenure of office causing people to be disinclined to adapt themselves to a given policy?—Yes, but the *ex officio* members were never in a majority. I do not suppose there was a board amongst the boards I ever had the honour of attending, in which the *ex officios* formed the majority, although I never took out the statistics on that particular point.

9447. I have in my mind that Lancashire incident of which you spoke, of a board of guardians who were constituted largely of employers giving out-door relief in order to keep their hands together pending the settlement of a strike or lock-out; that was purely a wrong act on their part, I take it?—From my point of view clearly so, but I think it was not infrequently done in those times.

9448. (*Chairman.*) That is an important point; you think it was not infrequently done?—Yes. When I was up in the North 30 years ago I suspected—of course it was a thing you could never prove—that relief was given very freely in cases of strike or lock-out, in order to keep the hands together; and I know my then chief, Mr. Cane, who was the inspector for the district, held the same view. He and I talked it over many times.

9449. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would it not also keep the strikers together?—Perhaps, but it kept the hands together.

9450. (*Mr. Chandler.*) In paragraphs 14 and 15 you speak of the diminution of the rural population and of the diminution of labour through the development of machinery which is constantly being brought to greater perfection, and was doing the work that was formerly done by the hand of man; might not that displacement of labour be one of the chief causes towards increasing pauperism?—No doubt. There is an influence in that direction which has not yet found its level, and I suppose will not do for some time. You must remember what happened after the introduction of machinery in the textile manufactures, and in agricultural work even. For instance, the riots in Wiltshire when agricultural machinery was introduced.

9451. Men have been displaced, and I do not think the resources of other employment have kept pace with their displacement, so there is still a very large surplus of unemployed men?—Yes, but there are new industries being created almost every day. It is impossible to put back the hand of time. You can never prevent machinery developing and doing work which was formerly done by the hands of man. Those men have to find other work to do or they have to remain idle.

9452. I do not say this displacement is the cause, only I thought it might perhaps have an influence?—No doubt it has an influence, which certainly accounts for some of the difficulty of to-day.

9453. Respecting the Employers' Liability Act, in answer to the Chairman you expressed an opinion that the operation of that Act had a tendency to increase pauperism by throwing different workmen upon the streets, if I may use that term?—Yes.

9454. Have you any definite instance of that, or is it simply a general opinion which you have formed?—I have seen several instances in which men have asserted that they could not get employment because they were now getting on for fifty. It stands to reason, because a man getting on for fifty is not active enough to avoid danger which a man of twenty-five or thirty would be able to avoid.

9455. Might not there be other causes? You mentioned that at Southampton Docks they refuse to employ men who are unfit; would that not apply to all classes of employers of labour?—I was speaking of men who were otherwise physically fit and who were willing and eager for work, but whose age alone stood as a bar to their employment. I will tell you of a case which was stated to me not long ago. A man's employer died, and the result was that the hands were all thrown out of work, and one of the men who was very nearly fifty tried to get other work, but could not. So long as his old employer lived and he was able to work he could be at work, but because he was fifty he could not get into a new employment.

9456. That would apply throughout the country, irrespective of the Employers' Liability Act, would it not?—The suggestion was the Employers' Liability Act, rightly or wrongly.

9457. In connection with that subject you also mentioned trade unions as being responsible for the increase of pauperism; that was somewhat explained in further replies to Mrs. Webb, but I suppose you have no definite idea how or by what means these increase pauperism?—I answered that as well as I could to Mrs. Webb. There is no doubt that if anybody who is not absolutely able-bodied does get out of employment, he finds it very difficult to get back into employment.

9458. Apart from fixing a minimum wage for competent men, are you aware that all the principal unions have provisions for old men accepting such wages as their earning capabilities will admit?—So I was told yesterday, but I am bound to say that I have not found it in practice. I should like very much to have further information upon that. The practical result of what I have seen has not led me to believe that that is so; it may be so in theory, but in practice I have not seen that apply.

9459. Do you speak generally of the country of your own particular district only?—Of my own particular district.

9460. Your particular district is largely rural, and as you know there is no such thing now as trade unionism among agricultural labourers?—There are two big towns in my district, and it is in those towns that the cases that have come under my observation have occurred. I cannot profess to speak with anything like accuracy, or to state a positive opinion upon the point;

Effect on pauperism of Workmen's Compensation Acts, &c.

Effect of trade unions on pauperism.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

the result of my observation in watching the cases that come for relief made me include that with the other influences referred to in that paragraph.

9461. I assume also that you are aware that trade unions provide for old age in the shape of superannuation, at least that is so with the principal unions which have to do with the towns of Southampton and Portsmouth ?—Some do.

9462. The engineers, the joiners, the shipwrights, and the boiler-makers all provide it, do they not ?—Yes, but the conditions are somewhat strict. I do not want to enter into details, because I am not master of them. So far as my experience goes, every man does not as a matter of course come upon the superannuation fund ; he has to fulfil very close conditions in order to entitle him to come upon it.

9463. My only desire is, as a set-off to the statement which you have made in your evidence, to put on the other side of the ledger the fact that they are doing a very great deal to prevent people from becoming paupers ?—All that I know ; and nobody appreciates more highly than I do the work which is done by trade unions. So far as, from my point of view, it is legitimate.

Removal from office of officers by Local Government Board.

9464. (*Mr. Loch.*) You have referred to the question of the dismissal of officers in connection with the Local Government Board. The dismissal question, I suppose, is settled by Article 187 of the Consolidated Order of 1847. I notice that the note of comment on the Order in Macmorran and Lushington's " Poor Law General Orders " is, " It has been held that under this enactment " that is, the Act of 1834, " the Poor Law Commissioners had a discretion to remove a relieving officer, though no charge had been made against, nor any notice given to him, nor any opportunity afforded him for making any defence " ; and then cases are quoted in support of that. Would it not be possible to resume that position so far as the Local Government Board are concerned ?—I think it would be very difficult with the officers now in office, because although that may have been a power which was exercised in those days, it certainly has not been exercised for a great many years past.

9465. I understand that the point of your remark is that unsuitable men stay on ?—That is so.

9466. And are undismissable ?—Yes, unsuitable men are appointed in the first instance, and they are kept on afterwards and they are practically undismissable, unless they do something sufficiently contrary to the regulations or to their own good character to show that they are unfit to hold office.

9467. Could you try to meet the difficulty in some other way ? The phrase in the Order is, " Every officer appointed to or holding any office under this Order, other than a medical officer, shall continue to hold the same until he die or resign, or be removed by the Commissioners, or be proved to be insane, to the satisfaction of the Commissioners." Could we require that he shall perform his service to the satisfaction of the Commissioners ?—There is no doubt that the Local Government Board have power to remove any Poor Law officer, if they chose to do it, by Order, at any time and without assigning any reason. They have the legal power, but as a matter of practice they would not enforce it, and never have enforced it, simply because a man does not do his work to the satisfaction of the inspector of the district.

Question of increasing powers of inspectors.

9468. Could we not take the inspector, or some other authority, as the test, and say that if a man did not do his work satisfactorily, according to the standard of good work, then the Local Government Board would intervene ? —It would be very difficult, because, as a rule, he is acting under the instructions and according to the wishes of his own guardians. He is the officer of the guardians, and not of the Board.

9469. But I would urge that, in view of a possible reform, it might be desirable to give the inspectors a somewhat different position. Would it not be possible to increase the powers of the inspectors in regard to various things, so that they had authority, we will say, first of all, as to inquiries and the conditions under which they were made, so that their word should be almost final as to what was required in the way of investigation ?—So far as I am concerned I should be delighted ; whether the Board would think it right to do that is another question.

9470. Take another point with regard to the question of the officers : would it not be desirable that, whatever staff you might want, the inspector himself should be responsible more or less for his district, and should have a concurrent power in regard to the dismissal with the board of guardians ?—I should feel very much disposed to agree with you, but that would be making a most serious alteration, because hitherto the administration has been entirely in the hands of the guardians. That would be transferring the balance of administrative responsibility to the Local Government Board and their officials.

9471. That is what I am suggesting, for this reason—that this and some of the other evils which are mentioned to us seem at the present moment to be beyond the reach of cure, because the inspector is especially enjoined not to take part in the administration, and we have had evidence, for instance, that he discusses the cases after they are settled, not as it were influencing the settlement of the cases ; and so with regard to the books that are kept. It is therefore difficult to see where the new power will come in that would carry out such a policy as you have before you. Another matter which I would suggest might be submitted as part of the duties of an inspector would be the enforcement as far as possible, of a definite policy, which policy the Local Government Board itself might set forth ?—I should be quite with you if the suggestion could be put into a shape in which it might be acted upon. But with regard to what you have said about the inspector in cases of relief, when I am at a Board of Guardians I constantly advise upon cases which are before the Board, and I do that before they are settled. If my advice is disregarded, I do not feel that I have done any good ; if my advice is regarded, I feel that the poor man has been harshly treated by being refused when I was there, when he probably would have got it if I had not been there.

Local Govern Board to inte individ cases o relief.

9472. But of course if you had in your hands a definite policy on which to work, and a policy recognised by the authorities, then your line would be clear ?—I have a perfectly definite policy. To a certain extent that has always been the policy of the Local Government Board, the Poor Law Board, and the Poor Law Commissioners. I have endeavoured so far as I can to carry out their views and their policy. But at the same time one is defeated by the statutory enactment that the Local Government Board shall not interfere in any individual case. If ever I want a thing done, or I tell the guardians that they ought not to do what they want to do, they may say, " You have no business to interfere ; here is a direct statutory enactment that you are not to interfere with us in the administration of relief."

9473. Can you tell me at all whether " interfering with any individual case " implies any kind of interference by an inspector by advice ; has it been so adjudged ?—No. I constantly advise them, and, as I say, my advice is sometimes taken and sometimes it is not taken.

9474. Therefore the interference would be the practical interference with an order for relief given by a Board of Guardians ?—Not quite so. I should often be glad to have the power to say " You shall not give the relief in this case." Take a drunkard ; it is absolutely useless to give out-relief to a drunkard, and I do not understand why guardians ever do that, but it is constantly done, although you might as well pour water into a sieve.

Questi sufficie and me of out-r relief : Prohib and Regula Orders.

9475. The other Orders, the Prohibitory Order and the Regulation Order, practically do not cover those difficulties, I think ?—No. You must remember that the exceptions under the Out-Relief Regulation Order and the Prohibitory Order were put in with a view to prevent the possibility of any case of hardship. If you will look back to the earlier reports of the Poor Law Commissioners, and to the many debates in Parliament at that time, you will find how it was attempted to show that the regulations of the Commissioners induced great hardship. These regulations were quoted to show that the hardship was not the result of the regulations.

9476. That is to say, they have not been so much a direction of Boards of Guardians from the point of view of the best administration possible, but a direction of the Boards of Guardians to prevent clamour and misjudgment?—I think so, to some extent. In the early days of the Poor Law you know how bitter the opposition to the Poor Law was, and how every little handle that could be got

hold of was worked for all it was worth to excite further opposition against it and to endeavour to upset it. I am referring to the early days when the Commissioners practically had to fight for its existence not only in Parliament, but outside Parliament.

9477. And all these Orders, the Consolidated Order and the others, date from the early days, the "forties"? —Certainly. By 1847, when the Consolidated Order was issued in its present form, the Commissioners had practically asserted themselves and held their own. But you must remember that in the early days of the Poor Law Commissioners their powers were only given to them for limited periods, I think in the first instance for three years, if I remember right, and then they were extended from three years to five years. Until many years after the Poor Law Board was constituted, it was not made a permanent establishment. It is most interesting to look back to the records and to the debates in Parliament at that time.

sufficient laries of edical icers, and il results.

9478. With regard to the medical officers about whom Dr. Downes asked you, what would be the average salary which they would receive at present?—I am afraid I can hardly tell you that.

9479. Would it be a very small amount—under £50 a year may we say?—The average for the medical officers would be more than £50 a year; but you must consider the ground they have to cover in the rural districts, and that they are at the beck and call of everybody for whom they get Orders, at all hours of the day and night, and that they may be held to account if they do not at once comply with an Order. The Poor Law Commissioners apprehended the difficulty of making the medical attendance upon paupers better than the medical attendance upon the independent labourer, and you will find in the early reports of the Poor Law Commission that it was hoped that that difficulty and that preference, if one might so call it, for the pauper over the independent labourer in regard to medical relief would be met by the furtherance and establishment of medical clubs.

9480. Your evidence would point to a re-organisation of the whole department of medical relief from the point of view of the remuneration of the medical officer, I take it?—I think it is most desirable that the medical officers should be much better remunerated than they are. They should be so remunerated that they could fairly be called upon to do the work as it ought to be done. There is a difficulty now if you say to a medical officer, "I find that you have been very little in the workhouse," and he says, "I do all that I consider necessary; that is my business, not yours. I do sufficient and you cannot show any complaint against me." I have come across striking instances in which I have been able to show a complaint. I remember going into one workhouse when the medical officer was not there. I said to the nurse, "Have you any bed sores?" She said "There is not a bed sore in the place." I went into some of the wards, and I saw one man looking very miserable. I said to the nurse, "Is that man all right?" She said, "Yes." I said, "Let me see his back." She turned him over. He had a bad bed sore. I looked at several other cases, and I found many bed sores. I sent for the doctor. I said, "I am very sorry to see the state of bed sore that these patients are in." The medical officer said, "There is not a bed sore in the place." I said, "Please come and look." I showed him bed sore after bed sore. "I am horrified," he said. I reported the facts to the Local Government Board, and my report was sent down to the guardians. The medical officer had died in the meanwhile, and the guardians referred my repert to his son who had succeeded him in office. He denied that there had been any bed sore, said that I was not a medical man, and I did not know what a bed sore was. By that time it was about six weeks or two months after I had found the bed sores. Dr. Downes was then Poor Law medical inspector for the provinces, and as soon as possible afterwards he was good enough to come down with me. Most of the cases had died, but those that remained showed evidence of the bed sores which I had seen, but they had meanwhile been cared for and healed. That medical officer to this day maintains that there were no bed sores, and that I calumniated his father by saying that there were bed sores. If the father had been properly paid to do his work thoroughly, he would probably have examined those patients. But he took the nurse's statement, because he was receiving an inadequate salary, and did as much work as he thought the money was worth.

9481. Is there not a certain grant made towards the salaries of medical officers?—Yes.

System of "Exchequer grants and proposed reforms.

9482. Do you think it is at all advisable to continue that grant from the central exchequer?—I do not care for those repayments myself. That particular repayment acts unfairly now. The establishment charges are repaid under the Local Government Act of 1888, as they stood at Ladyday, 1888, and they have never been revised by Parliament since.

9483. Suppose we dropped them all, should we do any real harm?—I doubt very much whether you would. If those payments are to be kept up, I think they ought to be brought up to date. In some cases they inflict considerable hardship. In those days there was very little nursing, but many of the unions since that time have practically established their nursing on a good footing, and they get no repayment towards it. Any salaries that have been added since 1888 are not repaid.

9484. (*Dr. Downes.*) As at present administered, that grant has no relation to efficiency, I believe?—None.

9485. (*Mr. Bentham.*) And it was never intended to have any, was it?—The history of that grant is curious. The proposal was that the cost of outdoor relief should remain a local charge and the cost of indoor relief should be repaid by the Government. When the Bill came before Parliament, Parliament would not accept that, and there was a compromise effected which was not that the cost of indoor relief should be repaid, but that the cost of the establishment charges should be repaid as they stood at Lady Day, 1888; except with regard to London, and for London there is a different arrangement made.

9486. (*Mr. Loch.*) To come to the question of these Exchequer charges, do you think that the Exchequer charges or grants should take any other form? Would it be desirable that a grant be made, for instance, for general in-door purposes, subject to report I would say by the inspector?—I should agree with that suggestion, and think it the best thing to do. I would not repay the whole cost of in-door relief, because if you do that, you have no check upon the extravagance which guardians may choose to indulge in. If they get everything repaid to them which they spend, they would have no inducement towards economy.

9487. If you are to use the grant as a means of producing good administration you must hold the grant in your hands subject to a report that is favourable, must you not?—Quite so; if the grant were to be given subject to the sanction of the Local Government Board that would be quite sufficient guarantee to prevent its misapplication or abuse. I should prefer that to the present arrangement, which stands, as the payment was settled, upon, as I think, very unsatisfactory grounds, at the amount paid in the year ended Lady Day, 1888.

9488. Would you make your grant turn partly upon the establishments of the Boards of Guardians, their amount, and so on?—Yes, to a certain extent; but I would make it dependent entirely upon the efficiency of the establishment, whatever the size of it might be. For instance, I would not grant it if the nursing was not efficient and if proper provision was not made for day and night nursing, and I would not grant it if the babies were not properly looked after. I would make it depend upon details of that kind.

9489. That is to say, it would be subject to report?—Certainly.

Lunatic grant and its proposed readjustment

9490. With regard to another branch, the lunatics, are you in favour of the continuance of the 4s. grant?—I can remember the time before the 4s. grant. I was so horrified at the terrible lot of those who used to be kept in the workhouse, that I hailed the 4s. grant with delight, because it transferred those cases from the workhouses to the asylums. Most of the people who are practically administering now cannot remember the days before the 4s. grant, and they do not remember

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

the horrors of keeping everybody in the workhouse that it would be possible to keep there, no matter what suffering and misery and discomfort they inflicted upon others, because the guardians did not like to pay the 12s. or 14s. which it was necessary to pay for them in an asylum.

9491. Granted that it has had that very good result, is it good at the present time, do you think ?—No, I do not.

9492. Have you any suggestion for a modification or an alteration of it ?—I do not know in what form the best suggestion might be made, but I should be very glad if that 4s. ceased, so far as it concerns the guardians.

9493. Suppose this suggestion were put forward, that, instead of a 4s. grant, there might be a grant for the afflicted (including the lunatics) and that some county authority or some local authority, subject again to report, was allowed to use this grant for any particular purpose to which at that moment it is desirable to apply the money; do you think that that would be too broad a basis ?—It is a new suggestion to me, but I should think that the difficulty might be met in that way. One knows how the county asylums are congested now, and how the fact of that congestion prevents their serving their proper purpose. The county asylum ought to be curative, and for those who are incurable and cannot otherwise be properly dealt with. Instead of which, the asylums are congested with cases which are sent there because there is nowhere else to send them. Those cases may keep out others whose cure depends on their being placed under immediate treatment, and may either prevent their cure or delay it almost indefinitely, and at the same time, give much trouble to the asylum authorities without any corresponding advantage whatever. It is of the first importance in mental cases to get them under control immediately, but they may be kept waiting before they can be admitted into the asylum, because there is no room for them. I do not say that it often happens.

9494. Do you think there is any objection to the authority, whoever it might be—say the local authority for the county—receiving a grant, as was done in the case of the Polytechnics in London, on the understanding that a certain amount of money were raised, possibly from voluntary sources entirely, so that in that way a rather more economical method of founding establishments of this kind might be supplied ?—I think that anything which would provide establishments for cases of mental disease intermediate between the workhouse and the county asylum, would be an advantage; and if any financial arrangement could be arrived at which would further that without putting an excessive expenditure on the county, it would be extremely desirable that it should be done. Very possibly your suggestion might lead to that result.

Need for new class of establishments for the insane

9495. Do you think that there might be a county authority which represented the guardians, and practically the guardians only, to manage these affairs, as against the county council ?—I do not see why the county council should not manage them. The county council have to manage lunacy, and this is a branch of lunacy; and they have the lunatic asylums. What I should be glad to see would be a subsidiary lunatic asylum, in which the arrangements for treatment would be sufficient for the class of case to be dealt with, but would be much less costly than is necessary for those who go in for curative purposes and those who are acutely ill and can never be recovered.

County council as authority for dealing with defectives.

9496. Would you transfer to the county council also the cure of the afflicted generally, including epileptics and imbeciles ?—I do not know about the sane epileptics, but I would transfer all the mentally afflicted to them. The sane epileptics are worse off than any class I know, because there is practically no accommodation in England for the sane epileptics except at Chalfont St. Giles and the Meath Home at Godalming, the institutions of Lancashire and a few others scattered over different parts of the country. It is a constant grief to me when I come across cases of sane epileptics in workhouses, and they have to remain there because there is nowhere else to send them. They are very nervous about themselves, and if they are put in lunatic wards and imbecile wards, they are put there for their own protection; probably they are happier there than they would be among the general inmates, because they are protected to some extent. But at the same time it is a wretched solution of the question. The sane epileptics should be treated quite differently from the insane.

9497. With regard to loans, the Out-door Relief Regulation Order says that relief may be given by way of loan to or on account of any person over twenty-one, or to his wife, or to any of his family under the age of sixteen; and then the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 says that the master or employer of the recipient can, in all cases in which relief has been given as a loan, be required by a justice, on application from the guardians, to show cause why wages due, or from time to time due to the recipient, should not be paid over in whole or in part to the guardians; and the justice can, if he think fit, taking into consideration the circumstances of such poor person and his family, require the employer from such wages to pay the debt to the guardians direct by instalments, or in a lump sum as may be arranged. Is that law at all effectual, is it ever done ?—I do not think it is acted upon. I do not remember an instance.

Recovery of loan relief of wages.

9498. Then practically it is obsolete ?—For practical purposes I regard it as obsolete, at least in the country.

9499. With regard to medical relief, the dilemma, so I understand, is that "as the exact cost of it in any individual case cannot in general be severed from the total cost of medical relief in the union, it does not seem to be such relief as can be given by way of loan. "But in some unions"—so the old note runs—"it is nevertheless so given"? ?—In the Bradfield Union they give all their medical relief on loan in the first instance, and decide afterwards whether they shall recover. But they had an exceptional bit of good fortune; they took one or two of their first cases who refused to pay into the county court, and the county court decided in their favour, and that decision was never appealed against and, consequently, never upset.

Difficulty of recovering medical loan relief.

9500. Why should not that county court decision be considered to apply generally ?—I am afraid you cannot give on loan when you cannot state what the amount of the loan will be.

9501. Is the dilemma insoluble ? Why should you not require by statute or by order that medical relief be given on loan if the guardians so desire ?—Because you cannot fix the amount of the loan, that is, the amount which will be due in any particular case. Where it carries a fee with it, such as a midwifery fee or an operation fee, it can be given on loan and it can be recovered. Ordinarily, a medical officer is paid by salary; he has to attend every case for which he receives a competent order, and you cannot distinguish the value of his attendances in that particular case from any other case. At Bradfield they have got over it by paying him partly by salary and partly by fee, and there they recover the amount which is determined as his fee in the particular case. I forget what the fee is fixed at, but it is about 6s., I think. That, although it answers their purpose, is unsatisfactory, because if he has only to pay one visit to a man, 6s. is excessive, and if he has to attend a man for six weeks 6s. is inadequate.

9502. Could not the dilemma be more or less adjusted on some basis, if, as I understand, you consider the loan system on the whole is desirable ?—I consider the loan system is most desirable, and that if it were applied more widely it would tend to encourage medical clubs and provident societies and would do a great deal to discourage pauperism. But with regard to medical relief on loan, unless you have a system of payment of medical officers by fee, it is difficult to arrive at the amount which you could legally claim. The system of payment by fee was tried in the earlier days of the Poor Law, and the amount of some of the doctor's bills was so large that the local authorities raised strong objection. If the medical officer can charge by fee, he may visit his case twice a day or three times a day, and he may run up any bill he likes. That was supposed to have been done in some of the old cases.

9503. If there was a reorganisation of the payment of medical officers, do you think this point might be taken into account, so as to make relief by loan possible ?—I think it might be done. It would no doubt have a very beneficial influence. I was most anxious to

encourage medical relief on loan, and one or two unions in my district were willing to do it; but I am sorry to say that it failed, except where there was a fixed fee.

Recovery of loan relief and of maintenance.

9504. With regard to the recovery of money on loan or the recovery from relations, it is a county court process to which you have to turn, is it not?—Yes.

9505. Would it be feasible to apply the system adopted under the Bastardy Acts? Under those Acts, the father can be brought before two justices, and in case the father neglects or refuses to make payment of the sum due under the order (and since any commitment or disobedience of the order) as well as the costs attending the warrant of apprehension and bringing him up, then the two justices may by warrant direct the amount with such costs to be recovered by distress and sale, and the father to be detained in custody until return is made of the warrant of distress, unless he can by way of recognisance or otherwise satisfy the justices of his appearance before them on the day appointed for the return of the warrant. I remember an experienced magistrate in London, referring to the way in which parents did not pay in the case of reformatory and industrial schools, saying that he believed that the adoption of this system would greatly facilitate the payment of moneys by relatives and others; what would be your opinion?—I think it would be an excellent enactment.

Possibility of administering relief through stipendiary official of central authority.

9506. With regard to out-door relief, would you suggest that if one wanted to strengthen the policy of what you yourself have put before us, that such rules as the Manchester rules should be pushed forward and supported much more strongly by the board; or would your policy be rather to recognise the system of relying on the orders and bringing them in various ways up to date?—The whole question is surrounded with very grave difficulties, but if it were possible that there should be someone in a position analagous to that of a stipendiary magistrate, who had power to control the administration of relief, you might bring about a uniform administration, which under the present powers is practically impossible. To go back to what I said yesterday, if you could have a central authority and parcel out the country into areas and into each of those areas send a representative of the central authority with power to administer and control the relief, you would get a uniform administration, and I have no doubt that you would produce eminently satisfactory results. On the face of it, and having regard to this particular object only, that would seem to be the right thing to do; but if you do that you take away from the local authorities the power of education in self-government. Boards of guardians, however badly they may administer, are most valuable as bodies of self-governors, and the fact of their carrying on the local administration has great advantages which must not be lost sight of in the regret that from a Poor Law point of view they do not administer better than they do.

Advantages of case-papers over application and report book.

9507. If we could look at the matter from another standpoint, and instead of falling back upon modifications of the present orders, if we took the application and report book?—May I say that I should be very glad to get rid of that book. I want to have the case-paper system instead. If you had the case-paper system thoroughly well done, you would get a very much better result, and you would then only want such columns of the application and report book as are necessary for statistical and report purposes, apart from the history of the case. I should like to have the history of the case on the case-paper system. That is perhaps hardly an answer to your question, but it has reference to the importance of the application and report book.

9508. At present the application and report book lays great stress on the relief ordered by the guardians in kind, in money, quantity and description, what time allowed, and nature of the order made. That is a system which lends itself rather to allowances than to a careful treatment of the individual case from any point of view that might occur, does it not?—Quite so.

9509. If, therefore, the latter plan were adopted as the true method, then it seems that the orders would have to be reorganised and re-co-ordinated from that point of view; would it not be so?—I should like that to be done. With regard to the application and report book, you do not get a continuous history of the case. A case may apply this year and may obtain relief; it may have relief for a month and then go off again. Next year that case may apply again; there is a fresh entry in the application and report book which makes no reference to the past history of the case. If you had the case-paper system, and had that thoroughly well done, you would have the history of the case from the beginning to the very end of it. I will take the Whitchurch union in Hampshire, where Sir Wyndham Portal was chairman for many years. He and his colleagues there introduced the case-paper system, only in the form of a record book, that is there is an alphabetical list of every pauper who has applied for relief since that book was started, now a great many years ago. By reference to the book you can see the history and the whole record of a family from the time of the first application. They may have been for years without relief, but if they come back again, there is their past history. It is annotated up to date. If a child gets employment, that is entered; an alteration of wages is entered. All those details are regularly entered, so that the record of the case is kept constantly running; and when a fresh application is made the guardians can refer back to the past history, not only of the case, but of every member of the family—those who are able to contribute, those who are not able to contribute, those who are married and those who are unmarried; those who have got children, and those who have not got children. The whole thing is recorded as the events occurred. At Tisbury, where Mrs. Downes was a guardian, she was instrumental in introducing the case-paper system. That gives the same results, only instead of being kept in a book, the records are placed in pigeon-holes in the board-room. They are constantly referred to, and if there is any detail wanted they give it. The application and report book does not give you that, and cannot give it to you.

Record book at Whitchurch.

9510. (*Dr. Downes.*) Who keeps the record book at Whitchurch?—The clerk or his clerk posts it up, but the relieving officer constantly gives the information.

9511. The clerk there does not give his whole time to the guardians, does he?—No.

9512. What is he, a solicitor?—He is a solicitor and the coroner. At Whitchurch all the guardians and their officers have worked most loyally together. It is only fair to say that it is a small union, but still the principle could be adopted in any union. If it were necessary to have a special officer to keep the record book or the case-papers, it would be well worth while to appoint him for the purpose.

Attractiveness of urban relief.

9513. (*Mr. Lock.*) The old principle of Poor Law administration would be that the condition of the recipient should be less eligible than that of the independent labourer?—Clearly.

9514. Do you think that that is at the present practically applicable in our urban administration?—I am afraid not. The condition of the pauper is often allowed to be better than that of the independent labourer. A great many independent labourers go through a very hard time in order to maintain their independence, and many paupers have a very easy time, because it pleases them to sacrifice their independence.

Character of rural indoor paupers.

9515. Could we revert to the real meaning of that statement if we ordered our workhouses better, or do the modern requirements ask so much of us that we cannot really put in force that definition?—I was referring in my last answer chiefly to the towns. In the country districts you have practically no one in the workhouse but just the residuum, that is, the people who if they are young are incompetent physically or mentally, if they are old are past their work, and the women who have illegitimate children and cannot maintain themselves and their children outside. I do not know that in the country workhouses there is any necessity for bringing the administration into stricter lines than it is now.

Abuse by inmates of privilege of leave of absence from workhouse.

9516. I am thinking of the urban districts?—In the urban districts a good deal more might be done. Of course it is very unpopular to try and bring about reforms, but there is one practice specially, that I think is a most mischievous practice, and that is constantly allowing inmates out on leave. Take the big workhouses. There, if the inmates do not misbehave themselves, they are allowed ont on leave regularly once a week. A very considerable proportion of them come back

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming

10 April, 1906.

drunk. I have known cases in which the men and the women were allowed out on the same day; I hope that has generally been stopped, but I am not sure that it does not prevail to some extent even now. They make assignations outside, meet outside, and spend the day together in anything but satisfactory conditions, and very likely both come back drunk. In some of the big town workhouses drunken returns are a frequent occurrence; it is well known that a proportion of those who go out on leave come back drunk, and so long as they are not noisy and disorderly and do not hit a porter or go for the master, they are put into some room where they can get sober quietly, and are left there to do the best they can for themselves.

9517. Would you therefore say that it is a question of administration whether we carry out the old principle or not?—Those are all questions of administration. They are questions which are now in the hands of the guardians. The guardians all know these things, but for some reason or another they do not choose to prevent them.

9518. Would it be within the scope of an Order to give instructions to prevent that?—I think it would be extremely difficult, unless you had some officer on the spot. These matters are not reported. Strictly speaking, it is very difficult to say whom you can blame. The guardians give the man leave to go out, the master may report that he comes in drunk, and they may stop his leave perhaps for a month or two months; but practically in a good many of the big towns it is taken as so common an occurrence that no notice is taken of it, so long as the man does not do some overt act of mischief.

Possibility of increased supervision of poor relief by inspector.

9519. Might not the inspector be made the pivot of the supervision, and if he found this was going on and it was contrary to the Order might it not then be suppressed?—That would be exceedingly difficult. What can an inspector do? I have got fifty-four unions in my district, and I cannot go round to them all more than about once a year. I go to the workhouse perhaps once a year, if I can manage it twice a year, to the bigger ones I go perhaps oftener. It does not do for me to interfere with the administration, because if I interfere I must take some responsibility for it, and besides I have no power to do it. I go to the boards of guardians once or twice in the course of a year. As I endeavoured to express yesterday, one has a certain amount of supervision, but the administration is not in the smallest sense in my hands. Unless you increase your staff enormously and cut down the areas in which they are to take part, in the administration, I do not see how you are to improve matters so far as the inspector is concerned.

9520. Is there really no way out of it but to increase their powers and increase the staff; how would it otherwise be possible to carry out even your own programme?—By educating the guardians.

9521. The process of education without a very close supervision is a very ineffective process; it is the supervision to a very large extent that makes the education real, is it not?—Yes. I thought that very likely your suggestion as to the grant depending upon a satisfactory report upon points of that kind might help very much. Guardians often say, "It does not matter; and if the inspector has not found it out it is all right." I have always repudiated altogether that description of the position, because how can an inspector find things out? I go to a workhouse, say, once a year, and how can I possibly know, how can I pretend to know, what is going on in a workhouse except on the one day that I happen to be there? I never willingly go to workhouses in the same neighbourhood on following days, simply because it is known when I am in a neighbourhood, and so I zig-zag and go to workhouses distant from each other. But even doing that whilst I am on one side of the workhouse I know that the other side of the workhouse may be being put into order. It is not seldom found that in the first sleeping ward there are dirty sheets on, but before the other end of the house is reached the beds have clean sheets. One is up to those tricks as one sees them going on, but it is impossible to stop them.

Possibility of systematic co-operation between guardians and charities.

9522. To take another point, you mentioned the benevolent fund at Farnham and other similar arrangements that have been made; do you think that that could be elaborated rather further? Would it not be possible, in view of a better line of inquiry and better results from the point of view of investigation, to promote, somewhat on the lines of Mr. Goschen's circular, a system of charitable or voluntary assistance side by side with the Poor Law and taking all cases that do not come under the stricter or special conditions of the Poor Law?—I think it might be done, and done with the greatest advantage, but whether you can make it compulsory is the point. Unless you can make it compulsory, can you get it done? And then comes the point, can you make it compulsory? When you go into the remote country unions where the population is scattered, where the workhouse establishment is very small, and where the guardians have got into a routine manner of doing business, I am afraid it might be very difficult to get such a body as you have in mind together to do active work. If it could be done it would be excellent, but the question to my mind is whether it could be rendered compulsory and could be practically carried out if it were nominally compulsory.

Maladministration of endowed charities.

9523. Might it be that the inspector properly backed might adopt and put forward such a policy, and that the endowed charities by statutory arrangement might be made the nucleus, wherever they are, of a fund for this purpose?—I think it would be admirable if it could be worked out. The charities are the old difficulty; they are the crux of the situation. There is nothing so difficult as to get charities fairly administered. I quoted some instances yesterday, and one knows that church and chapel charities are the old, old difficulties. Everybody who has got the distribution or management of a charity uses it for his own purpose, and is most unwilling that anybody else should get anything or should use it for any other purpose. It is a constant thing to find that people are obtaining relief from several charities at the same time. The over-lapping of charities is miserable, and it is only when it happens to be found out that anybody knows that there has been the over-lapping.

9524. The crux of the position is this, is it not? Suppose the board of guardians do their work very well, then will arise the necessity for the treatment of the case otherwise than by allowance or in-door relief?—Yes.

Operation of Farnham "Benevolent Fund."

9525. And then there would be nobody to refer to, unless there is somebody outside the board to do what is wanted; therefore the very adoption of a reformed system will create the necessity of an ancillary charitable system, will it not?—Yes, I thoroughly agree with you. At Farnham they have done that through the instrumentality of the board of guardians. The guardians work the benevolent fund, and one of them is appointed treasurer to the fund. He receives the money which is collected, and he has to account for it all. The guardians themselves make the order upon the benevolent fund, and the treasurer alone cannot give anything out of the benevolent fund, nor can any individual guardian do so. When the case is before the guardians, and they think it is not a Poor Law case but a case that ought to be helped by the benevolent fund, and can be prevented from becoming a pauper by means of the benevolent fund, the guardians themselves refer it to the benevolent fund. They decide how much should be given and make the order, and then the treasurer acts upon the order.

9526. (*Miss Hill.*) Can you tell us what amount is administered by that fund in the year?—I asked Colonel Fitzroy, who is one of the Farnham guardians, and a most excellent guardian too; he is the treasurer of the benevolent fund, and I think he told me recently that in no year had it amounted to more than about £20.

9527. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would the inquiry in these cases have been made by the board of guardians?—The inquiry is made by the relieving officer, and it is subsequently most carefully gone into by the guardians who distribute the benevolent fund. It does not follow that because a man is referred to the benevolent fund committee that he will be dealt with by the benevolent fund. It is quite possible that the benevolent fund might throw the case back to the board of guardians. If there were unsatisfactory features, it would be referred back to the guardians.

Proposed "pooling" of endowed charities, which are sometimes very important, funds.

9528. Do you think the charities might have some recognised status as co-operators with the Poor Law if there were by statute opportunity given for an organisation of charitable

in conjunction with voluntary relief?—I think it would be most valuable, and I would go further than that: I should like to pool all the available charities into one central fund which might be distributed to the different unions for the purpose you speak of. Some places have got very large endowed charities—very much more than they require for their own necessities; and in other places they have little or nothing of the kind. If they could all be pooled into the hands of one central authority for the county and distributed to the different unions according to their rateable value, or upon any other basis you might arrange as the most satisfactory and the most likely to be useful for the purpose, that would be a most valuable thing to do.

9529. That is to say, ideally at any rate one might deal with the charities of Salisbury, possibly, on some such basis?—Certainly.

Operation of Relief to School Children Order.

9530. With regard to the Underfed Children Order, 1905, do you think that the principle of that Order is right, by which the child is dealt with primarily apart from the parent, and then the parent either receives the relief (for virtually it is an allowance made to him) or else he is prosecuted for negligence?—It is very difficult for me to speak about that Order. It is an Order which has been determined by Parliament, and on which my chiefs have issued a circular. I have no difficulty in saying personally that I think the whole thing is a very great mistake; but it is not for me to set my opinion against the opinion of those who are above me, and who are very much wiser than I am.

Adoption of children by guardians.

9531. With regard to the powers of guardianship which the guardians have recently had imposed on them, are those powers working satisfactorily?—They are working satisfactorily so far as the children are concerned; but they have the very grave danger that they do enable any parent who wants to get rid of his child to do it: and as for getting the money from the parents afterwards, the powers might very nearly as well not exist.

9532. You said that child pauperism was going down?—Yes.

9533. But are not the guardianship cases increasing rather rapidly in urban centres?—Not sufficiently to affect the total, I think. At any rate not in my district.

Operation of Unemployed Workmen's Act at Southampton and elsewhere

9534. Take another burning question: the Unemployed Workmen's Act; are you in favour of having a concurrent authority for the relief of the unemployed?—Clearly not. Here again, I ought to speak with very great reserve; but I cannot help thinking that that Act has created a monster which may eat us up.

9535. In Southampton have you had that Act in force?—Yes.

9536. Have you seen the men relieved by the distress committee?—Some of them I have, but I have not attended any meetings of the distress committee.

9537. Have those men who have been relieved been on the relieving officer's books in any past year?—I cannot tell you, but I should think some of them probably have. The Southampton people have done their best to work that Act very loyally, and so have the Portsmouth people. They have dealt with a very considerable number of people. It is a strange fact that the outdoor pauperism in Portsmouth now is lower than it was this time last year. There were various influences which I believe have brought about that result, but the Portsmouth people themselves say that one of the influences is the work of the distress committee, which has prevented many from coming upon the poor rate who otherwise would have had to be dealt with as paupers. So far, no doubt, the effect has been good. At Southampton, the guardians and the corporation had a joint meeting, at which they arranged what they would do. The corporation had the control of a considerable plot of land where they were able to put people to spade labour, and the guardians themselves tried to employ some of the men who were said to be out of work on an estate which they have about three miles from Southampton. They arranged to send a good many of the men there by tramway—a tram went I think within about half-a-mile of the site. I forget what they were to pay them, but it was 2s. a day or about that sum. They gave a good many orders for this work. One thing they had to do was to provide against these men selling their tram tickets. Some of the men to whom they offered the work would not go to it. Some went, but others would not take the trouble to go that distance to get the 2s. a day. Altogether, I was very far from being impressed with the necessity for the work at all. The guardians, I think, acted rightly. They said "We want this work done; we are told there is very great distress, and we are perfectly willing, so long as it lies with us, to relieve that distress without pauperising the people. This is wages for work; this is not Poor Law relief." But the necessity was not keen enough to induce them all to take advantage of even that very easy work.

9538. That is to say, had the new organisation not been created, the pauperism would not necessarily have risen very much?—No. The guardians would have been able to do exactly the same as they have done now, except that it would not have been paid under the name of wages.

9539. It is a difficult process to apply wages to the relief of unemployment of that description, is it not?—Most difficult. Of course, from my point of view, the guardians ought to be the sole authority to deal with destitution. I would not allow destitution to be dealt with by anybody but the Board of Guardians, and I am confident that the past history of every attempt to deal with destitution outside the Board of Guardians, if it is only fairly recorded, has shown mischievous instead of good results.

9540. (*Mr. Booth.*) Do you mean distress or destitution?—Distress approaching or amounting to destitution; or distress relieved by public funds I think would probably be a better definition of what is in my mind.

Applicability of Danish relief systems to England.

9541. (*Mr. Loch.*) You would not be in favour of an alternative *quasi*-Danish system for the relief of the unemployed and for the relief of the aged, by which they would have a statutory right to relief through Poor Law agency?—No, certainly not. I do not think you can compare any of the countries which are dealing with pauperism and old age in that manner or form with England. Most of them have very small populations. Denmark, I think, only has about 4,000,000 in the whole country, and you cannot compare a system in a country with 4,000,000 inhabitants with a system for a country with 40,000,000 inhabitants.

Increased detention for "ins and outs."

9542. To take another point—the ins-and-outs; would you be in favour of a modification of the present system by which they are detained for a certain period, but after that can go out? Would you be in favour of dealing with them, for instance, under the Vagrancy Act, or in some other similar way?—Yes. For that class of hopeless ins-and-outs I should favour a much longer period of detention, and I should put them to very hard work indeed—I mean if they were physically capable.

9543. Would you put them under the Vagrancy law and have a committal by a magistrate?—I think I should. I am very reluctant to make any more criminal offences than is absolutely necessary, but I think a man who behaves like that really deserves to be treated as a criminal.

Advice by Local Government Board on legislative proposals.

9544. In paragraph 11 of your Memorandum you refer to the fact that the Local Government Board was not represented in regard to certain legislation, and you say: "So far as the Local Government Board are concerned, their discretion has been largely interfered with by the direct action of Parliament, and they have not had the free hand which was used in the early days of the new Poor Law by the Poor Law Commissioners and the Poor Law Board." Would it be feasible, do you think, to arrange that on all matters connected with the relief of the poor that come before the country the Local Government Board should be one of the advisers? Questions are now coming up before the country in regard to the feeding of children and similar matters, and it is quite possible that the view of the Local Government Board may be set aside or ignored?—I think it would be most desirable, if it be possible, that the Local Government Board should have an opportunity of stating their views upon all questions of that character. Everything that has to do with the relief of the poor should come before the board, but you see Parliament steps in, and it is, of course, impossible to say that the Government and Parliament should be in any way interfered with.

9545. (*Chairman.*) What Mr. Loch means is this, I think—that where a proposal is laid before Parliament

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

by the Government, it should be accompanied by a Report from the Local Government Board from the Poor Law point of view. (*Mr. Loch*) Yes, that is it—that there should be a statutory obligation on the Local Government Board to make such a Report to Parliament on any question arising relating to relief?—Personally, I think that would be an admirable enactment, but it would, of course, be putting a heavy duty on the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board already have more to do almost than they can do. I should like rather to refer to that. The Local Government Board is constantly blamed for not getting through their work as they should get through it. As a matter of fact I think one's marvel is that the Local Government Board keep anywhere near so well up to time as they do in their work. Take the matter of correspondence. You constantly find guardians say, We can get no answer from the Local Government Board. Very often the blame is the guardians' own. Suppose the guardians write to the Local Government Board. They write perhaps a day or two before the meeting and ask for an answer by return of post. The Local Government Board cannot do it. They may have to refer the papers to the inspector of the district, they may have to refer to the engineering department, or to the medical department, or to one of their expert departments in other directions. That must take a day or two. Then they answer the board of guardians, and their letter reaches the board of guardians: and then what do the board of guardians do? They say, We must consider this; we will appoint a Committee to consider it. That Committee is appointed. They may or may not meet before the next board day. Very likely their report is referred back to them. By that time, six weeks or two months have elapsed; and so it is not until about three months have elapsed that they can get an answer to their original question. Then they say at once, We asked the Local Government Board this question three months ago, and here, only to-day, have we got the answer, whereas, as a matter of fact, two months or more of the delay has been on their side and not on the part of the Local Government Board at all.

Allegations of delay on part of Local Government Board.

9546. I understand that in your Memorandum you suggest that a certain amount of the correspondence might be decentralised?—Certainly.

9547. Do you think you could decentralise still further by again making the inspector the pivot of the administration, and requiring a great many things that now come here to go to him first?—I should be perfectly satisfied to do it, so far as I am personally concerned.

Proposal to transfer to inspectors some of the Local Government Board's functions.

9548. That is, if the staff were provided?—Yes. Whether the Department itself would think it wise to allow a considerable amount of what might be very important business to be decided by the inspector without reference to the Board themselves, is another question.

9549. But there would be limits, would there not, in accordance with which such an arrangement might be managed?—If it could be properly limited, I think probably it might save a great deal of trouble. A great deal of work is done in that way now. I am constantly getting letters from boards of guardians, and from individual guardians, upon points which they have under consideration, asking what I think ought to be done. In the large majority of these cases I answer the letters myself, because I know what the board would wish done. That might be carried very much further I have no doubt.

9550. Do you think that a general policy of decentralisation on to the inspectors in the various ways which I have suggested to you might be feasible?—I think it might.

Poor Law infirmaries as medical training schools.

9551. I have only one more point to put to you, and that has to do with the infirmaries. Do you think the infirmaries could be turned to account for teaching purposes, and laid open to the medical profession from that point of view?—No.

9552. Would you kindly give your reasons?—Yes. I do not think that Poor Law infirmaries are at all to be compared with general hospitals. A person goes to a general hospital voluntarily, and by voluntarily accepting the treatment at the general hospital, he submits to the conditions which are there imposed. A person goes to a workhouse infirmary because he is sent there by the order of the guardians and it is the only form of relief open to him. Then, again, in the large majority of the cases people go to the general hospitals almost entirely for temporary purposes, and do not go there permanently. They go for treatment for a certain disease, and when it is over they go home again; if the treatment does not terminate in a cure they are not kept in the hospital, but they have to leave. In the Poor Law hospitals the large majority of the cases are permanent cases, or at all events a very large proportion of them are people who go there and have to remain there until the end.

9553. Is not the process now going on one by which the Poor Law infirmary is becoming an institution of two departments; is there one department for chronic and one for acute cases? To a certain extent that is so, but they are not separate departments, and even if they were, I doubt whether it would be advisable to treat them in any degree as you do the general hospitals. They are for relief purposes, and there are comparatively few of those infirmaries to which your suggestion could apply. It is only in the big town infirmaries where there is much surgical work to be done, I take it.

9554. I had those infirmaries in my mind more particularly?—If your proposal were carried into effect, I think you would find that the inmates would resent it very much indeed.

Present procedure for medical relief and desirability of its continuance.

9555. In Southampton, for instance, if a man applies for medical relief and it is an urgent case, and he goes into the infirmary, does the relieving officer make the ordinary inquiry as to the whole circumstances of the case, while he is in the infirmary?—Yes—or he should do so.

9556. That is a point, is it not, which is often omitted?—Both at Southamption and at Portsmouth, which are the two large infirmaries in my district, the Order in the first instance is given to the workhouse. At Portsmouth, where the infirmary adjoins the workhouse, everybody has to go in through the workhouse gate. The guardians have found it necessary to insist upon the infirmary Order being regarded as a workhouse Order.

9557. Would you adhere to that policy?—Certainly.

9558. And not to the policy of the medical institutions under the Poor Law becoming merged, as it were, in a general medical system?—No. I should certainly adhere to the policy of its being relief, and of its only being dealt with as the relief of actual desititution, and necessarily under the same conditions as any other form of relief, that is, under an Order for the workhouse.

9559. That is on the principle that medical relief may be the first step to pauperism?—Certainly.

Possibility and effect of increasing powers of inspectors.

9560. (*Chairman.*) It is clear from your evidence that you would not object to the present system of supervision as exercised by inspectors, being tightened up and more power given being to them. The present system, as I understand it, is really one of local administration and central supervision?—Quite so.

9561. Assuming that you tightened up the powers and gave a good deal more authority to the inspector, and he was to take a position at all analogous to that which you describe as the position of a stipendiary magistrate, would there be any difficulty in getting local co-operation?—I do not think so. I think that the local authorities, are as a rule, extremely willing to work with the inspectors. In the whole course of my long service, I have only come across one or two instances in which there has been anything like discourtesy on the part of the guardians or local authorities, or unwillingness to listen sympathetically to what the inspector has to say. Of course they know that the inspector has now no power, and that he cannot interfere with them if they do not want to be interfered with, except through the central board.

9562. Your functions now are advisory, are they not?—Purely so.

9563. Under the system which has been rather shadowed out in the course of your evidence they would become, to a certain extent, preventive?—Yes.

9564. And in certain instances, they would be punitive, because you could stop payments?—Yes.

9565. Would that not rather alter the position of the inspector?—Yes; but I doubt whether it would affect injuriously the position of the inspector with the local authorities.

9566. And you do not think it would prevent efficient and capable persons in the locality from co-operating?—I do not think so at all. I think they would know that, if they kept up to the standard—and it would after all be only a very moderate and reasonable standard—which the inspector desired, they would get their grant, and that if they did not do so, they would not get it. I do not think they would make it a personal matter with the inspector. They would very soon get to learn what the standard was, and the reasons why that standard was asked for; and I do not think that they would resent it in any personal manner as against the inspector, or that it need produce any friction or difficulty in the relations of the inspector to the local authorities.

9567. Then the Poor Law inspector would be more like a school inspector?—Yes, to the extent that he would practically control the grant that would be given.

9568. You would be quite prepared to risk any little inconveniences that there might be, I take it?—Personally, I should be quite prepared to risk that. The point is rather a new one to me, and previously it had hardly been put before me in the way in which it has been put before me to-day, so that I must be taken as answering it with a certain amount of reserve. So far as I can see the effect of it at the present moment, I do not see that it need in the smallest degree prejudice my position with regard to the local authorities; on the contrary, I think it would probably very much improve it. I should have some practical power of getting what I want done, and, at the same time, I would show the local authorities that I did not want anything unreasonable. If they got the grant from imperial sources instead of locally, provided they helped to get done what was wanted to bring matters up to the standard which I had set up, I do not think that they would in the smallest degree object.

9569. You have had such a great experience that your opinion is valuable; I gather that you would be prepared to risk this contingency?—Personally, I should be quite prepared to do so.

Possibility of curtailing existing pauperism.

9570. And you would prefer that the experiment should be made, rather than that we should go on drifting, as it were, as we are now?—Certainly. I am confident that that an enormous amount of the present pauperism and xpendi ture is really not only unnecessary but mischievous. Whether my dream, as it has been described, that we may ever come to a time when there may be no pauperism in the country, is a possibility, is, of course, very problematical, and it is quite as problematical to me as it is to you; but if I can see a means by which we can strive effectively, at all events in that direction, I should be glad to adopt it. Now, nothing is being done. We are at a standstill. Pauperism goes on being the trouble that it is, and auxiliary means of dealing with it are being instituted which appear to me to be exceedingly dangerous, and in the long run, are not at all likely to diminish but rather to increase pauperism. Therefore, I would hail with the greatest satisfaction anything which may be likely to tend in the direction in which I think the administration ought to lead.

Mr. Baldwyn Fleming.

10 April, 1906.

Operation of Out-door Relief (Friendly Societies) Act.

9571. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the out-door Relief (Friendly Societies) Act, do you think that that Act is tending towards thrift in your district?—It is certainly not tending towards thrift, because its whole influence would be in the other direction. I am bound to say, however, that it has had very little influence.

9572. That is to say, it has hardly come into force yet?—Yes. I have watched very carefully, and I have hardly seen a case in which anybody has applied for relief, who has got 5s. a week from a friendly society and has said, Because I have got 5s. a week from a friendly society, I insist upon having relief.

9573. The guardians, of course, are really quite free to act as they will practically in giving this or that amount to the person who is the applicant?—Yes. I look upon the Act as a mischievous one, because I think it contravenes the most important principle and the only sound principle of Poor Law administration. Destitution is to be relieved at the cost of the public funds, and I do not see how anybody can have any claim to money compulsorily taken from other people, so long as he is able to support himself by his own exertions or the exertions of those whom he can control in any way. But as I have said, I do not think, as a matter of fact, that the Act has had any practical effect. I have hardly seen a case in which it has been alleged that a man should be relieved regardless of the 5s. a week. For practical purposes, I do not think that the Act is doing anything, at all events in the country districts; I do not know what it may be doing in the towns.

TWENTY-SIXTH DAY.

Monday, 23rd April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*)

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Miss M. H. MASON, called; and Examined.

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

9574. (*Chairman.*) You are one of the lady inspectors under the Local Government Board?—I am.

9575. According to our practice we will take your written memorandum as your examination-in-chief. (*See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (A to M).*) After a long experience in work connected with Poor Law administration and the relief of distress, you were appointed in 1885, as I understand, Inspector of Boarding-out?—I was.

Staff of lady inspectors of boarded-out children.

9576. In 1900-01 the work was so hard that you obtained sick leave, and Miss Pell was temporarily appointed, and she has since been permanently appointed, and Miss Evans also, so that there are now three lady inspectors?—Yes.

9577. I understand that there is no boarding-out of children beyond the Union in Wales?—No.

Extent and machinery of boarding-out beyond the Union.

9578. Certain counties in England do not practice that system?—I should rather say that certain counties do not contain persons who have volunteered to undertake to form themselves into committees to receive children from other unions.

9579. The system necessitates voluntary co-operation?—Yes.

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

9580. How is the boarding-out committee started?—There is no agency for starting one, it is when people start of their own accord; perhaps they have heard that children are to be had in London.

9581. The Local Government Board do not take any initiative in that way?—No, any initiative by the inspectors is purely voluntary.

9582. A committee being started, the Local Government Board satisfy themselves that they are fit and proper persons?—As far as they can.

9583. Although a committee may start and be adequate in its composition, there is no power, if the members of the committee either give up their work or die, to replace them, is there?—They generally replace themselves, or we write down to them and say that, as they have only two members now, they ought to have three, and ask them to appoint someone else: or the inspector goes down and looks them up.

9584. Would the Local Government Board refuse to recognise a committee unless it was of the adequate number?—Yes.

9585. So that you have that compulsion over them?—Always.

9586. How are the children selected that are boarded-out? Is there some special mode of selection?—The guardians select them.

Conditions under which children may be boarded out.

9587. As far as you know, have they any rules or principles upon which they select them?—They select them between the limits of age laid down by the Local Government Board; that is, between two and ten, except in the case of brothers and sisters, when they may send them out over ten if they are placed in the same house as their brothers and sisters; and also that they must be technically orphans or deserted, or they may have been adopted by the guardians, so that they should be permanent.

9588. They are sent out sometimes as young as three?—Yes, sometimes at two.

Cases of boarding-out of unsuitable children.

9589. In your experience have any children been sent out at that early age who afterwards developed signs of feebleness, or were, in your judgment, unfitted to be boarded-out?—Some have had to be returned, some have been so feeble they have been returned to the Union; then others have grown up strong and well; they vary individually, like any other children only.

9590. It has not happened in your experience that any appreciable proportion of these children who were sent out young subsequently turned out unfit to be boarded-out?—Not more at one age than another. I have supplemented my evidence by a statement as to the number of children who have been sent back, returned by the Boarding-out Committees for one reason or another since the Poor Law Schools Committee of 1895; the number is not yet complete, but I hand it in so that you may see it. (*See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (L).*) It contains the number of those children that have been returned if they are not suitable for boarding-out. If they are found to be diseased, or too troublesome, or disagreeable in any way, the committee return them to the guardians.

9591. What is the proportion?—Out of the whole number I have got at present (several large unions have not replied yet), of 872 who have been boarded-out since 1895, ninety-one boys and fifty-five girls have been returned to the guardians as unsuitable for boarding-out.

9592. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) They are medically examined before they go, are they not?—Yes, and the medical certificate sent with them.

9593. That is by the board of guardians?—Yes, but the medical certificates do not always agree with the opinion of the committee or foster parents. Those who send do not always agree with those who receive. That is to say, that the guardians sometimes send the children with a full medical certificate that they are all right, and disputes have subsequently arisen as to the value of the certificate, and the children have been returned.

Attitude of foster-parents towards boarded-out children.

9594. (*Chairman.*) Your experience leads you to believe that the main inducement to the foster-parents is the profit which they make out of the allowance?—Yes, undoubtedly.

9595. If that is so, of course the smaller the income of the foster-parents the greater would be the inducement to take children?—No, I do not think the poorest people are at all the most avaricious; I find, in fact, that some of the worst homes are those where the people are the best off, and who take them rather as servants than as children—of rather a higher class than the children are themselves, perhaps.

9596. The kindness of the poorer foster-parents is, in your experience, greater, if anything, than the kindness of those who are better off?—Yes.

9597. The allowance was 4s. a week until recently, and it has been raised, I believe, to 5s.?—It has been raised permissively.

Adequacy of the boarding-out allowances.

9598. Is that calculated as the weekly sum which a labouring man, who was in receipt of good wages, would be able to spend on each of his children?—No, it is calculated, at least according to my idea, at a sum which gives a sufficient margin of profit to pay them for their trouble.

9599. What sort of margin?—That it is impossible to say. I always take it this way: take an average (I am always afraid to mention averages of working men's wages), but take a labourer with 15s. a week and a wife and three children; he has 3s. a person for everyone in the house, that is to say including their food, their clothes, and their rent, the man's boots and the man's working clothes; now if he gets one child even at 4s. a week the child does not eat that 4s., because the child shares with the family, and it is a distinct profit to have a fourth child which is paid 4s. a week for, and for whom they receive 10s. a quarter for clothes, besides doctor and school expenses and everything else; and no responsibility as far as further expense goes; extra nourishment, if it is ill.

9600. The benefit in that case to the foster-parent would be about 1s. a week?—It would be difficult to say that; it depends on how they feed and live themselves.

9601. You think the system of giving the foster-parents a sum out of which they can recoup themselves is better than directly paying the foster-parents for this trouble?—I do consider that direct payment.

9602. It might be done in another way: so much might be put on one side to be spent on the child?—I do not think you could see that it was spent. It is better to make it as far as possible, a member of the family and not a lodger. So long as they treat it like the rest of the family, as you have reason to believe if you thoroughly inspect it, that is far better. The object of the boarding-out system should be to incorporate it as far as possible in the family.

9603. Do the foster-parents put these children on the same level as regards feeding as their own children?—Food is the most difficult thing to ascertain, because unless you come in at dinner time you do not see what they are eating, and even then, if they are not feeding the child properly, they put the food on the plate while you are standing at the door. Most of them, I think, do feed the children like their own. I examine their dinner when they bring it to school, and I find it is very much the same as that of their foster brothers and sisters if they have any. I have found some instances where it has not been so.

9604. I suppose it is difficult in the case of the £2 a year to prevent misappropriation?—No, that should be comparatively easy, because the Committee ought to examine the stock of clothing every quarter and see whether it is kept up to the outfit with which the child is sent out in the first instance. There is a definite standard of what it should have, and a definite sum to replace it and keep it in order.

9605. Do the committees do that work?—Some do it very well indeed; some do not. Some give the 10s. a quarter to the mothers and say, "Here is your money;" then afterwards they say, "Where are the clothes"? Their power is gone when they have parted with the 10s.

Responsibilities for boarded-out children sent to service.

9606. When does the parentage or the connection between the foster-parents and the children end?—When they are sent to service, then the control ceases, but as a rule the relationship, such as it is, lasts through

life. They return to the foster-parents between their situations or when they are on a holiday just as if it was to a real home, and sometimes they pay the foster-parents, as they should do, I think, when they can, for their lodging and board when they come back in those cases; sometimes they do not, very often they come back for a visit in a friendly manner.

9607. Supposing the child cannot get employment, or fails to get employment, what happens?—The very last letter I received from a committee says: "I am writing to you as usual to help me. Annie has returned on our hands; can your sister find a situation for her?" That is part of what the inspectors do. The ladies of the committees find situations for them, and the foster-parents receive them back as a rule when they are out of a place; then someone pays; in this case I do not know who is going to pay; the lady is very kindly paying for this girl at present.

9608. On whom rests the liability?—Nobody; it is only a moral responsibility of the committee. Nobody is bound to take care of that girl; if it were not for the goodness of this lady that girl would be in the workhouse, but owing to her kindness and that of her foster-parents she is not.

9609. Do the guardians get rid of their liability by boarding these children out?—They get rid of all the trouble of them unless it is impossible to deal with them, and then the committee send the child back to the union.

9610. They do send him back?—Yes, and I have the number they have returned here; it is on the paper I mentioned before.

ter careers boarded- t children.

9611. They send them back when they get to the age when they should find employment and when they fail to find it?—Yes; if they cannot deal with them themselves. Here is the proportion: out of this 872 who have been boarded out since 1895, of course, most of them are still there, most of them are still young, four boys have been returned and eleven girls; but eighty-two boys have been sent to training-ships or training-homes, and seventy girls have been sent to the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, or "M.A.B.Y.S." The M.A.B.Y.S. really undertake those cases of girls which the committees find it impossible to deal with when they have gone, or should go, to service.

9612. The boys that go to the training-ships are in the habit of spending their holidays with their foster parents?—Yes.

9613. When these children are boarded-out in this way, is there any distinction drawn by the locality between them and the actual children of the foster-parents?—No, none at all.

arded-out ildren and stigma of uperism.

9614. The taint, so to speak, of pauperism is removed?—I have never found out where the taint of pauperism is; it is a catch-word I have never been able to follow.

9615. The stigma?—I have never found any stigma either; I do not know where it is. When the children are boarded out nobody cares where they come from; you may talk of the workhouse, nobody cares or regards it as a stigma; as a matter of fact nobody thinks about it, least of all the inspector; the people know perfectly well where the children come from, but nobody regards it as a stigma or taint.

ed for pervision boarded- t system.

9616. They go to school just the same as the others?—Just the same.

9617. It is clear that this system that you so fully describe may be open to very gross abuses unless it is very closely supervised?—Yes.

9618. It requires not only the supervision of the local committee, but it also requires some superior official supervision, not only to look after the children, but to see that the committee do their duty?—Exactly.

9619. You are not altogether satisfied with the system of inspection of children boarded-out within the union?—No, not at all.

chinery of arding-out hin the ion; and d for ther pection.

9620. Perhaps you would shortly summarise what the system is, and what the objection is to boarding-out within the union as regards the lack of supervision?—Since the Order of 1889, which is the last one, within the union the guardians are authorised permissively, not compulsorily, to employ the services of a within-the-union committee of ladies and gentlemen, volunteers, in the same manner as those which are constituted beyond the union. Wherever there is such a committee the children are boarded-out on very much the same lines, there is very little difference between their rules and those for children boarded-out beyond the union. The committee of ladies (there may be gentlemen among them) receive the money from the guardians and they administer the payments; they choose the homes and supervise them, but they are not inspected by the Local Government Board. Where there is no such committee the children are still under the relieving and medical officers. The relieving officer, who is a man, and cannot really inspect, is supposed to pay the money to the foster parents at their residence, and weekly, unless otherwise directed by the guardians; he has to visit and to report on each child once a quarter; and the medical officer reports every quarter at the remuneration of 2s. 6d. a quarter for it, and that is all.

9621. Do they report in each of those cases?—Yes, they are supposed to report on them always.

9622. They are assumed to do so?—Yes.

9623. Is it possible?—They do so, I think, but I do not think the inspections on which those reports are founded are of very much value. Then, again, there is another sort of system I spoke of as having instituted myself, which is that I started voluntary committees of ladies supplemental to the relieving officers. In that case, the ladies have no real official authority, they do not pay the money, and there is no real control, and my experience was that if they did find out anything which the relieving officer did not know of, the relieving officer did not like it and perhaps denied it; so that it is not much use. It is better perhaps than nothing, but it is not much use.

9624. Do the guardians, for in-boarding, make use of any associations for the purpose of putting their children out?—Do you mean the workhouse children, or the boarded-out children?

9625. I will put my question in another way. Do they board out their children by utilising institutions or associations?—No, not that I know of.

9626. They do it all directly themselves?—Yes, they must do it all directly themselves: even if they employ any of those institutions or associations indirectly, the associations are not responsible for the children.

9627. Are there any associations that take Poor Law children from a workhouse and board them out?—No, they are not allowed to do so.

Cases of Poor Law children boarded-out by certified institutions.

9628. There are certain institutions or certified homes that receive Poor Law children: do they ever board out?—I have known them to do so, quite illegally.

9629. It is contrary to the contract made between them and the Local Government Board?—Quite.

9630. But they do it?—I have known them to do it.

9631. Where you have ascertained that they have done this, I assume you have reported to the Local Government Board?—Yes.

9632. Do you know what the action taken has been?—Yes, action was taken in two cases by the Local Government Board: they had a long correspondence with the Association, and told them it was quite illegal, and that they were not to do it again. What subsequently took place in those two cases was that as the children were not in bad homes, instead of asking the Local Government Board to order their removal, I formed boarding-out committees myself in those places of the very people, the managers of the Homes. I turned them into boarding-out committees and I kept the children there, and tried to place them under proper rules.

9633. Are there any considerable number of children in these certified homes?—Yes. I should say a large number. I can give you a list of the homes, but they do not come under my inspection.

9634. Do they not?—No: the certified homes do not come under my inspection at all. I have only referred to them to say that I often recommend that a boarded-out child, especially an elder one, be sent to one of these Homes to receive some training; but at present I have no guarantee if the child is sent to a certified home, that it

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

will be there. I have known children (not any of my own children) who have been sent to these certified homes and have been paid for by the guardians as if they were in the home, and they have been instead boarded-out in the neighbourhood. I hand in a list of the certified homes.* There is one point, perhaps, that I might mention that I have not referred to, and that is you will see by the 4th column of that list that the cost of a child in a certified Home varies, roughly speaking, from £7 16s. to £26 a year, whereas the cost of a child boarded out is, roughly speaking, altogether £13 or £14 a year; so if the Association receives a child for which it is paid £15 a year and boards it out at £14, the association makes a little money on each.

Comparative cost of children boarded-out, and in certified institutions.

9635. As well as the foster-parent?—Yes. But the cost of boarding-out and certified Homes is about the same, generally, and in some cases, that of the certified Home is the lesser.

9636. I have here the list of the certified homes; some of them have very considerable accommodation. They are on pages 6 and 7; the Roman Catholic Female Orphanage, 350; the Jew's hospital for the education and employment of children of the Jewish religion; Dr. Barnardo's Home for Working and Destitute Lads, 378. Are those institutions at all used by the guardians for placing their children?—Yes, they are a good deal used by the guardians, but they do not come under my inspection. I have nothing to do with them. All I have to do with is the sending of the child to the institution. I recommend that it should be sent to the institution. All I am concerned with is that I should know it is in the institution to which I suppose I have been the means of sending it.

Inspection of certified schools.

9637. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The certified schools are inspected by the general inspectors?—Yes. My only point is that when I recommend that a boarded-out child should be sent to such a Home, I ought to know that the child is sent to the place to which it is supposed to be sent.

9638. (*Chairman.*) All the Poor Law children who are sent to any of these institutions, ought to remain in the institutions and ought not to be boarded out?—Certainly.

9639. Is the practice at all general, do you think, of boarding them out?—I cannot tell you that; it is not my business to make an inquiry. I have only told you what has come incidentally under my notice. But there is no safeguard.

9640. In Scotland, there are no committees of supervision?—No.

9641. You therefore are not very well satisfied with the system that there prevails?—Scotland only concerns me because they are always holding themselves up to us as a pattern for our imitation.

9642. You make these remarks rather to put Scotland on the proper level?—Yes, I think Scotland distinctly wants sitting on.

Adoption of Poor Law children by foster-parents and others.

9643. Out of this system of boarding-out children, there comes the practice of adopting children?—Yes, there is that practice, but we discourage it—at least I and my colleagues do, as far as possible.

9644. I think you state here your opinion that the children are very often adopted from purely mercenary motives and in order to get the benefit of their work?—Yes, that is my experience; certainly when they take children at a wage-earning age, I think they take them for the same reason that their own relatives and parents suddenly become so fond of them—when they become wage-earning.

9645. Assuming a child is adopted, have the Poor Law authorities the same control over it as they would have over a child who was boarded-out and not adopted?—No, they have no real control. Under the Act of 1899, they now have the power of appointing some competent person to visit the child and report upon it, at least twice in each year, and if they were dissatisfied, they could take it away; if they themselves adopted the child under the Poor Law Acts, they could do so in any case. There may be different opinions as to the competency of the persons whom they appoint to visit. I think that even if the person were competent the protection would be scarcely sufficient. I have given you two or three instances here: one instance where the "competent person" appointed to visit these unfortunate boys was the person who resisted their removal from a man who was picked up drunk on the high road.

9646. Assuming that whoever is inspecting reports that the adopted child is ill-used, is there power to terminate the adoption?—I think you must ask Sir Samuel Provis that. When once the child is adopted, I have no more to do with it.

Guardians' power to terminate adoption of a child.

9647. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There is a provision in the section, is not there? "The guardians may, if they think fit, at any time during such period, revoke their consent to the adoption, and thereupon the child shall be forthwith returned to them by the person having the custody of the same." I think that really answers the chairman's question?—It does. I have nothing to do with them after they are adopted, so I could not tell you whether in practice it has ever been done.

Increase in number of children boarded-out within the union.

9648. (*Chairman.*) In one part of your evidence I think you point out that there has been a great increase in the number of children boarded-out within the Union and I think you imply that this has in certain parts of the country become a sort of system of out-door relief?—It has so in great measure.

Dangers of boarding-ou children wi relatives within the union.

9649. The effect has been to increase the repugnance of those who were previously liable to support relatives to continue to do so?—I think distinctly so. For instance, I once attended the Gainsborough Board of Guardians to explain the boarding-out system to them. I went officially by direction of the Local Government Board. They were about to place out a family of four children with relatives within the union. I said "I should advise you to send them to persons beyond the union and persons who are not related, because if you board them out with relatives within the Union you will find other people will be reluctant to support their own nephews and nieces," and one of the guardians there and then got up and said, "It is perfectly true; because since it has appeared in the newspapers that these people are possibly going to be paid for having their nephews and nieces to board-out with them, I have had several applications from families to say that they will not keep theirs any longer for nothing."

Difficulties attending boarding-ou within the union.

9650. Assuming that the boarding-out outside the union is a good system, is there any reason why boarding-out within the union should not be made an equally good system?—It could be made an almost equally good system, but I do not think it could ever be quite so good; for these reasons, that there is a very great difficulty in not boarding them out with their relations; they apply for them, and it is a very difficult thing to get the guardians to refuse; and also the area within which they are boarded, unless the area is divided into several parts, as it is in the Mansfield Union in Nottinghamshire, and the Newbury Union in Berkshire, for instance, with several committees, is too large for the proper working of a single committee, and there is not that proper inter-visitation and joint responsibility on the part of the committee that we require from the beyond-the-union committees.

Numbers of children boarded-out within and without the union.

9651. In the Appendix that you have put in, (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (G)), I see that the number of children boarded-out in 1898 was 2,000, and in 1905 it had fallen to 1,800, whereas the in-boarded children during the same period had grown from 4,700 to 6,800, showing a very considerable increase?—Yes.

Causes and dangers of increase in numbers of children boarded-out within the union.

9652. Do you think that is the cause of the diminution in the numbers boarded out without the Union?—I think that is one of the chief causes, and you see also in my Appendix that I have dealt with the reason for the increase of boarding-out within the union. I say (in *Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (J)*) with regard to the increase, "This increase is, however, to some extent more apparent than real, as many of the children formerly classed as on out-relief with relatives have now been brought under the boarding-out regulations and classed accordingly. But boarding-out within the Union is, in a great measure, only a form of outdoor relief, and it appears to have increased with the recent general increase of pauperism. It is a system which extends automatically, for many persons who might maintain children related to them, but for whom they are not legally responsible, will not do so if they see that their neighbours receive parish pay for children under similar circumstances. Also, though there are now about 107 committees":

* Not printed in Appendix.

(there are now 111) "within the unions for which they act, there is no official inspection to report on and help their work; while the rest of the children are only under the supervision of the relieving and medical officers, who cannot make that thorough inspection of the homes and bodily condition of the children which a woman can. It is therefore probable that many of the homes are accepted in ignorance of what the treatment of the children really is, and that many of the foster-parents would decline to receive them at the low rates of payment often given if official investigation were made into the nature of that treatment and their expenditure of those payments." Some of them receive quite small sums, such as 1s. 6d. a week.

9653. The system of boarding-out has on the whole worked satisfactorily, in your judgment it is essential that it should be associated with a very thorough system of supervision ?—Yes.

9654. But even then it has its limitations ?—Yes.

Unsuitable boarding-out of children by charitable agencies.

9655. In your experience, have you come across cases where agencies other than the Poor Law have been putting children out to board and have sent children to the same homes and places where your Poor Law children were ?—Yes, I have found some.

9656. And those children, I suppose, would be much of the same class as the Poor Law children ?—Yes, I should say quite. In fact, I do not know that they may not be Poor Law children sent to the certified homes.

9657. Have you any cases, or do you recall any instances, where those children have been sent to homes from which you have removed your children ?—There were two boys chargeable to Southwark who were boarded-out in Sussex with an old woman who was deaf, and had next to nothing to live upon but their payments and those of country holiday children, who were sent to her also. She could not control the Southwark boys in the very least, and one of them she beat when she could catch him. I have pursued, or waited for him for an hour at a time, before I could find him myself, while he was running over the forest. I had those children removed, but it was too late to do anything with them, they were quite out of control. One, after being returned to Southwark, they could do nothing with, so he was sent back to this old woman to find employment for him. He lost one place after another. I finally found him in the garden of a friend of my own in Sussex. She had employed him there as a charity, but she could do nothing with him. She sent him first to the cottage hospital, and then to the workhouse, and finding nobody would have him (they could do nothing with him, he was so dishonest and insubordinate) she gave a sum of money to a certain voluntary agency to take him, and he was shipped off to Canada. The lady who placed the boys there with the old woman who was deaf, has sent boys from the voluntary association there since.

9658. The fault may have been as much with the boy as with the deaf old woman ?—The deaf old woman could not control two high-spirited boys like that.

9659. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Was the woman in receipt of relief herself ?—No; they cannot be in receipt of relief. They sometimes prefer taking the children. I have known cases where they have given up relief to take children.

9660. (*Chairman.*) Is this an isolated case, or are there other cases ?—I can collect them, if you like. I do not like to speak off-hand. There are other cases where persons without means live on the children.

9661. (*Miss Hill*). How long had that boy been with the old deaf woman ?—Two or three years. I inspected him at least for two or three years, I should say. He was with the old woman about five years altogether.

9662. (*Professor Smart.*) You consider she was quite unsuitable to take charge of any children ?—Absolutely. I thought she meant very well. She was a very respectable old woman, but quite unfit for the management of boys especially, and very dirty.

9663. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What did she get for that boy ?—She got 8s. a week for the two, and £4 a year for their clothing, and all the other extra expenses.

9664. You said some only pay 1s. 6d.?—That is within the union, not beyond the union.

9665. (*Chairman.*) The scale of the various institutions for boarding-out is the same as the Poor Law ?—No, it is not. The scale of the voluntary associations that I know most about gives 5s. a week, and that comprises clothes, which is a very bad plan. I mean to say speaking from my own experience that you cannot see what money has been spent on the clothing if it is given all together in a round sum.

9666. (*Mr. Loch.*) In out unions this 5s. is now also paid by the Poor Law ?—It may be. It is permitted; it is a new scale.

9667. (*Mr. Bentham.*) And clothing in addition ?—Yes.

Checks on proper expenditure of clothing allowance for boarded-out children.

9668. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is it not rather difficult to know about the clothes ?—They are not all new clothes. I suppose where one child is with a lot of other children, the clothes are made by some one from those of a bigger person ?—Yes, and that is all right.

9669. How can you test the expenditure of a certain sum per annum on the clothes of one child living with a number of others ?—I do not think you need go into exact details, if they have sufficient. I think it is only right to cut down the clothes of a bigger child to make clothes for a smaller one.

9670. If you limit your examination to the appearance of a child, it can equally be applied if they get 5s. a week or 4s. plus £2 a year ?—It is not the appearance of the child; we look through their boxes and see what they have besides what they have got on.

9671. It is a question of the new things that are bought ?—A question either of the new things that are bought or the old ones which are cut up instead. I mean to say, we have a distinct outfit sent out with each child. The girls usually have three pairs of stockings, two pairs of boots, three linen under garments, and three chemises, two top petticoats, two flannel petticoats, two summer frocks, and two winter frocks, a school cloak and a Sunday cloak and two hats. It is very easy to see if they have that number of garments still, and if they are in good condition.

9672. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) That is when they are sent out by the board of guardians ?—Yes, they are sent out with that. If the outfit is not sufficient, and they have not had a sufficient outfit, the committee complains, and I always support them in that complaint. I have found here one home which I came across yesterday. It is not a bad home; those are the marks of the bruises on a boy. (*Producing a book.*) The boys were removed afterwards, and the home has been filled up by others from a voluntary association. It is not one of the worst homes at all. That is one of my rough note-books which I take about with me. I did not really recommend the removal of those boys, because I did not think it bad enough, but the people gave them up themselves because they did not like them.

Cases of unsatisfactory boarding-out committees.

9673. (*Chairman.*) In part of your evidence you allude to some of the committees having done their work unsatisfactorily and misappropriated funds. I assume that those cases are very few and far between ?—Yes, they are very few and far between, but still they do now and then occur, and therefore it shows that such things are possible.

9674. It shows you do not always get the right people on the committee ?—We do not get them; they suggest themselves. If they are of sufficient social standing and they are respectable people, we could not very well refuse to authorise them—we must see afterwards how they turn out, and whether they do the duties which they have undertaken properly.

9675. A danger of this kind is clearly an inseparable factor, is it not, of the system ?—It is not a large factor. I have only given that as one of the extra reasons why there should be sufficient inspection.

Advantages of boarding-out over other methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

9676. You have given a great deal of attention to the education of Poor Law children generally. Each system seems to me to have its merits and demerits. To start with, there is the big school system, then there is the cottage or the scattered-home system, and then there is the boarding-out system. Have you been able at all to compare the results in after life of the children from the different systems ?—Yes, I have; but I think it is rather for you to compare them from the evidence you receive from the general inspectors. I should say this, that the

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

boarding-out system has one advantage that no other system can offer. As a rule, whether the home has been good or bad, the child has always a place to go back to, whereas no institution can receive them back again; when they go out into the world from an institution they can have no friends of their own, or their friends are not such as can help them; they have no place to come back to between situations. That is really why the M.A.B.Y.S. was founded, and what it is useful for—to look after girls in such circumstances; and now I am thankful to say there is a similar association for looking after and befriending the boys. It is rather those associations who should tell you how the children turn out. On the whole, I think under whatever system they are brought up, they turn out wonderfully well; so much trouble is spent on them under every system that I think, on the whole, considering what their inheritance is, what their natural disposition and circumstances have been, it shows that they must have been well looked after to turn out as well as they do.

9677. Two of the systems have obvious demerits. Under the barrack system the children are trained together and everything is done for them; they are well fed and well looked after; in the boarding-out system they are not so well fed and not so well looked after, but they gain a certain knowledge of the world, and they perhaps have a home to go to. Does not the cottage or detached, system combine those two advantages; they are better fed and better clothed and do get a certain knowledge of the world, and have, to a certain extent, a home?—They have not a home to come back to between their places. They have not a real and permanent home. They cannot be received back into any institution, however small and home-*like*, at any rate over a certain age. It is not a place to come back to. It is not a foothold in the world. Many of the children that I first inspected twenty years ago are themselves married now and have children of their own. A good many I visit, and one or two of them have taken boarded-out children since.

9678. Under what system were those children trained?—I am speaking of boarded-out children, children who were boarded-out, and who are now married and settled in or near the places that I visit.

9679. I think you have a fear that in this scattered home system the control and supervision are not as great as in the school system, and one child, coming in may therefore corrupt the others?—I am not speaking of the homes as a whole—I would rather not speak about them, because they do not come under my inspection. What I mean is this, no scattered home is a real home; it cannot compare with either the boarding-out home, that is to say, a real labourer's family, nor can it compare with a certified home, a voluntary certified home, because they have to take children of all kinds mixed. I was speaking there with reference to the dormitory arrangements and not with regard to their management in the day time. They are not looked after at night in a cottage home or a small home in the same way that they are looked after in a large place which has dormitories, when an attendant or officer sleeps in a cubicle or something of the sort, and can look after them at night.

Possibility of extending boarding-out system.

9680. The boarding-out system can never be developed more than to be a useful adjunct to the school system?—I think it might be developed a great deal more, because there are a large number of boards of guardians who do not board-out at all. They might board-out a good many. There are a great many places in both England and Wales where boarding-out committees might well be formed if there were some agency to start them. As it is, they only start haphazard, and I think it is rather surprising that there are as many started as there are. You cannot do without the other systems. You can only board out a certain number of children, and each committee can only find homes for a certain number. More could be boarded out than there are at present, and I wish every board of guardians boarded out a certain number of children.

9681. You state that the result of your examination of the Exmouth boys is that those who have been boarded out in families where they have not been well treated or well looked after showed the most anxiety to return to those families?—Yes, that is so.

9682. Was it the lack of regulation or the licence that prevailed there that was the attraction?—I think in some cases that it was; but in most cases it is rather that the foster-parents keep writing to tell them how they wish to have them back again, and offering them all kinds of delights.

Unsuitable boarding-out homes and their attractiveness for children.

9683. They will go back, even if they have been maltreated?—Yes, even maltreatment, they do not mind; when they have had their thrashing they forget it. One boy, I remember especially, last year said he wished he could go back. I took him from a home where he was thoroughly over-worked and his hands were as hard and as horny as any old labourer's. I said to him, "You know that you had very hard work to do there." "I like that," he said. They want to get him back; and he does go back for his holidays.

Distinction class of cas boarded-ou within and without the union.

9684. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the children who are boarded out, outside the union, they would usually be children, would they not, who would otherwise be in the workhouse?—Or the schools.

9685. I mean, in an institution maintained by the guardians?—Yes.

9686. That would not be so, would it, with the children who are boarded out within the union?—No, not always, because they are with their own relations very often.

9687. The two classes are not quite the same, are they: the children who are dealt with under the two Orders, the boarded-out within the union and the boarded without the union?—I should say they would be about the same class.

9688. I do not mean social class, but I mean the circumstances are somewhat different, are they not, in relation to the children generally who are boarded within the union and those who are boarded outside?—They are the out-relief cases, that is what you mean, as a rule.

9689. In point of fact the cases boarded-out within the union are cases with regard to which the guardians would ordinarily give outdoor relief, and in fact did give ordinary outdoor relief prior to the first Order being sent out?—Quite so.

9690. The object of the Order with regard to boarding within the union was that there should be proper regulations where out-relief was given to orphan and deserted children?—Partly that, and partly with regard to those that were truly boarded out.

History and purport of regulations f boarding-o within the Union.

9691. I am only talking for the moment about those that are within the union?—It was not solely for that purpose; the Boarding-Out Order of 1889 was not issued solely for the purpose of regulating out-relief; it was issued for the purpose of dealing with those children who were regularly boarded-out within the union, taken with the out-relief cases.

9692. Does not that account for there being a much larger number of cases of children boarded within the union than children boarded outside?—Yes, that is what I have said; that the increase is more apparent than real; because so many of those out-relief cases were placed under the Boarding-Out Order.

9693. If I remember rightly, the first Order that dealt with children within the union did not provide for their being put under a committee at all; it merely made regulations?—There were then no committees.

9694. That was an Order of 1877, I think?—Yes, it was.

9695. It provided that there should be certain regulations which should be observed, such as there not being more than a certain number of children within the house, and it being within a certain distance of the school, and for the visits of the relieving officer, and so forth?—Yes.

9696. Then there came the next step, that a boarding-out committee might be formed that would look after the children in the same way practically as the boarding-out committee does outside?—Yes.

9697. I think that was the history of the matter?—Yes, only that is permissive.

9698. Quite so?—It is permissive, and not half the unions, roughly speaking, have taken advantage of that Order. I might say also that some beyond union committees such as Clifton and Nottingham, have taken the

supervision of the committee of the within union children, out-relief cases and all, at the request of the guardians.

bjections increasing e classes children o may be arded-out.

9699. There is one other point, and that is, it is somewhere suggested that the class of children who should be boarded out should be largely extended, so as to comprise all children who would otherwise be relieved by the guardians ?—Yes.

9700. Would you be in favour of that ?—Most certainly not. It would put a stop to the boarding-out system, because, under the Order of last year, all permanent children may be boarded out, and if the temporary children were boarded out, the committee and the foster-parents would not put up with the trouble of changing them.

9701. Is not there also the danger of the interference of the real parent when the child is neither orphan nor deserted, or has not been adopted, in the way you have referred to before, by the guardians ?—Yes: the foster-parents constantly ask me if I know whether the child has parents, because they say: I will not have her if she has, because I will not be interfered with.

ocedure of arding-out.

9702. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I want to see whether I really understand the procedure which takes place when the board of guardians desire to board-out a child. Do they do it by committee of the board of guardians, or does the whole board decide who are to be boarded out ?—As a rule the guardians have a committee of guardians to decide what children are to be boarded out, and where.

9703. Then, having decided who are to be boarded out, they call in the medical officer, and he certifies that the child is free from debility or sickness, and is physically fit to be boarded out. That is so, is it not ?—Yes, he has a form which he fills in and says that the child is in good health, with certain exceptions, which he enters in a space for the purpose, if there are exceptions.

9704. Then the child is sent to the committee ?—Yes, to the country committee.

aracter early arding-out mmittees.

9705. Now, as regards the kind of committees: I think we gathered from your evidence that, to begin with, when the system was started in 1870 and for some fifteen years afterwards these committees were very unsatisfactory ?—I could not say whether they were unsatisfactory, because they were not inspected, and I never saw them, except such that I happened to know privately.

9706. I think it appears from what you say that this system had a very bad start, because it frequently happened that children were sent to these committees, and it appears they were lost sight of altogether, and the foster-parents practically were not paid the money which ought to have been sent to these committees, which did not really exist. I want to reach this: that the system had a very bad start ?—The system began gradually. It was not possible to make an organisation when there were only one or two committees, nor was it desirable to appoint an inspector until there was a sufficient number of committees to justify the appointment of an inspector. I do not remember saying the foster-parents were not paid the money, except in the special cases I have given.

9707. Does not that follow, because the payments were made by the guardians to the boarding-out committees, and if the boarding-out committees did not exist then the parents were not paid ?—I think the money somehow percolated through.

sponsi-lity of ardians for arded-out ildren and ssibility of creasing it.

9708. What I want to arrive at is this, that apparently in England whenever the board of guardians part with the child and the child is handed over to the committee, their whole responsibility seems to cease; they are no longer in the position of parent of the child. They are no longer *in loco parentis* to the child which is boarded-out. Is not that so ?—No, that is not so.

9709. What is the tie between the board of guardians and the boarded-out child ?—The tie is, the guardians still have control and can deal with the child as they please. If the guardians order the child to be removed it will be removed whether the committee like it or not.

9710. They do not inspect ?—No they do not inspect and they could not.

9711. How do they judge ?—They judge by the Committee's own reports. The committee reports to them every quarter on visits of not less than six weeks' interval, and the Inspectors also report if possible once a year on all the committees to the Local Government Board, and see and report upon as many children as they have time for.

9712. Does not it occur to you that possibly the intervention of the committee might be saved if the board of guardians themselves retained their powers over the children, and themselves undertook the duty of inspection ?—They could not.

9713. Either by themselves or their officers ?—No, they could not. They have complete control now as it is.

9714. Why should they not inspect ?—Because, in the first place, they could not. They do not know how to. Men cannot inspect. How can men undress girls ? How can men go up into a bedroom ? The woman would say: "Excuse me, sir, you must wait a minute till I put the room straight." They cannot.

9715. But if there is a lady inspector, as there is in some cases ?—You mean, supposing the guardians appoint a lady officer to go down ?

9716. Yes ?—In that case she would not be resident on the spot. Suppose the child broke its arm or leg, a child brought there and chargeable to a London Union (there are a great many still in Devonshire, and there used to be a great many in Windermere) there must be someone on the spot to look after it—a committee.

9717. Might not that be obviated by putting the duty on the guardians or the relieving, or other officer of the union or parish where the child is boarded-out ?—No; the ladies do it far better. That is put on the guardians and their relieving officers in the case of non-resident relief. They do not care a bit what happens to the pauper children; in my experience they pay the money and do not inquire. I have known children boarded-out in that manner, non-resident relief, and, nobody has inquired about them. The people have gone to the pay stations to fetch the money and nobody has supervised the child.

9718. You do not think it would answer the purpose at all to put any duty on the Poor Law administration or parish officials in the union in which the boarded-out child is boarded ?—It would not be any use; I know they would not take it, they would not like it, they would say, "Why should we have your paupers thrust on us ?" they would not do it. It would be very unsatisfactory if they did. They would not take the same interest. These ladies, whatever the shortcomings of some of them, take an immense interest in the children, and great pains in looking after them, and after the children have gone to service too.

9719. You think that the committees which now exist do their duties better ?—Those that exist now, most of them; it is quite impossible to speak too highly of the care they take for these children; some of them spend their lives in doing nothing else but looking after them. It is quite impossible to speak too highly of them. You could never replace those; you would lose that voluntary help and voluntary personal care which is the essence of all charity.

9720. At the same time I think your opinion of the committees is not uniformly good, because I notice in your statement you say: "Children are not infrequently placed out, not for their own benefit, but that of the coachman, gardener, old cooks or housemaids or other dependents of the committees, as well as with widows disabled, or other poor persons whom they wish to help to support" ?—You will see I have said the danger within the union is still greater because they are placed with the constituents of the guardians; if you throw on the guardians of the country unions the onus of finding the homes for the London children, you would find they would be used for the purpose of placing them with the constituents of the country guardians; there would be that additional danger.

9721. My point is, I think it might avoid any such result if the duty were put upon the board of guardians to find the foster-parents ?—You think it would be better for the guardians to do so ?

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

9722. It would avoid, would it not, the possibility of such a thing taking place as you refer to in Paragraphs 47 and 86?—No, I think it would increase the risk.

9723. Increase the risk?—Yes, ten-fold.

9724. In what way?—There would be the same local favouritism added to that of the chance of placing them with the constituents of the local guardians, and there would be the absolute impossibility of inspection, because the guardians neither could inspect, nor would they. I think, as I have shown, boarding-out within the union is bad enough already without wanting to place the without committees under the same authority.

Need for high class of persons on boarding-out Committees

9725. There is another criticism I think you make upon the committees in Paragraph 21, where you say: "These committees should consist of ladies of a class above that of the foster-parents whose homes they visit," otherwise the foster-parents resent interference by the committees. Has that happened very often in your experience?—Yes, it has happened when the committee ladies were of the same class as the foster-parents.

9726. The foster-parents resist and resent the interference of the committee?—They do.

9727. Must not that very often happen?—No, because in England, which is thickly populated, we can generally find ladies of some sort.

9728. You have to find ladies of social standing superior to that of the foster-parents where the children are boarded?—Yes.

9729. That is essential to the success of such a committee?—Yes; and the committee is also essential, I should say, to the safety of the boarded-out child.

9730. Why essential to the safety of the boarded-out child?—To have someone on the spot who can inspect and look after it.

9731. It does not require superior social standing to do that?—Yes, it does; because the foster-parent does not care for neighbours of her own class to come into her house and look all over her rooms and examine the child's clothing and see how much she has spent.

9732. If it was a duty of a committee, would not that be sufficient?—No, they would be very much afraid to do it. Neither the committee woman nor the foster-mother would like it. For instance, one committee I inspected was made up of engine drivers' wives entirely, it was in a suburb of a railway district: it all came to grief; they did not want to get into difficulties with their neighbours for inspecting.

9733. The foster-parents resent the interference of such a committee?—Yes.

9734. Have you often found that?—Wherever that was so, always.

9735. Can you give me an approximation of the number of cases of that kind?—I am always afraid of giving figures at a moment's notice for fear I should not be correct.

9736. Will you say generally?—I can recall another case where there was a Committee which has also come to an end, where there was a wheelwright's wife and someone else of the same class, and it was impossible for them to inspect; that was in Buckinghamshire.

9737. Quite good people for that purpose except for their social standing?—Quite so, and people I should have consulted. I should always consult working women to know what should be done with working people's children, they know what is right and best; only it is not for them to be the executive to carry it out; they are the best to give the advice, but not to carry it out with authority.

Duties of lady inspectors of boarding-out.

9738. Take now your own workers, the lady inspectors of the board. I think the lady inspectors, you tell us, are not appointed for the purpose of inspecting the children so much as for the purpose of inspecting the committees. Is not that so?—Yes.

9739. You have no official duties as regards the children and the homes?—Oh, yes, we inspect the children and the homes, and we report upon each child and each home. First of all, we do so for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Committees are putting them in proper homes and looking properly after them. We are not responsible for putting them in those homes, and not responsible for their care there.

9740. Do you desire to modify what you say in Paragraph 39 then? It was that which attracted my notice?—You have a very rough proof. I may say I wrote that in Nottinghamshire away from my references in London

9741. You say "the inspectors are not responsible for the children and homes." I deduced from that that you had no duty to inspect the children in their homes, no official inspection, "but they inspect them as the only real means of ascertaining whether the committees are inspecting and supervising properly. . . . The inspection of homes and children by the inspector also tends to keep the committees up to the mark in their inspection, gives them an example of how to inspect, and otherwise trains, helps, encourages and supports them in good work." Then you have a duty?—Yes, that is our principal duty. We inspect as many homes and as many children as we have time for under each committee, and we report on every individual child and every individual home in detail. That is why, you see, I have these books. This is my note-book. I take these notes on every single case that I visit, full details and full notes on every case.

9742. And those notes on each individual case that you inspect are communicated to the boards of guardians?—The report that is founded on those notes.

9743. You communicate it to the board of guardians and also to the Local Government Board?—Yes. We report to the Local Government Board on each child and home. Copies of those reports are sent by the Local Government Board to the board of guardians and to the committee of ladies.

9744. (*Professor Smart.*) Do you go alone or with members of the committee when inspecting?—I go alone as a rule, unless I take any member of a committee with me for her instruction. I always take members of a new committee with me, in order to show them how to inspect for themselves. I do not take them with me to show me the home; I take them to show them the home and how to inspect it and the child.

Amount nature, and results of inspection boarded-ou children by lady inspector.

9745. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I think you say, at the outside you get through 500 cases in the year; is not that so?—That is all that can be done to do them really thoroughly and well.

9746. And that in such case your inspection is so minute that you generally spend a quarter of an hour over each child?—Yes; it depends on whether it has all its buttons and boot-laces right, and so on.

9747. Do you find in these inspections that there is any resentment on the part of the foster parents?—Never, if they are doing right. I could not call to memory one. They always say: "Quite right; it is what I should like you to do if I had to leave my own child an orphan."

9748. I suppose such inspection really results in this that these children are probably put on a higher pedestal than the children of the foster parents themselves, are they not?—I do not think so at all. I think it is just the same; we only want to ascertain that they are treated as the foster-parents' own.

9749. You think it is necessary to go through the minute examination you give us in detail here, in order to ascertain that?—Certainly, you could not do it without. The best outsides are very often the worst underneath, and a rough looking outside may mean nothing more than a little carelessness, and the child is perfectly well treated.

9750. You do not think that this minute inspection interferes in any way with the class of foster parents that you get, because one could quite understand that some foster parents, who might be thoroughly willing to take children, might object to such a thoroughly minute inspection as you suggest. It really seems to impute that they are not doing their best to the children, but that they are doing their worst, and there is a sense of suspicion; does not that occur to you?—No, I would always refuse to inspect on suspicion. If you treat everybody alike there is no complaint. You should go round to the women and hear what they say. If you treat everybody alike everybody is satisfied. They know perfectly well that your inspection is not for the sole purpose of discovering what is wrong, but for the purpose of certifying that everything is

right. If ever I were instructed, as I do not anticipate, not to inspect properly, I should report simply on the outside of a case, and say: My impression, is that it is all right, but I will not be sure.

9751. Are you aware that that criticism has been made on the system?—Yes.

9752. As far as your experience goes it is without foundation?—I think it is. My ways are the ways of the working people themselves, not the ways of the theorist.

Reasons for decrease of numbers of children boarded-out without the Union.

9753. And you do not think that that system may, to some extent, account for the falling off in the number of boarded-out children outside the union?—I am sure it is not that.

9754. The difficulty of finding foster-parents?—No, I say it is not. That is why I give the reasons why some boards of guardians have given it up. I have given them with more detail than I otherwise should in the Appendix, the reasons why St. Pancras, Lambeth, and Wandsworth have given up the boarding-out system. I have given that in full detail, anticipating your objection; and Nottingham I may say I have given for that reason too; they board out within the union apparently because I cannot take their children in my own district.

Perfection of existing system of boarding-out.

9755. I see you have a very high opinion of the merits of your system, because you say that you could not offer further suggestions for its perfection?—No, I could not.

9756. Do not you think, having regard to the character you have given some committees and some foster-parents that that statement should be subject to some modification?—I said the system is the best that can possibly be. I have not said that the human beings of whom it is composed are, because I do not undertake to reform human beings generally, we are dealing with human beings, we have human beings on our committees and we are all fallible, our foster-parents are fallible too. We cannot in this world, I am afraid, form boarding-out committees of angels.'

9757. I quite assent to your view that the boarding-out system is the best for the children?—That is all I have said.

9758. You put it, I thought, rather higher than that, because you said you could not offer any further suggestion for its perfection. If it is the system you take, as compared with other systems, I assent?—If I had any further suggestions for its perfection, I should have made them before the issue of the Boarding-Out Order of last autumn.

Criticism of system of inspection of boarded-out children in Scotland.

9759. You have offered some criticisms upon the system which prevails in Scotland; I wish to ask you one or two questions regarding it. I think what you say is hearsay, is it not? You say you have never heard of this thorough inspection being made in Scotland, by which alone in your opinion the real treatment of the children can be ascertained. Are you aware that in Scotland there is an inspection not only by the parish council, who are the board of guardians, and by the inspector of the parish which boards out the children, but that there is also a duty upon the officials and others in the parish where the children are boarded out to communicate, if they see fit to do so, or the necessity arises for their doing so, with the parish which is boarding these children out and which has the responsibility for them?—Yes, I am quite aware of that.

9760. And that there are very anxious rules and regulations of the Local Government Board putting those duties on the people I have named?—Yes.

9761. There is also in some of the larger parishes, take Glasgow for instance, a lady inspector, and she is, of course, the person whose duty it is to inspect all the boarded-out children?—She was appointed after I had had some communication with some of the Glasgow ladies and we agreed how bad the system was without. I did not think it necessary to mention that.

9762. I was not aware of that. The schoolmasters of the parishes where the children are boarded-out (who are often the inspectors) also report any failure to attend school or anything calling for remark in the condition or conduct of the children?—Yes, that is so. But I should not consider that anything like sufficient; it is not inspection, it is only a mere cursory examination that does not take the place of inspection.

9763. You think so?—Quite so; I mean for this reason: the schoolmaster has no right to undress a child and cannot inspect its home and find out about its food and clothing and sleeping arrangements. He can only see how it comes to school. Our schoolmasters are all bound to report. We cannot board a child out where the schoolmaster is not willing to fill in a report, but we do not depend upon that.

9764. You appear to suggest, I do not know whether I take it up rightly, that there is an objection to boarding out children far from their own union, and you say that you believe some of those chargeable to Glasgow and Edinburgh are boarded out in Skye and even north of that. I rather gathered that some of the London children are boarded out as far as Westmoreland?—Quite so, but they are boarded out under committees in Westmoreland and Devonshire.

9765. There is no committee in Scotland, and you think to board them out so far away without a committee is bad?—Yes. I think Skye is a delightful place to board them out, but I would have a committee there.

9766. I only want further to draw your attention to this. You speak of a paper which you read, on the English system of boarding-out, in 1904.—Yes

9767. I do not know whether you propose to put that in?—I am quite willing to take that out, if you like. I will do it with pleasure.

9768. I do not think it really matters?—I only put it in to show I was not interfering with you: that I went there by request to speak.

9769. There was a description of the kind of inspection which prevails in Scotland given on the same occasion by Miss Aikman herself, a lady member of the Glasgow Parish Council?—I remember Miss Aikman quite well.

9770. Glasgow children are visited twice a year by two members of the council accompanied by an official, and they are all surprise visits, and a further description is given as to how that inspection is carried through?—Yes.

9771. You do not think that is sufficient without a further inspection by ladies and an examination of each individual child and a complete and minute enquiry as to whether that child has been well treated or no?—That you think is essential?—Yes, I think that is essential. I think that such an inspection as three people at a time going to a house, two members of the Council and an official with them, is very undesirable, I am always quite willing to take a guardian or anyone with me, but I always say I would rather have only one at a time. Three makes such a commotion, it fills the house, worries the women, and, as a rule, it is very much easier to find things out when there is one than when there is a whole party.

9772. Is it on that ground that you think that the system which prevails in Scotland (you say Ireland is an example to Scotland and I suppose Ireland is behind England on that matter of inspection) is so far behind?—Yes, I think so.

The re-action against boarding-out, the reasons and remedies for it.

9773. (*Mr. Loch.*) Do you think there has been anything in the nature of a reaction against boarding-out? I ask this in reference to what you say on page 6 of your Appendix, namely, that in Cornwall, Durham and Leicester there were committees in the old days but they are all now ended; and then on page 11 you refer to the various difficulties in creating committees, and you say one of the main reasons why boarding-out committees do not multiply more rapidly is the absence of any agency to find, start, or enlist them. Then, again, there are the figures themselves of out-union boarding-out which, at any rate, show a very slight increase from year to year. Therefore, I ask whether you think there is a reaction against the whole system?—I think there is a certain amount of it, because the extreme advocates of the system have claimed for it more than it can give. They have claimed that the foster-parents take the children from love. Then guardians sometimes, when they found it was for money said, "Well, here is your boarding-out system, and it is done for nothing but profit!" That is unjust, in fact both sides are unjust. The people

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

doubtedly take the children for money; but they may do that all the same, and having begun by taking them for money, may become fond of them subsequently. The extreme advocates have claimed for the system what it cannot possibly give, and, naturally, being disappointed, guardians have given it up; but I do not think that is the only reason for the diminution in the boarding-out system.

9774. Taking your first reason (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (J.)) do you think that there should be started some kind of agency to find, start or enlist committees? Can anything positive be done in that direction?—I think if the inspectors of the Local Government Board had the time for doing it, that that would be desirable, but I should rather deprecate having any voluntary and outside association for the purpose, because I think voluntary associations sometimes have a tendency to step beyond the limits of the purpose for which they are founded.

9775. To take your first suggestion, would you be prepared to think that what might be called explanatory work with regard to boarding-out is work that might be efficiently undertaken to a greater degree than it is at present, with a view to acting as an agency to stimulate the movement?—Yes, I quite think so; I think it might be done, only the inspectors have not the time. I have at length given you the number of meetings, as far as I can remember them, which I have addressed this year, in order to give you some idea of how I have tried to start further committees; but that is all in addition to my own proper duties, and I have not the time to do more. It would require additions to the staff to be able to undertake such work on any considerable scale.

Limitation of number of proper cottages for boarding-out.

9776. Then another question arises, namely, the insufficiency of cottage accommodation. I was struck by this statement in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Schools. "The number of children boarded-out beyond the union is 1,802, of whom 968 are chargeable to the boards of guardians in the Metropolis. This number represents a very small proportion of the children eligible for boarding-out, and we believe that good homes could be found for many times this number. The secretary of the Clifton Committee says:—'I have homes now; I am waiting for children to fill them.' Miss Jane Walker, M.D., who inspects the children boarded-out by Dr. Barnardo, says:—'I think the number is practically limitless of good country homes. I am always surprised when I go to a new centre; I am always expecting to find a set of bad homes when I start a new centre, but I never do.'" Does your information confirm that?—No. My experience is quite the opposite—I have given a sample of one of Dr. Barnardo's homes. As a matter of fact, you can write to every committee and you can ask them, and nearly all will say they cannot place more than a certain number of children in proper homes, owing to the want of cottage accommodation and owing to many other reasons—perhaps there is too large a family, perhaps the man drinks—there may be many reasons. Nor it is not every cottager who wants to take a child.

9777. If that is so, then there is a kind of natural limit to the extent to which this system can be pushed?—There must be.

Effect of country holiday funds on boarding-out.

9778. Do you think that the action of the country holidays fund, which of course deals with a large number of cases in connection with London, tends to make a limitation on another side, namely, that these people are quite content to receive those country holiday cases, and do not want anything more?—Yes, I think that has made a very great difference. I think I have seen somewhere that one association alone sends out 26,000 children a year. That naturally fills the homes. The people prefer to have the country holidays children, because they only have them in the summer for a short period, they are paid 5s. a week for them, they do not have to provide clothes, and really the children are no trouble, because they are sent there for the purpose of running about in the open air. There is an enormous number sent out in this way; the large towns send the children out in the summer as well as London.

9779. So that practically we get a new form of summer boarding-out, which is materially affecting the ability to deal with the permanent boarding-out?—Quite so; that really does affect it.

9780. Then we notice at the same time that the indoor boarding-out is increasing rapidly, that is to say, in 1890 the number of children was 2,899 and in 1905 the number was 6,814; that follows upon the Order of 1889 apparently, at any rate, that order presumably affects all these 6,814 children, does it not?—Yes.

Necessity for boarding-out committees for children boarded-out within the union.

9781. That order as it stands throws the whole responsibility upon the local boarding-out committee within the union, does it not?—Upon the guardians within the union, because it is only a certain proportion of boards of guardians who avail themselves of the services of a boarding-out committee of ladies within the union.

9782. Can you say to what extent that holds? Are there a great many boards who have no boarding-out committee?—I think there are about 650 unions, and out of that number there are a little under 111 which have boarding-out committees. There are 111 within union boarding-out committees. There is more than one within the union in a few instances.

9783. The greater number of these 6,814 children who were boarded out within the union of chargeability, would be looked after by no committee?—No; they would be looked after by the relieving officer and the medical officer only.

9784. Do you think that is at all satisfactory?—No, not at all.

9785. Would your conclusion be that the boarding-out order should make it compulsory that there should be a committee wherever there are children boarded out, whether inside the union or outside?—I think it would be desirable, but I doubt as to the possibility of making it compulsory. I think something might perhaps be done to promote it by issuing a circular? I should myself be more in favour of that than of compelling them to do it all at once.

9786. But if your argument holds that the relieving officer plus boards of guardians are not able to see to this matter thoroughly, does it not follow that there should be either a boarding-out committee or some other organisation?—I think there should be a boarding-out committee. My only doubt about the question is as to the practicability of forcing it all at once upon the guardians. It is only a matter of expediency, and not of what it is desirable to do.

9787. Might I make a suggestion—that there might be some intermediate step? Would it be possible to arrange that a lady or two ladies should be as it were recognised as voluntary assistants in this matter; in that way creating, not a formal committee, but something like a special agency for this purpose?—That is what I have described that I did myself in Nottinghamshire, before the Order of 1889, and found quite insufficient. The ladies had no real authority and did not consider themselves really responsible. If it were not possible to force it upon the guardians, I think, with all deference to Sir Samuel Provis, that what would be much better would be for the Local Government Board to send round a circular pointing out that it would be advisable. Whether it should be forced upon them, or whether such a circular should be written, would be a matter for the Board.

Sufficiency of boarding-out allowance

9788. I gather you are of opinion that the payment now advocated of 5s. is sufficient?—Yes. I think it is more than sufficient in cases where the children are small, and in districts where the wages are low. Where the wages are low, the present scale is quite enough, but where the wages are higher and the rents are higher, the people will not take the children for 4s.

9789. Accepting 5s. for out-union boarding-out, should you not logically accept it for in-union boarding-out?—I think it might be made permissive, but I should be sorry to encourage it, because I think it would make a great rise in out-relief.

9790. At present, according to the evidence before us, it would seem that what is inadequate outdoor relief is being given on the plea of its being money expended in boarding-out, that is to say, eighteenpence or so is given in that way; and the consequence is that if the standard adopted in out-union practice is right the in-union must be wrong?—I think there is altogether a great deal that is wrong in the system of out-relief, but it would be very difficult to lay down a fixed and unvarying rate of payments for in-union boarding-out. A great many of the children are with relatives, and it

would be very difficult to apply to those cases the same universal scale of payments which is given in the case of children who are sent right away from their own district and where there is no question of out-relief.

Lack of official information as to boarding-out within the union.

9791. Has any inquiry been made about in-union boarding-out in recent years, in the form of a report by a Commission or any other body?—Not that I am aware of.

9792. Then the whole subject has not been re-examined?—No, it has not been re-examined into since 1889, when that Order was issued.

9792. Then the whole subject has not been re-examined into?—No, it has not been re-examined into since 1889, when that Order was issued.

9793. Was there an inquiry as to in-union boarding-out in all its branches before that Order was issued?—There was no investigation beyond what I told you I made myself.

Value of certified institutions as a supplement to boarding-out.

9794. In the paragraphs beginning at 95 you have dealt with the question of voluntary homes, and, speaking first of all, of Voluntary Homes and Certified Schools you say "Generally speaking, I have found these homes invaluable both for the reception of children not suitable for boarding-out, or for training older girls or boys who have been either unmanageable or incapable when boarded out, or who have had to be removed from unsatisfactory homes." Do you consider that the boarding-out system should be supplemented by a kind of special home system?—No, I do not think it is necessary that it should be specially supplemented by such a system, but I think that these homes, existing as they are, are already an excellent supplement.

9795. Would it depend upon the inspector to consider this point, or upon the committee?—The committee and the inspectors, when they find a case of a child who would be better dealt with in a certified home, take steps to send it there.

9796. But in the case of in-union boarding-out there would be nobody to send the children on to a certified home if they were unsuitably boarded out?—No, not unless there is a certified committee or unless the guardians think of it for themselves.

Cases of Poor Law children boarded-out by certified institutions.

9797. With regard to the "three cases of homes where children ostensibly sent by the guardians to be trained in there, were illegally boarded-out instead, and it was admitted by the secretary of one society that they boarded-out all children under six sent to their certified homes;" how would the secretary of such a society receive the money? He would receive it, would he not, under conditions which the very receipt showed would necessitate his boarding-out the children that he received the money for?—I am not an inspector of certified homes, and I could not say what form he would send his receipt in. I cannot speak about these cases, because they were not cases that I came across myself. That was his own statement. In the cases where I found it out myself, the guardians sent the payment to the secretary or the managers of the certified home, supposing that the child was in the home, whereas, apparently without saying anything about it, they had boarded them out in the neighbourhood. The guardians paid for the child as in the home, and so the secretary of the home received the money, but the child really was placed outside, where it ought not to have been.

9798. Do you suppose that in a rather large voluntary institution, there are a great many payments made by guardians on the understanding that the children should be in certified homes?—Yes. The guardians pay straight to the secretary or managers of the certified homes. There are a large number of children in such homes, but I cannot tell you how many. Understand me, they are not all Poor Law children; they are mixed; some are voluntary, and some are Poor Law. I could not tell you how many are Poor Law, because they do not come within my inspection.

9799. Therefore, for these cases, there is really *no* supervision to enable a board of guardians to see whether the certified homes keep the children for which they pay?—No. They know that the child is sent there, but they have not always known where it really is, and I do not see that there is any means of knowing where a particular child is.

9800. We follow the children into the certified homes, and we inspect the homes, do we not?—The home is inspected.

9801. But we do not follow the children into the voluntary boarding-out institutions, and inspect those homes?—That is not supposed to be done. I only found it out by some accident.

Need for further inspection of boarding-out within the union.

9802. Do you think that the in-union cases should be inspected by inspectors appointed by the Local Government Board, as the out-union cases are, and on some similar plan?—Yes, I do.

Question of inspection of children under care of charitable associations.

9803. Do you think that the voluntary cases should be inspected on some similar plan?—I do not think myself that the voluntary cases could be; I do not think that we could undertake the voluntary cases.

9804. Granted that it is not a question of staff, but that it is a question of principle, do you think that it would be desirable to inspect the voluntary cases?—That would mean the inspection of the whole of charity. I do not see how the Local Government Board could undertake the inspection of charitable institutions and agencies; I scarcely see how they could.

9805. The evidence that has been put before us is that some of the greatest ills might arise in connection with that very class?—I think the greater ills of those children must be dealt with as the ills of children in their own homes are, under the Cruelty to Children Acts, by the society which undertakes to look up those cases. I think you can only take the extreme cases of abuse and the extreme cases of cruelty. I do not see how the Local Government Board could undertake to inspect the whole of the voluntary doings.

9806. Do you think that the number boarded-out in voluntary homes is very large?—I do not think the number is so very large.

9807. It would be a question then rather of principle, that is to say, it would be a question whether a statutory body like the Local Government Board should inquire into voluntary cases?—The Local Government Board have nothing to do with the funds with which voluntary societies deal. The Local Government Board supervise the work of guardians, and inspect it, because they are dealing with public money. This is dealing with private subscriptions. I think that is where the line should be drawn.

9808. My suggestion is that the principle adopted of certification, where you send a child to a voluntary home certified to be good to receive a child, might possibly be pushed further in the case of voluntary associations?—I would on no account certify those societies and their boardings-out.

9809. In regard to these cases as they stand, if the in-union cases were inspected, you would have to have a considerable addition to the inspectorate here, would you not?—No doubt.

Increase of staff necessary for inspection of children boarded-out within the union.

9810. You think that about 500 cases (it is your own figure) is a year's work?—I think that is the outside that anybody can do, to do it thoroughly, and in addition to do the amount of writing and other duties which are required of the inspectors. Therefore I have said that I think to take all the within-union children would require at least six more inspectors in order to inspect them every two years.

Motives of guardians in boarding-out *e.g.*, Islington.

9811. Do you think this boarding-out system is used by guardians at all to clear the schools? I notice that Islington has 127 boarded-out cases; is that owing to local politics, or is it owing to a special desire to board out?—At present I think Islington are pressed for room. At the same time Islington, I must say, are very careful where they board out. They always write for information as to what committees to send them to. They do not board the children out wholesale in any way.

9812. To whom do they write—to you?—Generally.

9813. Then you act as a kind of centre of information?—As a kind of register.

Question of a central authority for London for boarded-out children.

9814. Turning again to the Report of the Departmental Committee, I see they refer to the dual control as a bad thing, and suggest a central authority with regard to London; are you at all in favour of a change in that direction?—I do not quite remember what they said; and I should not much regard what they did say.

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

9815. This is what they say: "The whole evidence reveals to us the fact that in the present dual system of control by which the guardians board out, and the Local Government Board inspect the children, there is an element of danger which must be faced and dealt with. When comparing Dr. Barnardo's methods with those of the Poor Law, in respect of his plan of receiving back his boarded-out boys for a period of training, Miss Mason commends the doctor's plan and says, 'But, you see, the difference is, Dr. Barnardo boards out his boys, and he can have them back when he pleases. The Local Government Board do not board out these children, and there is no central place at which to have them back for training.'" And then they conclude, "It seems evident to us that the authority boarding-out the children should possess the power to deal with them under all circumstances, including their inspection, and after full consideration of the whole subject we recommend that the duty of carrying out and supervising the arrangements for boarding-out the Poor Law children of the metropolis be intrusted to the suggested central authority." Are you in favour of any great change in that direction?—In the first place, let me say that you quote my own words to me, but I will not at all undertake that I said them. After that committee published its Report, I printed a very simple paper with what they said I said in one column and what I did say, according to their own report of my evidence, in the other, and there was a very great discrepancy between the two. I could not say, therefore, whether I said that; but I certainly do not remember commending Dr. Barnardo's plan of having his children back. It is simply this, that he sent them out and he had them back, and the guardians do much the same when necessary. The guardians send their boys out, and if they want to have them back for training or to send them anywhere for training they can do so. According to a return which I have here, and which I am going to hand in presently (*see* Appendix Vol. I.(A), No. XX. (L),) out of 872 children boarded-out since 1895, eighty-two boys have been sent to training ships or training homes, and seventy girls have been sent to the M.A.B.Y.S. or to training homes. I do not see what more you want; certainly you do not want a central body. The Local Government Board are the central body, to deal with central matters.

The after-care of boarded-out children.

9816. Therefore, what is called here the after-care required, you say is practically a thing that is dealt with as it arises in the cases?—Quite so. The boarded-out children are admirably looked after for the London unions by their committees when in the country, and by the M.A.B.Y.S. when they come up to London. With regard to the country unions, the Girls' Friendly Society does a great deal, but not in a very systematic way.

9817. As I understand your position from your memorandum, you would desire to develop associative work on the lines of the M.A.B.Y.S.?—Yes.

9818. And to take the cases up where the guardians leave them?—Yes. The Metropolitan Association does that for London, and I should like to have it extended to the country unions. It is very desirable that it should be.

9819. That is a form of co-operation with charities that you would wish to advocate?—Quite so.

Functions of the guardians under the Infant Life Protection Act.

9820. You know, I think, the Infant Life Protection Act of 1897, which requires that there should be a notification to the local authority in regard to any person retaining or receiving for hire or reward more than one infant under the age of five years, and so forth; and so throws the responsibility, if I remember right, in London on the County Council, and elsewhere on the guardians; have you come across children who are being dealt with under that Act?—Yes.

9821. In London?—No. I do not visit any homes in London. There are no children boarded-out in London

9822. Have you ever come across them outside London?—Yes, I have.

9823. Are you inclined to think the Infant Life Protection Act could be in any way dealt with in connection with the general system of inspection of boarded-out children?—That again, you see, is voluntary; they are paid for from voluntary funds. I think it would be difficult.

9824. Yet here we have, if I remember right, the guardians acting as the authority for inspection outside London?—Yes, that is so.

9825. So that you have in this case two forms of inspection already going on—the supervision of in-union boarded-out cases and the inspection of "infant life" cases under this Act?—Yes.

9826. So that the guardians already in this matter have extended their functions so as to include voluntary children?—Yes.

9827. But you think on the whole that it would be better not to go on that line?—I am not at all sure that if there was some other authority, that would not be better than the guardians undertaking the inspection of infant life because it is not a Poor Law matter. If there were any other authority who could undertake the inspection under the Infant Life Protection Acts, I think that would be desirable rather than letting the guardians do it.

9828. (*Mr. Chandler.*) I gather from your remarks in paragraph 52 that, providing the same system of Government inspection were compulsory in regard to boarding-out within the union, you would consider the system perfectly satisfactory?—If you mean to say if that the system existed within the union that there is beyond the union, my reply is, Yes, I should think this as satisfactory as it could be, taking human nature as it is.

9829. And you do not wish to see it disturbed in any way?—No, I do not.

Adequacy of boarding-out allowance.

9830. Do you think that the amount of the payment that is made for the children has any relation whatever to the treatment of those children?—No. I do not think a child is a bit better treated for 5s. than it is for 2s. If a woman is kind, or if she is conscientious, she will do her duty for whatever sum she has consented to receive the child at.

9831. I think you have said that the basis of payment was fixed with a view to giving a slight profit for the trouble that is necessarily entailed in looking after a child?—Yes.

9832. You quoted the instance of a man earning 15s. per week with five in family, which averages 3s. per head per week; there the payment of 4s. gives a profit of 1s.?—Yes.

9833. Then you also told us that in your experience the worst treated children were by no means in the families of those who were low paid?—Yes, that is so.

9834. Do you not think that that may have something to do with the standard of living in those houses? The standard of living in the case of a mechanic who will earn 30s. per week, would be generally higher all round than the standard of living in the case of a man who is earning 15s. per week, would it not?—Yes.

9835. In that case, the 4s. a week which would be paid for the foster-child would be rather below the average for the man's family, and, therefore, it probably might be considered that an injustice was being done to them by paying such a small amount?—Yes, and sometimes they do complain. It is the richer persons who complain that the money is not enough. Therefore it is that we have raised the permissive limit so that the people who are better off may find it worth while to take them.

9836. That is, you have raised the limit so that you make it a permissive 5s.?—Yes. We do not wish to have only the poorest class of people taking these children. Wherever the committees find that 4s. is not enough, they are now empowered to ask for 5s. from the guardians.

9837. And that, you think, quite ample?—Yes, I think it is.

Attitude of foster-parents towards boarded-out children.

9838. In regard to the advantages of the boarding-out system, you say that it furnishes a home to return to between situations or on a holiday when in service; but, of course, the payments towards the child cease when the child goes out to service?—Yes.

The putting out of boarded-out children to service or to trades and its effect on the labour market.

9839. Do you think that the desire to recognise them as one of the family, and to take them in between situations is prevalent after the payments cease?—Yes.

9840. Is that really so?—It is almost universal.

9841. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is it habitual for the guardians to pay anything for apprenticing boarded-out children after they have ceased to be chargeable?—It is not habitual, but it is occasional; it is not infrequent.

9842. That would be apprenticing them to some trade, a local trade probably ?—Yes, it is generally a local trade at some place in the neighbourhood.

9843. I have heard it said by people living in the country where there are boarded-out children, that the boarded-out children for whom the guardians pay generally get all the country places round about, and that the real village children have to turn out and look for work elsewhere; do you think there is much in that ?—It may be so now and then, because the ladies naturally take trouble to find places for their boarded-out children, and those have got powerful friends in the neighbourhood who will find places for them. Naturally, these children must after a time cease to be paid for, and so the ladies who have looked after them until that time try to get them places.

9844. Might we, therefore, have a sort of circulation of town boys getting country work and country boys having to go up to the town ?—I have never heard of its driving the country boys to the town. I have heard sometimes that boarded-out children get the best places in the neighbourhood, but I have never heard that they have driven the other children away.

9845. I take it that the girls get no training for service in this way ?—They get no more training than any ordinary girl. We all know that a girl first goes out as a "tweeny" or a "general." The girls do not get special training; the training they get is learning to take care of themselves in the world, and learning the ordinary life of a cottage.

ords of
r-careers
oarded-
children
l diffi-
ties in
nection
rewith.

9846. Do you think it would be difficult to institute a system of records, showing what became of the children after they ceased to become chargeable, so that we might have a systematic record of them ? It struck me on looking through your evidence before the Departmental Committee on Poor Law Schools, that there might be a considerable number who returned to the workhouse after they had ceased to be chargeable as children—not a large number, but still a considerable number ?—I got returns from every clerk to the guardians of every union that has boarded out, but I found it quite impossible to tabulate them accurately. I have done it as best I can, and I will hand in the results to the Chairman presently. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (K).) But I think you will find the summary of the history of every union which I gave much more useful than a mere tabulation, because I have given the circumstances and the reasons why the children returned. Then again, I have brought with me another table which shows what has happened to the children since the Poor Law Schools Committee reported. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (L).) I am not quite sure whether that return is accurate, because I am not quite sure whether all the clerks to the guardians understood that I referred to the return to the union of children who have been boarded-out before and after 1895. I have got those who have been returned to the union as unfit for boarding-out or for some other reason, while they were still young, and also those who have been returned to the union after they have entered service because they failed in service or something else happened.

9847. But we have not at present, have we, either for the school children or for the boarded-out children, a record for, say, three years, until one might say they were fairly started in life ?—A great many committees keep such a record, and I have got a great many from the different committees. There is, for instance, a committee at Sidmouth which keeps a perfect and complete register of the history of all the children who have gone out. Then, again, Mr. Trevelyan, of Calverton, who died last Christmas, had a correct list of about 200 boarded-out children; but Mr. Trevelyan was exceptional in his work and influence, and I do not think his case should count; but Sidmouth can count.

9848. Could it be made universal, do you think, so that there would be some definite information to go upon and to judge the results by ?—Yes; I could collect it.

9849. If it was kept as it went along, it would be very much easier than collecting it at a particular time ?—A good many committees do keep a register, and I could get a ready-made register from a large number at once. One thing to be considered is that the statistics which you have to rely upon are often very inaccurate and are carelessly compiled. Mr. Mundella was not satisfied with my account, and I think he did not care much about it. He asked the Local Government Board for another, and Sir Samuel Provis will remember that the Local Government Board themselves sent out officially and collected statistics from every union, showing what had become of the children. Those statistics will be quite available to you. It is "Board of Guardians (Boarded-out Children)" Return to an Order of the House of Commons dated 22nd March, 1897. (Mr. Mundella.)

9850. Have the guardians themselves any system by which they know for three years what is happening to all the children who were boarded-out, so that they may be quite able to tell you ?—That would not be the case with quite all boards of guardians, but most of them. For instance Paddington and St. Pancras have such a system; they keep very accurate registers, and they could tell you, always. I think you will see something of the difficulties of ascertaining accurately, if you will look at the supplement to my evidence before the Poor Law Schools Committee.

9851. I have looked at it, and that is what made me think that if this system should be made universal, those difficulties would disappear ?—I think it could be, and I should think it would be a very good thing. Long before my official appointment I tried to make such a record through the Girls' Friendly Society, but I found the society itself very impracticable about it. Also, they only look after girls of good character, whereas we want to know about all kinds of girls.

9852. When we talk about children turning out well through all these systems, we are talking a little in the air sometimes, because we do not know what has become of them; therefore any accurate knowledge would be a help ?—I quite agree with you; I have always wished it myself, and if I had time I would do it for the boarded-out children.

9853. About the Country Holidays Fund, that only lasts, does it not, for about a month, and in the summer ?—It lasts a little more than that; it lasts, I should say, quite six or eight weeks.

Effect of country holiday funds on boarding-out.

9854. Do you think that for a payment from the Country Holidays Fund for six weeks these foster-parents would find it worth their while to forego having boarded-out children ?—It would really mean more than that, because I think they begin sending the children out about June, and they go on until nearly October, at any rate they go on all through September sometimes, and they often have several at a time. They do find it quite worth their while.

Adequacy of boarding-out allowances.

9855. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Could you give us any reason why the children who are boarded out within the union should only be paid for at the rate of 4s. a week, whereas those who are boarded out without the union may be paid for at the rate of 5s. a week ?—As a matter of fact they are not always paid for at the rate of even 4s. a week within the union; it is about 3s. to 3s. 6d. within the union.

9856. What reason is there for that ?—Because country guardians do not like parting with the money.

9857. Is that the only reason ?—Chiefly that, and also because a good many of the children are boarded out with relations who sometimes take them for 1s. 6d.

9858. If a board of guardians wants to pay 5s. they have to get the leave of the Local Government Board to pay it. We only asked last week at my board of guardians for permission to pay 5s. for two children boarded out within the union ?—I do not see any reason why you should not pay 5s. if there is any special cause for it. I do not see why the limit should not be raised within the union. At the same time, I do not think you would find the guardians would be so very anxious to give it.

9859. That is not the question. The point is that the Order for boarding out within the union at present only allows a maximum of 4s., and I am asking you whether you can tell us what reason there is for the rule that 4s. should be paid for boarding out within the union, whilst it is 5s. for boarding out without the union ?—As a matter of fact, the reason simply is that the Order for boarding out beyond the union was issued late in last autumn, and that there has been no fresh boarding-out Order for within the union since.

Reasons for decrease of boarding-out without the union.

9860. Can you give us any reason why boarding out without the union increases so slowly ?—I have given you the reasons in the appendix to my memorandum.

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

9861. They do not seem to me very clear?—First of all, there is no agency to start them; that is the principal reason. These committees are started voluntarily by ladies and gentlemen who have heard of the boarding-out system accidentally. A great many ladies and gentlemen living in the country have never heard of it, and do not know anything about it, although they might be interested in it if they heard of it. Then another reason, as I have said, is that boarding-out within the union has taken away numbers of the homes in which other guardians could board out without their union, as naturally the local guardians fill the homes which are available in any particular village. Then, thirdly, I think the number of country holiday children has most distinctly limited the field.

9862. Do you think those three reasons cover the ground, practically?—I do. I think there are a large number of places where boarding-out commitees might still be formed if there was anyone to start them. I have given other quite clear reasons in the extract from my report (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (J).) The financial obstacles are now removed.

Attitude of foster-parents towards inspection.

9863. You told us just now that you thought that the very best foster-parents appreciated a very minute inspection?—They do, most distinctly.

9864. And in any case where you find the parents do not like that very minute inspection, you imagine there is something wrong if you could only find it out?—I never imagine.

9865. You would be led to think, then?—I am not led to think, I know it by finding it out. I could give you a reason in any particular case why a particular foster-parent has objected to my minute inspection.

9866. Wherever you find a particular foster-parent objecting, you are convinced then and you do not imagine?—No, I have found it out.

9867. You are convinced by your experience that there is something wrong?—I have actually found that there has been something wrong.

9868. In every case?—In every case. I do not say anything as to what a foster-parent may have said afterwards to a committee behind my back; that is quite a different matter. But in every case where I have met with any objection to my inspection at the time, I am not "convinced," as you put it, but I have found facts which certainly gave me sufficient reason for the objection to inspection.

Boarding-out at Farnham.

9869. Referring now to your statement (Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (F)), where you deal with the Farnham boarding-out committee, do you think what you say there exactly represents the facts that took place, from the point of view of the committee as well as from your point of view?—Perfectly, except this: that in my revised proof I have altered a little what I have said. I wrote this very quickly whilst I was away from London. I would like to say this, if I may, first. I have given the names of places and the names of people, only that you may be able to follow them up later if you wish to do so, but I intend to take them all out. These names are only for your own information, because I think anonymous information is not so valuable.

9870. You refer to what the secretary did on the occasion of her visit with you, and you say, "Afterwards she went back upon it"; that is, I presume, she went back upon her word or agreement that the three boys concerned should be removed?—Her agreement with me or her opinion that the boys should be removed.

9871. The reason why she went back upon what she had stated to you was, was it not, that other information had come to her knowledge?—She did not tell me so. I do not undertake to say what her reason was. I know that she did so.

9872. Supposing that that was so, then this particular secretary, it seems to me, was guilty of very unbecoming conduct, in that she practically broke her word?—She did not promise, make an actual promise, as far as I remember, and she did not explain to me the reason why she changed except the one that I told you, that those particular foster parents would not put up with my inspection. That was the only one that she gave me; and I am not surprised that they did not like my inspection.

9873. I think you tell us that in consequence of this case, the Wandsworth Guardians ceased to board out anywhere, but I notice on page 6 that they still do board out?—They did not withdraw all the children they had boarded out, but they resolved to board out no more; and they have not boarded out a single case since.

9874. I understand that there are fresh children boarded out with that committee, since the date of this Farnham case?—I do not think there are any fresh ones, but at any rate if there are the guardians must have rescinded their resolution, and I am not aware that they have. They did pass that resolution at the time, and I tried my best to prevent them.

9875. Certain members of the committee I know only continued to act until these present children had ceased to be boarded out?—The whole committee has changed.

9876. Then when that resolution was altered, some of the members resigned?—I am glad to say they did. There are fresh members on now.

9877. And Wandsworth is now boarding-out?—No—only the few children who were allowed to remain.

9878. Since that improvement in the committee consequent on certain resignations the Wandsworth Board of Guardians has resumed boarding-out with that committee?—I think not. That was almost the very last committee that I have inspected, and I do not remember any fresh child boarded out.

9879. I was told it was so?—I have got the information actually with me now, and I can give you the dates of every child there. I find on reference that there has not been a single child boarded out since.

9880. Do you say then that the re-organisation of the committee has not resulted in fresh boarding-out in the district?—I am sorry to say it has not, as far as the Wandsworth Guardians are concerned: I wish it had.

9881. Practically, boarding-out as far as the Local Government Board is concerned, in its present form or its late form, has ceased to exist?—If you want to know what I think about it, I think the guardians have been very unreasonable. Of course, the former state of things was unsatisfactory, but there is no reason why they should stop the boarding-out for all time. But that is what guardians do; if you discontent them about one committee, they say, "We will not board out any more."

9882. And you think that the Wandsworth Guardians and the Farnham Committee are the only people to blame for the discontinuance of the boarding-out?—Yes, I do.

9883. The only people?—That is the reason why they gave it up; that is what they told me at the time, and they have boarded out none since.

Duties of, and instructions to, lady inspectors.

9884. (*Dr. Downes.*) In the first instance, I think you had no definite instructions from the Local Government Board as to your duties?—No, none at all; as long as I was the sole inspector I had none.

9885. But when it became necessary to appoint a second inspector, the Local Government Board issued a memorandum of instructions, I think?—Yes.

9886. That was issued in March 1898, was it not?—Yes.

9887. I do not know whether you have put a copy of that in?—No, I have not; I did not think it worth while. I resumed it as well as I could in my rough draft from memory when I was in Nottinghamshire, and had not the paper with me.

9888. By a letter dated May 6th, 1898, the Local Government Board applied their memorandum of instructions to yourself, and asked you also to inspect the district of each boarding-out committee once at least in each year, I think?—I was only instructed, as far as circumstances would permit, to proceed on the lines laid down in the Minute. I was only definitely instructed to visit every committee in my district once a year.

9889. I have asked those questions, because I want you to explain the word "impossible" in paragraph 10. You say there, "In trying to carry out in a thorough manner this impossible task I broke down." Would you kindly explain what it was you found impossible in the new duties?—What I found impossible was to inspect the whole of the committees in the half of England every year, and as many children in those places as I myself deemed necessary. It was impossible for me to do that in the year.

9890. It was impossible you mean to get through that work in a fixed time ?—Yes, and that has been proved by my breakdown; and so the Board have appointed a third inspector, because two were too few.

9891. On the retirement of the second inspector on her marriage they appointed two inspectors who now act with you ?—Yes.

Inadequacy of medical officer's certificate as to health of boarded-out children.

9892. You have told us in your evidence that the medical certificate that was sent down with the child was not always acceptable to the recipients of the child. Form 5 of the Order requires the medical officer of the Poor Law union sending the child to give a certificate which is to this effect—"I, the undersigned, having this day personally examined aged residing at hereby certify that he (or she) is not suffering from any contagious or infectious disease and that his (or her) bodily health is good with the exception that ." Then he is to state the particulars of the exceptions. Then it is dated and signed by the medical officer. That is the form of certificate, is it not ?—Yes.

9893. And that you say is not always satisfactory to the people who receive the child ?—What I meant to say was that the people who have received the child have sometimes said that it had got complaints which were not entered in the form, which the medical officer had not mentioned. They have done so sometimes—not very often, and there have been disputes between the committee and the guardians as to the condition in which the child arrived.

9894. Has there been any serious difficulty on that head ?—There have only been a few local disputes, that is all.

9895. I notice that there is no limitation as to the time within which the certificate is to be used; does it ever happen that the certificate is an old one at the time that the child comes down ?—I could not say that. I have never had it mentioned to me. I do not see the certificates myself when they come; I only hear what the committee and the foster-parents tell me afterwards. I have had several cases of ringworm and itch, when there has been a dispute as to whether the child brought the complaint with it or not when it was first boarded out.

Cases of boarding-out of unsuitable children.

9896. Do you find any cases in which children who are morally depraved or are mentally unsuitable to be boarded out are sent out ?—Yes, I do find some cases that sort.

9897. Do you consider that this certificate as it is worded would be a sufficient safeguard against the sending down of those children ?—No, I do not think it speaks about anything but their bodily health.

9898. Do you think there should be some safeguard provided against sending children who are mentally or morally unsuitable ?—I do not see how you can frame a rule to insure that. I do not think the guardians have any right to send such a child down, and if it is found out it ought to be sent back again. But I do not see how you can draw up any rule, unless you were to add to that form that the child is not morally or mentally unsuitable.

9899. Do you find that many cases are sent down that are unsuitable for boarding-out ?—There are not many depraved cases, but there are a great many that are sent down and are found to be unsuitable after they have arrived, and I have given you their number in the Appendix. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (K and L).)

9900. Is there any danger, in your opinion, of children who are troublesome from infirmities or otherwise in the schools being sent away and boarded out ?—Yes; a great many of the children who are very troublesome from their habits are sent out. I hear that almost every day of my life.

9901. So that the boarded-out children may in that respect not be what I should call a very suitable pick of the children ?—I think they are the pick of the children, and I think the rest the guardians get are perhaps worse. They all come into the workhouse from poverty or misfortune of some kind, and therefore they come in with every kind of defect both bodily and mental.

9902. Do I understand that you think that the children with infirmities are retained in the schools or that they are sent away to be boarded out ?—I could not say, because I do not see the schools; but I can say that they do send out a great number of children with certain infirmities, and that some of them get cured after they have been boarded out, and some do not; some have to return as incurable and the foster-parents cannot put up with them; on the other hand, a great many are retained, and the foster-parents have shown the utmost patience with them.

9903. Do you think that any evil that there may be in this direction is of sufficient extent to necessitate any alteration of the Order ?—No. I do not see what you can do.

Medical and dental attendance on boarded-out children.

9904. With regard to the medical attendance, is it compulsory on the committees to provide for medical attendance ?—Yes. It is part of their formal agreement with the board of guardians that they must provide medical attendance. They have to enter into an arrangement with a duly qualified medical man for attendance on the children, and for the supply of the necessary medicines.

9905. Is that provided for in the form of an agreement ?—Yes, there is a regularly scheduled form.

9906. And similarly for the dental treatment ?—Yes, since the new Order.

9907. How do they usually make the arrangements for the medical attendance ?—That altogether depends upon the neighbourhood. In most places they make an arrangement with a doctor that he will see the children whenever he is sent for, at the rate of 10s. per year, which is the sum that is given.

9908. I see that in your last report you mention a case where the committee provided for the children to be attended on the club system ?—Yes. Many of them are attended on the club system; that costs rather less, as a rule.

9909. So far as you are aware is that system satisfactory ?—Yes.

9910. Have they any difficulties in making those arrangements with regard to the medical club ?—No, none at all. The doctors, in fact, are most generous. As to the dentists, there is one dentist who I know attends something like fifty children for 2s. per head for the year; examines them every half year to see whether anything is the matter with them, and does the stoppings and extractions, besides, whenever wanted.

9911. In your last report to the Local Government Board—the same report I have just referred to—you have given an account of a rather unsatisfactory case where a woman professed to take a child up to London to see an oculist, and the guardians apparently knew nothing about these visits to the oculist, although they had to pay for them, but eventually they sent the child to an independent oculist who said there was nothing the matter with its eyes ?—I remember it. The guardians knew that they paid for an oculist, and they knew that the child went up to London; but they only knew through the committee what the oculist was reported to have said.

9912. Ought not the committee to have reported to the guardians what was going on, in that case ?—Of course they ought. That is an unsatisfactory committee, and that committee is one which I have not recommended to any more boards of guardians. It therefore has now dwindled down to one child, allowed to remain because it is in a good home, and I visit it once a year. But I do not want that committee to have any more.

9913. That is an exceptional case ?—That is quite an exceptional case. The reason I put that case in was only as an illustration of why foster-parents want to adopt children, and what sort of people they are. It was not illustrative of the neglect of committees.

9914. Have you had any case where the guardians, have refused to pay such expenses as that; for example when they think the committees have not used reasonable care ?—Yes. The guardians do refuse to pay the expenses sometimes, and they are not always reasonable in their refusal. Reason is not always on the same side.

9915. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do they contract with the doctor to pay him 10s. a year for the visits that he

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906

may be called on to make?—Yes, they contract to pay him 10s. per head, and sometimes less. The contract with the doctor is not the same in every case. Sometimes they do not contract at all, but pay the doctor simply for the services that he renders. The sum for which the doctor can do it depends upon the district—whether, for instance, there is a doctor near at hand or whether it is a scattered country district.

Insurance of boarded-out children by foster-parents.

9916. (*Dr. Downes.*) The Boarding-out Order has a provision that the foster-parents are not to insure the children; have you had any cases where that has been going on?—Not many, but I have had some.

9917. Do they appear anywhere in your returns?—One of them was at Farnham.

9918. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In that case it was done through inadvertence, was it not?—Quite so, and I should like to say so.

9919. I think it ought to be said, too?—I say it gladly. It was done by inadvertence; but it was done through the neglect of the committee to enter into proper arrangements with a doctor.

9920. I think Dr. Downes's question really had burial clubs in view?—Yes. Most of the Farnham children were insured in burial clubs, because the secretary of the committee had not entered into a proper arrangement with a doctor to attend them. It was left to the foster-parents to do what they pleased, and the foster-parents, quite inadvertently, and not with any bad motive, did insure the children in different medical and burial clubs. They had no bad intention, I think, whatever; it was simply because the sick club payments included burial expenses. I have found a few more cases, but at this moment I cannot recall, speaking from memory, which they are. I think Miss Evans has found a few more in the north.

The boarding-out of epileptics.

9921. (*Dr. Downes.*) You mention the case of epileptics in your appendix; do you get many of those in your inspection?—No, not many. There are very few of them boarded out, and where they are, they are generally removed. I have always recommended their removal where an epileptic home could be found for them; but, as you know, until quite lately there have been no special homes for epileptics.

9922. Your view would be that the epileptics should rather go to a suitable institutional home than be boarded out?—Certainly; it is most unsafe to board them out.

9923. You refer to your visit to the "Exmouth," and you speak of a boy who wanted to go back to rather unsatisfactory foster-parents; in your report you go on to say, "The effect was that the unsatisfactory foster-parents were 'nibbling' at these boys in order to get them back now that they were at a wage-earning age, and their labour profitable;" is that so?—Yes.

9924. I merely asked you that, because it might have appeared that the boys were not happy on the "Exmouth"?—I think they were quite happy as far as the "Exmouth" went, except those who did not like the discipline.

Records of after-careers of boarded-out children.

9925. I think you told us that some of the committees follow up their children and keep records, and Miss Evans in her last report mentions some committees who also keep records of their children. She says: "The Windermere, Southport and Ruyton-Eleven-Towns boarding-out committees are, amongst others, particularly good in following up their former boarded-out boys and girls and looking after them." I ask you that, because it may be useful if we had information where we can obtain evidence as to the results of boarding-out, and I do not know whether you are able to supplement that list of committees?—If the Local Government Board will allow me a little extra time, a little extra law, that is to say, I will write to every committee and I will ask them to send me their records. I could send you a few now. Most of the committees do keep such a record, only many of them keep their books in a very unbusiness-like manner. I think nearly all of them could tell you where the children are.

9926. Do you think that the existing information would be worth collection?—I should say that, on the whole, it would, although one of those very committees mentioned by Miss Evans showed me a list of children when I inspected them, and it was very incorrect; they really did not know where the children were, for I found some of them at quite different places to where they said.

9927. Setting aside cases that are doubtful, do you think there exist a sufficient number who have kept careful record as to give results that would be useful to the Commission?—Quite so.

9928. If that is so, it would not be so great a matter then to collect the information from those selected committees, would it?—No. I would collect them from all of them, if you like.

9929. (*Chairman.*) If you could give us any information which would show reliable results, I think it would be very useful to us?—I will do so with pleasure. In the appendix to my statement you will see the results of all those who have gone back to the union, and I take it for granted that those who have not gone back to the union are doing well. There is also the return which Mr. Mundella got, which tells you how many have gone to service; but I can assure you it is very inaccurate, for I saw the proof, or the substance of the returns in each case the forms came in.

Cases of P Law childr boarded-ou by certified institutions

9930. (*Dr. Downes.*) You have mentioned cases where apparently children were being boarded-out illegally from certified homes; I suppose you are aware that certified homes are inspected by the general inspectors?—Of course.

9931. The general inspector usually gives a list of the children actually in the home and the unions sending them?—I think he gives the numbers of the children, but he does not give their names, and he has not any means of knowing whether they are the same children in the homes or not.

9932. He usually gives the number of the children and the union sending them?—Yes, but, as I say, not the names. So you see a board of guardians might send Mary to that home, and then they might afterwards send Jane to that home, and Mary might be boarded-out in order to make room for Jane, and the inspector would not find that out, because he has not got either girl's name.

9933. The boarding-out within the Union Order I think does not apply to any London union?—I suppose not, but I have really never considered the question.

Insurance o boarded-ou children.

9934. (*Mr. Phelps.*) You said it was forbidden to foster-parents to insure the children; why is that?—Because it would be such a temptation to get a sum of money at their death.

9935. Do you really think that is necessary?—Yes, I think it is necessary to forbid it. It is not necessary that they should insure them for a sum of money at death, because the board of guardians in their agreement have a special provision that the board will pay for the burials, so what is the use of the foster-parents insuring for that?

9936. It may be a very good thing to begin early to insure a child, but what I wanted to put to you is this: It is surely taking a rather low estimate of the average foster-parents to hold that they should be restrained by regulation from proceedings which would be practically murder?—We hope that it will not come to murder, but we would rather stop it before it comes to murder. They should be made to understand that it is not at all a right thing to do, and as a matter of fact I do not think many do it.

Boarding-ou without the union con- fined to urban unions

9937. As a rule boarding-out is confined to urban Unions is it not?—As a rule it is.

9938. You do not find any country unions boarding out, do you?—Very few except within the union.

After em- ployment of boarded-out children.

9939. When children in that way go down into the country from an urban union and they are boarded out, their future in life is mainly settled by the committee, is it not?—Yes.

9940. Would the committee as a rule, do you think, plant out those children in the district in which they were boarded out?—Yes, as a rule; some of them send them further afield.

9941. If a child is started in life by the urban union itself, he would generally be apprenticed, but if he is planted in life by a boarding-out committee he would become an agricultural labourer I suppose, generally

speaking ?—Not always, because some of the committees are situated in places where there is not very much agriculture.

9942. But the majority of them are in country districts, are they not ?—Yes, most of them are.

9943. Are there any boarding-out committees in the towns ?—Yes, there is one in Hull, and there used to be one which reached into Nottingham, and there also used to be some in Birmingham, but these two latter do not exist any more.

9944. Do you think that if a boy's future is put in the hands of a boarding-out committee his prospects are as good as if it were in the hands of the board of guardians which was responsible for him ?—I think that the prospects of the girls are distinctly better, because the ladies find better places for them. The prospects of the boys are about equal, because if the ladies can find situations other than agricultural situations they do so in suitable cases. The guardians as a rule are quite willing to pay to help them on, if they can get into such places.

9945. Is there much chance of a boy who has been boarded-out being apprenticed and becoming an artisan ?—Yes.

9946. Do you find boys doing that ?—Yes, a great many of them.

ir-space
d other
quirements
r boarding-
t homes.

9947. Have you any instructions as to the conditions under which a child may be boarded-out; for instance, as to cubic space ?—No, not as to cubic space. I take a measuring tape with me, but I only measure in the most extreme cases. I do not use it once in two years.

9948. Have you instructions in that respect, or do you act only on your own judgment ?—On my own judgment, or our own judgment.

9949. You have in your own mind a kind of standard, have you ?—No, I have no standard at all as to the cubic space, and it is impossible to require it in cottages, because they are all different. If there is overcrowding, and if there is really an unwholesome number of people sleeping in the same room or house, or if the sexes are not properly separated, then in those cases I say so in my report on the case.

9950. Could you formulate those cases ?—Do you mean tabulate them ?

9951. Could you put them into the form of general rules ?—No, that is not possible.

9952. Then you could not draw up anything which would be the basis of a certificate ?—No, because we do not build these houses for the purpose; we have to take what houses we can find.

9953. Still there are certain classes of houses that you would exclude by the nature of the case, are there not ?—Certainly.

9954. Do you think anything like that could be applied to the certified homes to which children could be sent by the voluntary associations Mr. Loch spoke of ?—I think the voluntary associations might do it themselves—and some of them do, more or less.

oposed
ntrol by
al
thority
er board-
g-out of
ildren by
arities.

9955. But you do not think that the local authority would certify homes or refuse to certify ?—No. In a rather recent case of overcrowding under a Country Holidays Fund, the sanitary authority stepped in. The clergyman of the place wrote privately to the sanitary authority, and he came and said that there was a window to be put in and that there were not to be more than a certain number of people in the place. He secured the window, but I do not feel sure that he secured the number.

9956. That would be under the general Act, which would apply whether they were the people's own children or children that were taken in ?—That is so.

9957. You do not think that the taking in of children is so exceptional a thing that the local authority should be charged with seeing that a certain standard should be maintained, do you ?—I do not think the local authority should have anything to do with the regulations for the official boarding-out.

9958. Not even to insist on a minimum of conditions ?—Certainly not. I do not even think that the Local Government Board could do so, because each house is different.

9959. You do not think it would be a good thing for the local authority to inform you in the first instance as to the number such and such a house was suitable for ?—No. The guardians have a form of questions which they send down, such as how many rooms and how many people there are, and that is quite sufficient for them. They judge upon the merits of each case, and upon the number of people in the house and the number of rooms. If they are not satisfied they do not send the child to that house. And if the accommodation is not sufficient, then the inspector is sure to find it out on her next visit and to report it.

9960. There are boarding-out committees in various parts of England, but in some parts of England there are none; does the existence of a boarding-out committee at all depend, do you think, on the rate of wages in the district ?—Its cessation does. They are glad to have the children in the poorer districts, but where they are too well off they do not want them.

Connection between rate of wages and facility in boarding-out children.

9961. You do not find that there are some districts in which the rate of wages is so low that it would be inexpedient to board out children in them ?—No; I do not think that is a reason for not boarding out children in a particular district.

9962. It is rather where the wages are high that the people do not care to be at the trouble of taking the children ?—That is so. There was one committee at Esher, for instance, which was started by the late Duke of Albany. They could not get the people to take the children under 6s. a week, and the committee themselves privately paid the extra 2s. a week. The people were so well off and rents were so high that they would not take the children for less. But it was a mistake; the committee could not afford to go on paying the 2s., and so they have taken no more children; that committee has come to an end for that reason.

The M. A. B. Y. S. and kindred societies.

9963. (*Miss Hill.*) The M.A.B.Y.S. to a great extent watches over the girls in the Metropolitan area, I suppose, after they are started in life ?—Yes.

9964. Where there is a boarding-out committee in the country I suppose there is not the same need for such an association; they fulfil the functions of the M.A.B.Y.S., do they not ?—Yes.

9965. In other large towns are there any similar institutions, do you know, dealing with girls who have started out ?—Do you mean for those who come into the town, or for those who go out of the town ?

9966. I mean for Poor Law girls who are started in service ?—There are some local societies; for instance, there is one in Liverpool and I think there is one in Manchester, and I have one of my own at Nottingham.

9967. With regard to the boys, the London association for looking after them has not been started very many years ?—No, it was started quite recently.

9968. Does it cover the whole of London ?—I think so.

9969. You do not see any particular necessity with regard to the boarded out children to extend the M.A.B.Y.S., or do you, because the committees fill the place ?—I see no cause to extend it, for that reason. When the boarded-out girls come into London, then the M.A.B.Y.S. take them in hand.

Inspection of children by boarding out Committees; its reception and results.

9970. (*Professor Smart.*) In paragraph 48 (b) you say that "the visits of the guardians tend to keep up and accentuate the connection of children with pauperism, which it is one of the chief objects of the boarding-out system to remove;" do you not think very much the same might be said of the visits of ladies ?—No, I do not think so at all. The ladies are friends of the local people.

9971. I suppose everyone knows that these children are boarded-out children ?—Yes, but it is not so marked when they are visited by ladies. It is thought rather a distinction to be visited by ladies from the neighbourhood and by the lady from London; but it is not a distinction to have a number of guardians going round in a van.

9972. I am not speaking of the lady from London, but only of the local ladies ? I am afraid I come from a country where it would not be at all appreciated ?—Very likely; you have not tried it. Certainly they like the

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

visits of their ladies, and it certainly does not tend to bring any stigma upon them.

9973. I do not think you say very much about the duties of the ladies, particularly their inspection duties; what duties of inspection have the ladies?—The ladies have to see that the children are kindly treated, and, as far as they can judge, that they are properly fed, that they are given a periodic or occasional bath, that they are kept clean, that the money which is given for their clothing is properly expended, that they are sent to church or to chapel as the case may be, and that they are sent to a day school and to a Sunday school. These are their duties.

9974. How are their duties distinguished from your own?—Those are their duties. I ascertain whether the ladies have been inspecting in these respects when I go down.

9975. Do they inspect the children's clothing and all that sort of thing, just as you do?—Yes, that is their business.

9976. Do they do that constantly?—Yes.

9977. How often are these ladies' visits made?—That depends. Sometimes they make a thorough inspection on one or other of those points at one time, and on another point at another time. They are bound to visit each child and its home at least once in every six weeks, but most of them do so much oftener. And those who live near see the children casually, constantly.

9978. There are always ladies in the place, I presume?—In the place, or near it. There is a limitation that no child may be boarded out more than three miles from some member of the committee, so that there should be always someone at hand to look after them and watch over them.

9979. Do they go singly or in couples, as a rule?—Where they are brave they go singly, where they are frightened they go in couples.

9980. Do you find as a rule that the ladies on these committees as well as being persons of social standing are persons of tact?—Ladies differ in tact like other people.

9981. Do you find that the ladies who offer themselves for that purpose are as a rule persons who can be trusted with these delicate duties?—Yes, I quite think so; as a rule they are very good indeed.

The constitution of, and responsibility for, boarding-out committees.

9982. The committees are self-elected, I notice?—Yes, they are.

9983. Did you ever hear of a board of guardians rejecting any trio who offered themselves as a committee?—The boards of guardians have nothing to do with their selection; they are not under the boards of guardians in any way. The boards of guardians do not choose them, and do not appoint them. Perhaps if a guardian has a friend in any particular neighbourhood, he will suggest to her that she should form a boarding-out committee, and she may do so, but boards of guardians as such have nothing whatever to do with the initiatory steps; the ladies suggest themselves to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board authorise them. The guardians have nothing to do with the appointment or regulation of the committees.

9984. I suppose in this case the Local Government Board is yourself practically?—There are two other inspectors, and there is the office behind us.

9985. What steps, for example, do you take to find out the qualifications of these women who offer themselves?—We have a form which you will find in the Boarding-Out Order, in which they say they are the wife or the daughter of somebody, if they have not got a profession of their own; and then, if we see they are of respectable standing and know nothing against them, we authorise them. We cannot do more than that. Here is the form—"We will truly and faithfully observe the regulations which are prescribed in the said Order or which may from time to time be prescribed by the Local Government Board with respect to the boarding out of pauper children, and we do also hereby undertake to furnish to the Local Government Board or to any inspectors of the Board all such reasonable information respecting pauper children who may be boarded out under the superintendence of the Committee as the said Board or inspectors may from time to time require, and we do also undertake that meetings of the Committee shall be held not less than at on days to be fixed by the members of the Committee at their first meeting in each year"—and then there are to be minutes.

9986. You have no power over individual members of that committee, only over the whole committee, as I understand?—Yes.

9987. For example, if you found any of these ladies making a mess of things, what would you do?—For myself, I should, in the first instance, speak to her committee about it, and the committee would probably either try to see that she did better, or ask her to resign. If the committee could not manage her, then we should have to deal with them officially. The committee are responsible for all their members.

9988. How do you see that these ladies are trained—by their going round with you?—Yes; and then I ask them to train each other; that is, when one knows how to do it, to take the new ones with her and show them.

9989. Once the committee is formed, the child is out of the hands of the guardians altogether, is it?—The guardians are still responsible for the children, and they still pay for them, and they may recall them any time they please.

9990. I think you said they have no power of inspection?—They are not allowed to inspect generally.

9991. I see you count always on the fact of the pauperism being known, and you cannot conceive of any system of boarding-out that would avoid this publishing of the fact of pauperism, and would at the same time be consistent with adequate supervision?—It is not published, but it is known. I think it is a very objectionable thing to draw attention to it in any way.

Objection of foster-parents to visits of the relieving officer.

9992. It is known, you say?—It is known, but nobody regards it. I may say, however, that there is a difference in that respect between town and country. In Hull, for instance, the reason why the guardians specially asked the Local Government Board that I might inspect there was because the foster-parents objected to the visits of the relieving officer; they did not want it to be known that there was anyone in their house paid for from the rates. If the local ladies or the inspector go to the house, that does not convey that knowledge to the neighbours. But in the country everybody knows all their neighbour's affairs, and it does not matter and they do not care.

9993. If I were to say that a person might be living in a village in Scotland, say, where there was a number of pauper children, and yet might be utterly unaware that the children were paupers, you would say I had not had my eyes open, I suppose?—I should say that they were not inspected, naturally; but I think it would be better that they should be inspected.

Limit to number of boarded-out children in one home.

9994. What is the limit of the number of children that may be taken by any one foster parent?—They may only take two, except in the case of brothers and sisters, and then they may take four—always, if there is sufficient room in each case, and there are no more other children than allowed by the Boarding-out Order.

Motives of foster-parents for taking boarded-out children.

9995. I gather that you think that in the vast majority of cases almost the sole motive for taking the children is profit, and that the children in after life rarely can regard the place as a real home?—The children are taken for the sake of their payments, but they do always regard the place as a home. The foster-parents receive them back in after life as if it was a real home. They very often grow attached to the children, and certainly the children grow attached to the place, which is the only place they know.

Employment of boarded-out children by their foster-parents.

9996. Do I gather that the foster-parents have any right to employ these children for domestic service, such as their own children would render?—Certainly, so long as they do not overwork them.

9997. So long as the children are treated as well as the other children are, that is all you ask?—Quite so.

9998. Among the agricultural classes, for example, a child will very often work alongside his parent in the fields; would that be allowed in the case of a pauper child?—You see they have to be at school, and there are only the holidays when they can work, or before

school, or in the dinner hour, or after school, or on Saturdays. Sometimes I think they work their own children too much at those times, and we do not wish them to overwork the boarded-out children. If they work at the foster-parents' homes, of course we say nothing about that, but if they send them out to work for hire, it is open to great abuse, and we do not allow it, except in special cases which must be reported.

9999. If a labourer had an allotment of his own, for example, I take it you would not object to the child being set to dig ?—Not in the least, and most of them do. I think they always send the boys to dig where they have an allotment.

ptives of ster-parents r taking arded-out ildren.

10000. I think you do not believe that there is a sufficient number, say, of childless couples, or couples with a small family, who would be glad to have boarded-out children, partly for company and partly for giving the same domestic help as other children do ?—There is not a sufficient number to take them only for that reason ; those who take them for company are the best homes as a rule.

10001. But you seem to think there are very few of them ?—Not a sufficient number, but I am always surprised to find how many people there are who have no children.

10002. I am glad to hear you say that, because my impression was rather that you considered it has come to be regarded too much as a business ?—I do not think it is regarded too much as a business. I think it is only human nature ; I think the foster-parents take in these children just as many ladies who are wanting means take in Indian children, and many of them become very fond of the children. Many foster-parents certainly grow attached to them. I do not call it baby-farming, and I do not think there is any blame at all attaching to them for taking the children for money. How can they love a child they have never yet seen ? They may want companionship, and they do in some cases, but not in the large majority of cases. Afterwards they become used to the child. One excellent woman whom I know always appeals to me for protection, because the lady who chiefly works the committee is always wanting her to take another child, and she says, "I do not want another child, I love my Lottie and I do not want any other." I say she should not have one, as she does not not want one.

10003. The profit, according to your calculations, is so extremely small, that I can scarcely understand why so many children should be taken unless for motives of company—I do not say of affection, but of company ? —People who have children of their own do not, and cannot want them for company. You may take it this way : As I have said, there are many labourers who have 15s. a week, and I think the wonder is not that they should take these children for profit, but how they manage to live on the 15s. a week. If they have only 15s. a week for the whole family to live upon, surely it must be an advantage to have one child endowed with 4s. for its eating and trouble alone, besides £2 a year for its clothes. You must take them according to their means ; it would not be a profit to you or to me to take in a child for 4s. a week, but to them it is.

ntiguity of ea of each arding-out mmittee.

10004. In paragraph 67 you say, "The Local Government Board have now strictly limited the area of each boarding-out committee to certain parishes adjoining and grouped together" ; what do you mean by the word "adjoining" may I ask ?—Where the parishes touch.

10005. You mean a group of parishes touching each other then ?—Yes.

10006. Not adjoining places where the child comes from ?—No.

10007. That is why London children can be boarded out in Cumberland ?—Yes, that is so.

dvisability boarding-t at a stance from ild's old rroundings.

10008. Do you agree with the view that children should be boarded out as far away as possible from their own old surroundings, and, particularly where the children have bad parents, that they should get as far separate from the parents as possible ?—Yes, I entirely agree. That is one reason why boarding out beyond the union will always be better than within the union.

10009. I do not propose to cross-examine you upon what you say about Scotland, but may I ask, do you know that the report of the Poor Law School Committee in 1896 said that the system had been an unqualified success in Scotland ?—Yes, I do.

10010. You do not agree with that ?—No, indeed. I know of many funny things that that committee said.

Report of Poor Law School Committee on Scottish system of boarding-out.

10011. (*Mr. Bentham.*) With regard to the general methods of dealing with the Poor Law children, there are, first of all, the workhouses, then the scattered homes and cottage homes, institutions, schools, and boarding-out ; I take it that you distinguish as to what class of children should be dealt with by each of these methods, and that you do not hold the opinion that one method all round is the best for dealing with all Poor Law children ? —That is so.

Utility of boarding-out limited to a special class of children.

10012. Those children who are more suitable for boarding out are a special class of children ?—Yes.

10013. Therefore, there is no necessity for a large extensive system, whereby all poor law children might be boarded out ?—No, certainly not.

10014. And the class which boarding-out is most useful to, is the class just mentioned by Professor Smart, namely, those whom it is advisable to move from undesirable surroundings ?—Yes.

10015. Or from relatives who will always be nibbling at them, as you term it ?—Yes.

10016. And keeping their eye upon them until the time when they become of working age ?—Yes.

Dangers and difficulties in regard to boarding-out within the union.

10017. Boarding-out within the union offers rather a temptation, does it not, to undesirable people to keep in close touch with their children ?—That is so.

10018. Therefore, boarding-out without the union is applicable to a different class of child from the child which is suitable for boarding-out within the union ?—It applies to the same class, and to others besides.

10019. You would not think it advisable to board-out children within the union whose parents or relatives were undesirable and lived in the immediate neighbourhood, would you ?—Certainly not.

10020. Those who are boarded out within the union are usually those whose relatives are desirable relatives, that is, those who might keep in contact with the children without doing them any harm ; is that not so ?—Not in all cases.

10021. I am speaking of the ideal boarding-out within the union ?—Yes, it is true of the ideal.

10022. If boarding-out within the union is carried on to a large extent, do you not think another difficulty enters in, that is, the amount that it is necessary to give ? In answer to a question put to you by Mr. Gardiner, you said you did not see why the amount should not be the same for boarding-out within as it is for boarding-out without ?—I said I did not see why the permissive maximum might not be the same. I did not say I thought it was possible always within the union to give exactly the same sum as beyond the union.

10023. Is there not a difficulty involved in paying an amount for boarding-out children within the union which is far in excess of that given in the way of ordinary relief ? Take a widow with children ; the average per head for the children would be something like 1s. 6d., and possibly close by there would be another person who is a distant relative of the child who is boarded out with her and she is being paid 4s. or 5s. or 6s. per week. Does that not create a difficulty in the minds of the people who do not see these niceties of distinction between what is boarded-out and what is out-door relief ?—Yes, it does.

10024. It creates a very great difficulty, does it not ?— It does, and I think that is one of the objections to boarding-out within the unions.

10025. Therefore, boarding-out within the union is not to be encouraged from that point of view ?—No, I think not.

Effect of boarding-out and of Poor Law care of children on desertion.

10026. Another class of child is the child that is deserted ; has the boarding-out in your experience, or the better treatment of children in various ways, had a tendency to increase the number of children who are deserted ?— Not that I know of.

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

10027. Have you any particulars of the number of deserted children who are boarded out?—No, but roughly speaking I should say about one-third. It does not very much affect them, because they are beyond the union, and their deserting parents and acquaintances within their own unions do not know anything about them.

10028. Have you any comparative figures, say of twenty years ago and the present time, as to the number of deserted children who are boarded out?—I have no comparative figures.

10029. Do you think that boarding-out within the union, where people can keep in touch with the children, has a tendency to encourage desertion?—No, I do not think that boarding-out has ever had as far as I know a tendency to encourage desertion for the sake of having the children well looked after. I think sending the children away by boarding them out beyond the union checks desertion, just as emigration does, because then they cannot get at them when they want them; but I do not think that boarding them out within the union makes much difference.

10030. Boarding-out within the union does not check desertion, does it?—It does not check it, but I do not think it encourages them any more than having the children in the schools, because they feel they can get hold of the children when they are in the schools.

10031. Dealing with all children within the union either by means of cottage homes or by means of schools has the effect of encouraging people to desert their children, because they know where they can find them when they want them?—I am not speaking officially here, because neither schools nor cottage homes nor any institutions come under my inspection. Before my appointment, when I used to visit the Nottingham Poor Law School, called the Training Institute, at Radford, I was told at that time that the school had a great tendency to encourage desertion, because the people knew that their children would be looked after there till they should want them and that they could get at them again. I have never heard of that in reference to boarding-out. That is the only school I have had to do with personally, and I have heard nothing about this matter since I ceased to visit it twenty-one years ago.

10032. I think you said in answer to a question by Mr. Loch that a re-action against boarding-out had taken place, and that it was caused on the one hand by its advocates saying that the foster-parents take the children for love, and on the other hand by those who condemn it saying that they took them only for gain?—Yes; there is more or less a re-action.

Motives of foster-parents in taking boarded-out children.

10033. Does not most of your memorandum go to show that you think that the children are all taken for gain?—Most of them are, but I do not think that is any reason against the system. People are so unjust on either the one side or the other; they claim for it what the system cannot give, and they condemn it for reasons which are not just or valid.

10034. Then you think very little affection enters into it at all?—In the first instance very little affection enters into it at all, but a good deal grows up later.

10035. The homes where there is a desire for a child for other than pecuniary interests are very few, I suppose?—I do not say they are extremely few, but they are a minority.

10036. And so far in a minority that you could not hope to get a sufficient number of homes to meet requirements for boarding-out without increasing the price?—That is so.

10037. That is the reason the increase has taken place, is it not?—I should say so.

Reasons for elasticity in scale of boarding-out allowances.

10038. If 5s. is considered to be the maximum amount, do you think it advisable that there should be a lesser amount paid in the same district—in point of fact, should any boarding-out committee take 5s. in some cases and 4s. in others?—It depends, I think, on the circumstances and on the age of the child. I do not think that a child of two or three ought to be paid for at the full rate unless exceptionally delicate or troublesome. If you will read the circulars issued with the Order, you will see that the Local Government Board has pointed out that a child of three or four does not cost as much as a child of nine or ten. But when the child comes to be about nine or ten, the foster-parents often complain that it eats as much as a man or a woman, and that it costs a great deal. Then I think they might have rather more given to them; but if you have given them the 5s. when the child is quite young, you have played away your trump card, and you cannot give any more when it has grown bigger.

10039. You suggested another reason just now, and that was that in some homes the standard of comfort was higher, and they naturally would not take the child at the same price as another home would where the standard of living might be lower?—That is so.

10040. That means that you would have two standards as it were in the same district?—No, I would not give a different rate in the same district. But I would give more to the people who had the bigger child that ate more. I would not give more to one house because they were better off and refuse it to the poorer one—no.

10041. That would apply to anywhere, then?—Anywhere in the same district. In the earlier years some boards of guardians used only to pay 3s. a week and others used to pay 4s., and as different unions boarded out under the same committee and in the same place that gave rise to endless discontent. I only mean that some districts are more expensive than others; Esher, for instance, is a more expensive district than Dorsetshire is, and people will take them in Dorsetshire for what they will not take them for in Esher. But I should not in the same place give one parent more than another for a child of the same age, or it would cause endless jealousies.

Responsibility for choice of homes for boarded-out children.

10042. When homes are offered by a boarding-out committee to a board of guardians, do you think it advisable for them to send the children without having first ascertained the character of the district or the class of homes that the boarding-out committee offer?—No.

10043. Do you think that it should remain entirely in the hands of the inspector who recommended the formation of the committee?—I think at Bradford you write beforehand and inquire about the home.

10044. We visit every home that is offered to us before we send a child?—Many boards of guardians have forms with a list of questions which they require to be filled up and answered. They do not think it necessary to visit, because even by visiting they would not find out so much as by the answers to this form of questions.

10045. Why not?—Because they then get it down in black and white.

10046. They can get it down in black and white on the spot, and see it for themselves, can they not?—I do not think they always find out everything when they go to the place.

10047. There is no reason why they should not, is there?—Yes; I think a man cannot find out, because he cannot inspect the house.

10048. It need not necessarily be a man, it may be a lady guardian?—If a lady guardian goes, I think that might be a very good thing.

10049. That would satisfy you?—It might satisfy me about the choice of the home in the first instance, but not about the inspection subsequently.

10050. It is the choice of the home I am referring to entirely?—For the choice of the home I think it might be a very good thing that a lady should go in the first instance; but not afterwards, I think.

10051. There is another point in deciding on a district where you would send children, and that is, as to the prospects of absorption into the ordinary population, particularly of the boys, as affected by the occupations of the district; would a lady be the best person to decide upon that?—Yes, I think so; she knows about that as well as a man.

Suggested re organisation of inspection of Poor Law children.

10052. Do you advocate generally the inspection of all Poor Law children—whether they be in cottage homes or boarded out within or without the union, or in certified institutions—by the same inspectors of the Local Government Board?—By the same inspectors? No.

10053. By the same system of inspection as yours?—I think the general inspectors do so inspect them.

10054. I am thinking of the inspectors of boarded-out children. Do you think it would be advisable to put all those children who are in certified homes and in cottage homes, boarded out within and without the union, under your inspection?—No.

10055. Why ?—In the first place, I should have rather too much to do.

10056. I do not mean you, personally, but lady inspectors for the purpose, instead of its being a duty of the general inspectors ?—No ; I think the general inspectors can do it very well, because they inspect the institution more than the individual child and you can sample the institution. In London, as a matter of fact, they are inspected by a lady.

10057. The children want inspecting in the certified homes, do they not, just as well as those who are boarded out ?—Yes.

10058. And a man cannot do that, you say ?—Not in the case of girls boarded out.

10059. Would you put the girls' homes under this inspection ?—I do not think it comes within my department to say.

10060. I was really on the question more of the general principle whether, it being necessary to inspect these children that are boarded out without the union at the present time in the way in which they are inspected, it is not equally necessary to inspect those in the certified homes and those that are boarded-out within the union ? —I think it is necessary to inspect those who are boarded-out within the union. With regard to the certified homes, they really do not come within my province. At the same time, you must consider that what you have to look at in inspecting an institution is the way it is managed. An institution is more under control than the boarding-out homes are. It is under management, and you can inspect the management ; whereas every child is in a different home when it is boarded-out. They are all different homes, and you cannot sample them, and you cannot judge one by the other, although you can sample an institution.

10061. You cannot sample the children in an institution surely ?—You can, by seeing that a certain number of the children are healthy ; you can go in and see their food, you can see that they go to school regularly, and you can notice them, and look at their clothes, and see that they are kept clean.

10062. In a certified home, as in a cottage home, some of the children might be almost unmanageable, or they might be tiresome children ; those are the ones that would get the ill-treatment if there is any, are they not ? —Yes.

10063. How can you discover them, unless you examine every child ?—I do not think that you can ; but then you could not have dual inspection, and so you must either have the general inspector or else you must have a lady as assistant to the general inspector to inspect the children's homes. You cannot have the two inspectors ; it would be conflicting.

Inspection of Poor Law children in institutions.

10064. I do not mind whom it is done by ; I only want to get your opinion as to whether it is necessary that all these children who are in institutions—there are 7,700 of them, we are told, almost as many as the total number boarded out within and without the unions—should be individually inspected, as the boarded-out children are ? It might be better, but it is not so necessary. The children in the institutions are in different circumstances. The matrons and other officers of the institutions are paid regular salaries, and they cannot make a profit out of the children ; that is one reason why they are safer, because there is not the temptation to make a profit out of the children.

10065. I want now to ask your opinion, which you may prefer not to give me, with regard to the establishment of cottage homes without the union, for the purpose of taking the place of boarding-out where it is impossible to get suitable homes ?—Those do not come under my inspection.

10066. Possibly they might at some time ?—When the time comes it will be soon enough to ask me, I think.

10067. You are not prepared to express an opinon on that ?—No, I do not wish to express an opinon on anything which does not come within my province or touch my province ; and that really does not.

10068. It does not come within anyone's province just now. Why should not there be a scattered home in Westmorland, for instance, belonging to either one board of guardians or another in the South of England ?—Of course it would be beyond their reach to inspect it.

10069. Then the inspection should come under some department ?—No ; I should say it would be too far off.

10070. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) How many ladies form a committee, as a rule ?—There must be three people on a committee, and many committees have more. There must be at least one lady on it.

Number of members of a boarding-out committee and their zeal.

10071. How many of these people really take an interest in the work and do the inspecting ?—All but a very few. They used not, you must remember ; there used to be great abuses, but those abuses are done away with, and they all now at the present moment, with a very few exceptions, take a great deal of interest in the work.

10072. So that the old days when really the secretary did all the work have passed away ?—Almost entirely.

10073. And these ladies do really give up their time and look after the children thoroughly ?—They do indeed.

10074. That has grown up lately, has it not ?—No ; I think they differed in the past, but of course they are more looked after lately.

10075. You mean a good many of them differed, did they not ?—Yes ; and they differ still. There were some very bad ones.

Paupers or quasi-paupers as foster-parents to boarded-out children.

10076. Is it true that these committees are very often formed by people who find homes where the persons occupying them are people in the receipt of out-door relief, or who are likely to want out-door relief, and who get children sent to them instead of out-door relief, and so the rate of pauperism for the particular village comes down ?—That is not the fact to any appreciable extent. There is such a case here and there, but they are very few.

Ages of foster-parents

10077. Will it be true to say that a large number of the people who take boarded-out children are over fifty years of age ?—I think they are quite young over fifty years of age. That is not at all too old to look after a child.

10078. I am not thinking about that for the moment ; how many of them would there be between fifty and sixty ? —I could not tell you. Some of those are the best homes, because they are people whose own children have grown up and gone. The middle-aged people who act as grandparents to them are amongst the very best homes ; the young people with babies are not the best.

10079. I rather want to find out the average of people who take charge of children under the boarding-out system ?—I could not tell you the average at the moment. They are of all ages. I do not like them to be too old to be able to look after the children, nor so old that they will become too old by the time the child grows up and goes out into the world.

Motive of foster-parents in taking boarded-out children.

10080. Is it not true that a large number of them would have to get relief if they were not taking those children ?—No, it is not true of a large number of them ; a small proportion would, but it would be quite a small proportion.

10081. Are there any children now boarded out at Aspley Guise ?—None. That came to an end.

10082. Most of those were ladies of a very uncertain age, I think ?—You must not judge the whole boarding-out system, because that may not have been satisfactory.

10083. The rate of pay may now be 5s., may it not ?—Yes, it may be.

10084. In the home where the head of the family is only earning 15s. a week, if they take four children at the maximum they will really get more for those four children than the income of the breadwinner ?—Yes.

10085. That would be a considerable advantage to the breadwinner and his wife who happened to be the lucky pair ?—Yes, but there are very few homes where there are four boarded out.

10086. Still, there are some, are there not ?—I should say that in my present district there are certainly not twelve—I should not think there are six.

10087. How many are there altogether ?—I cannot tell you, but I will ask the other inspectors, if you like. I should not think there are many. It is very difficult to find a home which has the space for four children.

10088. When they have four children in one of these cottages, how do they sleep them ?—It depends upon the cottage, and as I say every cottage is different. I have one case where there are five brothers and sisters

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

boarded out with an unmarried woman who has got very comfortable means of her own. She has got money. That is the only case I know.

10089. It is a very comfortable piece of business for her, is it not?—Yes, and it is very comfortable for them too. They are thoroughly well cared for. They have in that house three bedrooms, besides a spare room; the boys sleep in one room in two beds, and the girls sleep in another room in a very good bed.

10090. Then where there are only two children it is also rather good business for the man and his wife?—I am glad that you see that it does pay them, anyhow; I think it pays them.

10091. Personally I have no feeling about whether it pays them or not; I am quite certain that they will see that it does. I am like you, I am not under any delusions about it; I think people take them because they want to make something, however small it is?—Most of them take them for that in the first instance, undoubtedly.

After careers of boarded-out children.

10092. How many children really are assimilated into the population?—I do not quite know what you mean.

10093. How many of them when they get 15 or 16 get work in the neighbourhood and become part and parcel of that community?—They nearly all do; I have given you the proportion in the statement which I have drawn up for the Appendix. You may take it for granted that all those that have not returned to the union are assimilated in that way, and have had employment found for them on the spot.

10094. Is there any evidence that they have become part of the population there?—I find them there myself, very often, living there.

10095. It is a considerable number of children, is it not?—Yes. They are all in employment in the neighbourhood, or if not, that is because everybody shifts and moves nowadays and people do not stop in the same place. You may take it that all these who have not returned to the union are doing well, and that employment has been found for them by the local people.

10096. If the same kind of evidence is forthcoming about the barrack schools, and the ordinary institutional schools, can we say exactly the same for them? I mean, if we get a return as to how many children have come back to the workhouse, and if we say that those who have not come back are doing well, then we can say, can we not, that the overwhelming majority are doing well?—I think you can, in default of evidence to the contrary, and that is all one can say, that one does not know anything to the contrary. But with regard to the boarded-out children, as I tell you, I see a great many of them personally, and I know that they are doing well.

10097. As for the girls, in the main they go to domestic service, do they not?—Yes.

10098. What do the boys do, generally?—They do all sorts of things. In agricultural neighbourhoods they go on to the land; a great many of them come up to the "Exmouth" training ship, some are apprenticed as carpenters, some as plumbers, and some go into shops.

10099. Have you any idea what percentage of boys go to the "Exmouth" and what percentage go into the Army?—I have given you in a table all the boys that have gone to the "Exmouth"; I cannot tell you what boys have gone into the Army.

10100. Exactly the same thing happens to the girls as happens to them in an institution, that is, they go to domestic service?—Yes.

Functions of M.A.B.Y.S.

10101. In the case of children in the country, they are looked after by the Girls' Friendly Society, and the girls belonging to the London Guardians come under the M.A.B.Y.S., do they not?—The Girls Friendly Society look after some of the girls who have been boarded out in the country; but have no organised system for the purpose

10102. So that in the case of a Metropolitan child who has once got into service, even if she falls out of her first place, the M.A.B.Y.S. looks after her and will take care of her and see to her?—Yes.

10103. So she is no more trouble to the local committee, is she?—Yes. The committee usually keep up with her. And the boarded-out children do not come under the M.A.B.Y.S. unless they come up to London; the boarded-out girls have places found for them in the country.

10104. Is this not true, that most of the Metropolitan Boards hand the whole of the placing of their girls over to the M.A.B.Y.S.?—I believe so.

10105. Both the boarded-out children and the children in institutions?—Not the boarded-out children.

10106. We did it at Poplar, and I thought probably it was a general thing?—No, it is not. With regard to the boys who have gone to the "Exmouth" or to the training home, there appear to have been eighty-two according to my list here; but it is not yet complete.

Difficulties of finding employment for boys.

10107. Have you found that there is a difficulty in placing boys?—There is more difficulty in some districts than in others. There is more difficulty in placing boys than in placing girls.

10108. Poplar has given up boarding out; they must have had rather rough kinds of centres, because they found a difficulty in placing out boys over and over again?—Some of them do find a difficulty in placing out the boys; others again are glad to have them.

Boarded-out children the stigma of pauperism.

10109. Is not one of the reasons why certain unions have given the system up this—that they have found that instead of the children getting absorbed in the ordinary population, and therefore being benefited by the people not knowing they were paupers and all the rest of it, that really does not work out under boarding out?—That may have contributed, but I think that no union has given it up for that reason alone. It may have been one of the contributory reasons why they have, but I have not had it given to me as the sole reason by any board.

10110. Of course a child does not become less a pauper in the eyes of the people through being boarded-out, does it?—I never hear the word "pauper" in the country, and I doubt whether they would know what you meant if they heard it. I do not believe they think about it.

10111. That is true, but you do think that they think about it when they see a child come out of an institution?—No.

10112. Do you think there is any difference?—Not much.

10113. One of the reasons for boarding-out children is that it does remove all the stigma of pauperism; but is it not true that in the villages where these children are, they are known as "Poplar children" or "Bradford children," or whatever district they come from?—They are known generally as "orphans," and I do not think that people know or care what district they come from. They call them sometimes "London children" and sometimes "orphans," and they seldom know the particular union from which they come.

10114. Would you say that that was true of Aspley Guise?—I dare say they did know there, but then you must remember that at Aspley Guise there were a great number of children—at least forty. When you import as many as forty children, that is a very patent fact.

10115. Well, take Corsham?—At Corsham they had also about forty. You are speaking of places where many are sent, but in many places they have half a dozen children, sometimes even only three or four, and then nobody takes any notice of them.

10116. If you do not have them in big groups, you will only be able to deal with very few, will you not?—The majority are not in large groups. I think it is a mistake to send as many as forty to one place.

10117. That, too, is an improvement of late, is it not?—The reason is that we are rather more careful not to let a committee enter into an agreement with too many boards of guardians; and generally also that the guardians, before they send out a large number of children, privately consult the inspector as to how many children are there already, and whether they should send others.

Type of child suitable for boarding-out.

10118. It is only the best children really that are boarded out, is it not?—Yes.

10119. There are so many things that bar a child that the really troublesome child has to stay at the school, has it not?—That is quite true.

10120. Is it not also true that the child who ought to be boarded-out is the troublesome child who needs attention and care?—I do not think that follows. The kind of attention and care which they get as boarded-out children is not the kind which suits the troublesome child. The troublesome child wants more discipline than is given by foster parents. They lose patience with it.

10121. Does it need personal attention to find out just the kind of treatment it ought to receive?—Yes, but the kind of personal attention which they would get in an ordinary cottage is not the kind to suit it.

10122. Still, the village child whose parents are alive,

and who does not become chargeable, has to get that sort of treatment, has it not?—Yes, but then we are not concerned with those. Many of them would be very much better off if we could alter their parents.

10123. Is another reason for boarding-out that you get personal attention for the child?—Yes, that is true; only the kind of personal attention is one which will suit one disposition or class of child but not another.

10124. Still, if that also breaks down, is that not another reason why the guardians will not bother about it; if they are only to send their best children, and if it is unsuitable for children who need special care and attention, why should they bother about boarding-out?—That is one reason why they do not board out—because they do not want to send away their best children and keep the worst.

doption of arded-out ildren by ster-rents.

10125. Why should they? There does not seem any reason for it, to me, at any rate. Could you tell us how many children have been adopted by the foster-parents?—I do not approve of adoption, and I always do everything I can to check it. I could not tell you how many.

10126. Not a large number?—No, not a large number.

10127. Is it not an unusual thing for a foster-parent to take a child, and say I will take over the whole responsibility of it?—Some of them would like to do it when the child gets to a wage-earning age..

10128. I mean before the child becomes of a wage-earning age?—Not very many then, but some do.

10129. It is only a very few, is it not?—A very few.

10130. Is it not true that what you said just now operates pretty well all round, namely, that as a child gets older, the foster-parents, especially when they are poor, get a bit sick of it, and find out a good many faults with it, which necessitates its removal very often?—Some do, but not very many.

ler arded-out' ldren urned by ter-parents guardians.

10131. That must be an improvement too, or else Poplar was very unfortunate in the three or four districts in which they boarded children out?—That is just what you were. And several other unions have been unfortunate in their particular district, and therefore they have condemned the whole system—which is a great pity.

10132. We found as the child got to ten or eleven years of age it developed no end of faults, and it got really vicious and bad, and we had to shift it?—But then, as I say, you should not judge the whole boarding-out system by one committee.

10133. I think it was four committees we judged it by, but I am not sure?—If you had found four others, perhaps you would have found four good ones.

terrence of arding-out a form of ef.

10134. That may be so; but the point is, why bother if they only want our most excellent children? As to the standard of living of these children, they get a doctor found them and they get a dentist; does it not place them rather in a superior position to all the other children in the village to have a dentist looking after their teeth, and all the rest of it?—It would be a very good thing if all the other children could have it too.

10135. I think so too; but are they not being placed in a more eligible position than the children of the independent labourer?—I do not see that that matters. I think all your children, wherever you bring them up, whether they are in the schools or boarded-out, or wherever they are, are in a more eligible position, and I do not see that that is an argument against boarding-out any more than against any other system.

tinction ween rding-out hildren l out-relief children

10136. I do not either. About boarding-out within the union—I do not know whether I ought to ask you this—if it is good to board children out within the union, where the mother is living and she is a decent woman, why should not the children be boarded out with her?—They are, under the name of out-relief.

10137. I am afraid not in such an eligible manner as when she happens to be dead and they go with another woman; then there is 4s. a week paid for them; but there are very few boards of guardians who would give 4s. a week to the mother for one child. Would you see any objection to giving her 4s.?—I do not think she should have as much as that.

10138. Why should another woman?—I think she should have a better allowance than she very often does have.

10139. If you want to keep up home life—because there is no other reason at all for boarding-out; that is the bottom reason, that you want to maintain home life for the child and to give it the supposed advantages of home life—surely the proper person is the mother, and why should she be expected to be able to do with less money than another one?—Because natural affection and natural duty oblige her to look after her own children; but nobody is obliged to take other people's children and look after them, and you must offer them some payment and remuneration for it.

10140. Take a mother with a young baby?—It is not what the child costs, but what the people will take it for, you see.

10141. That is another thing; for the moment we are taking that 4s. a week is a proper sum to pay to a woman to keep a child within the union. In the case of a mother who is a widow, and who has one or two young children under three years of age, and two or three over that age, what reason is there for not paying her the same amount?—In the first place, I think that out-relief should be discouraged as much as possible. I am not in favour of out-relief at all, where it can be helped. The reason why you should not give a mother so much as you would give to a woman who is no relation, is that the money is not given for the food of the child only, but for the trouble as well; and you do not pay a mother for taking trouble for her own child, whereas if you give it to some other woman you must pay her, or she will not take it; you must give her something for her trouble.

10142. I understand you do give it to the relatives when you board-out within the union?—That is a very different thing; but I have said that I think that form of out-relief with relatives is a very bad thing.

10143. Do you not think that you keep the family life better that way?—Perhaps in a particular case you may, but you encourage other people to ask for relief. I think out-relief is most short-sighted. It may be cheaper in the individual case; but it entails a much larger expenditure in others. That is the chief reason why pauperism has increased, and the rates have risen as they have.

10144. What is the difference in principle between it and taking a person's children from her and boarding them out, and relieving her altogether of the whole responsibility and paying some one else to do it and leaving her free?—But I would not take a woman's child from her and board it out. If the woman cannot support her child and she does not have out-relief, I should take the children into the institution—that is the best plan—and bring them up properly there. I would certainly not board them out with somebody else, or take them from the real mother, and give them to someone else; there is no sense in it.

10145. I agree with you about that, and I am glad you said that, because really I was going to ask you to say that or something else about it which is in your mind. But my point is just here: I understand your argument to me just now is that one of the reasons for the increase of pauperism is that we have given outdoor relief, etc., etc., and I put it to you that if you take the children of a woman and relieve her of every scrap of responsibility in regard to them, and put them into an institution, what is the difference in principle between doing that and giving her out-relief to look after the children herself? If you put them into an institution you are paying somebody to look after them for her?—If you have the children in an institution, you have the control of the children.

10146. I know, but what I want to get at is where the magic is that makes the one thing vicious, when it is not vicious the other way?—You are discussing the whole question of out-relief, not of boarding-out. I think myself that out-relief is a bad example, because it tends to make people not self-dependent; they rely upon it to have money given to them to keep their children with them. If you are going to take the child from the woman, she will try to keep it with her; that is the incentive to her to keep her child and support it if she can. If you say, if we are to pay for your child, we must take it from you and put it into an institution, she is more likely to try to support it herself.

10147. My last question was a general question, to which you answered that to board-out a child within the union when its own mother is there, is foolish, I agree you with, but that is what is being done now in London?—I did not know it was being done.

10148. It is not actually boarding-out, but we have homes set up where we are supposed to be keeping up the home life, and the mother of the children may be living next

Miss M. H. Mason.

23 April 1906.

door to them. But then the other question I want to get at is, what is the difference in principle between giving the mother the relief in the workhouse or in the school and giving it in money? I may be very dense, but I do not see the difference. You are relieving her anyhow; that is my contention against you. I know it has not anything to do with boarding-out, but it all came up because of this boarding-out within the union. About desertion, is it true that the bulk of the children are deserted children? —Not the bulk. I do not ask whether they are orphans or deserted when I visit them; but as far as I hear, I should say that one-half or one-third were deserted.

14149. I should not have thought that held, because I should say that the number of deserted children in a union like Poplar was very tiny?—I have no statistics and I have no means of speaking accurately, and so I may be wrong, but as I go about I hear they have been deserted.

10150. I do not want to pin you to figures, of course; the point about is that if you remove them right away their relatives cannot get at them?—That is so.

10151. Then, again, it is not true that Poplar had a very bad experience in that way?—We found that undesirable relations got at them just as easily away, especially when the children got old enough to work?—That was your fault or your clerks' fault, for letting them have the addresses.

Refusal of addresses to undesirable relatives of boarded-out children.

10152. They never let them have the addresses, I may say?—Some people do let them have the addresses.

10153. You can only refuse the address of a child if you have taken it under control, and I am not speaking at all of children who are under control. I am speaking of children against whose relatives there was not anything to justify you in not allowing them to know where the children lived?—I think that you would be justified if these relations who applied to you were not maintaining the children and were not responsible for them.

10154. If there is no other reason then poverty?—If there is no other reason than that you do not think it desirable.

10155. After all, a person may not be undesirable, even though he may be very poor?—That is so.

10156. I am dealing here with what with all due respect to you is not true—with the statement in the table on page 10 that Poplar ceased to board-out, because of the experiences of Mr. Crooks, and because of the dispute with the school authorities who refused to admit boarded-out children free?—I am quite willing to correct that, and I intended to do so, in fact.* You will see I have headed it "Reasons as far as I am able to give them." I have not written to inquire, and not all the unions have given me their reasons definitely. They are as far as I know them, and as far as I can give them; but there may be many other reasons besides what I put down.

Competence of schoolmaster as inspector of boarded-out children.

10157. In defence of mere man and the schoolmaster, surely the appearance of a child, without stripping it, has some relation to how it is being cared for or not cared for? No, I am afraid not.

10158. I have ten children, and I should always judge by the look of a child's face what was happening to it?—You know your ten children.

10159. And I know a lot of others?—But when you have got to visit other people's children you could not at all find out in that way, certainly; besides which none of your ten children require that inspection if they are all right. You cannot possibly judge by your ten comfortably cared-for and well brought-up children.

10160. I am one of the people who did not go in a van, but who as a guardian visited these places, and I sorted out straight off the children at Aspley Guise who ought to come away?—But then you know you are unusually clever, and I should not find another like you.

10161. The chances are that you have not bothered to try. Surely it is rather a sweeping sort of thing to say that the schoolmaster cannot judge of what is happening? —I just happen to have in my book here, which I brought for another reason, the marks of the size of the bruises on one of the very cleanest and tidiest girls I ever saw. I brought in the schoolmistress, who had not the slightest notion of it, in order to corroborate the bruises and to write her report on them. You shall see the size of the bruises on that well-dressed, well cared for and clean child who was supposed to be all right.

10162. Did the child look happy?—Yes, quite happy; she was used to it.

10163. Perhaps she deserved what she got?—Whether she did or not, your question is, Had she been whacked?—and you said you could find it out by her face.

10164. No, my question is whether the child was unhappy?—I used to be whacked but I never was unhappy? I do not think you were whacked to this extent that I am going to show you.

10165. I don't know about that. I put this to you, that there is a value in the reports of the schoolmaster on the appearance—not the dress, but the appearance—of the child, the look on its face, and the general demeanour of the child? When a child is cowed and bullied, it shows it in its face, does it not?—Some children cannot be any more cowed or bullied than you were.

10166. That shows it does not hurt them, then?—It hardens them; that is even worse. In the case of some, if it does not cow them, it hardens them. *Those* are the marks on the child that the schoolmistress saw; I think those marks are too big—it was done with too big an instrument (*producing notebook.*)

10167. Is it not true that the schoolmasters in their reports very often have called attention to the children not being physically fit, and looking very miserable and tired, and as if they were not properly treated?—I entirely agree with you that the schoolmasters' reports are most valuable, but they are not all-sufficient. That is all that I would say.

10168. There we all agree; nothing is all-sufficient no inspection can be all-sufficient?—You want the inspection of ladies as the foundation, and that of the schoolmaster in addition.

Objection to visitation of boarded-out children by lady guardians.

10169. Would you object to lady guardians having power to visit these children?—Yes.

10170. If they did not go in a van?—Yes.

10171. If they went one at a time?—Yes. The expense would be too great, for one thing. You see, many of the committees receive children from several unions—one I have given you in my Memorandum, the Thorndon Hall committee, had children from nine unions. If nine boards of guardians are free to send an inspector down to that committee, the people will be worried out of their wits, and will give up the system. Moreover, even lady guardians, admirable as they are—I think lady guardians are the cream of the earth—are not expert inspectors, and very often they do not in the least know how to find things out. They can do things that men cannot, but they do not always do them, because they do not always know how. The point of my evidence is that inspection is a thing which has to be learnt, which does not come by nature, and which requires training; and it is not everybody, simply because she is a woman, who can do it.

Communications between boarded-out children and relatives.

10172. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to the communications that take place between children and undesirable relatives, are they initiated to some extent by the children themselves, do you think? Do they seek out their uncle or their aunt, or whoever it may be, whom it is desired they should not communicate with?—Now and then they do, but very seldom. It is much more often the uncle or aunt who tries to find out where the children are.

10173. The children would almost always know from what union they came, because the foster-parents know it, and therefore the probability is the children would know it too; so that if a child wished to find its relations, it would at least know where to go to find them?—Very often the children are very anxious when they grow older to find their relations, and they often ask me to help them, but I cannot—I can only refer them, through their committees, to the clerk to the guardians.

After care of Poor Law children.

10174. Then it does happen sometimes that they seek their relatives?—Yes, they do sometimes. But chiefly their brothers or sisters—not uncles or aunts. It is the natural instinct of children to find someone belonging to themselves. I should like to hand in now for the Appendix (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (K)) the Summaries of the returns from the clerks to the guardians given in my evidence to the Poor Law Schools' Committeee, of the numbers of children who have returned to the union. Next, I have brought you the results of boarding-out, a table showing what has happened to the children since. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (L).)

Epidemics in Poor Law and other Elementary Public Schools.

The third document deals with epidemics. One thing aid by the Poor Law Schools Committee and other people is that the children in Poor Law schools are subject to epidemics. I thought you ought to know the sanitary conditions of the country; therefore I have here tabulated the number of elementary country schools which have been closed for epidemics in my district, Miss Pell's and Miss Evans. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XX. (M).)

* Subsequently partially amended.

TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 24th April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Dr. ANDREW FULLER, called; and Examined.

10175. (*Chairman.*) You are one of the poor law inspectors for medical purposes?—I am the inspector for the provinces of England and Wales. Dr. Downes is the senior medical inspector for poor law purposes, and his duties lie within the Metropolitan area.

10176. What medical colleagues or assistants have you?—None, except Dr. Downes.

Duties of General and Medical Inspectors.

10177. According to our practice, we will take your written memorandum as your evidence-in-chief. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXI (A-C). In that you state that your primary duty is to make six routine inspections in each of the thirteen districts. Would you define a little more what a "routine inspection" means?—An inspection, in the company of a general inspector, of poor law infirmaries, or sick wards, of nurseries and workhouses; and occasionally schools, or the children in cottage homes.

10178. How long does an inspection take—a day?—It depends on the size of the workhouse, or the size of the institution.

10179. It would mean, I suppose, six inspections of separate institutions?—Yes.

10180. You do not report on the parts of the workhouses other than the infirmaries, or those appropriated to younger children unless there is something special?—Not unless the general inspector requests me to do so.

10181. So that the special province, if I may say so, of the two officials is naturally defined. The inspector takes the workhouse other than the infirmary and the nursery?—The general inspector as a rule takes the whole. It is only when I am associated with him that I take the inspection of the infirmaries in his company.

10182. Do inspectors report upon infirmaries, so to say, off their own bat, and without the cognizance or assistance of medical officers?—Yes; every year, every institution.

10183. They could, or they might, report on an infirmary without referring the matter to you?—Yes; I am put in the position of an assessor, so to speak.

10184. A scientific assessor?—Yes.

Prospects, personnel, and conditions of Poor Law Medical Service.

10185. Medical officers are appointed by guardians; is there anything like a special poor law medical service? For instance, do men who are appointed to the poor law medical service as a rule remain in it?—Those who have life appointments do, as a rule; but the assistant medical officers, or the resident medical officers, of large infirmaries do not, as a rule, stay longer than just a few years, sometimes one year or two, or it may be, five or six years.

10186. I suppose there are a large number of medical men appointed locally for poor law purposes who practise besides?—Yes; it is the general case that they are in practice outside.

10187. Assuming a man was to devote all his time and his attention to medical poor law work, is there a higher sphere of promotion open to him?—No.

10188. Have you ever thought whether any special service of the kind would be advisable?—I cannot quite see how it would work practically, because the appointment depends upon the local guardians in almost every case.

10189. I suppose there are so many nominating authorities who would probably have different ideas?—Just so.

10190. As a matter of practice, assuming that a medical officer in a comparatively small infirmary does his work well, is he likely to be appointed by another board of guardians to a larger infirmary?—If he should apply for the position, other things being equal, the guardians might appoint him in preference to anyone else who applied.

10191. The Local Government Board do not recommend, do they?—Never.

10192. They leave it entirely to the local authorities?—Yes.

10193. All they can control, or have a voice in, is the remuneration?—Practically that is what it amounts to.

Disadvantages of provision of drugs by Medical Officers at their own expense.

10194. Whilst we are on the subject of medical officers, you have a strong opinion as to the unwisdom or impropriety of medical officers having to provide their drugs at their own expense?—Decidedly, for workhouse use.

10195. I see you here quote a sentence that dispensary medical relief is given largely, and one guardian said because it cost them nothing?—That is the answer I gave to the particular guardian who made a statement in answer to a question of mine.

10196. If they paid for drugs, it would cost something to those who gave it, though not very much?—Yes, but I was speaking or thinking more particularly of the medical relief being included in the actual attendance of the medical officer who is appointed at a stated salary.

10197. And the increased amount of medical relief given costs the guardians nothing?—Comparatively speaking, very little in the individual case.

10198. It merely puts additional labour on the medical officer?—Yes.

10199. I think it has been alleged by one witness that making medical officers provide their drugs in the poorer agricultural districts sometimes results in their ordering alcohol, instead of giving drugs to patients?—I should certainly endorse that statement.

10200. It does?—It does, without a doubt.

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

10201. That is one of the direct evils of the system ?—I think so, as applying to workhouses. Of course, as regards the district medical officer he has no power to order and to see that alcohol is given. The district medical officer only has the power of recommendation.

10202. I suppose the medical officers of all the larger or better organised infirmaries do not pay for their drugs ?—That is so.

Effect of medical administration on Consumption of Alcohol in Workhouses.

10203. Is it a practice now that generally prevails in the agricultural districts ?—I think one might say not only in the agricultural districts, but other unions, urban unions as well. I should like to add, in respect to the question of alcohol and workhouses, that in the best medically administered workhouses one finds very little alcohol given. For instance, at the Leeds Union Infirmary the average amount of alcohol given per annum does not amount to £1 in value.

10204. That is a large infirmary ?—It is.

Infirmaries under quasi-separate administration.

10205. Would you look at paragraphs 17, 18, and 19 of your memorandum, which relate to the separation of infirmary administration from the workhouse ? You say in paragraph 18 that many large workhouse infirmaries, mentioning some, though not legally, or theoretically, separately administered, are so practically with the happiest results ; then you go on to say : "Should the Board insist upon the General Consolidated Order being carried out in such cases, which, of course, would be a physical impossibility, it is probable a separate order would be asked for, a large expenditure result, and possibly no improvement result in the administration." What would be the result of insisting upon the General Consolidated Order being carried out ?—The master and matron would have to make a round of the whole establishment twice a day.

10206. I am afraid I have not made myself very familiar recently with the General Consolidated Order ?—It is part of the regulations that they must make a round of the whole establishment twice a day, morning and evening, at certain hours. Of course, in a large establishment where there are 1,100 or 1,200 inmates, it would be naturally quite impossible for them to do it.

10207. What you wish to point out is that the General Consolidated Order, on this particular point, is obsolete ?—Exactly.

10208. Whilst we are on the subject of separation of infirmary administration, you would like to go further, and classify infirmaries, if possible ?—Yes.

Separate control of Infirmaries under the Basingstoke Order.

10209. That, of course, could only be done in a very large union, or where a number of unions combined ?—I do not think so. I think that an extension of what we call the Basingstoke Order would meet the difficulty in certainly a majority of the unions.

10210. I am afraid I did not make my question clear. I gathered from your evidence that you would like to divide up infirmaries, and have one infirmary dealing with a particular class of case, and other infirmaries dealing with other classes ; am I wrong in that ?—I am sorry, I am afraid I have not been as clear as I wanted to be in that way. I merely meant the separation should be as regards the control of the medical officer and superintendent nurse as opposed to the control of the master and matron.

10211. The Basingstoke Order modified the General Consolidated Order, and enables that to be done ?—It does.

Classification of Pauper Patients.

10212. With reference to paragraph 33, does not that rather indicate a further division of infirmary cases ? —A classification by the medical officer of the local union ; for instance, for what we might term incurable cases, the same expensive accommodation and equipment is not necessary.

10213. Would it be possible, say in London, to have one infirmary dealing with a case in Class 1, and another infirmary dealing with Class 2 ? Would that simplify it ? —I do not think you would want that. What I had in my mind was the fact that there are a great number of "chronics" among the infirmary cases who do not require the skilled care and attention of a nurse by night and day, and those might very well be accommodated in what we term "infirm wards," as distinct from hospital wards.

10214. It was merely a more distinct classification inside the infirmary itself ?—Yes.

10215. Not the classification of infirmaries ?—No.

Poor Law phthisical cases : Question of their transference to Public Health Authorities

10216. You have a strong opinion as to phthisis cases ? You think those are not fit cases for ordinary poor law treatment ?—Not so much that, as that the cases in the first stage do not as a rule come under the poor law medical officers.

10217. They do not come before the poor law medical officers in certain cases until the disease has developed ?—Until they become actually destitute.

10218. And the patient is probably almost incurable ? —Yes, incurable as far as being returned to work fit as an able-bodied man.

10219. It was in connection with the outdoor relief more particularly that you were speaking ?—Yes, more particularly.

10220. As regards these cases would you suggest that sanatoria should be provided ?—Not for poor law cases. I think that it should be a public health charge and a public health matter altogether.

10221. In fact, take it quite from the poor law ?—Yes ; I do not think that a man who suffers from phthisis pulmonalis ought to become practically disfranchised.

Rate-aided and other kinds of public hospitals and their proper spheres of operations.

10222. A separate provision, of course, would have to be made independent of the poor law for those cases ?—Yes.

10223. In paragraph 85 you say : "It has been apparent that public opinion, at least in some large urban unions, has been steadily drifting in the direction of rate-aided infirmaries taking the place of poor law infirmaries." What is the distinction between a rate-aided infirmary and a poor law infirmary ?—An infirmary for all classes of cases, not necessarily the destitute cases.

10224. In fact a hospital ?—Yes. I think that one of the earliest books that was published which led public opinion in that direction was "State-aided hospitals" by Dr. Dolan of Halifax.

10225. The inevitable tendency under pressure of public opinion is to make each finished workhouse infirmary more and more a competitor with the hospitals ?—I think so ; for instance at Sheffield and at Halifax, and other large union infirmaries that might be named, there are always a large number of cases, that are not strictly speaking poor law cases, under treatment ; and the reason for that is to a great extent that the local general hospitals have not sufficient accommodation to take those cases in, they may go for two or three days and then they are transferred to the local union infirmary, either because they are incurable, or deemed to be incurable, or else they are not quite the class of case they would keep in a general hospital

10226. Following out that idea, what would be the result ; would there be a rate-aided hospital in addition to the existing hospitals ? To what class of case would you limit the poor law infirmaries ?—Strictly speaking to the destitute cases ; cases that really are in receipt of relief and have no other means of obtaining the medical and nursing attention that is necessary.

10227. Most of the hospitals are free ?—I believe so.

10228. Would not it result merely in those who could not get orders going to the poor law infirmaries ?—I should think that that is already the result in a great many of the larger areas.

10229. Is it possible in any way to combine the two sets of institutions ?—I do not know that I have ever thought it out to that extent, so as to form any definite opinion as to what should be. I think in the initial stage the principle of competition with a voluntary hospital or a charity-aided hospital comes in, and I think that is wrong.

10230. Are there any rate-aided hospitals now ?—What practically amount to rate-aided hospitals, but not officially recognised as such.

10231. Rate-aided in the sense that the Corporation vote them lump sums ?—No, rate-aided as being supported by the poor law.

10232. Are there any rate-aided hospitals in England outside the poor law infirmaries ?—Isolation hospitals and public health hospitals.

10233. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) When you say "rate-aided" hospitals do you mean hospitals to which the guardians subscribe?—No.

10234. What do you mean by a "rate-aided" hospital, do you mean one provided by a local authority?—Provided by the poor law authority taking all classes of cases irrespective of poor law.

10235. Are there any such hospitals?—No, I merely say that that is what it appears to be coming to.

10236. (*Chairman.*) In contradistinction to poor law infirmaries, you use the word "rate-aided" infirmary as one that would take all classes of cases, not merely poor law?—Yes.

Increased percentage of deaths in workhouse infirmaries.

10237. Statistical evidence has been submitted to us which shows, I think, that a larger proportion of the population die in workhouse infirmaries now than died before, which looks as if there was a greater tendency than before for people who are seriously ill to come in to be nursed and possibly to die, in the infirmaries. Has your attention at all been called to those figures?—Not particularly to those figures, but some three or four years ago I was struck with the increase in the number of deaths in different institutions that I visited from time to time; so I asked one or two of my colleagues whether they could furnish me with any tables relating to the increase in the number of deaths in workhouses in contradistinction to the normal increase of deaths in the localities, and in the only return that I received the increase of deaths in the district was ·4 per cent., while the increase of deaths in the workhouses of that district was 35 per cent.

10238. We have had figures from some of the inspectors which confirm that. (*Mr. Loch.*) Will you give the totals upon which that percentage is taken?—I can put in this sheet, which is the only sheet that I have.*

10239. (*Chairman.*) What area was that?—This was the Nottinghamshire district, and comprised the period from 1896 to 1902.

Inspections of Medical Inspector.

10240. (*Mr. Booth.*) I am still not quite clear about the meaning of paragraph 2; you say that your primary duty, until recently, was to make six routine inspections per annum in each of the thirteen districts. Does that mean that you make per annum six times thirteen inspections?—Yes.

10241. Six annual inspections in each district?—Yes.

10242. Then when you say "until recently," does one of these paragraphs afterwards qualify that with an alteration up to the present time?—I merely meant that under the late chief general inspector that was considered to be my duty, but since Mr. Davy's accession to office my duty has been somewhat enlarged on the lines of Mr. Ritchie's Minute.

10243. It is entirely a question of enlargement. You still have to make six routine inspections in thirteen districts?—Yes. I do not think Mr. Davy looks upon that quite as a primary duty. He looks upon my primary duty now as being at the beck and call, so to speak, of the general inspectors for any particular inspection which they may require to be made.

10244. Even if it should prevent your carrying out the six routine inspections?—Yes.

10245. So "until recently" applies to the word "primary"?—Yes.

10246. So that although that is your duty, that may be over-ridden by the special calls upon you to deal with the difficulties raised by the general inspectors?—Exactly.

Proposed extension of principle of rate-provided hospitals.

10247. With regard to this question of rate-aided institutions, hospitals of whatever kind, would it be correct to replace the word "rate-aided" by a word we are now all familiar with: "provided"? Is that the same idea that we have with regard to the schools? Do you mean an institution paid for entirely out of the public purse for certain special purposes? Is that the meaning of the word "rate-aided" as you use it?—No; that the guardians, in addition to their own union workhouse infirmary, should also be large subscribers, if not wholly providing, as regards the building accommodation, for ordinary sick cases arising in any part of the union among any class who could not provide the necessary accommodation for themselves.

10248. In a similar way to the treatment of infectious cases?—Exactly.

10249. The suggestion is to extend that idea, and especially you speak of the extension for phthisis cases, they being so dangerous to the public health?—Yes, and I had in my mind too the idea that if we conceded the principle that the Poor Law were to provide for the treatment of phthisis cases in the first stage, we were conceding the principle that the Poor Law should provide for all cases of acute illness among a certain class; by that I mean among the working classes.

10250. Is there not a distinction in the object in dealing with infectious diseases or disorders that are likely to spread to others. In those cases you insist on people who can afford it being in isolation in their own homes or in some institution?—Yes.

10251. Where they are poor you insist on their coming into a publicly provided place where they can be not only treated but safely isolated?—I do not think that is so altogether in the provinces.

10252. What I mean to ask is whether you wish to go beyond the consideration of the public interest in the prevention of the spread of infectious diseases to a more socialistic and wider dealing with illness, irrespective of its effect upon the neighbours?—That is what I think we are drifting towards. I do not agree with the principle of it.

10253. You do not agree with the principle of it: that is what I want to make clear?—No.

Medical Officers for Poor Law Schools and their functions.

10254. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to the inspection of Poor Law schools, there is always a medical officer attached to the Poor Law schools, is not there?—Yes.

10255. Should not it be his duty to see that the proper standard is kept up for nursing and medical attendance and things of that sort?—It should be his duty, but I think you can understand that the discharge of such duties by a local medical officer sometimes is inclined to be apathetic.

Importance of outside practice for Poor Law Medical Officers.

10256. Is not that rather because he has also a private practice?—It may be to a certain extent. I do not think it ought to be. I think a man who is in touch with the outside world ought to be very much more keen in the discharge of his duties in an institution such as a Poor Law school.

10257. You agree that the medical officer should not be appointed simply to do the one particular work, but that he should have a general practice outside?—I agree with that general principle.

10258. That, of course, would apply to paragraph 15 too, the indoor medical relief?—Yes.

Appointment of visiting as well as resident Medical Officers of Workhouses.

10259. Do not you think it is liable to a good deal of abuse, to pay an outside doctor a salary to do something which certainly in large urban districts he never has time to do himself, because of the very large practice he has outside?—No, I think that we ought to have our large Poor Law infirmaries put upon the same principle as the general hospitals, the visiting medical men and the resident medical men.

10260. Your experience is that that always works out all right?—I think it works better than having one man to devote his whole time to the duties and not to be really in touch with the outside professional world. In London it may work very well, because I believe there is an association of medical superintendents, but in the provinces you have one man resident who is not in touch altogether with his medical colleagues.

10261. I am thinking of large infirmaries just now with 600 or 700 inmates. Do not you think in those cases it ought to be the rule that the chief simply devotes his whole time to the business?—No, I think it is a mistake; that the man in such a position gets into a groove.

10262. Of course, I am not a medical man; I was only going to say that, with 600 or 700 cases, it seems to me he could hardly get into a groove, because there are so many different cases he has to deal with; it is almost the same as an ordinary general hospital, from the point

* The figures referred to by Dr. Fuller also form part of the statement of evidence handed in by Mr. Herbert. (Vide Appendix Vol I. (A), No. XVII. (A), paragraph 10.)

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

Appointment of visiting as well as resident Medical Officers of Workhouses. (*e.g.* Crumpsall, West Derby, Bradford, and Stoke-on-Trent.)

of view of experience ?—From that point of view, but I believe in a man keeping a liberal mind, and I am afraid my experience is that after a man has been resident in such an institution for some years, you find that he is far from having a liberal mind on all points, medical and general administration.

10263. The other point is that if he has so much work to do outside, some part of his work must suffer. He cannot pay attention to everything ?—I do not think you will find that. My experience is not so. We will take Crumpsall, for instance. The visiting medical officers there are men of the highest professional and social standing in the locality, and the work there is admirably done. To take another instance, it is the same in the West Derby Union Mill Road Infirmary.

10264. It is only because I so thoroughly agree with your paragraph 15 that I am putting these questions. The medical officers do not do this sort of thing; at any rate, my experience of them is that they do not ?—My experience is that when you get a man who is resident, who devotes his whole time, he is much more apathetic after a period of years than he would be if he were in touch with the outside world by visiting.

10265. Do you think that applies to the Metropolis ?—I know nothing about the Metropolis; I have no duties specially there.

10266. The largest are in London ?—I believe so.

10267. Take Bradford, for instance; I do not know what you say about that ?—I have a very high appreciation of what has been done at Bradford during the last ten years. Mr. Bentham knows what I thought of Bradford twelve years ago.

10268. Is it the custom, outside London, to have an outside doctor ?—As a rule it is.

10269. Do you think it ought to be so, with regard to workhouses, as apart from infirmaries—I mean workhouses where they have an infirm ward, an able-bodied ward, a children's ward, etc., a workhouse where the sick as sick are not treated, where they are treated in a sick asylum, or other places ? I think you call them hospitals in the North, do not you ?—Unless it is a very large workhouse, I should say there would not be enough to occupy the man's whole time.

10270. I am thinking of workhouses with 1,000 inmates ?—Do you mean 1,000 excluding the sick ?

10271. Yes, but including the infirm, the infirm which you would call chronics, people who want day and night attendance but not night and day nursing ?—I should say you would require a resident assistant medical officer and a visiting medical officer in a case like that.

10272. You think even there we want the visiting officer ?—Certainly.

10273. What sort of man should this visiting doctor be, a local man ?—A local man, and naturally if opportunity offer, a man of the best professional standing in the locality.

10274. You are not advocating physicians coming down in the fashion that they have at the hospitals, are you ? It is a purely local man you have in your mind as the visiting medical officer ?—Yes.

10275. You think they are necessary ?—I do.

10276. And a resident assistant man too ?—In a very large institution such as you speak of.

10277. What would be the salary of the visiting medical officer ?—That would vary according to the locality. For instance, at Stoke-on-Trent the visiting medical officer has an honorarium of £50 a year: the resident medical officer's salary is £150, rising by instalments; I forget now the exact amount.

10278. I suppose you will tell me you do not know anything about London, if I ask you what applies to London ?—No; but at Stoke-on-Trent that particular method answers very well. You go to another union, perhaps, of the same size as Stoke-on-Trent, and you find the visiting medical officer with a salary of £250, and the resident assistant with a salary of £200 a year, and that works equally well.

10279. You will not say anything about London ?—am not in a position to say anything.

Insufficient salaries of Medical Officers.

10280. In paragraph 25 you say the majority of medical officers, in or outdoor, are paid salaries miserably inadequate. Is the Stoke-on-Trent salary a miserably inadequate one ?—Do you mean the visiting medical officer's salary ?

10281. Either; I do not mind which ?—No.

10282. You think they are both paid fairly ?—I think so, for the duties that are required of them according to the agreement.

10283. There must be other unions where they are very badly paid. Is that so ?—A very great many, I am sorry to say.

Functions Local Governme Board in regard to scale of salaries.

10284. Does not the Local Government Board fix a maximum for outdoor ?—No, there is no Regulation under which the Local Government Board can fix it.

10285. Is not there one in London ?—I am not conversant with the London policy at all.

10286. Does not the Local Government Board draw up scales for other officers, relieving officers, for instance ?—There, again, I am out of my province; I could not tell you.

10287. As the Local Government Board has a good deal to do with regard to the fixing of scales of salaries, as to how much a board may or may not pay, do not you think it would be a duty of the Local Government Board to draw up such a scale?—I think we might have an amendment of the Poor Law, as I suggest in paragraph 87 of my memorandum.

10288. I suppose you do know that the Local Government Board does fix maximum salaries for certain officers; I am under the impression that for dispensers in London they have fixed a scale; is there any reason why the Local Government Board should not do a similar thing in the country ?—The Local Government Board in the case of nurses asks for a statement from the guardians as to the maximum salaries to be given, and then they sanction a certain staff, and that is the only case that I know of where the Local Government Board have asked for a maximum scale of salaries to be furnished to them before assenting to the appointments.

10289. Do not you think in a case like this the Local Government Board ought to have a scale and send it out to the various boards of guardians and tell them if they want proper medical attention they ought to pay a certain sum for it ?—There, of course, you hit at once at the question of local government and local administration; if there is to be any alteration in that, of course the question of central authority as to the salaries to be given arises, and then comes the central responsibility.

10290. But the central authority does control now; it will not allow a board to pay just what it pleases in the matter of salaries. If a board said it would give its doctor £1,000 a year you would interfere ?—That is what I should call a very unreasonable suggestion.

10291. You could prevent them paying that; all I want to ask is whether you do not think the Local Government Board ought to prevent boards of guardians paying miserable and inadequate salaries ?—I think if the Local Government Board had power to do that they would do so.

10292. Have they ever issued any standard, any order or memorandum explaining what they think would be a proper rate to pay for a medical officer to do certain duties ?—I am not in a position to answer that question.

10293. You have not issued one as medical inspector, have you ?—I have no power to issue any memorandum of any kind; it is not within my province to do so.

10294. Not on anything ?—Not on anything.

10295. As to out-door medical officers, again, I am afraid I shall not be able to ask you anything very relevant, because I have London in my mind. I was going to ask you whether you thought it was good to give those appointments to very busy local practitioners ?—In London ?

Allegatio that out-patients needlessly sent into Infirmari by Distri Medical Officers.

10296. Perhaps this does not apply to the country; have you ever heard complaints that the out-door relief man bundles people into the sick asylums or infirmaries because he does not want the trouble of them, and they very often fill up the beds in the infirmaries ?—I can only speak as to the provinces, and there it is a matter of personal persuasion; there is no hurrying into any workhouse infirmary or any other institution on the part of any medical officer; no one has the right to compel anybody to go into the workhouse infirmary.

10297. But there are various means by which you can compel people to do things; if the medical officer recommends to the guardians that the case is better treated inside, the case has to go in, has it not?—I should not like to say that. The guardians as a rule make a very careful consideration of each case before they take any action as to cutting off out-relief; and they never allow a medical officer to cease attending on a case because the case refuses to go into the workhouse infirmary.

10298. After all, it is only a minority that would refuse to go in after the doctor had ordered that they should go in?—Now-a-days I think that is so, but in times gone by a very large majority used to refuse to go in.

10299. We are dealing with them now, are not we, rather?—I mean within the last ten years.

10300. Have you come across the statement that outside medical officers simply treat cases that do not need much attention outside, and that the others are sent in on purpose to get rid of them?—No, I should not like to subscribe to that statement.

10301. I only asked whether you had heard the same sort of complaint?—No, not in the provinces.

cility with hich out- or Medical elief is tained.

10302. Then you say that there is a great deal of abuse in regard to out-door relief. I should like to know what you mean by that?—In some unions an order for out-door medical relief is given without any inquiry, simply on the application of the person, or the relieving officer, without any due inquiry as to the condition of that person.

edical elief the ghway to uperism.

10303. Is not that because the relieving officer has no knowledge of whether the person is very sick or not? I mean, a son or a daughter goes up, or a wife goes up for a medical order for the husband; the relieving officer does not know whether he is dangerously ill or not, does he?—Not necessarily; but what I meant was the giving of an out-door medical relief order was the commencement of permanent out-door relief without sufficient reason.

10304. They would not be put on permanently, would they, without sufficient inquiry?—In some unions they are.

10305. You think they would in some unions?—Yes.

ovision for thisical upers.

10306. In the provinces is phthisis very prevalent in urban districts?—Judging by the returns that have been available for the last four years, it is, more or less.

10307. In the meantime, before the public health authorities or private charities do what you suggest, do you think it is good to be treating these people in the ordinary sick asylums and infirmaries?—Not in the ordinary sick wards; they ought to be treated in wards where they are entirely separated from the ordinary sick.

10308. In places where they have not got those wards what are they to do?—I often find cases treated in ordinary sick wards.

10309. They have to treat them there because they have not any other place?—That is so, usually.

10310. In this matter of phthisis, your board has had before it for some time now particulars in regard to the ravages made by consumption, especially in London; and no steps have been taken by anyone to provide what you say is necessary to be provided. Do not you think it would be better to let the poor law authorities do it rather than that it should not be done at all?—Giving my personal opinion, as distinct from an official opinion, I should say yes.

10311. Your real reason for not wanting the poor law to do it is because you do not want a man suffering from such a complaint to be treated as a pauper?—Exactly.

10312. You think he is no more a pauper than a person who suffers from small-pox?—Exactly.

sfranchise- nt in tain cases Medical lief.

10313. I want to put it to you, and I do not want to press you too hard on this, because, perhaps, there are other reasons to be stated: If a man breaks his leg and becomes chargeable, and has to go into an infirmary, is there any real reason why he should be treated as a pauper any more than the man who gets phthisis by following a particular trade or calling?—There is no particular reason; but then, in certain localities there are no general hospitals to which a case like that could be taken, and in very large urban unions, such as those I have mentioned, the general hospitals, as a rule are not infrequently full and cannot take the case in.

10314. I have that in my mind, too. In principle there is no difference, is there?—No. We will take the case of the Hatfield Union, where all railway accidents have to go into the workhouse infirmary. That I consider to be a wrong state of affairs altogether.

10315. Those men ought not to be disfranchised any more than the man with phthisis. That is the point I want to put to you?—I quite agree.

10316. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) They would not be disfranchised, would they?—If treated inside they would.

Waste food in Workhouses.

10317. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to the cost of food in workhouses, do not you think there is a good deal of waste through serving out to everybody a certain amount. You are bound to put down so much bread, so much meat, so much potatoes, and the rest of it, whether the person wants it or not?—Are you referring now to the workhouse infirmaries or to the workhouse dietary?

10318. The workhouse dietary generally, not the infirmaries so much?—No, not under the present system.

10319. You do not think there is?—No.

10320. I do not know what happens in the provinces, but do not they nearly always keep pigs?—Not so many as they used to have under the old system.

10321. Do they keep any now?—They do, and masters have frequently said to me: "It is not so cheap now to keep pigs as it used to be, we have so very little waste." I have numbers of times inspected what is called the waste tub, and found very little waste. It is a matter I have gone into very carefully, both as regards the waste, and the general workhouse diet, as well as the infirmary diet.

10322. Is the dietary for aged people the same outside London as inside London?—It depends; the local authorities choose the rations altogether.

10323. I think you call it No. 1 dietary in London for the aged people?—No, No. 1 dietary is for able-bodied men.

10324. Then it is No. 2?—There is a very large list of rations to choose from.

10325. I know; but there is so much bread for almost each meal?—You will find in almost all provincial workhouses there is a regulation that either a half, two-thirds, or three-quarters of the bread should be served in the first place.

10326. Do not you think that is open to abuse? Nobody knows really how much is used?—There comes in the personal equation of the accounting officer.

10327. The master?—Yes.

10328. Under the present arrangements, where you leave it free, it is open to the abuse of the people not getting what it is said they do get, is it not?—I must say that I am very agreeably surprised, taking the country as a whole, at the very few complaints one does get as regards the service of food.

10329. What I would like to put to you is, whether it would not be better to serve out to the people, and let them get what they need, and serve it up in a more varied style; instead of fixing certain things leave more to the discretion of the people who are preparing it and serving it?—No, I think it would be open to much more abuse than the present system.

10330. The present system is open to abuse, is not it?—Any system must be open to abuse, not necessarily in a Poor Law institution.

10331. My point is, that being so, you might just as well face it, and use up scraps and things as you would in a private house. It seems to me that there ought not to be any waste at all in a workhouse?—There is always an irreducible minimum of waste.

10332. Do you think we have got to the irreducible minimum?—In some, in what I call well-administered houses.

10333. As to rate-aided infirmaries, you do not agree with the tendency that is going on just now?—No.

Expensive Infirmary equipment. Sheffie d.

10334. What is your particular complaint about the buildings? You say that they outvie the latest in the equipment, especially in regard to the operating room. Is it that they spend too much on the buildings?—Not

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

necessarily upon the actual building, but upon the equipment. For instance, at Sheffield, I believe the equipment of the operating room alone cost £500.

10335. Would that expenditure be sanctioned by your board?—Sanctioned among other items, not necessarily sanctioned as the equipment of the operating room.

10336. Who would advise the guardians as to what was necessary for the operating room?—In that particular case the guardians formed a committee, and they visited various other Poor Law infirmaries and general hospitals throughout the country, and then advised their Board.

10337. Would not they be guided by their local medical man?—To a certain extent, but not entirely.

10338. They would not themselves know much about the implements necessary for cutting people up, and the table, and all the rest of it, would they?—In that particular instance they would; they had some members of the committee who knew what ought to be provided.

10339. Who were medical men?—One was a medical man, and another was the President of the Pharmaceutical Society.

10340. So that they really had good advice in what they were doing?—Yes.

10341. And they followed that advice, so as, if they treated people at all, to treat them in the best possible manner, and get them well as quickly as possible?—I do not know that I should subscribe to that statement.

10342. Why did they spend the money?—This is putting it in my own words: because they wanted their operating room to be one of the best.

High percentage of recoveries from operations in certain moderately equipped infirmaries. Liverpool.

10343. What does "one of the best" mean, except that it is to carry the operations through in the best manner possible to get your patients well quickly?—I do not think it is necessary to have such a very elaborately fitted operating room to get your patients well quickly. I know other workhouse infirmaries where the percentage of recoveries from operations is higher than in the local general hospitals, and I should like to name the Mill Road Infirmary of Liverpool, as the first that occurs to me, where the percentage of recoveries is higher than in any one of the Liverpool general hospitals, I believe.

10344. Is that a well equipped operating room?—If you were to ask the superintendent medical officer of that institution he would tell you that he was not at all satisfied with it, it was a very poor place.

10345. Very likely his percentage would be higher if he had the means that he really wants, he ought to be the best judge?—What I mean is this: that the recovery in great measure depends upon the personal equation as regards the medical officers concerned and the nursing.

10346. You mean it depends on the doctor and the nurses rather than anything else?—Rather than upon the equipment of the operating room.

10347. You do not subscribe to the doctrine that guardians just throw this money away because they have someone's else money to spend, and therefore they will spend it willy-nilly, somehow?—No, not altogether, I do in some cases.

Responsibility for expensive infirmary buildings, &c.

10348. Do you in the case of building infirmaries and that sort of thing? Who puts it into the heads of Boards of Guardians that they want a new operating room; do they think that themselves?—As a rule I should say the suggestion comes from the medical officer.

10349. That is the point I want to get at, as a rule these extravagant things are suggested by the gentleman who is the adviser of the guardians on such matters?—Not always.

10350. In the case you have just mentioned of Liverpool I expect that gentleman will agitate his Board, if he is like most gentlemen in that position, and will keep on agitating individual members that it is a very miserably equipped place that he has to do these successful operations in, and he could do them much better in a nicer place, and eventually the guardians will bear the obliquity of having had it done?—I do not think the medical superintendent would do that in that case.

10351. In the last resort the medical officer does advise as to whether he wants certain equipment or not, does he not?—No, I should say not, there again, not always. I have known guardians make alterations without referring to their medical officer at all.

10352. Have you ever known them make alterations when the medical officer has asked them to make them?—I have known them refuse to make alterations when the medical officer has asked them to do so.

10353. Have you ever known them agree to make alterations which medical officers have asked them to make?—I think the reply to that is a very obvious one, that it is so in some cases.

10354. That the guardians do carry out the wishes of their officers and therefore have to incur the kind of odium that comes here, that they only do it for the purpose of spending money?—No, not at all.

Profession status of provincial District Medical Officers.

10355. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Did I understand you to say about the status of medical officers in the provinces, that they belong to the upper ranks of the medical profession?—No, I think I said that the visiting medical officers should belong.

10356. As a matter of fact, they do not?—In a number of instances they do not.

10357. The majority do not, do you think?—I should not like to say the majority.

10358. Is it more in the rural districts than the urban districts in the provinces that they belong to the lower ranks of the profession?—It applies more particularly in the rural districts.

Scope of Medical Inspector's power to report to Local Government Board.

10359. I suppose with regard to salaries, it would be within the province of the medical inspector to make a recommendation to the Local Government Board on the subject?—No, that does not come within my province at all.

10360. He could draw attention to it in his annual report?—We are not called on to make annual reports.

10361. You could make one if you liked?—Not unless requested to do so.

10362. Are you not permitted to make a report to the Local Government Board?—I should not like to say I am not permitted, but I should like to say I am not asked to do so.

10363. May I ask what the natural channel of communication between you and the Local Government Board is?—In what respect?

10364. Any remarks that you have to make about the institution that you are inspecting?—I rather hoped I had made that clear in my memorandum.

10365. I thought I was clear on that point?—I deal with it in paragraph 5.

10366. Do I understand that you do not feel at liberty to make a report to the Local Government Board, except on those points?—It would have to be in some very special emergency that I should depart from the routine practice.

10367. The only opportunity the Local Government Board has of learning your mind on the subject of your work is in connection with structural and sanitary irregularities and defects?—And as regards the personal condition of the inmates of sick wards of infirmaries and nurseries and schools.

10368. There is no regular channel for any observations you may have to make on the general trend of medical relief?—No, my report entirely depends on myself, there are no questions to answer at all.

10369. What I want to know is whether you feel at liberty to make such a report to the Local Government Board outside these matters mentioned in Section 5?—I should, if I considered any special case required it.

10370. Would not the matter of salaries of medical officers be a case requiring it?—I have no voice whatever in the question of salaries of medical officers.

10371. Upon the salaries, I suppose, depends, to a certain extent, the efficiency of the medical relief that is given? Surely that would come under your purview?—I think I am right in saying that that does not come within my province.

10372. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would what you said in paragraph 7 with reference to the past five years, refer to that: "During the past five years, however, the practice resolved

itself into writing a report whenever my colleague and myself considered it desirable." What I want to ask is whether what you say in parargaph 7 is limited by what you put in paragraph 5, that no medical report is made, unless with regard to grave administrative, structural, or sanitary irregularities or defects, or does paragraph 7 widen the issue ?—Paragraph 7 is really the growth of feeling between the general inspectors and myself, that reports must be made on occasions, not special occasions.

10373. It does widen to some extent the limitations which are put in paragraph 5 ?—Yes. Paragraph 5 was really founded upon Mr. Ritchie's Minute.

10374. Are you dissatisfied with the present arrangements ? Do you think you are still too limited in your action as to reports ?—I think we are gradually growing, as it were, and becoming more liberal in what one has to do.

10375. The growth might go further with advantage ?—I think so.

ombination f office of Vorkhouse nd District ledical fficer.

10376. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Coming back to the District Medical Officers, is it a common thing at all for a man to hold the office of indoor medical officer combined with that of outdoor medical officer ?—That is very infrequently the case. The workhouse medical officer holds, as a rule, one of the district appointments. At Chichester, for instance, there is only one district, and the medical officer of the workhouse is also district medical officer.

ursing of utdoor aupers by Vorkhouse urses at hichester.

10377. Does that work well ?—I think in that particular area that works exceedingly well, for this reason, amongst others, that the nursing staff in the workhouse is what I call a very sufficient and a very efficient one, and that staff is also available for district nursing. The result is that at Chichester we get a vastly better nursing staff than we have in other workhouses of the same size.

10378. It is not at all common, is it, for the nurses to go out ?—That is really the only good example in the country.

10379. Is it unique ?—Other unions have tried it, but they have not carried it out to the same extent.

lethods and esults of ranting ledical elief.

10380. With regard to the recommendations of district medical officers, you say that is very often the beginning of a course of outdoor relief. Do you regard the recommendation of the outside medical officer to give medical comforts as a purely medical recommedation, and (if I may combine this question) do you find that the guardians take it as such, or that they act upon it as a semi-administrative recommendation ?—I think that the guardians, as a rule, are very careful before allowing an outdoor recommendation of that kind in reference to alcohol.

10381. I was not thinking only of alcohol, but of any other nourishment that might be considered necessary, quite apart from alcohol ?—I think they are very liberal.

10382. Do the guardians feel bound to give medical comforts outside upon the medical officers' recommendation, or do they regard it merely as a medical opinion upon which they have to form their own decision in accordance with the other circumstances of the case ?—My personal experience as an outdoor medical officer was that the guardians never refused medical relief "in kind," but they frequently refused medical relief in the shape of alcohol.

10383. So that practically it has the force of an administrative recommendation ?—Yes.

10384. That would be a strong ground for the discovery that it leads frequently to inadmissible outdoor relief, that the medical opinion of a district medical officer is taken as a binding recommendation that outdoor relief has to be given in the particular case ?—Yes. The guardians do not look upon the medical officer as being a suitable officer to say whether medical relief ought to be given or not. If a medical man protests against the fact that he has to attend a certain case, they do not regard that medical officer as being a fit person to judge whether he should attend or not, on account of destitution or otherwise.

10385. But suppose the medical officer says that certain things are necessary, do the guardians ever come to the opinion that the medical officers recommendation for certain comforts is to be refused and that indoor relief would be preferable ?—Yes, they do.

10386. That is frequently the case ?—Yes.

10387. They regard it, therefore, merely as a medical opinion ?—A medical recommendation ; but in many cases it does carry the force of an administrative recommendation.

10388–91. And that is where the danger lies ?—Yes.

Return as to phthisis in Workhouses.

10392. With regard to phthisis, you spoke of certain returns which are available as to phthisis throughout the provinces. Are they confined to Poor Law statistics, or were you referring to general statistics ?—They were confined to returns relating to cases treated in workhouses, the number of cases under treatment, and whether there was any special treatment as regards treatment in outdoor shelters or in wards specially set aside for the treatment of phthisis. (Returns handed in. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXI. (D–E)).

10393. That does not occur in the Annual Report of the Local Government Board, does it ?—No, it has not been referred to at all. The returns are based upon the General Inspectors' Reports made from time to time. You quite understand that the General Inspector does not report at periodical intervals upon particular workhouses. He may report on a workhouse in January, and probably the next report he may make would be in the June of the following year,so that those returns are not comparable, though they do furnish some criterion of the number of cases that there are under treatment at the workhouses.

10394. There is no periodical return ?—No.

Compulsory notification of phthisis.

10395. There is one—I do not know whether there are two now—but certainly one corporation which has succeeded in getting compulsory notification ; I think it is Sheffield. Have you remarked the returns there to see whether any of the improvement which you expect has actually come about ? Perhaps you do not know the case of Sheffield ?—I know Sheffield is one, but I think there are other places where notification is compulsory.

10396. I think there is one other corporation in the South of England which has a Bill, but it has not become law yet. I wondered whether you had been able to make any investigation in Sheffield on the operation of that ?—It is some years now since I inspected Sheffield workhouse infirmary.

10397. Are you acquainted with Dr. Newsholme's work at Brighton ?—I read his Annual Reports.

10398. He has been allowed to make use of a portion of the Fever Hospital for consumption patients ?—I do not know anything about the actual working of it. That is a Public Health matter which does not concern the Poor Law.

Open-air treatment and isolation of phthisis cases in Workhouse Infirmaries.

10399. I suppose the return will show us, at any rate, whether the open-air treatment is being attempted at workhouse infirmaries ?—Yes, it does.

10400. Do you regard it practically as a disinfecting process in favour of the other patients ?—I think that all cases of phthisis, more or less, according to the particular stage they may be in, are infective to other people, unless the proper precautions are taken, and those you cannot expect to be taken among the lower classes.

(Effect of Plenum system of heating on chest cases at Wakefield).

10401. It is more important to save other people from infection than to afford treatment to the individual. That is the primary object of having an open-air ward in the infirmary. It is quite possible to supply an infirmary with pure air, and, of course, it is comparatively easy that the patients shall have sufficient sunshine ?—No, I do not think so. From what I know of the Wakefield Union Infirmary, which is heated and ventilated on the Plenum system, the medical officer there is unable to treat his pneumonia cases in the ordinary sick wards.

10402. Why ?—He finds that they go under ; they die more frequently than they should do.

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

10403. To what does he ascribe that?—To the want of what we call fresh air.

10404. He considers that fresh air heated is not as good as fresh air cold?—It does not seem to have the right effect upon such chest cases.

10405. You are aware there are very great authorities against that opinion, I suppose?—Yes. I was only speaking of an institution which came within my knowledge. The medical officer of Wakefield Infirmary finds that he has greater success with cases of pneumonia where he can have the windows open than in wards where the Plenum system is in full use.

10406. In infirmary wards where an opportunity has been afforded of comparing the open-air with the other treatment, have you found the superintendents and the nurses generally are inclined to extend the open-air treatment to the other classes of patients?—Yes.

10407. It is better for the patients from a medical point of view?—Yes, and better for themselves, too. The nurses are in better health.

10408. Of course. Then with regard to compulsion, would you advocate the compulsory isolation of these cases in all cases where the relatives and friends are unable to give them sufficient isolation and care?—Most certainly.

Compulsory isolation and detention of phthisis cases

10409. Under the ordinary conditions that are carried out by municipal bodies in such as fever cases?—Yes, I think so.

10410. Would you extend the action of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1867 by which certain classes suffering from infectious diseases could be detained in the workhouse, to phthisis?—I believe the Local Government Board hold that such cases can be detained.

10411. Really?—I believe the Bath case was the last one that came up for decision.

Proposed compulsory removal to Workhouse of certain classes.

10412. With regard to other persons in whose cases it seems distinctly insanitary or dangerous to other persons, or to themselves, that they should be left alone, infirm-old people, under what conditions would you suggest that the law might be altered to enable guardians compulsorily to admit them? Would you be in favour of such compulsory admittance?—I should. I will quote a very recent case which occurred at Bedford. The workhouse medical officer there made an entry in his Report Book to the effect that an old woman recently admitted was in the most filthily dirty condition he had ever seen any person in, and that she had large bed-sores, and he attributed the whole condition of the woman to the want of attention outside, and that he thought that under similar conditions the guardians ought to have power to remove such cases for treatment to the workhouse As a matter of fact, that case came in, and died within three days of admission.

10413. I did not mean under what regulation of the people, but under what administration regulations do you think it would be safe to entrust guardians with that power?—On the certificate of a medical man.

10414. On that alone, or would you have an Order of a Justice in addition to that?—No, I do not think I should go to that expense.

10415. Purely on the certificate of a medical man?—Yes, because a case can always take its discharge from a workhouse infirmary if it wishes.

10416. That was just such a case, I suppose, in which you would like to have an extension of the Act of 1867 for compulsory detention?—Yes.

10417. Under those circumstances, do not you think it is desirable that there should be an Order of a Justice?—If it is for compulsory detention in a workhouse after admission; but in the first place, I do not think an Order of a Justice is necessary.

10418. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Compulsory removal has no effect without compulsory detention, has it?—Yes, I think so, because, as soon as the case becomes well enough, if it ever becomes well enough, it might want to discharge itself.

10419. The same motive that induces a patient to remain outside would induce him or her to leave the infirmary the first moment he or she could get out of bed?—No, I do not think so at all. My experience is that when these people are brought in or persuaded to come into the workhouse, their only regret is that they did not come in before.

Nationalization of indoor-relief.

14020. (*Mr. Nunn.*) At the end of your Memorandum you just touch upon the most interesting question of the nationalisation of infirmaries and hospitals. I do not know whether you intend us to go further into that. Is it part of your suggestion or apprehension that hospitals and workhouse infirmaries should all be treated on the same lines by some central body?—No; a personal impression in the first place which has never been officially enunciated, is, that indoor relief should be a national charge with a central control as regards expenditure.

10421. But with the intention that Poor Law relief in an infirmary should not be any less eligible than relief in a hospital?—I do not know that I carried it quite as far as that.

10422. You do not mean that?—I do not carry it so far as that. I have not done so yet.

Question of deterrence Medical Relief.

10423. Have you considered in what ways medical relief within the walls of an infirmary can be made less eligible than in a hospital. Loss of liberty hardly counts, does it, to people who are deprived of their freedom?—I think it would be more from an administrative point of view, and, of course, the disabilities, as regards a person who was in good health, of disenfranchisement.

10424. I was thinking now of the sick in infirmaries. It is difficult to see that their lot is any less eligible than the person who simply goes into a hospital. At present it is becoming less and less so?—From the strictly medical point of view, I do not think it should be any less eligible, and all reasonable expenditure for such cases is welcome in Poor Law.

10425. From the medical point of view, still, do you see any ways in which the condition of the pauper may be hedged in so as to make it less eligible?—I do not think you can make any restriction from a medical point of view. Our point of view is that you must do your best for the individual, no matter in what class they may live or what class they may come from.

10426. You think we shall have to accept the position that the workhouse infirmary is to be made just as eligible as an ordinary hospital?—As regards the medical and nursing attention.

10427. That is practically all, is not it? That means practically everything to the patient?—No, the cost of the equipment is very different, or may be made different without any hardship on the individual patient.

10428. You mean the comfort of the surroundings?—Yes.

10429. All that has an effect upon health, I suppose?—Yes, but I agree with my colleague, Dr. Downes, who has stated very fairly that the composition of the nursing staff has a very material effect upon the patient.

10430. Could you tell me any details or particulars in which a thoroughly good workhouse infirmary is less eligible than an ordinary hospital ward?—No, I do not think I could.

10431. You do not think it is?—No, not from a medical point of view.

10432. From any point of view. I do not see how you can have any other point of view when you have a patient in an infirmary ward?—I had not thought it out quite to the extreme that you put it, so that I cannot really say.

10433. The problem is an important one, of course, as bearing on the relation of pauperism and thrift?—Yes.

10434. If one gives working men no incentive to provide against sickness, in the form of these disabilities one is injuring a very great many, and it has a very important bearing on the character of the people at present. That is what I mean?—I quite agree, and that is one of my objections to making the Poor Law infirmaries take the place of the voluntary hospitals.

10435. You perceive that that is coming; you describe it as an evolution?—I believe that it is on the way, from what I have seen and heard in different parts of the country.

10436. You think that is coming, and you think there is no real method by which we can draw a distinction between the two?—Not from the medical point of view.

10437. (*Mr. Bentham.*) When a communication is sent to the Local Government Board from any Board of Guardians which involves a medical opinion, is that usually referred to you for your observation?—Usually.

10438. Not always?—Not always. What I mean by that is that sometimes I never see the plans for a workhouse infirmary till they are completed.

10439. Does no other medical man see the correspondence on behalf of the Board?—Not as far as I know.

10440. If it is with regard to a medical appointment, is that referred to you?—Not unless there is some special point in it that requires advice.

10441. Would the question of salary be considered a special point?—No.

10442. Many medical questions might be dealt with by the Board, then, without ever coming under your notice, or under the notice of any other medical man connected with the Local Government Board?—Certainly if they were considered to be questions of administration pure and simple.

10443. In paragraph 22 of your Memorandum, you refer to the Basingstoke Order as removing a difficulty in administration, where a superintendent nurse has control of the hospital. As I understand it, the Order limits the master and matron's duties with regard to visiting the hospital wards, and places that duty upon the superintendent nurse. Is not that very often acted upon in the absence of an Order?—Yes. The guardians have often to my knowledge given instructions to their master and matron not to visit, except some special occasion called for it, and in the majority of cases that works very well, and does not require any report being made to the Local Government Board.

10444. And no friction takes place in consequence?—No.

10445. Are there many workhouses of that kind?—I should not say that there are many; there are a fair number.

10446. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Did I rightly understand you to say the Board of Guardians are empowered to instruct their master and matron to that effect?—No, but they do do so, and where the thing is working harmoniously you can quite understand it would be inadvisable for the General Inspector to take any action.

10447. (*Mr. Bentham.*) It is really inadvisable on the part of the master and matron to object to it when they know the Local Government Board would probably issue such an Order?—That has become an understood thing.

10448. So it is acted on now in the absence of an Order generally?—Yes.

10449. Would not the separation in administration of the infirmaries and the workhouses generally be more easily effected if the workhouse accounts were simpler?—I should like to see workhouse accounts made very much simpler. I think there is a great waste of book-keeping, particularly in relation to the medical administration.

10450. I suppose you know that many boards of guardians are anxiously awaiting an Order of the Local Government Board on that point, are they not?—One has heard that for some years past.

10451. At the present time it is almost impossible for guardians to keep separate books and to know exactly what their sick inmates cost as apart from the ordinary inmates of the workhouse, where there is no absolute and complete separation of administration?—It practically amounts to that.

10452. With an Order simplifying the methods of keeping accounts, that difficulty could be removed somewhat, could it not?—I think so. I think you would be able to see at a glance then the costs of the respective departments.

10453. With regard to paragraph 25 of your memorandum and the supply of drugs, you recommend that there should be a compulsory Regulation that guardians should supply all the drugs. Have you come to that conclusion because of any complaints on the part of guardians that the medical officers do not supply proper drugs?—No. I have come to that conclusion from my own observation in different workhouses where I have seen cases that I have thought ought to be under drug treatment of one kind or another, and those drugs happen to be expensive drugs, and they are not included in the agreement made with the medical officer to supply expensive drugs, and he has never taken sufficient interest to ask his guardians to supply those drugs.

10454. Is there not also a danger on the other hand of the medical officer experimenting with new and expensive drugs that he would not use on his own private patients, in the first place because of the expense, and in the second place because of the effect it might have?—No, I have sufficient faith in my colleagues that they would not do so.

10455. Is it not true that the most expensive drugs known are used in workhouse infirmaries at the present time?—In some of the larger infirmaries it is so, I think, without a doubt.

16456. That is, of course, entirely in the hands of the medical officer, is it not?—Yes.

10457. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Does the medical officer's salary include the drugs in many cases?—Yes, in the majority of cases in England and Wales.

10458. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I ought to have made it clear in my question that I meant that when the drugs are found and paid for by the guardians the most expensive drugs are used?—I know several instances where that is so.

Insufficient salaries of District Medical Officers and proposed standard scale of salaries

10459. In paragraph 25, speaking on the salaries of medical officers, you attribute the miserable and inadequate salaries to their own want of cohesion as a working body of men?—Yes.

10460. What do you mean by that?—As an example, perhaps I had better state my own experience. I was a candidate for an outdoor medical officership, and a colleague of mine offered to do the work for nothing for one year if he was appointed, and afterwards at a much less salary than I asked for.

10461. That is not usual amongst medical men, is it, it is very rare?—I am afraid it is not so much so now as it used to be in days gone by.

10462. In paragraph 30 you speak of the standardisation of salaries of medical officers. What basis had you in your mind upon which they could be standardised?—The number of patients, calculated on a report for the past five or ten years, that a man would have to attend.

10463. That is outdoor medical officers?—Yes.

10464. Would the basis be founded on the number of patients they deal with, or the number of visits they pay?—On the number of patients they deal with, the same as a club salary is computed.

10465. Would not that be likely to lead in the direction of paying so much per head for them, if the salary were calculated upon that basis?—It might lead that way but I do not think that it would; because you would, of course, find at once there would be abuses of the payment per case.

10466. You think it would be a mistake if that were so?—I do.

10467. With regard to outdoor relief, would you also agree to the principle that the guardians ought to provide the drugs, or do you think the medical officer should provide them?—In large urban unions, I think the guardians should supply the drugs; in the rural unions, of course, that would be an impossibility.

10468. You do that purely in the interests of the patient?—I do.

Inadvisability of Out-Relief for phthisis cases

10469. In paragraph 38 you say no case of phthisis pulmonalis should be treated by outdoor medical relief. Do you think the guardians ought only to order indoor treatment in those cases?—No, I think that as the matter stands at present you cannot compel them to go in. It would all depend upon whether phthisis pulmonalis is to be a compulsory notification. What I meant by my paragraph 38 was that from the medical

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

point of view it is impossible to treat properly, with out-door medical relief, a case of phthisis pulmonalis. The reasons are very obvious why you cannot.

10470. You would advise guardians to take all such cases inside ?—I should.

Separate wards for phthisis cases

10471. Following that, you would also advise guardians that it was their duty to provide special wards for those patients ?—Yes.

10472. In order to protect the other inmates of the establishment ?—Yes ; I think that the guardians, generally speaking, throughout the country are beginning to realise that there must be separate accommodation for the treatment of the indoor cases.

10473. And for hopeless cases you think that could be done practically in every workhouse infirmary by setting a ward apart for the purpose ?—It is already done in a great many cases.

10474. So that that difficulty is already met ?—It is. We have some plans now under consideration for an addition to a workhouse infirmary, a new block, where they are making special provision for such cases.

Question of disfranchisement upon Medical Relief.

10475. Has not your admission that cases of that kind should not be disfranchised led you into the position that all Poor Law sick cases should be under the same category. Have you thought that out ?—Personally, that always has been in my mind, but I have never thought it out to the extreme that the Poor Law ought to provide for those cases without disfranchisement.

10476. I mean the fact that you say that a case of that kind ought not to be disfranchised has led you into the position of thinking that no person who is treated inside through sickness ought to be disfranchised. You cannot draw the line really, can you ?—I would rather answer that question in this way, that it is a question which bristles with difficulties, and there are various sides from which to look at it.

10477. But in answering Mr. Lansbury's questions you have already committed yourself ?—Purely from a medical point of view, I said.

10478. It was not from a medical point of view the questions were put ?—I rather hoped I made it clear that my answers were to that effect.

10479. The question involved is whether we should any longer expect people to provide against their own sickness of any kind rather than depend upon the public to be provided for in all respects ?—I think that the case of phthisis and the case of a broken leg, if you look at it from an administrative point of view, are two different questions altogether. The case of phthisis is not going to be cured in six or eight weeks, and you can cure a broken leg, or a similar case, in that time.

10480. Now you are drawing a line which you did not draw before ?—That is from an administrative point of view.

10481. You have already admitted that you cannot draw the line between one case of sickness treated in a workhouse infirmary and another ?—From a medical point of view.

10482. The medical point of view is not in question at this moment, it is the social point of view as to whether a person should be deprived of his franchise if treated for one class of illness and not deprived of it if treated for another class of illness. I want you to show me where you would draw the line, if you can draw one ?—When I wrote these paragraphs in relation to phthisis cases, what was in my mind was that hitherto we have had very rarely what are called curable cases, or cases in the first stages of phthisis pulmonalis, under treatment by Poor Law medical officers, or in Poor Law medical institutions.

10483. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Did I not understand the distinction to be, as you stated it just now, that in phthisis you simply have to maintain a man under certain conditions for a year, or years, perhaps, and in the case of a man with a broken leg you simply have to cure him as quickly as possible, which may be done in a few weeks ?—That is a medical point of difference.

10484. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You think that a person who is treated in the interests of public health for a certain disease ought to have no disabilities any more than if he were suffering from any other infectious disease ? Is that the whole of your point ?—As I said before, the answer bristles with difficulties, and you have to approach it from so many different points of view that I do not see that I can give you a definite answer.

10485. You do not limit it to the line as I have just stated it ?—I should like to answer the question by a statement that because a person is suffering from scarlet fever, and he is treated in a public hospital, he should not necessarily be disfranchised for it.

10486. Therefore you think that a person suffering from phthisis, which is also an infectious disease, ought not to suffer any disability from it either. Is that what you mean ?—I have made that statement.

10487. For the same reason as a person suffering from fever ?—I have made that statement, that it is a question of public health and not Poor Law.

10488. You do not go beyond that ?—Certainly not.

10489. Cases which are treated under Poor Law and not in the interests of public health, but in the interests of the individual, should be as at present ?—I think that only the incurable cases of phthisis pulmonalis should be treated under the Poor Law, because they would never again be restored to the community at large.

Report of Department Committee on Workhouse Nursing : Minor Training Schools for Nurses.

10490. With regard to workhouse nursing in paragraph 63, you refer to the Nursing Committee's Report of 1902.* In that Report minor training schools are recommended. Do you approve of minor training schools ?—I approve of minor training schools in so far as by their establishment we should have a class of nurses provided who would stay a reasonable time as nurses in the smaller workhouses where now it is impossible to give any inducement whatever for a trained nurse, or a nurse who has had any training, to stay for any reasonable time.

10491. She would not be really a fully-trained nurse, only having been trained in a minor training school, not having the same facilities for training as in a higher or major training school, as it might be termed ; therefore it is a creation, is it not, of an inferior class of nurse ?—Not a creation ; I think it is simply an adoption from another country. That class of nurse has been found, from what Sir Henry Robinson said before the Departmental Committee, to work very well in Ireland, and, if you notice, the nurses I mentioned are called nurse attendants in my evidence-in-chief.

10492. That would mean that if country nurses are to start in workhouses of that grade, people who are sick in those workhouses would not get the same skilled treatment as those who are sick elsewhere ?—They would get very much better nursing treatment and skilled treatment under the conditions which are suggested in this Report of the Departmental Committee than they do at present.

10493. Then you agree with the Report of the Departmental Committee in that respect ?—I do absolutely.

Cottage Homes for Children.

10494. On page 4 you speak of the housing of Poor Law children over the age of three years. Really that does not come within your Department, does it ?—I have to inspect these cottage homes and such like grouped homes and scattered homes, occasionally from time to time.

10495. You express an opinion in these paragraphs with regard to the treatment of Poor Law children over three, which is clearly not a medical question ?—I think the treatment of children under three years of age is essentially a medical question.

10496. This is over three ?—It happens to be a question to which I have devoted a certain amount of attention, quite apart from my official position.

10497. In paragraph 64 you refer to some children who were boarded-out at a cottage home in another union within a short distance of a thickly populated area : these children were removed from a workhouse where you considered they were properly cared for, and that they could not be so well cared for at the cottage homes in the other union they were removed to ?—That is so.

10498. What were the cottage homes like ?—They were grouped homes.

* Cd. 1366-1902.

10499. Are we to understand in this particular case the grouped home treatment is not so good as the workhouse treatment was?—Not in that particular case.

10500. Does not the board recommend the removal of all children from workhouses, however small in number?—As a general recommendation and a general matter of policy.

10501. Was the fault here because of the cottage homes not being so well managed as they ought to be?—It was the fault of the person who was appointed; there, again, comes in the personal question.

10502. The personal appointment?—Yes, the man appointed.

10503. The management of the homes?—Exactly.

10504. We should not infer, I think, that that was the explanation from this paragraph just as it stands. In paragraph 66 you refer to large villa residences or boarding-houses, or so-called cottage homes; that is the only class of homes you are referring to again, the grouped cottage home, is it not?—Not always now, because some of the grouped cottage homes are much smaller than they used to be.

10505. It is with reference to cottage homes, grouped or scattered, generally, you are speaking? Do I take it you do not approve of that system of dealing with children?—No, except in individual cases. I agree with the general principle of the scattered or the grouped homes, either. To use a hackneyed expression: "What'ere is best administered is best."

10506. In paragraph 73 you refer to the Dietary Order with respect to children under three years of age. Where the workhouse medical officer has not fixed any diet for these children under three, which you give us to understand in this paragraph happens sometimes, how are they dieted?—Sometimes at the discretion of matron.

10507. That would be quite regular, would it?—It is not regular according to the regulations. I make that a point in my evidence.

10508. In the Dietary Order there is no medical dietary for children under three?—No, I do not advocate one for one moment.

10509. Then the matron really would have to form a dietary of her own?—No, I say it is the duty of the medical officer, that these children ought to be considered as sick persons, and that their diet ought to rest entirely under the medical officer's directions.

10510. That, of course, is the fault of the medical officer?—I think I make that clear, that they are very apathetic in this matter.

10511. In paragraph 82 you refer to the recent scientific investigations with regard to food values, and I take it they might affect your opinion upon the dietaries that are in vogue at the present time. Is that so?—I think that the investigation which was conducted by Professor Chittenden, which has been commented upon by Sir Michael Foster and Dr. Hopkins of Cambridge, and also Dr. Robert Hutchison, tends to the outcome that we are eating too much meat as a whole, and, therefore, in Poor Law diets we can reduce the quantity of meat without any harm resulting to the persons so dieted.

10512. You would recommend an alteration in the dietaries at the present time, would you?—On the lines I propose in paragraph 82.

10513. Practically all the inmates of a workhouse now are dieted by the medical officer, are they not?—All the inmates in the sick wards.

10514. If you look at Article X. of the Order, it says: "It shall be the duty of the medical officer for the workhouse, for the purposes of classification under this Order, to examine each inmate as to his or her physical condition and fitness for employment, on the admission of such inmate, and at such other times as may be necessary, either in pursuance of any regulations, prescribed by us, or by the guardians, or upon an application of such inmate, and to certify the result of such examination in the workhouse medical officer's Report book." Does not that really leave the diet entirely in the hands of the medical officer?—It might be so construed, but as a matter of practice it is not so. The inmate comes into the receiving ward and is put on a diet by the master.

10515. Where they have a resident medical officer it always forms part of his duty?—I hope so.

10516. Therefore, the resident medical officer would put down the diet which those persons should have?—He should do so.

10517. If he does so, then really all the inmates are dieted by the medical officer?—Subject to the statement on page 6 of that Order, at the bottom of Regulation 1, as well as the first four lines of the regulation and Art. III. It is of "Schedule A. Part 1. Regulations."

10518. In actual practice, where there is a resident medical officer, the whole of the inmates are placed on the respective diets by him, are they not?—I should think that that would be the practice. I am not conversant with the practice of the whole of the workhouses so administered.

10519. The whole responsibility practically rests in the hands of the medical officer for the class in which each inmate shall be classified?—For the purpose of diet.

Classification of Workhouse inmates by diet.

10520. Really the classification is on diet now, is it not?—It practically amounts to that.

Effect of Dietary Order on economy of food.

10521. With regard to the waste of food under the present Dietary Order, do you think it is more economical than the old form of dietary, where the guardians made their own and submitted them to the Local Government Board for approval?—Yes, I think so, as a whole.

10522. You think it tends to less waste?—It does, certainly.

10523. Do you think if those restrictions as to quantity were removed, it might tend even to a greater waste still, by an excess of food being allowed?—No, I should say it would tend rather the other way, that the master of the workhouse, desiring to show a considerable saving in the feeding of the inmates, would be inclined to restrict the quantities given.

10524. You think it might possibly be detrimental to the inmates?—I think so. It would be really going back to the old times before there was any prescribed dietary.

10525. The prescribed dietary is really in the interests of the inmates, is it not?—Yes, I think one may take it so, generally speaking; and the interests of the ratepayers.

Proposed reduction of diets.

10526. (*Professor Smart.*) In regard to paragraph 82, you think that there might be a not inconsiderable saving in the way you indicate, by reducing the meat allowances?—I count the meat allowance as being part of a ration that you can reduce without reducing in any very material quantity the bulk. These people have always been accustomed to having bulky rations, and they would feel it a hardship to have anything taken from them that would make a difference to the bulk.

10527. Do you really mean bulk and not weight?—Yes, I mean as regards the amount of food in bulk that they take rather than the amount by weight.

10528. The substitution of vegetables would make it more pleasant, perhaps?—I would not propose the substitution of anything; I would simply propose the reduction in the meat allowances, at present at any rate.

10529. You speak of "vegetable soups"; would they be substituted for meat soups?—They would be made by simply taking out the meat allowances as specified in the ingredient tables added to the Order.

10530. And substituting vegetables for the meat?—There are already vegetables there, and I do not think it would be necessary to make any increase in them.

10531. Has this suggestion been put before the Local Government Board in any form?—Not at present.

10532. Do you not think it should be?—That is a matter for conference with my colleague, Dr. Downes.

10533. It is only through the Local Government Board that any change like this could be made then?—I daresay you will regard this paragraph, and indeed the greater part of my statement-in-chief as an *obiter dictum* on my part.

Inspection of Workhouse Children.

10534. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In paragraph 13, you speak of inspecting the children in workhouse schools; do you inspect the inmates of the workhouses as well as the

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

children in the schools?—Not unless the general inspector requests me to do so, or I get some special instructions from the Local Government Board to do so.

10535. Your instructions are different on that point as regards workhouses and schools, are they?—Yes, as far as regards any instructions at all; I am to inspect infirmaries and the children in the workhouse nurseries.

10536. You say they do not come within the purview of the medical inspector of the education authority; is that an inspection which is carried out at all systematically?—I should not like to say that, as I am not conversant with the education authority's directions.

Different methods of supplying drugs.

10537. With regard to the question of supplying drugs; what different systems have you come across?—In workhouses or outside?

10538. First of all in workhouses?—In the workhouses, in the majority of cases, the medical officer's salary is supposed to include the supply of drugs; but in the larger workhouse infirmaries the guardians almost invariably find the drugs for use in the workhouse and in the infirmary.

10539. When they find the drugs, what system do they adopt; do they keep a stock by them, for instance, or do they buy as required?—As a rule there is a stock kept.

10540. Do you find a danger from that, owing to the drugs getting old and stale?—I have never had my attention drawn to that, though, of course, it is likely. The actual control of the drug supply is in the hands of a committee of the guardians. The medical officer in the first place makes a requisition, which probably goes through the steward if it is a large infirmary, or through the clerk in the ordinary way to this committee of the guardians, and they have the power to strike out any drug or any article that is requisitioned for, quite irrespective of the medical officer's recommendation.

10541. With regard to out-door medical relief, and the drugs in that case, what systems are in vogue?—I might say that in almost every district the salary of the district medical officer includes the supply of drugs. In some cases, such as the Cardiff union, the Cheltenham union, the Birmingham union, the Wolverhampton union, and a good many more that I could mention, there is a dispensary system. It is not always the case that the outdoor patient attends at the dispensary, but the prescription given to the recipients of out-medical relief is dispensed by this particular dispensary.

10542. Would the dispensary be an office of the guardians, or would there be a chemist who is appointed so to speak, as dispenser?—As a rule the dispensary is an office of the guardians.

10543. They would have an office at which there would be a store of drugs kept?—Yes. There are cases in which local chemists do make up prescriptions in that sort of way, but they are very few.

10544. That is to say, the owner of a particular chemist's shop would be appointed dispenser?—No.

10545. Then would they pay so much for each prescription that was made up?—I believe they would pay so much.

10546. You say that it is impossible to adopt such a system in rural unions; what are the difficulties?—The distances which the people would have to travel in order to get their medicines.

10547. Is that, do you think, a serious difficulty as compared with the present system?—Supposing this system was to be adopted in the rural unions, I do not think the advantages would be at all commensurate with the expense that the improvement would lead to.

10548. Would it really make such change in the system by which they now get their medicines?—Yes, because I do not think that there would be a dispensary for every particular district; I think that there would be a dispensary for a union, or a dispensary in two parts of the union, while the union may be divided into six or seven medical districts.

Combination of Unions to deal with phthisis.

10549. With regard to cases of phthisis, you propose that there should be more classification of unions; have you any experience of unions combining for those purposes?—The only case that I can quote is the combination of Toxteth Park, the Liverpool Select Vestry, and the West Derby union.

10550. How many beds does their institution contain—I think it is twenty-five, is it not?—I was going to say twenty or twenty-five.

10551. Is that really an adequate provision for the three unions which it represents?—No.

10552. That is to say, it does not take nearly all the cases?—No, it does not.

Provision phthisis a Liverpool Chorlton.

10553. I have looked into that particular case; on what principle of selection do they go, do you know?—The selection of cases rests with the three medical officers of the different unions, who are appointed to attend to this matter.

10554. Do they refer to curable cases?—As a rule, I believe, they try to select curable cases.

10555. And only curable cases?—Only those.

10556. You are familiar with the Chorlton workhouse of Withington, I presume?—To a certain extent, yes.

10557. Do you know the phthisis ward there?—Yes, but I cannot tell you the exact situation of it; I know that there is one.

10558. Do you think there is a very great advantage from a medical point of view in the case of Liverpool over a ward like that at Chorlton which is specially built and equipped for phthisical patients?—Speaking strictly from the medical point of view, I think so.

10559. You do think there is a great advantage?—Judging by results, one would be inclined to think so; but then, of course, the Heswall Sanatorium has hardly been in existence long enough for one to make a definite statement about it.

County Sanatori for phthi

10560. Do you think it would be possible to make the proposal, or to get it carried out, that the county should be the unit for the purpose of providing such a sanatorium?—There again comes in the question of the public health point of view; and I am supposed only to deal with the Poor Law.

Risk of infection from phth in Workhou Infirmari

10561-2. You say with regard to phthisical cases that they are better not treated in the patient's own home; do you think there is any danger of infection in an ordinary workhouse infirmary from introducing a phthisical patient?—Yes, and I could give you instances.

10563. Take the ordinary workhouse infirmary ward, which contains people who are suffering from senile decay; is the risk of their catching it great?—No, the risk is reduced to the minimum in those cases.

10564. It is not anything like so great a danger as the danger of leaving the case at large?—I should say not.

10565. Have you much experience of out-door medical relief?—As an official of the Local Government Board very little, except when sitting on inquiries.

10566. But you were an out-door medical officer?—Yes, once I was.

10567. Might I ask in what part of England?—In the union of Northampton.

Nursing out-door paupers.

10568. Do you think on the whole that the nursing in the case of out-door medical relief is adequate?—In those years I should say it certainly was not.

10569. Have you any proposals that you could make with regard to its improvement?—I think the guardians as a rule, taking the country as a whole, are availing themselves of the district nurses to ensure better nursing for their out-relief medical cases.

10570. The district nurses being supplied from voluntary sources?—They are supplied by the voluntary associations.

10571. Do you think that is covering the ground?—I think it does better than the guardians being allowed to appoint nurses for their own out-medical relief districts.

10572. Do you think that the administration of out-door medical relief is satisfactory as a whole; that is, do you think the patients are well and sufficiently attended, or do you hear many complaints on that score?—Unofficially, one is constantly hearing complaints.

Duties of Medical Inspector

10573. (*Dr. Downes.*) With regard to your duties I think they are governed by the Minute of Mr. Sclater-Booth which you put in?—I believe so.

10574. That has laid down the conditions under which you make your reports?—The conditions are laid down in the Minute of Mr. Sclater-Booth promulgated in 1878,

and also in Mr. Ritchie's Minute, which originally was only of temporary application, but is now generally construed to govern my appointment.

10575. The present procedure is dependent on the Minutes of those two Presidents, is it not ?—That is so.

10576. I think you have stated that in addition to the inspection of the workhouses, you do from time to time inspect Poor Law schools in the provinces ?—Frequently.

10577. Could you tell us whether you are satisfied with the ophthalmic state of those schools at the present time ?—My knowledge of them, with the exception of one in Lancashire, is about three years old.

10578. Take your latest knowledge ?—No, I am not, my notes were not satisfactory on that score.

10579. Is there any provision in the provinces for dealing with ophthalmic cases similar to that which now exists in London ?—Except in the case of the Liverpool Select Vestry, none.

10580. What do the Liverpool Select Vestry do ?—They have provided a separate hospital, or what they term a cottage hospital, for the treatment of these cases.

10581. Is that sufficient for their purpose ?—I have not inspected it since it has been opened, so I cannot say.

10582. Do you know what is the accommodation ?—I forget that.

10583. Do you consider that some such provision is desirable ?—I think in large unions where ophthalmia is prevalent, such as those of Manchester and Liverpool, it is.

10584. What do they usually do with the ophthalmic children in the country infirmaries ?—They treat them in the ordinary wards.

10585. Can they educate them there ?—As a rule there is no provision made for their education.

10586. Would that answer apply also to cases of ringworm in many instances ?—Yes, and to almost all cases that are detained in the workhouse sick wards, or in the infirmaries for any length of time as sick cases. Of course, there are some instances, such as at the Chase Farm Schools of the Edmonton Union, where special provision is made for the education of the children that are under treatment in that way.

10587. But that is exceptional ?—Those cases where provision is made for education are very few—not more than five or six.

10588. It is a difficult matter, is it not, for the guardians to provide education for isolated cases of that character? —I think so, very.

10589. Is there any class of sick for which you think special provision should be made in the provincial districts? —In the case of children suffering from tuberculosis in different forms, I certainly think that they ought to have the benefit of the "open air" treatment.

10590. Then you think that more special accommodation for that class is required ?—I do think so—in the urban unions more particularly.

10591. Have you considered how such accommodation could best be provided ?—I have made recommendations in one or two cases.

10592. On what general lines ?—On the lines that the Liverpool Select Vestry have proceeded on quite recently.

10593. That is a particular union providing for its own cases ?—That is a particular union providing for the treatment of tuberculosis amongst young children.

10594. Assuming buildings might suit the special conditions should you favour taking in cases from other unions?—I think that that would be an admirable arrangement.

10595. On the principle of payment by agreement ?—Yes.

10596. Do you find the treatment of surgical cases in the country workhouses satisfactory ?—Not in the country workhouses as country workhouses; but in some of the provincial unions I think that the treatment of surgical cases is of the very best possible class.

10597. It is easier for the guardians of a large union to make proper provision than it is for the guardians of a small union, is it not ?—Certainly.

10598. What is usually done in the small unions with regard to the operative cases ?—If the inmates can be persuaded to be moved to a general hospital, they are moved, and in very rare cases the guardians empower their medical officer to call in surgical assistance. Of course, in some cases the workhouse medical officers themselves operate. *Dr. Andrew Fuller.* 24 April 1906.

10599. Do you find that the improved nursing generally facilitates the performance of operations which formerly could not be done safely in workhouses ?—I am very decidedly of that opinion. I have frequently expressed real pleasure in finding the nursing staff so very much improved as to enable that sort of thing to be done, where it was not possible before.

10600. You mention in your memorandum the question of the remuneration of the medical officers, which you regard in many cases as inadequate; is it not the fact that the cost of medical education has considerably increased since the General Consolidated Order was drawn up in 1847 ?—Yes, and not only that, but within the last ten years it has very considerably increased. Inadequacy of Medical Officers' Salaries and increased cost of drugs and of medical training.

10601. The duration of the curriculum has been extended ?—Yes.

10602. And the cost is enhanced in various ways ?—Yes.

10603. Is it not also the fact that the cost of medical and surgical treatment is greater nowadays and tends to become greater ?—I think so, throughout the country, in any union where what I term proper medical and surgical treatment is given.

10604. And that, quite apart from any question of experiments with new drugs ?—Yes.

10605. Are there not new drugs which have an established reputation, which nevertheless are very expensive drugs ?—That is so.

10606. Take the case of anti-toxin—anti-toxin is a very costly drug, is it not ?—It is.

10607. I think I saw in a current medical journal an estimate that a case would cost from £1 to 30s. ?—I believe that is so. I think I may say that the Local Government Board frequently have applications from different boards of guardians for authority to defray the cost of this particular use of anti-toxin.

10608. So that a medical officer's salary may have been fixed some years age, but since that salary was fixed the cost of treatment may have materially advanced ?—I think it has very materially advanced.

10609. And yet it may be part of the medical officer's contract and agreement to provide everything that is required ?—Even so, and that with recent appointments within the last twelve months.

10610. Do you, of your own knowledge, know that there are cases where that may act prejudicially to the patient ? —Yes; I could give illustrations, but I should prefer not to give names, naturally. About three weeks ago I was inspecting a workhouse, and I noticed a case in bed; I asked the medical officer what the case was, and he told me that it was a case suffering from syphilitic disease, and apparently, from what he said, it was curable. I asked him if the case was having drug treatment. He said, "No, I cannot afford it; my salary is not sufficiently adequate for me to find the expensive drugs necessary." I asked him then whether he had reported this matter to his guardians, and he said, "No," and I advised him to do so. Evils arising from inadequate salaries of Medical Officers and suggested remedy.

10611. (*Chairman.*) Is that the only case ?—That is the latest case. I think that is a very good example of cases that frequently come under my notice.

10612. Of cases, that is, which have come under your notice previously ?—Yes.

10613. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Do you know what the salary was ?—Not in that particular case.

10614. (*Dr. Downes.*) With regard to the payment of fees for extra services, I think that is under consideration ? —I believe so.

10615. Can you suggest any remedy for this state of things which we have just been discussing, namely, the under-payment of medical officers ?—As a matter of fact, I am in favour of the repayment of the whole salary in the

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

case of resident assistant medical officers, and of part repayment of the salary in the case of the ordinary visiting medical officers or the district medical officers.

10616. Somewhat on the principle which has been adopted in the case of other medical services?—Yes, particularly in the case of the public health.

10617. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I do not quite understand what repayment of the salary means here?—That instead of becoming a local charge, part payment is made out of, I believe, the national funds and part payment out of the local funds.

10618. (*Dr. Downes.*) By a grant-in-aid?—It practically amounts to a grant-in-aid.

Security of tenure of Medical Officer.

10619. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In return for that the medical officers of health cannot be got rid of except with the consent of the Local Government Board, I think; they are protected by the Local Government Board in consequence, are they not?—I should say so, but I am speaking off the book there.

10620. (*Dr. Downes.*) The Poor Law officer, I believe, is not removable except with the consent of the Local Government Board?—That is so.

10621. His appointment is also subject to the approval of the Local Government Board, is it not?—I think it is, in so far as approving of the payment of the salary; I do not know that the Local Government Board ever exercise any discretionary power as to the appointment of the individual *qua* the individual.

10622. There is a formal approval, is there not?—Yes, there is.

10623. The salary is practically fixed by the guardians?—I believe so in almost all cases.

10624. I am speaking of the provinces?—In the provinces it is so.

Function of Local Government Board as to salaries of Medical Officers.

10625. What power would the Local Government Board have to regulate any salary in the provinces, if the guardians were unwilling to do so themselves; are you aware of any?—I am not aware of any, except a power of suggestion and personal interview on the part of the general inspector.

10626. Such powers as are in the possession of the Local Government Board for that purpose are not of a practical character?—I think not,

10627. In regard to the questions that were asked you about the salaries of medical officers being regulated by the Local Government Board, I dare say you are aware that in London there is a fund known as the Common Poor Fund?—Yes.

10628. Which places the matter on really a different footing, I think?—I believe so.

Concerted action by Medical Officers as to inadequacy of their salaries.

10629. In paragraph 25 of your memorandum, to which we have just been referring, you attribute the unsatisfactory state of the salaries in some cases to the want of cohesion of the medical profession as a working body of men; am I right in supposing that there have lately been certain cases in which there has been more cohesion on their part?—I think that the tendency is now more towards establishing a "trade unionism," as it were, among medical men in relation to these appointments.

10630. There is a case at the present time, is there not; it has been reported in the public press, so there is no secrecy about it?—There are two cases. One is the case of the medical officer for the workhouse in the Aberystwith Union, and the other is the case of the medical officer for the Bangor workhouse.

10631. They are both matters of public knowledge, are they not?—They are.

Cases of Bangor and Aberystwith

10632. Will you shortly state what the facts are in those cases?—At Aberystwith, the medical officer, I believe, was in receipt of a salary of £30 a year; he asked for an increase, and the guardians declined to give it, without giving any reason. The medical officer, as a protest, resigned. Then the guardians asked him to resign all his other Poor Law appointments; he refused, and the Local Government Board supported him in that refusal.

10633. Have the guardians appointed anybody to the workhouse?—As a temporary measure they came to terms with the local voluntary hospital committee to allow their house surgeon to attend at the workhouse at intervals. This arrangement is to expire at the end of this month, and, as far as one knows, there is no other possible arrangement to be made.

10634. Do you know whether the British Medical Association have taken any action in the matter?—The British Medical Association took action from the very beginning, and, I believe, wrote through the secretary of the Local Association to all the medical men in practice in the district, asking them not to apply for the appointment.

10635. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is the appointment that of the workhouse medical officer?—Yes.

10636. How many inmates are there in that workhouse?—About seventy, I think. It is some time since I visited Aberystwith, so I am not quite sure about the numbers. The numbers in Knight's Directory do not always correspond with the actual numbers in the house.

10637. (*Dr. Downes.*) It is not a very large place, is it?—No.

10638. I do not know whether you would care to give the details of the Bangor case?—The Bangor case is one where the medical officer had to resign for various reasons; I think the Local Government Board called upon him to resign. The guardians offered what the British Medical Association, that is, the local association, considered an inadequate salary. There again, representations were made to all the local medical men not to apply for the appointment, and no one applied. The guardians have now re-advertised the appointment, with an increase of £20, and the local association consider that £70 per annum, which is now offered, is an adequate salary, so there is no restriction, or no suggested restriction, upon application.

10639. So that there are two recent cases in which there appears to be some action on the part of the medical profession as an organised body?—In the provinces; I believe those are the only two cases that have happened during my term of office as medical inspector.

Effect of Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act.

10640. You had, previous to your appointment, some experience of out-door medical relief; have you any recollection of any change which followed the passing of the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act?—Yes. In the first twelve months of my appointment the number of cases that I had to see as a district medical officer amounted to twelve or thirteen in the course of the week, but these gradually mounted up till I had a list of twenty-five to thirty cases. Then I wrote a protest to the local authorities, saying that I did not consider some of these cases should be treated as out medical relief cases, and they replied with a suggestion that I should apply for an increase of salary, and I did so. I was informed by the clerk to that union that the guardians did not consider that any opinion of mine as to whether these cases should be treated as out medical relief cases came within my province, as I was not a relieving officer.

10641. To what did you attribute that increase in the number of cases?—To the passing of the Act to prevent medical relief disqualifying a person from voting. That Act was passed in 1885. Rightly or wrongly, I put it down to that; not that it happened within the next year—I believe it was two years after the passing of the Act—but it became known that it did not disqualify about that time in that particular union.

10642. Do you know whether it was that the people applied more readily or that the orders were given more readily?—I think that it was both. It gradually became known that the Guardians did not refuse, neither did their relieving officer refuse to give orders for out medical relief.

Workhouse Infirmaries under *quasi* separate administration.

10643. On the question of the separation of the infirmary administration from the workhouse, in your experience you have had to deal with infirmaries administered on quite a different basis, have you not?—Yes.

10644. Are not some of the largest infirmaries and some of the best in the provinces administered without any order other than the General Consolidated Order?—Yes. I have mentioned one in particular, the Crumpsall workhouse infirmary—the infirmary in Manchester township. There is no order relating to the administra-

tion of that infirmary, and yet it is administered for all practical purposes on separate infirmary lines.

10645. And satisfactorily so, I understand?—Judging by inspection, most satisfactorily. I might mention other unions, and I have refrained from mentioning one that I had in my mind and have had always in my mind for about ten years; that is the Bradford (in Yorkshire) workhouse infirmary.

10646. Is that administered on similar lines?—Yes.

10647. So that it is perfectly possible to have a satisfactory separate infirmary without the very definite regulations from the central authority?—I think so. I think the administration of almost all the institutions, whether they are large or small, depends entirely upon the personal equation of the different officers concerned. If they choose to work amicably, they can work amicably, in spite of the so-called strict regulations.

10648. Would you apply that to the case of the smaller workhouses too?—Yes, as a whole; but in the small workhouses there appears to me to be more time for personal feeling to have some bearing upon the administration.

10649. And perhaps there is less separation of departments in a small workhouse?—Of course that is so—very much less.

Administration of Workhouse Infirmaries with visiting Medical Officers.

10650. Then with regard to the administration of the infirmary itself, you have mentioned to us that in some of them the medical staff are partly visiting medical officers; in some cases, I believe those visiting medical officers are men of high consulting rank in their profession?—They are.

10651. Where you have a medical visiting staff, how do you regulate the supervision of the internal administration of the infirmary?—In the first place, the guardians define the duties, or are supposed to define the duties of their resident assistant medical officers; and if there happens to be a matron of the infirmary as distinct from the matron of the workhouse, the duties relating to administration are divided between the visiting medical officer and the matron rather than between him and the resident medical officer.

10652. What officer would there be to exercise a check on expenditure?—There would be a steward.

10653. Could he regulate the expenditure on sick diet or on the drugs or on costly surgical dressings?—No.

10654. It would be rather difficult, would it not, for him to do that?—Yes. He merely acts as an agent passing on the requisition of the medical officer for drugs and surgical dressings to the committee of the guardians. The committee of the guardians as a rule exercise the control.

Provision of Sick Diets under Dietary Order.

10655. If I remember rightly, in the Dietary Order there is a provision for workhouse medical officers to revise their sick diets from time to time, is there not?—Yes.

10656. Is that duty carried out?—Not as much as I should like it to be.

10657. Should you regard it as an important duty?—I think it is a most important duty.

10658. If it is not properly carried out, there may be considerable waste and extravagance, may there not?—Yes. One constantly finds that certain cases are not eating the diet that is ordered for them, and it is very obvious that they could not eat the diet.

10659. In these large separate infirmaries with visiting staffs, on whom should the duty fall of revising the diet?—In the first place on the resident medical officer, subject to the discretion of the visiting medical officer from time to time.

Medical Administration in Country Workhouses.

10660. In the small workhouses do you find sufficient care in the classification of the sick, with a view to economy of the more expensive infirmary beds?—No; I think that the medical administration in that respect as a rule in the country workhouse is very slack. There is no difference made. In some places you will find that the infirmary accommodation is taken up almost entirely with infirm cases, as distinct from chronic cases, or cases requiring the attention of a nurse by night and by day.

10661. That is to say, costly machinery is utilised to deal with cases that do not necessarily require such costly machinery?—Yes. *Dr. Andrew Fuller.*

24 April 1906.

10662. Is the remedy for that within the power of the guardians?—I should say so, certainly.

Number of Poor Law Nurses.

10663. In Paragraph 45 of your Memorandum you give a very interesting table showing the number of nurses; does that include the whole of the Kingdom, London and all, that is to say, is it for the provinces and London also?—Certain unions in London are included in the third table, the Separate Infirmary table.*

10664. Does it refer to the whole of England and Wales or to only a part of England and Wales?—It refers to the whole country plus one or two infirmaries outside the immediate metropolitan area. I believe a place like Croydon, for instance, is included in the columns under Separate Infirmaries. This was a return furnished to me by the B. department of the Local Government Board. When I revise the evidence I will make it clear to what it does refer.*

Departmental Committee on Workhouse Nursing. Recommendation as to minor training schools.

10665. You have been asked some questions about the recommendation of the Departmental Committee on Nursing as to minor training schools; am I right in stating that the recommendation there does not aim at the creation of an inferior class of nurse, but is rather intended to insure the regulated instruction of an existing class of nurse?—That is so.

10666. There are, as a matter of fact, places where they have so-called probationers, but no regulations for their instruction, I believe?—There are places where they have absolutely no regulations for their instruction, and what is more, where there is no instruction obtained at all, except what they may happen to pick up by rule of thumb from the superior officers, whoever they may happen to be.

10667. And that condition of things, I believe, is not entirely confined to the Poor Law?—I understand so.

10668. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you think it advisable that nurses should be trained in institutions of that kind, that is, in small workhouse hospitals?—No. There are some workhouses that have probationers to-day that I do not think at all suitable for the purpose, but there are no regulations forbidding their appointment. If the guardians like to appoint probationers they can do so. Speaking from the one point of view that half a loaf is better than no loaf, it is better that the people should be nursed by probationers than, as they used to be under the old conditions, by people who had absolutely no training and had no appreciation of responsibility in the care of the inmates.

10669. Would this system of minor training schools include those places as being proper places for training nurses according to the regulations?—No. It would give the general inspectors and Dr. Downes and myself the power of restricting these places in number, according to what we thought they should be as regards the materiel that was available for the training.

Provision for venereal cases.

10670. (*Dr. Downes.*) In speaking of the special classes of the sick, I omitted to ask you whether you had anything to say on the supervision made for lock cases in the different workhouses that you visit; is it done satisfactorily, or have you any suggestions to offer on the subject?—I have in some cases. In some large workhouses I have made suggestions that there should be separate provision. One is in favour of those cases where possible being sent to hospitals such as the Lock Hospital at Paddington Green.

10671. But that is not always possible, is it?—No. In a large union, or in any union, I think those cases ought to be kept entirely separate from the ordinary sick.

10672. Should you be in favour of their being dealt with as a special class, if there was any combination of unions or any arrangements for dealing with special classes?—I think that would be an admirable arrangement, and I do not think that any pleas, such as that of the hardship of being separated from their relations and being too far out of reach of their relations to be visited would bear at all in those cases.

* This Table includes all the London Separate Infirmaries and the other Tables the Workhouse Infirmaries.

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

10673. (*Chairman.*) Are there many of those cases?—Proportionately, one would say there is a fair number.

10674. Have you any idea of the proportion?—No. Sometimes you do not meet with a case at all in a workhouse, and perhaps in an adjoining union you may find two or three, and then you may go two or three years in that particular union and not get a case.

10675. Are they getting worse?—That is a very difficult question to answer. Some medical men tell me "no."

10676. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) But you get it in particular localities?—Yes.

10677. Was there not a hospital somewhere near Farnham?—Yes, it was near Farnham, but that is closed. It was the Aldershot hospital.

10678 (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Have you any recommendation to make as regards the powers of removal and detention in these cases, both male and female?—There you open up a very wide question.

10679. Merely from the medical point of view, I mean?—One finds that medical opinion differs so very much in that respect. I should not like to offer an opinion. I think that it is practicable to have a combination of unions, or to have the accommodation found by the county, to which these cases could go; and I do not think there should be any hardship in removing them from one union to another which might be central to the whole of the unions in that paticular county.

10680. And detaining them?—Yes.

10681. (*Dr. Downes.*) The question of their compulsory detention, I think, is a legal question?—It is a question which I think has to be settled by the House.

10682. It is a question that has been before the Law Officers, has it not?—Yes.

The treatment of phthisis under the Poor Law.

10683. You have been asked questions about the provisions for phthisis. From a purely medical point of view, is there not a distinction between the class of case which you mention in your Paragraph 36, on which those questions started, and some other classes which were brought into the discussion?—The essential point about phthisis, as contrasted with a broken leg, is that it may be communicable, is it not?—That is so.

10684. Then there is also this distinction, is there not, between phthisis and certain other communicable diseases which were mentioned, such as small-pox, that although phthisis is communicable, it is communicable in a minor degree and the communication is more readily prevented?—Yes, I should say so, decidedly.

10685. So that from the medical point of view there is a distinction between those classes of disease which came into the account?—Yes. In my mind I thought the distinction was rather clear, before I came here to-day.

10686. I think that in regard to phthisis you attach special importance to dealing with the early cases?—Yes.

Nature of phthisical cases coming to the Poor Law.

10687. Does your experience show you that such cases do not come to the Poor Law as a rule until the disease has become advanced?—The whole of my experience up to now is that it is very unusual indeed for what is called a curable case to come to the Poor Law. I have used the word "curable" because it is a word in common use, rather than use the technical expression for it. Curable cases are very rarely under treatment in Poor Law institutions or as out medical relief cases.

10688. (*Mr. Loch.*) What is your suggestion with regard to these cases of phthisis? Presume that there is notification, or that in some way the case in its early stage does come; then what would you propose as the better course to take?—I think that under the Poor Law the treatment is outlined in the sanatorium which has been established near to Skipton for the Bradford Union, and in the Heswall Sanatorium near to Heswall, in Cheshire, for the Liverpool combined unions. They are very good instances of the way to provide for these cases.

10689. It would be in the earliest stages that you would send them to the sanatorium?—To a sanatorium of that kind, yes.

Relief of families of phthisical patients.

10390. How would you deal with the family? I understood you rather to suggest that the Poor Law should take possession of the cases that were past treatment in the main——?—As to the individual.

10691. What would you do? Put the Poor Law aside for the moment, please, from the point of view of general relief: would you propose that there should be a grant for out-door relief in every case in order to keep the family if the husband goes away; or what would you suggest?—I think the family would immediately become destitute, and so they would come under the Poor Law.

10692. Therefore in regard to the Poor Law you would suggest that the family came on as a matter of fact for out-door relief?—I am not speaking about out-door relief; for me it is a question of out-door medical relief.

10693. Suppose a man has to go into a sanatorium on your own proposal, what is to happen to his family if they cannot support themselves; you would not offer them the house, would you?—No.

10694. Therefore you would give them out-door relief?—That is a question for the local authority to determine.

10695. True, but that follows, does it not?—This is a mere personal opinion of mine I should like to say, and it has nothing to do with me as an official.

10696. I understand; but that is a factor that has to be considered, is it not?—Of course one would like to see them relieved in any other way than by the Poor Law, say, by charity.

10697. There is this suggestion made, that if there were sanatoria in connection with the public health authorities, then so far as it was desirable to send these people to sanatoria, the Poor Law might provide the out-door relief. That is one suggestion, and another is that the charitable should do it. What would you do?—I favour the charity point of view.

10698. Then you would propose, really, that the local people should organise themselves better in order to deal with these cases at an early stage, irrespective of the Poor Law?—I think so, decidedly.

Effect of provision of sanatoria type of phthisical cases applying for relief.

10399. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Have you any information as to whether, where sanatoria are provided, these curable cases come under the notice of the Poor Law rather more frequently than before?—Some year or two ago, in discussing the matter, I think, it was with Dr. Raw, or Dr. Smart, he told me that he thought we should not get any curable cases in Poor Law at all, and that there were no such cases taking the Poor Law as a whole. From a conversation that I had with you yesterday, I gathered that your experience in the Bradford union was that there are curable cases coming under the Poor Law.

10700. Really they do come under notice earlier than before?—Yes; just in the same way that I suggested that one result of this Act of 1885 was that the people gradually got to know that it did not disqualify, and therefore they applied when they had not applied before.

10701. Do you know whether that obtains in the Liverpool union or not?—I was at Heswall two years ago, but I have not been there since, and I have not had a chance of talking the question over with them.

10702. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Do some of the unions now erect wooden shelters, which are very economical and which are found to be very useful for incipient cases?—Yes. I may say that I am constantly recommending them.

10703. That is a very much cheaper and less expensive mode of dealing with the question than the building of sanatoria, is it not?—I think that is the right way.

10704. Is that in use in England?—Yes, in a great many cases. I do not know that those cases are particularly reported to the Local Government Board, but it is reported that provision is made for the outdoor treatment of phthisis.

10705. I think it is the case, is it not, that these shelters accommodate perhaps a couple of patients for something like £30; is that not so?—I believe that is so.

10706. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I think it cannot be said that that is applicable everywhere, because some workhouse hospitals are in situations that are not suitable for treatment of that kind?—That is so. I should like to say that the methods which they have adopted in the Bath uinon and in the Kettering union are two very good specimens of making provision for this class of case within the workhouse grounds.

Dietary of children under 3.

10707. (*Dr. Downes.*) With reference to the dietary of very young children, I think you state that medical officers do not always carry out their duties in that respect?—That is so. One tries to remedy that by a personal application to or a personal interview with the medical officer concerned.

10708. The old regulation, if I remember rightly prior to the existing one, was that the matron should consult the medical officer in regard to the dietary of the children?—That was so, and a great many of the older matrons have continued to think that that is the best way of doing it.

10709. So that in a way the medical officer may yet have a voice in the matter, although he is not carrying out this particular duty?—Yes; but in some cases he never carries out the second paragraph of the regulation, which I consider to be the most important one.

10710. Do you mean this—"The medical officer shall give directions in writing as to the service of food to inmates under three years of age, and as to the time at which each infant should be weaned"?—Yes. If Article VI. consisted of those four lines, and the five lines preceding them (that is, the first paragraph of the article) were deleted, I should say that those four lines would be sufficient, because the whole responsibility for the feeding of these children ought to rest on the medical officer.

10711. Do the guardians take any action in the matter, if the medical officer does not carry out his duties?—They have said on several occasions that they have given instructions to the medical officer that he is to carry out Article VI.

10712. It is within their power to require him to do so, is it not?—Yes, and they do so in fact in writing, but whether he does take any notice or not, I am not always in a position to say. I know that in some cases the medical officers do not take any notice.

Discretion of Guardians as to diet.

10713. You were also questioned as to the duty of the medical officer with regard to the dietary of the inmates generally, and Article X. of the Dietary Order was referred to. Article X. renders it the duty of the medical officer "for the purposes of classification under this Order, to examine each inmate as to his or her physical condition and fitness for employment?—Yes.

10714. Is it not the fact that the Order gives the guardians an almost entirely free hand as to the dietary they will allow to the different classes?—Yes. I believe that one of the Commissioners who has examined me read me these lines from Schedule A part 1—"The Guardians may from time to time direct the removal of any inmate from any one to any other of such classes in which such inmate can properly be placed. . . . . provided that any male inmate certified by the medical officer of the workhouse as a healthy able-bodied person shall be placed either in class 1 or in class 1 A for purposes of diet."

10715. That is the only instruction as regards healthy inmates, I believe?—Yes.

10716. The other instructions are as to the sick and the certain semi-infirm and ailing classes which are dieted by that Order?—Yes. Those are included under Articles IV., VI., VII, and IX.

10717. (*Mr. Bentham.*) That dietary has to be submitted for the approval of the medical officer, has it not, before it can be put into operation, even though it is selected from the Schedule?—I think the Order reads very clearly that they shall merely consult him. It is not to be referred to him, but it says the guardians shall forthwith in consultation with the medical officer for the workhouse do so and so.

10718. In Article II. it says: "Before the dietary tables so framed are adopted by the guardians they shall be referred to the medical officer, who shall, as soon as may be, make a report thereon. Such report shall be laid before the guardians and considered by them, and a copy of it shall be entered on the Minutes of their proceedings"?—Yes, that is in the Order.

10719. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It goes on: "After considering the report of the medical officer the guardians shall settle the dietary tables, with or without alterations" so they can alter them if they choose, and they are not bound by the medical officer?—That is so.

10720. (*Dr. Downes.*) Did not the circular which accompanied that Order contain this statement: "The functions of the medical officer in this matter will be purely advisory, and the final settlement of the tables will rest with the guardians alone"?—Yes. On page 2 of the circular it says it may be necessary for the guardians to lay down general rules for the classification of inmates for the purposes of the dietary.

Waste of food in Workhouses

10721. On the question of the waste of food, and the cost of the dietary, does not that first of all depend on the selection of the foods made by the guardians?—It does.

10722. And secondly on the way in which the Order is administered?—It is so.

10723. When it is said that so much bread is issued, is that not a matter entirely within the power and discretion of the guardians?—It is, as I think I have mentioned in my previous answers. The guardians may order a half, or a third, or two-thirds, of the quantity that they think suitable to be served in the first place.

10724. I believe that it was found by the Departmental Committee which inquired into this question, that the waste in these matters was almost entirely on bread?—That is so.

10725. It was suggested that scraps might be usable in a big workhouse, as in an ordinary house; would there not be a considerable danger in such a proceeding?—I think that would open a very wide door to abuse.

Cooking in Workhouses.

10726. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is not the cooking a very important matter in a workhouse?—One regards that as almost the essential.

10727. (*Dr. Downes.*) It is so important that I understand the Local Government Board arranged with the School of Cookery to publish a Manual?—That was so, and I think that in the Circular which accompanied the issue of this Order there was some reference to the appointment of a cook in houses where there was no cook.

Hospitals for accidents supported out of the rates.

10728. You were asked whether there was any instance of a hospital provided out of the rates by a local authority other than Poor Law. Are you aware that there are rate-aided hospitals for accidents and for general diseases, which are not provided under the Poor Law?—I am aware that the guardians subscribe varying amounts from time to time to voluntary hospitals.

10729. Are you aware that in the case of the Widnes Local Board, in 1876 it was held that a hospital for accidents might be provided under Section 131 of the Public Health Act?—That had not come under my notice.

10730. I believe that there have been other proposals for hospitals for purposes not connected with infectious diseases, but under the same section of the Public Health Act. I take it you are not aware of those cases?—I was not aware of those cases; they have never come under my cognisance.

10731. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) You sit as assessor, do you not, at inquiries into the conduct of medical officers?—Yes.

Powers of Local Government Board as to removing unsatisfactory Officers.

10732. Judging from your experience, are the powers of the Local Government Board adequate to get rid of unsatisfactory officers?—No, I should say not. Unless they are first reported by the guardians, the Local Government Board do not move in the matter.

10733. Is this a fair question? Would it not be well if the Local Government Board were empowered to move, as far as medical officers are concerned, and perhaps superintendent nurses?—There again you open up rather a wide question of administration, which would, of course, interfere with the local authorities. The true system on which we go is local administration by local government.

10734. It is the fact, is it not, that almost every Board of Guardians is entirely in the hands of its skilled officers like the doctor and the superintendent nurse. They seem to be rather a different class to, say, the relieving officers, whose work comes under the notice of the Board every day, and they can therefore more or less criticise and estimate its value; but the work of a doctor a board of guardians cannot estimate?—There, I think, the power of the Local Government Board ought to be altered, unless they might by part repayment of salaries have a voice in the matter, without having to hold a public inquiry, if in the first place misconduct, or want of care and attention on the part of the officer, were reported to them.

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

10735. They should have a voice both in the appointment and in the removal ?—I think so.

Nursing of out-door poor at Chichester by Workhouse Nurses.

10736. You made a very interesting remark about the Chichester system, whereby the infirmary nurses go outside the infirmary and nurse the poor; are their services confined to those in receipt of relief, or are they given to the poor generally ?—They are confined entirely to the cases that are referred to the nursing staff by the district medical officer, who is also the workhouse medical officer.

10737. I suppose as a matter of experience you find, do you not, that the fact of the nurses going outside to nurse particular cases tends to make the nurses more satisfied with their position and to remain longer in the service ?—I think in that particular case it has worked admirably.

After effect of Poor Law treatment of phthisis cases

10738. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is this the case with regard to phthisical patients—that when they are dismissed after long treatment in special institutions, they are averse to taking up regular work again ? I have had experience of one or two, and I have found that it is very hard to make them resume work ?—I have seen a fair number of cases, and I have often been told by different medical officers more particularly by the medical officers of workhouses, that the man becomes, to use the words of a medical officer who spoke to me about this the other day, a "corner" man.

10739. Has that anything to do with the nature of his complaint, or is it merely that he has been kept for six months or a year doing nothing?—This particular medical officer I am speaking of told me that it was in consequence of the attention that the man had received while he was in the sanatorium. The man was told to have so many minutes' rest before his meals, and so many minutes after, and he was not to do this, and he was not to do the other, and being a man of limited education he took these as a sort of axioms by which he ought to live.

Employment of phthisis patients under treatment.

10740. That is exactly what the men I came across did. Did you recommend that there should be employment found for them in the sanatoria ?—Yes, I think that all these people ought to be employed according to their capacity, the capacity to be adjudged by the medical officer only.

10741. It would not impede their treatment necessarily, would it ?—No; I think in some cases it would very materially help their treatment, and help their restoration to health.

10742. Is there any employment at all for them in the present sanitoria ?—At Heswall when I was there, there was nothing but games for these people to occupy themselves with. I am not quite sure about the Bradford sanitorium, as it was sometime since I was there.

10743. (*Mr. Bentham.*) There is a large garden there, and all of them who are suitable for it are employed in garden work ?—I was not aware of that at the moment.

10744. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Really there appears to be a great danger that we are creating a much more dangerous disease than that which we are curing, if we turn them out hopelessly pauperised ?—That is another point which goes off my particular province, I think.

10745. Could this be enforced in these sanitoria—could they be made to work, or might the work perhaps be put to them as part of the treatment ?—I think it ought to be left entirely to the local medical officer. He is the best judge whether they can be made to work, or should be asked to work in any way.

Child mortality in Poor Law institutions.

10746. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the children that you referred to who are in the workhouse, is there any return of the deaths of children in poor law institutions which one could set against the deaths outside the poor law institutions ?—Not in the provinces, so far as I know.

10747. Would it throw light upon this question of mortality in workhouses, so far as children are concerned, if we could get that informotion ?—I obtained the information for the purposes of the report which I have quoted in my memorandum for the five years previous to 1896.

10748. Would it be difficult to bring it up to date ?—I should be obliged to have a special instruction from the Local Government Board to bring out a corresponding report.

Mortali statistic institut

10749. I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that the deaths in institutions such as hospitals have increased as well as the deaths in poor law institutions, so that it is not remarkable so far as the poor law is concerned merely ?—That is so, and I did not wish to emphasise that point at all. My purpose in obtaining the return as regards the deaths in workhouses was to use it as a lever in urging the guardians to provide better nursing accommodation as well as nurses, because we could not expect the nurses to stay in these particular places where they were so much wanted if there was not good accommodation for the nurses to live in.

10750. The argument is that the Poor Law is being very much more used by people in their old age or infirmity than it used to be; hence a large number of deaths; but that is equally true of hospitals relatively speaking, is it not ?—I think so decidedly.

10751. As far as the figures go, I mean ?—Certainly I should say so. The difference is a matter of personal observation. I have noticed in the last thirteen years that the class of case coming into a workhouse infirmary is very much more a class requiring the constant care of a nurse by night and day. They are very often brought into a workhouse infirmary within the last few weeks of their life, if not within the last few days of their life.

Child mortalit and its preventa bility.

10752. If a return of deaths in childhood were possible, could the form of it be that of Dr. Tatham's last return, which gives the numbers according to age, under one year, and so on, taking the same grouping of sicknesses ?—Yes, and I think it ought to be done in that way; it ought to be comparable with the ordinary returns for the whole country.

10753. Is it your opinion that a good many of the deaths are avoidable, so far as the diseases are concerned, among the children ?—Certainly, without any doubt. I may say that for twenty years past I have made a particular study, so to speak, of this very question, and that I have become more and more convinced that, I was going to say 80 per cent. of the deaths of children under one year of age are due to preventable causes.

10754. Are you speaking now of the children in workhouse infirmaries ?—Anywhere, not necessarily in the workhouse; but as my particular province is in the workhouse, I naturally direct my attention to them.

10755. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is that true of the rich as well as of the poor ?—It is to a certain extent.

10756. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to another branch of the question—for we must look at it, as far as this Commission is concerned, not merely from the point of view of the Poor Law—do you think that an improvement could be arrived at by such an arrangement as this, that some paper, or statement, on the subject should be issued by all hospitals similar to this which you have referred to in your memorandum, and that it might have some currency as being more or less officially sanctioned?—Yes, it could be done easily, and I think it would very probably help.

Instructi in child rearing.

10757. Has anything been done to your knowledge by way of, not merely the relieving officers, but any officers of the Poor Law who have to do with mothers who are in receipt of out-door relief, and others, giving them this information ?—In some areas the relieving officer, or the vaccination officer, has directions to issue a form of instruction to mothers how to feed and clothe their children; and that form of instruction is usually prepared by the medical officer of health. I am glad to say that the majority of medical officers of health throughout the country are looking upon this as a public health question, and so all classes, of course, are reached. What I lay stress upon is that we have in the workhouse nursery a focus or a centre for the dissemination of practical knowledge how these children ought to be fed, and therefore we ought to avail ourselves to the utmost possible extent of that.

10758. As to what I may call the medical organisation of the future, which you in a manner led up to, as I understand it you would desire that the incurable cases should

be dealt with as far as possible by the Poor Law ?—Yes. I regard it that the incurable cases can never earn their own living, and therefore they must be provided for by the only authority that there is, and that is the Poor Law authority.

10759. On the other hand, the curable cases should be dealt with by the other agencies ?—Yes.

10760. If that is to be the policy, what steps could we take ? Would you desire that there should be an understanding in any of our large provincial towns as between the Poor Law and the voluntary institutions that they should reject the one case and take the other as a matter of course ?—I think that might easily be arrived at, because it would be a matter for the jurisdiction of the medical officer of health ?

10761. The medical officer of health, or rather the health organisation of the community, would deal with the infectious diseases, scarlet fever, and the rest as a group ?—Yes.

10762. Then apart from them phthisis might, or might not, be added to that list ?—Exactly.

10763. Then apart from that, the voluntary hospitals might take all the curable diseases. How would you arrange that ? Would you be able to come to an understanding with a non-statutory body to limit itself in this manner ?—I do not think you could do that precisely; but I think that an arrangement could be made, though not a definite understanding.

10764. Why should we not go a step further and give the hospitals a status, leaving them voluntary, but requiring them especially to deal with this class of case, or rather recognising them as institutions for dealing with this class of case, but not as receiving any grants from the State ?—If a case came under the Poor Law I should say that the Poor Law guardians ought to be able, as they are at present, to subscribe to these sanatoria and have the call of so many beds.

10765. By subscribing to a general hospital ?—Yes, or to any other similar institution, not a Poor Law institution.

10766. Would not it be possible, by an arrangement on the lines I have suggested, to refer these cases to the hospitals, and make it their responsibility to deal with them without any grant necessarily from the Poor Law ? —Yes, if it were made purely and simply a public health matter.

10767. If that were so, could not the organisation which you say is available take any form which would be satisfactory to your own conditions; so that, instead of the infirmary being made a rate-aided hospital, you would be able to recognise voluntary institutions as doing work which it would be dangerous under your conditions for the rate-aided hospitals to do ?—In relation to phthisis cases only, do you mean ?

10768. In relation to all disease ?—In relation to all infectious diseases, yes.

10769. And to all curable diseases ?—I would say that it would be possible, but I do not think it would be probable under present conditions.

10770. Do you hold out to us any line of development in accordance with your own limitations other than that ? —I believe, more particularly in the north of England, that the feeling is altogether in the direction that these infirmaries are, as it were, adjuncts to the voluntary hospitals, and are not Poor Law institutions.

10771. That they are not Poor Law institutions ?—Yes, although they are provided out of the rates. I believe that is the undercurrent that is every now and then coming to the surface.

10772. And that the infirmaries should take the incurable cases ?—Yes; and the cases that there is no room for in the local general hospitals. I believe that is what is giving rise to the suggestions which come up from time to time to the Local Government Board that we delete any reference to paupers, or poor persons, in the orders that are issued for the government of these infirmaries.

10773. Then the outcome of that would be a kind of medical organisation which would include a rate-aided infirmary for the incurable and a voluntary institution for the curable ?—It would practically come to that; but also practically it would come to this, that cases would be continually coming into these rate-aided infirmaries which were not incurable, but would be sent there merely because there was no room for them in the voluntary hospitals.

10774. If that difficulty could be met in any way, there would be a distribution of labour on those lines ?—I think it is a matter for regret that there is not an extension of the voluntary hospitals.

Phthisis cases in general hospitals.

10775. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there not a practice springing up in some parts of England of treating phthisical cases in the vacant wards of general hospitals ? I refer to a practice which I understand has been followed in Brighton, judging from what I read the other day of what Dr. Newsholme is doing there; where there are vacant wards in the general hospital, these vacant wards are now being utilised for cases of phthisis ?—I believe that is the case, but I do not know it of my own knowledge.

10776. Would you approve of that ?—There I think you would have to judge whether these wards might not be called upon in some sudden emergency to be used for some other purpose. What would you do with your phthisical cases then ?

10777. Of course, it is only during the time when these wards are vacant that they could be utilised. Small pox hospitals also, when there are no small pox cases, are being used for phthisical cases, I understand ?—I cannot speak of my own knowledge as to that.

Provision of drugs.

10778. As regards the drugs, is there in England any practice of paying a fixed sum to the medical officer or to a druggist for drugs, as well as the practice of including the cost of the drugs in the salary of the medical officer; does that obtain anywhere here ?—Speaking off the "papers" at the Local Government Board, I am not in a position to say.

10779. Is it the general practice to include the cost of the drugs in the salary of the medical officer ?—Yes.

Basis of Officers' "Grant."

10780. You have suggested, I think, that that is a system which should be abolished if possible, and also that there ought to be some power of revising the salaries of the medical officers; and I think you have further suggested that in London the salaries of the medical officers are calculated to a certain extent on the grant which is given under the Act of 1888 ?—That was in answer to a statement that was put before me by Dr. Downes, but I have no knowledge that that is so. It does not come within my duty as medical inspector in the provinces.

10781. Can you say whether the rules and conditions under which that grant is administered following upon the Act of 1888, are stereotyped under that Act ?—I think that there has been no addition to the sums allocated to the different unions since 1888.

Abolition of pauper Nurses in Workhouses.

10782. And they may not be altered, because in accordance with the provisions of the Act I understand they are stereotyped until Parliament otherwise directs. The reason why I ask that is that it is so in Scotland also, and the conditions there having very much altered, Parliament has been approached with a view to having this restriction altered. To go to another point, is there any pauper-nursing in the workhouses in England now ? —I know that it has been formally abolished, but *de facto* is there any ?—No, not officially.

10783. Has it absolutely disappeared ?—Yes.

10784. And is there trained nursing in all the workhouses ?—No, not in all.

10785. Is the matron, as a rule, a trained nurse ?—I should say not frequently.

Trained Nurses as Matrons.

10786. Is there any rule or suggestion that she should, if possible, be a trained nurse ?—There have been suggestions made from time to time. I think that it is a very good arrangement, other things being equal, where it is not possible to retain the services of a trained nurse, that the matron should be a trained nurse.

Period of training for Nurses.

10787. Have you had your attention directed to the question of the standard of training nurses, and to the question whether the present minimum of two years' training should be maintained or increased ?—We have a

Dr. Andrew Fuller.

24 April 1906.

minimum of three years in all our large workhouse infirmaries in the country. In all that we call the "recognised" schools the three years' training is the limit and there is no two years' training.

Public Institutions for Phthisis.

10788. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the establishment of institutions for phthisical cases, there are one or two that have been authorised to be established, are there not?—There are two in the provinces.

10789. The Local Government Board have not shown any indisposition to authorise them in the provinces, supposing application has been made, have they?—No. If the guardians can show a very good reason for their establishment, they have permission to provide the accommodation.

Type of Rural Medical Officers.

10790. (*Mr. Booth.*) I think you mentioned in reply to Mr. Lansbury that in some of the rural districts the medical officers might be not so highly qualified or so skilful as they ought to be, did you not?—I do not think I put it quite in that way. I meant that the personal element entered so largely there that the man was not quite of such good standing professionally or socially in some of the rural unions.

10791. What I want to ask is whether you consider that they have as good talent as is available in the district, or do the more qualified men refuse to take the position?—I have known instances where the better qualified man has refused to apply for the appointment, and a man who is not considered to be "quite the thing" has been appointed.

10792. Would that be at all a general characteristic?—You can apply it to parts of the country, but not to the country as a whole.

10793. That would be partly due to the low remuneration I take it?—Yes, I think so.

TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY.

Monday, 30th April, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).

Mr. HERBERT JENNER-FUST, called; and Examined.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

10794. (*Chairman*). You have been one of the general inspectors of the Local Government Board since 1884?—I have.

10795. You were appointed inspector for the Lancashire district in 1892?—I was.

10796. During that time there have been fluctuations in the pauperism of your district, but the tendency has been upwards, has it not?—Until quite recently.

10797. That is during the last few months?—Yes.

Effect of administration and of Local Government Act of 1894 on pauperism.

10798. As regards the difference in the ratio of pauperism in parts of your district, you attribute a good deal of that difference to the administration?—I do.

10799. Has the Act of 1894 had any effect upon the principles of outdoor relief?—In some instances outdoor relief has been given more freely since 1894.

10800. Has it generally affected the returns?—No, I do not think I am prepared to say that it has.

Conditions in Prestwich in 1891.

10801. You give an illustration in your memorandum, which, according to our practice, we will take as your evidence-in-chief (see Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXII. (A to D)), of a district where pauperism has risen very considerably, Prestwich. Could you shortly state what occurred there? Was there any special cause that led to the change in administration, or any special elections?—I do not think so. I think the change has come rather quickly. For instance, in 1892 the total pauperism was 1,063. In 1906 it had risen to 2,929. Of course, there had been a considerable increase in the population during that time, but the proportion of paupers to population in 1892 was 1 in 141, and in 1906 it was 1 in 67.

10802. The ratio had more than doubled itself?—Yes.

10803. Was this mainly in the outdoor relief?—The indoor relief had risen between those dates from 368 to 871, and the outdoor from 695 to 2,058. The out door had increased more in proportion.

10804. So far as you know, there were no material changes in the condition of the district?—Nothing, I think, to account for that.

10805. Is Prestwich a district outside Manchester?—Prestwich is mainly a part of Manchester.

Instance of successful large Poor Law school.

10806. Passing to the 18th paragraph of your memorandum, you say you have one school of the barrack type?—Yes.

10807. What has been the result of that school: has it been unsatisfactory or satisfactory?—The results have been extremely good until within the last two years, when there has been a serious outbreak of ophthalmia; otherwise the results of the school have been excellent; the children have done well in after-life.

After care of Poor Law children.

10808. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Are records kept of the career of the children subsequent to their leaving the school?—To a great extent.

10809. This is the first case in which we have been told there have been records kept?—I would not like to say in every case, but in a number of instances the subsequent career is known. A few years ago the jubilee of the school was kept, and the old boys and girls came back in very large numbers indeed to assist at the celebration, showing they took an interest in it and did not look down upon it in any way.

10810. (*Chairman.*) What is the size of the school?—It is a school for about 600.

Grouped cottage homes for children.

10811. A good many unions have adopted the system of grouped cottage homes?—Yes.

10812. Has that system worked well?—Yes, I think that has worked very well.

10813. The Roman Catholics have made special provision for their children, and I gather from your memorandum that they have established schools for the reception of pauper children only; is that so?—Almost entirely for that.

10814. So far as you know, what effect has that had on the results in after life of the children?—It is rather early to judge, because some of these schools have only been opened for a few years. I do not think I am prepared to give any opinion as to the after career.

10815. It has been put forward by several of the preceding witnesses that it is very advisable, as regards school life, to remove, if possible, the taint of pauperism from the children, but under this system they would be known as pauper children?—Yes. If I may say so, in these separate schools, cottage homes and others, the question of pauperism does not seem to exist; the children consider themselves by no means as paupers, the name is hardly ever used, and they look down upon the workhouse and consider themselves entirely independent of it.

10816. They as a rule attend the ordinary elementary schools?—Do you mean in the certified homes?

10817. No, in these grouped cottages?—Some do; not the larger ones.

10818. They have schools of their own?—Yes.

10819. They are just on the same footing, then, as the Roman Catholic schools?—In that way, yes, only that the Roman Catholic schools are more of the barrack type than the others.

10820. The remainder of your memorandum, I think, mainly deals with very strong recommendations as regards the advisability of extending the areas?—Yes.

10821. You give a number of illustrations of the success which has attended combinations in the neighbourhood of Liverpool and Manchester?—Yes.

10822. I think you express the opinion that, in your judgment, even West Derby Union, large as it is, is not large enough for successful combination.—Yes.

10823. You conclude your memorandum by making a number of recommendations which would result in the County of Westmorland being one union. Have you ever tested at all what local opinion would be with regard to such a proposal?—I have, to a limited extent, and the local opinion, I think, invariably is that they each prefer to have their workhouse, however small.

10824. The opposition to combination would, I assume be less strong in urban than in rural districts?—I think so.

10825. Your suggestion was that in the very big towns the areas of the board of guardians should be co-terminous with the municipal area?—Yes.

10826. I think you suggest an election on the same day both for the town council and the board of guardians?—Yes.

10827. At present there is nothing to prevent boards of guardians combining their areas if they can get the assent of the Local Government Board?—Nothing, I believe.

10828. If there is a strong local opposition, the suggestion you make would have to be carried out by an Act of Parliament, and the opinion of the locality would have to be over-ridden?—Yes.

10829. Is not that a very serious objection now?—I take it that is the objection that obtained in 1834 to the formation of unions. I think the combination of parishes into unions had to be done compulsorily.

10830. The areas would be much larger. Take the case of the rural workhouses; the relatives now are within a reasonable distance of those who are within the workhouses, and they can see them periodically. That would be very much more difficult under your scheme?—Yes, but the means of locomotion have so increased since the existing workhouses were formed that the visiting would not be nearly so difficult as some years ago.

10831. You have looked on this mainly from an administrative point of view, based on your great experience?—I have looked upon it in this way, if I may explain briefly: that public opinion seems to demand classification of the indoor poor, besides the main classification laid down in the general consolidated order; guardians are called upon to classify according to diseases; to separate the phthisical, and the scrofulous; to separate the ophthalmic; to divide imbeciles from the sane, and sane from insane epileptics, and to make various subdivisions of the kind, which it seems to me it is impossible to obtain with the existing areas.

Classification and economy obtainable by increasing size of Poor Law areas for indoor relief.

10832. To put it in another way, an effective scheme of classification is impossible under the existing areas?—Yes.

10833. You think that a thorough system of classification would tend rather to economy than to increased expenditure?—I think it should.

Proposed general grant-in-aid from Exchequer to Poor Law authorities.

10834. Your idea is that the Imperial Exchequer should make a certain contribution towards the authority of these larger areas?—It seemed to me that any contributions the State might make would be more easily given to a large area than if they had to be distributed and divided among a number of small areas.

10835. Have you thought out at all whether this contribution should be in the shape of a lump sum or whether it should be earmarked for certain specific purposes?—At present there are various contributions for specific purposes which might be increased if it were thought just.

10836. If a contribution is made in connection with a specific purpose, it has been hinted that the tendency is rather to run up the expenditure, or to increase the number of persons upon which payment can be obtained?—Yes; I think my idea was a lump sum towards the in-maintenance, to be administered by the county board of guardians, without being definitely given to any particular object.

Proposed administration of out-relief by the district councils.

10837. Assuming that the county authority or the central authority were able to administer or control the institutions, how would you deal with out-door relief?—I would have relief administered by the existing boards of guardians, or, if it were thought possible, by the district councils. Applications would be made to them; they would have the control of the relieving officers and of the district medical officers; they would decide whether a case was to be relieved by out-relief or in-door relief, and in the case of the out-door relief they themselves would pay; in the case of in-door relief the individual would be handed over, if the offer of the house was accepted, to the central authority; the county board of guardians.

10838. The out-relief would be a charge on the district?—Yes.

10839. (*Mr. Booth.*) On the smaller district?—Yes.

10840-1. (*Chairman.*) Whatever the local unit was?—Either on the existing union or upon the district council, if that was adopted or whatever the area might be.

Need for consolidation of Poor Laws and Orders.

10842. You make also some recommendations with regard to certain miscellaneous points. I think most of those have been before us and have been advocated by preceding witnesses. You think there is a need for a consolidation of the poor law and the orders of the Local Government Board?—I do.

10843. And a clearer definition of some of the terms?—I do not know that I have felt that particular objection, but the main point, to me, is that guardians and their officers have the greatest difficulty, as things are, in ascertaining what Acts and orders are actually in force; they are scattered about, and there are a large number of amending Acts and orders which are apt to be overlooked.

10844. There are a great many benefit societies and co-operative societies in Lancashire?—Yes.

10845. Have they increased much, do you know, during your tenure of office?—I am afraid I could not say.

Increased freedom in workhouses and resultant decrease of deterrence of relief.

10846. Have the deterrents to pauperism lost their effect at all in recent years?—I think in a few instances the greater freedom that has been given to inmates of workhouses has tended to diminish the deterrent influence By "freedom" I mean more freedom in receiving visits.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

from their friends and going in and out when they feel inclined.

10847. That loss of liberty which prevailed in previous years was a considerable deterrent?—It was almost the only deterrent that existed in the case of the aged and infirm; the conditions under which they are maintained are much more comfortable than in their own homes; it is only the discipline, it seems to me, that exercises a deterrent influence at all.

Comparative stigma of in- and out-relief.

10848. I assume that you would corroborate other witnesses who state that a great difference exists, in the minds of those who may be compelled to have recourse to the poor law, between out-door relief and in-door relief?—Yes. There is a stigma attached to in-door relief which is conceived not to exist in the case of out-door relief.

Publication of list of paupers.

10849. Do any of the Lancashire unions publish a list of those in receipt of out-door relief?—I think only two or three at the outside.

10850. Turning to your statistics, there are only one or two unions where the rate of pauperism is extraordinarily low as compared with others. In your Return of the number of paupers, if you look half way down the page, the proportion in The Fylde Union is one to 141 and 118 of the population; and if you look down the list generally there are only two other unions where, in the period from 1900 to 1904, the proportion was one to over 100, and at 1st January 1905, one to over ninety. Is there anything exceptional in the condition of those three unions? They are The Fylde, Haslingden, and Lancaster?—The Fylde has Blackpool, which is very populous and very prosperous and has a large population without much pauperism. I think that tends to keep down pauperism, but I would attribute the low rate to the administration mainly. Prestwich, when I first remember it, had as low a pauperism as The Fylde, or very nearly, and now it has increased considerably.

Conditions in The Fylde, Haslingden, and Lancaster Unions.

10851. What about Haslingden and Lancaster?—Haslingden, I think, is entirely due to administration; the relief has been strictly administered there for a number of years; and as to Lancaster, I do not know of any other cause to which to attribute it, except administration.

The problems of suburban unions.

10852. Have you round the big towns any very poor districts which are caused by the migration of the wage-earning classes from the centre of the populous districts?—Both in Liverpool and in Manchester the poor population is being pushed from the centre, which is being more and more occupied by offices, to the outside districts, and in the case of Liverpool it is invading the West Derby Union to a great extent, and in the case of Manchester, the Chorlton and Prestwich Unions.

10853. Are those unions outside the municipal boundaries of the big towns from which the people are forced?—Only partially.

10854. Have you any knowledge whether there has been any great difficulty there as regards rating in consequence of the increase of rates in these districts?—I have not heard of any particular difficulty beyond the usual complaints when rates go up.

10855. The tendency, we are told, of these districts which augment thus rapidly is that the Poor Rate remains low for a certain period, but the school rate is very high; then in course of time the Poor Law rate rises also and forms a combination which some of these poor districts find it rather difficult to bear. You are not aware of any districts of that kind in Lancashire?—I do not think to any excessive degree.

Effect on pauperism of Workmen's Compensation Act.

10856. Have you noticed, or have you been told, that the Workmen's Compensation Act has at all affected the age at which people lose employment?—Yes, I have heard of that constantly: that men over fifty can hardly get occupation.

10857. You were in Lancashire before the Workmen's Compensation Act came into operation, I think: have you noticed any difference yourself, in the workhouses, as regards the younger age of those who are unable to get employment and thus fall back on to the Poor Law?—No, I do not know that I have noticed it.

10858. What you are stating is the impression formed in your mind by the general opinion of those whom you have heard speak of the matter?—Yes. I hear it constantly mentioned as a thing to be regretted.

10859. That particular feature of the Act?—Yes.

Mutual waiver of settlement in certain unions; effect of total abolition.

10860. It has been suggested to us that the law of settlement might be abolished, inasmuch as now the main qualification is only one year's residence: have you any views on the subject of settlement?—I venture to point out in my scheme for enlarging the areas that the area might be enlarged to the county, as far as the indoor poor are concerned; but in large towns, in Manchester and in Liverpool, the three Poor Law authorities, which in each case make up those cities, by agreement do not remove against each other, except in the case of lunatics.

10861. What are the unions?—Liverpool, West Derby and Toxteth Park are the three unions in Liverpool; Manchester, Chorlton and Prestwich in Manchester.

10862. Are there many applicants, for instance, in Liverpool, whose settlement is in a union outside the three unions you have just mentioned?—Yes.

10863. How would Liverpool be affected if the law of settlement was abolished?—I hardly know.

10864. It would be in places of that kind, I assume, that the most difficulty and inconvenience would arise?—Liverpool, of course, is subject to a number of outsiders being landed and being or becoming destitute and having to be relieved there.

10865. You would hardly go so far as to advocate the abolition of the law of settlement?—I do not think I would.

10866. But the increased area, of course, would largely reduce the number of contentious cases relating to settlement?—Yes, so far as in-door cases are concerned.

Roman Catholic certified Poor Law schools.

10867. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to these large Roman Catholic certified schools, is it the case that they do not take in any persons except paupers?—The great majority are paupers, and the schools are established really to deal with certain unions, but they do have others from outside in much smaller numbers.

Question of boarding out of children by the managers of certified schools.

10868. Have you ever known of any case where the managers of a certified school have boarded out children who were sent there?—I do not think I have known of any such instances, in my district.

10869. Do the managers keep records showing what children are sent from particular unions which the inspector can see when he visits the school—Yes, we have those now, but, as a rule only recently, certificates of health are sent now with every child to most of these schools.

10870. Would you know anything about it supposing a child was sent there and was boarded-out by the managers and not really kept within the institution itself?—It might easily be done without my knowledge, I think.

10871. You do not know of any case where it has happened?—No, I do not think of any case in my district.

Combination of unions and their difficulties.

10872. You have had one or two cases of combinations of unions under the Poor Law Act of 1879?—Yes.

10873. Have they worked pretty well?—Yes, I think quite well.

10874. You had some little difficulty in forming them had you not?—There was a difficulty as to how the expenditure was to be charged.

10875. As to the apportionment, I suppose?—As to the apportionment and as to the committees being allowed to charge the rates on their own responsibility. That was got over by arranging that each joint committee should call upon the constituent unions for what it required, and that each union should then decide whether it would raise any part of what was called for by loan, supposing it to be for a purpose for which they could borrow money, or whether they would pay the contribution out of the current rate.

10876. You have not got any outdoor relief unions in your district, have you?—No, none.

10877. You have not had any occasion to consider how they work?—No, I have not.

Difficulty of making the county the Poor Law area for indoor relief.

10878. The plan that you were suggesting just now, of having the county as the area for indoor relief, and a smaller area for outdoor relief, would come to pretty much the same thing as having out-relief unions, would it not?—Yes, I suppose it would. I am not very familiar with the working of these out-relief unions.

10879. Quite so, not having them in your own district. Then, taking the question of having a large area, supposing the county was the area for indoor relief, do you think there would be a risk of the guardians wanting to send an undue number of cases into the workhouse if outdoor relief was a union charge and indoor relief was a county charge ?—I think it would tend to a strict administration of relief.

10880. Do you think the county would be a good area for the purpose ?—Some counties, not all.

10881. Do you consider the difference there is in the areas of the different counties ? Are they not very large in extent in point of acreage ?—Yes.

10882. Would they not be very large ; take Somersetshire, for instance, which has an acreage of more than 1,000,000 acres ?—I do not anticipate any real difficulty.

10883. How often would you propose that there should be a meeting of the central authority for the county ?—I do not suppose the whole body would meet very often, but committees would meet frequently as in the case of the county councils.

10884. Is it not one of the difficulties in the administration by county councils that they meet so seldom ?—The tendency, I suppose, is to throw more of the work into the hands of officials.

10885. And that it is difficult to get expressions of opinions from a county council because they only meet once in three months ?—Yes, but the different committees of the council meet more often than that.

10886. Is the committee to represent the whole area or only a part of it ?—I think there would be committees for areas.

10887. Then it would not be administration, would it, by the whole county, it would only be administration by representatives of a part of the county ?—That is really what takes place in the present administration of the poor law, it is mainly, in the large unions, carried on by committees.

10888. But I thought the proposal was to get administration by representatives of a larger area ?—Yes.

10889. Could you get that ?—I think you would as a matter of general policy.

10890. Take another point, the visitation. Who do you propose should visit the institutions ? I think they would be visited in the same way that the asylums are now.

10891. Would that be by representatives of the particular area in which the institution is situate ?—I think very probably it would be, as a matter of convenience.

10892. It is stated that one of the advantages of the present system, under which the workhouse in a rural union is generally in the market town, is that the friends of the paupers come in on the market days, and therefore they have an opportunity of visiting their friends in the workhouse, and it is suggested if there is a larger area that that opportunity would be lost. Do you think there is anything in that ?—I think that opportunity no doubt would be lost, but I think the advantages more than compensate for that drawback.

10893. Supposing a pauper's relatives are one end of a county, and the institution is the other end is not the difficulty of getting there very considerable ?—Yes, but we constantly find sick poor sent to the hospitals at a considerable distance, where their friends can hardly ever see them.

10894. Are they sent there for long ?—Yes, very often for a considerable time ; a number of weeks or even months.

10895. I am not sure what hospitals you had in your mind ?—I mean voluntary hospitals.

10896. Is it not rather different in the case of a workhouse where an aged person may be taken in for the rest of his life ?—Yes, I think it is, but you would not, in the case of a county, have only a single workhouse for the aged, you would have several in a large county, and the individuals from the localities would be sent probably to the nearest as far as possible.

10897. Take a case like Westmorland where the population is small, even there would the workhouses practically be at any considerable distance from each other, taking into account the difficulty of access on account of intervening mountains and so forth ?—I do not think so because the population tends to live in the valleys, and the railroads occupy the valleys, and the central workhouse for Westmorland would be, I think, quite reasonably accessible. It occurred to me also that the Paupers' Conveyance Expenses Act, and the corresponding Order, might, if necessary, be extended in order to facilitate visiting where it was thought desirable.

The payment of costs of visits of paupers' friends.

10898. If the expenses of the friends who go to visit the paupers are to be paid out of the rates that would make a considerably increased charge, would it not ?—There is that power as you are aware now.

10899. Yes, in certain circumstances. Of course, the expenses would be much greater in proportion as the distance increased ?—Yes.

Unions in more than one county or borough.

10900. Do you remember that a Report was made by a Commission which was appointed in 1887 with a view to bringing unions into counties, for making unions and counties co-extensive in the sense that there should be no over-lapping of boundaries ?—Yes.

10901. Was anything attempted in Lancashire to give effect to that Report ?—Yes, a good deal was done, and boundaries were very largely simplified.

10902. Was there much opposition ?—No, I do not think there was.

10903. How far do the unions come within the county ? Have you got much overlapping ?—No, there is not much. Clitheroe and Ashton-under-Lyne are the two which overlap.

10904. There has been some endeavour at Manchester to combine the unions so as to make the whole of the city one poor law union ?—It is supposed that the City Council have that in view, but it has not taken much shape hitherto, and there has also been a proposal to unite Manchester and Salford into one big city. That I believe has fallen through for the present.

10905. Chorlton and Prestwich extend outside the city do they not ?—Yes, to a small extent, not much. They are gradually being absorbed.

Difficulties of combining Poor Law areas.

10906. Do you remember a proposal some years ago that a joint committee of the county council and the borough council should alter those unions, that is to say, should alter the parishes so as to make them all one parish in Manchester ?—Yes, I held an inquiry on the subject. The result of it was to leave the old City of Manchester as one parish, and to combine the northern parishes into one parish, and the southern parishes into another, so that there are now, as it were, three parishes constituting the city.

10907. Was that an instance of the difficulty there is in getting areas altered. The actual alteration made was a sort of compromise, was it not ?—The original proposal was to form a single parish for the whole city

10908. That was objected to, was it not ?—That was objected to.

10909. Therefore, that is an instance, is it not, of the difficulty of getting alteration of areas effected, particularly if it involves any considerable alteration in the incidencies of the charge ?—I think that was the great objection raised to it.

Local Government Board's powerlessness to require building of a new workhouse.

10910. On the last page of your memorandum you say you think there is a lack of power on the part of the Local Government Board to secure proper provision for the indoor poor ; have you anything definite in your mind ?—What I mean is that I think that in the last resort there ought to be power in the Local Government Board to order provision to be made.

10911. That is to say, to order a new workhouse to be built ?—Yes, if necessary.

Mutual waiver of the law of settlement in certain unions.

10912. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) You said that there were two large cities where the law of settlement was not put in operation one against the other ?—I mentioned Liverpool and Manchester.

10913. Was that because it was found that the operation of the law produced hardship to the people ?—I think it was because it caused a great deal of expense ; it was almost impossible to carry out ; people were constantly shifting from one side of the line to the other, and the litigation caused was considerable ; and by mutual agreement they settled they would not remove against each other.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

"Settlement" as between England and Ireland.

10914. No question of hardship arose from the application of the settlement?—I do not think that was the reason.

10915. Do you think either of those cities would be inclined to go further, and extend the same to Irish paupers? Do you think the feeling is very strong in favour of putting the Law of Settlement in operation with regard to the Irish paupers?—I have not come across that much.

10916. There are a good number of Irish paupers, are there not, sent from those two cities to Ireland?—I could not answer that with any accuracy.

10917. Can you give me any information as to how they determine whether these paupers are really of Irish birth?—I cannot.

10918. Or what is the nature of the inquiry made?—I am afraid I cannot.

10919. Is the law of settlement put in operation to a very great extent in these cities? Are these two cities you have mentioned the only ones where it is suspended?—They are the only ones I know of.

10920. Are there many cases which come up from time to time?—There would be a large number.

Procedure for setting in motion the law of settlement.

10921. In the ordinary unions do these questions come before the boards of guardians at their daily meetings?—Yes, they do. But as a rule they are simply referred to the clerk to deal with as he finds; to make the inquiries and act upon them.

10922. But can a case be removed by the clerk without the direct instructions of the board of guardians, in each particular case, by resolution?—No, I think not.

10923. So the clerk, therefore, makes a report to the guardians, and they order the case to be removed?—He makes a report either that he thinks the guardians ought to contest the case, or that the case is settled in their union, and they had better accept it.

10924. The clerk cannot deal with them on his own initiative on general instructions from the guardians?—No, I think not.

10925. May the clerk litigate?—No, I think not.

Mutual waiver of the law of settlement in certain unions.

10926. (*Mr. Booth.*) I understood that this modification as to the settlement merely referred to the inter-communication of the three great divisions of which Liverpool and Manchester each consist. It is not an abrogation of the law of settlement altogether, but the non-application to the three unions which form each of those cities. Is that right?—Yes; they do not remove as against each other.

10927. It is not as between Liverpool and Manchester, but in Liverpool as between West Derby, Toxteth and Liverpool itself, and as regards Manchester, between Chorlton, Manchester and Prestwich?—It is only between the three constituent Poor Law authorities in each case.

10928. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Those that are within the municipal boundaries of Manchester and Liverpool?—The boundaries are not quite the same.

10929. They are practically the municipal boundaries of Liverpool and Manchester?—Nearly so, but the unions project outside.

10930. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do I understand that, supposing a pauper becomes chargeable in Liverpool who is really settled in Toxteth Park, the Liverpool guardians make no effort to remove him?—Yes.

Difficulties of allocating State grants to small areas.

10931. It is not that the other people accept him without question?—No, the question is not raised.

10932. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) You said, I think, that the State contributions to these unions would be more easily distributed over combined areas?—Would be more easily given to an enlarged area than if they had to be distributed over smaller areas comprised in it.

10933. Why would that be so? Is there any difficulty in the distribution of the money now?—No, but I had in my mind the report of the Local Taxation Commission, who found considerable difficulty in recommending principles upon which State contributions should be given to unions.

10934. Are these State contributions not measured by expenditure under particular heads?—No, they are lump sums at present given to the county authority, and distributed under certain heads by them.

10935. How are these lump sums ascertained?—I do not think I can answer off-hand.

Visitation of children in service up to fifteen.

10936. Are children sent out to service in the large city unions in your district before they reach the age of fifteen years?—Yes, in some instances they are, in others they are kept.

10937. Is any inquiry made by the guardians from time to time as to these children when they are under that age, when they are sent out to service, as to how they are treated?—Yes, they are visited.

10938. Not in cases where they are boarded out, but when they are absolutely discharged and put to service, are they still visited?—Yes, they are still visited by the relieving officer, and very often individual guardians interest themselves and keep the children in view.

10939. Is there no objection made by the persons to whom they are hired out to the visits of the union officer?—Very seldom.

10940. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Is not it a condition of service that they should be visited?—Yes, it is the duty of the relieving officer to visit.

10941. The guardians would not allow a girl of fifteen to go to a particular place except on condition that the relieving officer should be allowed to visit at visiting times?—The duty arises immediately the child is sent out.

10942. And the person employing the child knows that condition before?—Yes.

Question of reduction of size of boards of guardians.

10943. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Boards of guardians generally consist of very large numbers, from forty, to seventy or eighty?—Yes.

10944. Do you think that is a workable administrative body?—No, I think it is too large.

10945. What suggestions have you to make with a view to removing those difficulties?—It is difficult to say. The fixing of the number is in the hands of the county councils.

10946. I suppose the most simple way of doing it would be to group parishes, would it not?—Yes.

10947. And to give the group a representation by one guardian instead of, as I understand at present is the case (I may be wrong), each parish having a representative on the board?—There is power to unite one parish to another for the purpose of an election of guardians, but I do not think there is power to combine three. You can combine two, but not three.

10948. Would you suggest that such power should be provided?—I think it would be useful, but the difficulty is that, except in the shape of an application for an increased representation, the fixing of the number does not come before the county council.

10949. However arrived at, would it not be a good thing that that power should be provided?—I think so.

10950. With a view of making the board of guardians a more workable and businesslike body than they appear to be at present?—I think so. The smallest board, I have, I think, is Manchester, which consists of nineteen guardians including co-opted members.

10951. That is for the Manchester union?—Yes.

10952. How is it that the board is so small there?—I do not know; it has always been so.

10953. (*Mrs. Webb.*) The Manchester representatives used to be elected at large, not by wards. They are still elected at large?—I think they are. The area only consists of one parish, the old parish of Manchester, or the old City of Manchester.

10954. It used to be under a Local Act in the olden days?—I think it was.

10955. The overseers are still under a Local Act?—Yes, the overseers are.

10956. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) When applications are made for relief, I see you state as a rule those applications come before committees of boards of guardians?—Yes.

Effect of guardians administering relief to paupers from their own constituency.

10957. Is it your view, as has been represented to us by several of the inspectors whom we have had before us, that it frequently happens that some of these guardians are instigated in giving relief by influences which are brought to bear upon them from the parishes which they themselves represent, or that they desire to rather favour applications which come from their own parishes. Is that your experience?—The guardians who administer

relief on these committees are generally the guardians for the places of which the relief district consists. I think the effect of that is to make them more willing to give than they otherwise would be. It is easier to say "No" to somebody else's neighbour than it is to say "No" to your own next-door neighbour.

10958. That does not seem to be the best method of administration. Have you any suggestion to make by way of altering it?—I do not think I have, for the reasons that, even if you alter the constitution of the committees, you cannot secure the attendance of guardians from a distance. In many instances these committees have been mixed, as they call it, have been composed so as to include guardians from outside the relief district.

10959. When a case comes before these Committees does the applicant himself appear, as a rule?—Yes.

10960. The Committee then deals with the case, and the Committee's decision is final, is it?—Practically it is. In theory it has to be confirmed by the Board, and some Boards, the Manchester Board for instance, and others also, have rules, and if relief is given contrary to those rules, the case has specially to be brought before the whole Board to be confirmed or otherwise.

spective isdiction com- ttees and ole Boards guardians to adminis- ing relief.

10961. When the question comes before the whole Board is the relieving officer present, the same relieving officer who was present before the Committee; if so, has he an opportunity of stating his view of the case?—I am not quite sure that I have ever heard a case opposed under those conditions. As a rule I should say the relieving officer is not present.

10962. Taking the general question, do you think it would be the right thing that there should be a power of appeal, either by the applicant himself if he does not get what he thinks he is entitled to, or by the relieving officer if he thinks the applicant is getting more than he is entitled to? Do you think it would be well to have a power of appeal from the decision of the Committee to the whole Board?—I do not think the appeal should come from the relieving officer. It would be appealing from the decision of part of his employers to the whole of his employers; but it might come from individual members of the Committee.

10963. I do not desire to call it an appeal, but that he should state the case which he has represented originally and which has been over-ruled?—I think at present any individual member of the Committee might bring the case before the whole Board; there is nothing to prevent that.

10964. I do not understand that that system prevails generally, but would you approve of such a system being introduced, if it does not prevail generally, the power, that is, of appealing against the decision of a Committee? I think the power already exists, but it is very seldom that it is used.

10965. You tell us, in paragraph 19, that there are only, in your district, as I take it, thirty-two children boarded-out outside the union?—That was the return given by the clerks in 1904.

all number children arded-out thout the ion and asons there- .

10966. Apparently the system of boarding-out children outside the union scarcely exists in your district?—Very little of it.

10967. Is there any reason for that that you can state?—In the case of Liverpool, they tried it and they did not like it. At one time they had 100 children, I think, boarded out, but they were not satisfied, and they did not board out any more, and the number gradually fell away.

10968. Can you inform us why that was: what reasons operated to induce Liverpool to give up the system?—I cannot give you a special reason.

10969. Was it the difficulty of getting homes?—No, I think they were not satisfied with the results of the system.

10970. It did not suit the children, or they did not benefit by it?—They thought they could do better for the children in their own schools.

10971. It is a very much more expensive system in their own schools, is it not?—Yes, per child.

10972. We have been informed by Miss Mason that in Westmorland and Cumberland, which I think are both within your district, there are a great many boarded out children from other parts of England?—Yes.

10973. Apparently the system does not appeal to the boards of guardians in the district in which these children are boarded out?—That is so.

10974. And the reason, as I understand you, is that the children have not benefited to the extent that they do in the scattered homes and other grouped homes where they are at present being put. Is that so?—My answer just now referred to the reduction in the number boarded-out by Liverpool, but I think that answer would apply generally to Lancashire.

10975. Has the system of inspection that is pursued as regards boarded-out children come under your experience at all?—No, only from reports.

Extravagance in Poor Law buildings and its causes.

10976. You further tell us of a very large expenditure upon buildings and purchase of sites for workhouses, schools and infirmaries. Do you think that the expenditure is more than it ought to be, that there is extravagance in building? Has that come under your notice at all?—I think some of the buildings might have been more cheaply built than they have been—might have been built in a simpler style. Cottage homes, for instance, I think, might be less like villas and more like labourers' cottages than they are.

10977. To whom is the extravagance due? Is it to the boards of guardians, or is it to the methods pursued as regards the architecture?—I think it is perhaps mainly the difficulty of getting an architect to build sufficiently simply. He likes to put up a building that he considers will do him credit, at all events, from the outside.

10978. I think it is also the case that the architect has a percentage, has he not, upon the whole cost of the buildings?—He has, of course.

Mutual waiver of the law of settlement in certain unions.

10979. As regards the question of settlement, I understand you to say that in Liverpool and in Manchester there is a regulation or a system in operation under which no removals are made from one parish of the three parishes in Liverpool to either of the other two parishes, and similarly in Manchester?—Yes, except in the case of lunatics.

10980. That really is, as I understand it, an inter-municipal arrangement; it is an arrangement which exists solely within the municipalities, to take it generally, of Liverpool and Manchester, although the boundaries are not practically the same?—They are arrangements between the Poor Law authorities.

10981. Have you any idea what the cost of settlement litigation in your district is?—No.

Decision of settlement cases by Local Government Board.

10982. Are all cases litigated, or are any of them sent to arbitration by the Local Government Board, there being that power in existence?—Some are so sent; no great number.

10983. To arbitration?—By the Local Government Board, yes.

10984. Do you think it would be a good thing that all settlement cases should be referred to arbitration by the Local Government Board? There is a movement at present in some parts of the country that that should be done?—I have not considered the subject, but, speaking off-hand, I should say "No."

10985. Is that because of the amount of work which would be involved, or what is your reason?—These really are cases requiring evidence to be taken on both sides, and it seems to me that that would be more desirably done in the ordinary course.

10986. Does the present system hold out any inducement to litigation on the part of officials at all?—I do not think so.

10987. That does not operate at all?—I do not think it does.

Conditions in West Derby Union.

10988. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to West Derby the pauperism there is increasing on the whole rather rapidly, is it not? I notice from the figures supplied to us here it is increasing faster than the population?—The population is increasing very fast.

10989. Is that simply that the Liverpool poor people or paupers are passing into West Derby to such an extent?—That has a great effect. I should say that is the main cause.

10990. Is the position being accepted that in their new homes at West Derby practically there is to be the same amount of pauperism that there was in Liverpool; because it is very serious that this new city, or this very

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

large area, should be subject to that, is it not?—You mean that if the paupers are pushed out of Liverpool into West Derby they will be paupers in West Derby?

10991. That is to say the conditions are simply reproducing themselves; there is no depauperising going on, there is a reproduction?—I think that is so.

10992. Is that inevitable? Can administration do nothing still further to prevent that?—If the administration of West Derby were very much stricter than that in Liverpool no doubt there would be a result.

Decreased deterrence of indoor relief.

10993. West Derby is well supplied with institutions, is it not?—Yes.

10994. I notice, in reply to questions sent from here, they say that the institutions are losing their deterrent effect. Is that so?—I think that is distinctly the tendency as a result of the increased comfort.

10995. I notice that in 1895, on 1st January, the pauperism was put down here at 6,937, and on 1st January, 1905, it is put down at 10,150, and the increase is so extraordinarily great that one is inclined to think that either 1905 must have been an excessively bad year or there is some special reason to account for it?—I am afraid I have not anything to refer to with regard to that.

Effect of enlarged Poor Law area for dealing with indoor relief.

10996. Supposing you treated Liverpool, Toxteth Park, and West Derby as a single area for indoor relief, somewhat on the lines of your own suggestion, do you think it would have any effect in the reduction of pauperism?—I think you would have a reduction in pauperism if those areas each paid for their own out-relief; I do not know that you would otherwise, as a consequence of the combination.

10997. But supposing it were possible to have a single board for the indoor relief of that area, which I think is again on the lines you suggest, would that board settling these cases of admission reduce the pauperism?—That board, according to my proposal, would not deal with applications for relief, they would simply deal with those cases that were sent them by the constituent authorities.

10998. Then practically there would be no control, so far as that board was concerned, on the admissions; it would be simply that the local bodies would send to them those that they thought suitable for indoor relief?——Yes, they would have of course the same power of discharge that boards of guardians have now.

10999. How do you tackle the outdoor relief question, because now these bodies pay for their own outdoor relief?—Yes, but it seems to me that if a larger area paid for the indoor relief than paid for the outdoor relief there would be a greater tendency to what is called "offer the House" than to give out-relief.

11000. That is to say the pecuniary charge would not so directly fall upon them, it would be more like our London arrangement?—And also that the numbers of those who accept the offer of the House is comparatively small.

11001. The effect would be really to put a premium on the offer of the House?—I think it would have that tendency.

11002. Do you think in the long run you can trust to a system of that sort; if your House becomes less deterrent will not that system fail?—I think you would be able with a larger area to establish more of what we call test-houses, that is to say houses for the strictly able-bodied who ought not to be in a workhouse at all, where they can be put under stricter discipline than they can in the general workhouse.

11003. Then practically you would adhere to the deterrent in some form?—I think you would.

Paupers' leave of absence from workhouse.

11004. Would you allow them to go in and out of the workhouse as they now do on leave?—Yes, within reason I would.

11005. Do you think that now, with their frequent leave, they exceed reason?—I have known instances where they were allowed to go in and out every day just as they liked.

Bad condition of Salford Union and possible remedies.

11006. With regard to Salford, Salford strikes one as in rather a difficult plight from the point of view of pauperism. The figures are in 1895 on the 1st of January, 3,762, in 1905, 6,223. The figure in 1885, that is to say, twenty years before, is 4,035. I suppose that its pauperism has increased by something like 60 per cent., and its population has increased by something like 12 per cent. Why is it that Salford is not included with Prestwich, Manchester and Chorlton in the arrangement you refer to, because Salford is almost part of Manchester?—I think it should be so included, but it is a distinct borough by itself.

11007. Is it that which prevents it coming in?—I do not know.

Proposed power of compulsorily combining Poor Law areas.

11008. First of all, if this is a unit from the Poor Law point of view, Salford, Manchester, Chorlton, and Prestwich, do you think it would be well to have compulsory powers to bring in an area like that on your own scheme?—Yes, my own scheme proposed the inclusion of Salford.

11009. Then practically you would give the Local Government Board, or some authority, a very large power of reorganising areas under urban conditions?—Yes. It should be a general power extending to the whole country, not merely in view of a particular city.

11010. It would get over particular difficulties?—Yes.

Conditions in Salford Union.

11011. Is it not true that in Salford there are some very large charities?—Yes.

11012. Have you ever seen anything of the working of those charities?—I think I may say "no."

11013. At the same time it is the case, is it not, that the outdoor relief at Salford is very large?—Yes, the outdoor relief is large.

11014. That is to say, it is 3,527 out-door as against 2,696 in-door. You have not, in any of your inquiries in Salford, come across the fact that the outdoor relief recipents are receiving charitable relief as well?—I have not.

11015. Has any investigation been made with regard to Salford, from the point of view of outdoor relief and charity by yourself, or by anybody on behalf of the Local Government Board, in any way?—I do not think so. If I may just say so, the percentage of outdoor to total pauperism in Salford is not very high. It is 56 per cent., just over the half.

11016. But it has an excessive pauperism, at least, I should imagine it has rather an excessive pauperism; it stands at 2·6, but of course, that is not the real test, because the pauperism has been increasing at a much greater rate than the population?—Yes, but in Manchester and in Liverpool, speaking of them as areas, something of the same conditions obtain as in London, namely, that there is a very large non-resident population, and therefore the proportion of pauperism to population seems very high.

11017. Of course, the actual figure 2·6 is not so very high at the moment, it is only by analysis of the figures that you find it is higher than it should be?—The rate for the county was 20·6 per 1,000 on the 1st January, 1905.

11018. Is there any other reason, besides what I have referred to, for Salford being in this position? Is the municipal energy of the place high?—Yes, I should say so.

11019. Is it that the municipal energy of the place does not take special account of pauperism, and matters of that kind, that there is this very large increase of pauperism?—It is the board of guardians who have the administration in their hands, not the municipality.

11020. Generally the municipal energy does not find its way on to the board, is that it?—I do not think I can answer that.

11021. Is there any other special cause for this state of things?—I am not aware of any.

Boarding-out of children within the union and need for its inspection.

11022. With regard to boarding-out, you said that there was next to no boarding-out outside the union. Is there much inside the union?—Yes, a great deal more than there is outside. I think I do give the number; there were about 500 boarded-out inside.

11023. That is not a very large number for such a populous district?—No.

11024. Are you inclined to think that there ought to be any inspection of such children by an inspector of the Local Government Board as there is in the case of boarded-out children?—I am inclined to think that there should be. It is difficult, because many of these really are children in receipt of outdoor relief who are technically classified as boarded out children.

11025. Practically in many instances it is a form of rather cheap outdoor relief ?—Yes.

11026. And therefore there is the more reason to inspect it ?—I think there should be an inspection.

11027. You refer in paragraph 36 to casuals in Liverpool and West Derby, and now in Toxteth Park. What is the scheme you refer to as made in common with those unions ?—The West Derby Guardians have built new casual wards in which the whole of the casuals of Liverpool are, or will very shortly be received. They have themselves paid for the erection of the building, and the others will pay their share, as far as it can be estimated, towards the cost of the maintenance.

11028. So there will be one centre for the whole of the three unions ?—Yes.

11029. Is that connected with any special workhouse ?—It is close to the Belmont Road Workhouse of the West Derby Guardians, and is administered from that.

11030. Is there a large number of applications from casuals in those three unions now ?—Yes, a considerable number. I might also mention that the guardians have built infirmary wards for the sick casuals as distinguished from the general infirmary.

11031. So practically they have organised Poor Relief for casuals as almost a separate department ?—Yes.

11032. Is the result, so far as it can be traced, a reduction of the number of casuals ?—That is an extremely difficult question to answer, because we have no information as to the number of casuals. We have only information as to the number of admissions.

11033. Does the number of admissions keep up ?—I am not quite sure whether these new wards are open; if not, they are on the point of being opened. They have not been at work for any length of time, though for many years West Derby has been dealing with Liverpool casuals —for fifteen years past.

11034. I have been to see the building. Can you say now what has been the result as between West Derby and Liverpool; has there been a reduction of the number ?—I could not say. My information does not go far enough back.

11035. The West Derby Union, in your paragraph 37, are set down as dealing with the acute sick ?—That is so,

11036. Practically, therefore, the West Derby Union infirmary is a rate-supported hospital, is it not ?—All the modern workhouse infirmaries have a tendency to become that.

11037. Is there, within reach of West Derby, no large voluntary hospital that would take the acute sick?—There are several hospitals in Liverpool which do receive a large number, but if they are full, the cases have to be sent on to the Poor Law Infirmaries.

11038. Is it not the case that the West Derby Poor Law Infirmary is more and more becoming a hospital in that sense ?—I think it is.

11039. Are you prepared to accept that position by which the infirmary should become practically a hospital ?—I do not see how to avoid it. A case is brought to the door that requires immediate attention. It cannot be turned away because it is not, in the Poor Law sense, absolutely destitute.

11040. I presume that those very urgent cases are not the normal cases ?—A good many apply at this particular infirmary that have been refused admission for want of room at the voluntary hospitals.

11041. Do you think there is any possibility of there being an arrangement made with the hospitals by which they should take a definite share of the common work, the chronic cases going to the infirmaries and the acute cases, and only the acute cases, possibly, being dealt with by the hospitals. Do you not think it would be at all possible to give the hospitals a definite position in these matters, and require of them a certain duty as we do in Poor Law work normally from the infirmaries ?—No, I do not see how you could do that so long as they are supported by voluntary contributions.

11042. You do not think, because an institution is voluntary, you cannot claim of it a definite responsibility? —They must manage as they please, I take it.

11043. According to that, you could not leave an institution voluntary and give it a definite obligation by giving it a status subject to the fulfilment of those duties ? —You would have to face the possibility of its declining to go on, if it did not like those conditions.

11044. You might also, of course, by a method of organisation, arrange that certain advantages should be given which are not given now, as in the case of friendly societies, which, without registration, would not have some of their advantages. If those inducements were sufficient, possibly you might bring them into a common organisation ? —In some instances boards of guardians subscribe liberally towards local hospitals, because they feel that they do take a large number of cases which otherwise would find their way to the Poor Law infirmary.

Proposed re-organisation of public hospital systems.

11045. Now, I understand, if an acute case comes to the hospital and there is no room for it; it is sent to the infirmary. If an acute case comes to the Poor Law infirmary, it must be received; the consequence is, there will be more and more drifting of acute cases from the hospitals, unless they expand very much, to the infirmaries ?—I think the tendency is all in the direction of our Poor Law infirmaries becoming State hospitals and the voluntary hospitals gradually ceasing to exist.

11046. Practically, in that view, would you suggest that the hospital system of the country be re-organised on a basis apart from the Poor Law ?—At the public expense ?

11047. At the public expense ?—I am not prepared to make that suggestion.

11048. But, of course, it would happen, would it not, that if your Poor Law infirmary was to become more and more the general hospital, the element of dependence, or pauperism, which was so identified with admission to Poor Law relief, would be either blurred or got rid of ?—Yes.

11049. Would you be prepared to accept that result ? —Unwillingly, I confess.

11050. But you have no alternative ?—I do not see the alternative.

The financing of county Poor Law areas.

11051. With regard to your suggestion of the charges being imposed upon the county for the institutions relating to indoor relief, would you propose a county rate to support those institutions, or would you work on the lines of a sort of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—My idea was that by the time any scheme of this kind came into force there would be one basis for the levying of county and poor rates; that these institutions would be supported out of the county rate, and that the State contribution would go towards the alleviation of that rate.

Proposed unification of county and parochial assessments.

11052. Does that imply, in your mind, a county assessment right through the county, a single assessment ?—An assessment for all purposes.

11053. You would not accept the parochial assessments as they now stand ?—Not if I could help it.

11054. You would treat the counties as you would a borough ?—I think strongly there ought to be a single assessment for the county and poor rates.

11055. Your scheme is dependent upon the acceptance of a single assessment for the whole county ?—No, but I think it would be improved by an acceptance of such an assessment.

11056. It would be made juster by it ?—Yes.

11057. Otherwise you would have very varying payments towards your common fund ?—Yes, just as you have now in the contributions towards the county rate, which are levied on one basis, and to the poor rate which are levied on another.

Existing system of Exchequer grants and possible reforms.

11058. Are you in favour of keeping up the present contributions for salaries, and so on, which are made to boards of guardians; as the rateable value of those areas is going up immensely is it desirable that the payment of these comparatively small amounts should be continued ?—In some form or other the contributions, I think, should be continued.

11059. Would you be in favour of paying in a lump sum, but subject to report; making the payments dependent upon efficiency of administration ?—You mean as it is done in the case of the police ?

11060. Yes ?—I see no objection to that.

11061. Are you dissatisfied with the present system of payment for lunatics, the 4s. grant ?—Yes.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

11062. Would you be prepared to adopt a similar system with regard to that?—No, I think I would not.

11063. What do you suggest?—If you had the whole of the indoor poor maintained by the county there would be no object in a grant of that kind.

11064. Your lunacy would then become a county charge?—Yes.

11065. You would still desire, however, a grant towards the lunatics from the State?—Yes. I do not mind whether it is towards the expense of the lunatics or whether it is towards the expense of the indoor poor, but in some way or other I think there should be large grants made so that personal property may be laid under contribution.

11066. Would you not keep the lunatics as a separate department from the Poor Law in your proposed county arrangement?—Yes.

11067. Then your grant to them would be a special grant to a separate department?—It might or might not be. The grant might be simply in aid of the county rate as a whole.

11068. Leaving it to the county to apportion what it would to lunatics?—It seems to me it would not signify how the county apportioned it, in this way: they would have to pay for the maintenance of the poor, and they would have to pay for the maintenance of the lunatics.

11069. I will put this to you: would it not be desirable, if your proposal is adopted, that the grant from the exchequer to the county should be a grant definitely either for indoor relief connected with the poor law, or for lunatics, and that in most cases the contribution should be by way of a grant subject to report?—The question of distribution by the county itself would hardly arise.

11070. It is a point I should wish to have arise?—You mean that the grant, we will say, for lunatics should be dependent upon the report of administration?

11071. Yes, as a separate grant?—I see no objection to that. [But see Q. 11424.]

Possible methods of supervising out relief.

11072. You refer, on your last page, to relieving officers, as a point to which you would call attention. Would you kindly expand a little what you say in those words: "The supervision of relieving officers"?—In some unions there is a superintendent relieving officer who generally superintends all the officials on the relief staff, and my suggestion would be that wherever the number of relieving officers exceeds, say, three or four, there should be some one superintendent to regulate the others, just as you have a superintendent nurse where the number of nurses exceeds a certain number.

11073. But, from the point of view of the inspector, what ability has he, at the present moment, to see the inquiry work of the relieving officers of these important areas is properly done?—Very little indeed.

11074. Would not it be better that the inspector should have at his disposal something of a staff which should investigate and supervise, from the point of view of the whole district, how the work is done in detail?—I do not think it would take the place of the other.

11075. Granted it would not, would not it be better, even if you had the other; in a large number of Unions very possibly you would not get the cross-visitor at once, and even if you had the cross-visitor, still a system will only go on well if the administration is continually supervised from without?—I do not think it is work that could be usefully done by an inspector.

11076. But by an inspector's assistant?—I do not think so.

11077. To what do you trust to raise the level of the investigation if there is no one from without coming in and saying, "This is not up to a certain standard and, therefore, it ought to be improved"?—I think the superintendent would do that.

11078. But he, after all, is a local servant?—Yes.

11079. It may be that he would get to a certain standard of work and then drop. There is nothing to keep him up in his turn?—He is in the employ of the guardians.

11079A. Have not you found there are boards of guardians who pay very little respect to what the relieving officer may say?—Yes, but I would not extend that so much, at all events, to a superintendent relieving officer.

11080. Do you think they will attend to the superintendent relieving officer when they will not listen to the relieving officer of a district?—Yes, I think they are more inclined to consider his opinion.

11081. You are not inclined to think that possibly they may treat them all with the same partial disregard as to their information?—I think, to put it generally, a superintendent relieving officer would have more influence with a board of guardians than an individual relieving officer.

The proper authority for relief of the unemployed.

11082. Are you in favour of having a separate body, in a Union or group of Unions, for the relief of the unemployed on the lines of the Unemployed Workmen's Act, separate bodies like distress committees dealing with the question of the unemployed as apart from the Poor Law?—I think that depends rather on whether you mean the actual relief of the distress arising from unemployment or the larger question of removing the causes which lead to unemployment.

11083. I meant only the action which might be taken under the present Act of Parliament, if that were extended?—I think the relief of distress should be kept to the boards of guardians.

10084. And would you include in that the relief of unemployed persons?—They have to relieve them now if they require it.

11085. Therefore, what you contend for would not need a separate Act of Parliament for the purpose?—Not for the actual purpose of relieving the distress as distinguished from removing the want of employment.

Aged Deserving Poor: Effect of Mr. Chaplin's circular.

11086. Has the Aged Deserving Poor Circular made any difference in the administration in your district?—Yes, I think it has. The idea was moving before: it may have given an additional stimulus to it. In most of the workhouses, certainly the larger ones, one generally finds now special wards set apart for those that are considered the more respectable of the aged poor.

11087. Has it given any real impetus to outdoor relief?—The misunderstanding of it has.

11088. On the whole, would you be inclined to revise the circular, or to bring it into accord by the kind of consolidation which you propose of the Orders and Circulars of the Board?—I do not propose to consolidate the Circulars, but the Orders.

Proposed devolution of powers of Local Government Board.

11089. Would you not have to bring in a good deal of information that is in the Circulars, if you are to produce a document which would cover the ground for boards of guardians?—I am in hopes that if the extension of areas should take place, such as I venture to suggest, the minute control which is now exercised by the Local Government Board would, to a great extent, disappear. You would not require the detailed duties to be so minutely laid down as they are in the Consolidated Order.

11090. There would be the new centre for local administration as between the Local Government Board and the Guardians, and to that all these questions would go?—I think to a certain extent they would. As to the control of officers, for instance, you would not require a County Board of Guardians to submit every appointment for approval to the Local Government Board.

11091. And so with dismissals?—And dismissals the same.

Existing difficulties in removing inefficient Poor Law officers.

11092. Have you found, at present, great difficulty about dismissals?—Yes

11093. On what grounds?—Mainly where an officer was simply inefficient; thoroughly respectable, perhaps, nothing against him, but not capable of doing his work properly.

11094. The order itself is broad enough, is it not, to allow the Local Government Board to dismiss a man like that?—Yes, but the Local Government Board would require some evidence before it exercised its power.

11095. Would not the new authority you refer to be in the same plight?—The officer would be the officer of the new authority.

11096. That is to say, all the officers for in-door relief being practically employed by one body, that body could get rid of them?—They could deal with them as they chose.

Effect of administration on pauperism.

11097. (*Mr. Chandler.*) Speaking of the ratios of pauperism in your district you mentioned, that to a

considerable extent, the various figures represent differences of administration, and I think you specially mentioned the change in the Prestwich figures as being due mainly to a change in the principles of administration ?—Yes.

11098. Can you tell us in what way a change in the principles of administration has been responsible for that ?—My general meaning was, that the relief was administered less strictly than it had previously been, that is to say, that out-relief was granted more freely and to more individuals than it had been.

11099. Yet in Manchester proper that would hardly apply, because there we have, as is often quoted, some very strict rules for the administration of relief ?—That is so; but in Manchester the increase has been considerable also.

11100. In spite of the decrease of population in Manchester proper, the number of paupers on January 1st, 1905, was very high, was it not ?—Yes.

Effect on pauperism of recent abnormal distress.

11101. That could hardly be attributed altogether to the administration, could it ?—Of course there has been more distress than usual during the last few winters.

11102. That is what I wish to bring out. Is it not a fact that a census of your district on January 1st, 1905, would hardly give a fair comparison, because the guardians had then to deal with the distress that had arisen through the short-time in the cotton mills of Lancashire which had, for quite a long period prior to that, been in operation ?—That is the case.

11103. So that all the Lancashire unions on January 1st 1905, would be suffering most acutely in consequence of that operation ?—Yes.

11104. The docks at Manchester and at Salford, I suppose, would have something to do with the existence of casual employment ?—Yes; there would be an increase, and a considerable increase, in the casual labour owing to those.

Effect of increased facility for paupers' leave of absence from workhouse.

11105. I think you expressed an opinion that the granting of liberty to the inmates, rather tended to do away with that deterrent which should exist, as far as going into the workhouse is concerned ?—Yes.

11106. I suppose that would not apply to unions in your district, such as Chorlton and Manchester, where the workhouse simply contains the aged and the infirm ?—I have an instance in my mind where the freedom to go in and out, and to receive visits from friends, was enlarged considerably, and where, in consequence, the discipline of the workhouse suffered and the numbers increased. A certain amount of change has taken place, and there has been a change in the results in consequence.

11107. But the real and chief reason for restricting the liberty of the inmates would apply, I take it, to the able-bodied inmates rather than to the aged an infirm ?—No, I would apply it to the aged as well; otherwise you would take away all incentive to avoid having to come to the workhouse.

Effect on pauperism of Workmen's Compensation Act.

11108. In answer to the Chairman, you spoke of the general influence of the Employer's Liability Act as having had something to do with old age pauperism; would that apply in those parts of your district where there are cotton mills ?—Yes, I should imagine it would apply there.

11109. Do you mean to say that employers get rid of their hands on account of the risk that old age brings in connection with this Act ?—I think that if there are two men of equal ability applying for work, and one is a young man and the other is an old man, it would go hard with the old man.

11110. That is so to-day and every day, is it not, under any circumstances ?—Yes; but I think from all I am told, that the Workmen's Compensation Act has had an effect in that way.

Boarding-out of children.

11111. I understand you have in your district various systems of dealing with the children; do you find that the boarding-out system has been successful in the district ?—There is hardly any boarding-out beyond the union.

11112. Boarding-out within the union has not been successful, has it ?—I should not like to say it has not been a success, but I think all boarding-out of children requires the most careful watching.

11113. So far as the future of the children, after they leave the care of the guardians, is concerned, has the boarding-out system produced as good results as the system of grouped homes ?—I do not think I could answer that question. The grouped home system has produced very good results. Speaking generally, children brought up in workhouses do not return in after life to any great extent.

After-careers of Poor Law children.

11114. In any case, the grouped home system must give them a better training, both males, and females, for starting out in life, must it not ?—I think so, personally.

11115. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) As regards the schools, I think, owing to the Act of 1903, the children now are examined by the Board of Education, are they not ?—Yes.

Examination of Poor Law children by inspectors of Board of Education.

11116. Could you give us any information as to what have been the results of the inspection ? Do the inspectors of the Board of Education find that the children in these big schools are as well educated, or better educated, than the children in the ordinary elementary schools ?—I do not think the system has been in operation sufficiently long to be able to speak to that. I have seen no notice of it that would enable me to answer that.

11117. When the inspectors of the Board of Education first visited the schools, there were no reports made out for the information of the guardians that you know of, were there ?—I have seen a few, but very few—not enough to found an answer upon.

Need for further assistants to inspectors.

11118. Might I ask one question as to the size of your district; it is one of the largest in England, is it not ?—Yes, it is.

11119. And has a larger population than most ?—Yes.

11120. Have you any recommendations or advice to give us as regards an increase in the staff of inspectors for so large a district ?—I have an assistant, and mine is the only district outside London that has.

11121. Supposing both you and your assistant were able to give more time to the boards of guardians, would you be able to raise more rapidly the level of administration inside and outside the workhouse ?—One point on which I feel that I have not been able to do so much as I should have wished, is attending out-relief committees. There are a great number of them in the district, and I have not time to attend them all, or nearly all.

11122. I suppose a great deal of your time is really taken up by performing duties which might be performed by an assistant, so giving you more time to attend to matters of that kind which are of greater importance ?—No, I do not think I would say that, because my assistant does most of the formal inspection, and leaves me free in that way to attend to whatever seems to require attention.

11123. Of course, your relief committees being so numerous, you cannot get to them as often as you could wish, can you ?—No, you cannot.

11124. Therefore, your influence cannot be continuous ?—No, it cannot.

Need for unification of county and parochial rate.

11125. As regards the recommendation or suggestion you have made about the county rate, that would involve, would it not, an assessment of the whole county made by one authority, a county authority ?—I do not think it would necessarily involve that, but certainly there should be one basis.

11126. There should be one, no doubt, you would say ?—I think everybody agrees in that.

11127. In so far as you know anything about the urban districts, that is to say, the smaller districts, you are thoroughly dissatisfied, are you not, with the way in which the overseers discharge their duty—perhaps "thoroughly" is too strong ?—I am not prepared to say that. My point is, that whereas at present there is one basis for levying the county rate, and another for levying the poor rate, there should be one basis for the two, and one valuation for the two—in, fact, for all purposes.

11128. Made by an authority other than that which makes the rate ?—I think helped by another authority; I would not take the valuation out of the hands of assessment committees, because local knowledge is extremely valuable, and I do not think it could be supplied in any other way.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

Compulsory detention in workhouses of certain classes.

11129. In paragraph 75 (5), you say you would like to call attention to the compulsory removal to, with detention, in a workhouse in certain cases; would you amplify that?—Every now and then, there is a case of an old man or an old woman who is a nuisance to the neighbours, whom it is impossible to nurse under existing conditions, and who in his or her own interest, ought to be removed to a place where he or she can be looked after—perhaps it is an old person living in a room without furniture, filthy to the last degree and objectionable in every way, who steadfastly refuses to accept an order for the workhouse; I think that, under conditions—make them as stringent as you like—there should be power to remove that person against his or her will.

11130. Would your recommendation extend to any other class of case, beside the aged and infirm, either as regards detention or removal?—No, I do not think so. Those are the cases I had in my mind.

11131. Not phthisical cases?—No; I do not go so far as that.

11132. Or any other case of that kind?—No.

Diminution of filial responsibility and its causes.

11133. Statements are often made in the south, that in parts of your district, children are less willing than they used to be to contribute to the maintenance of their parents; is that a libel on your district?—I am afraid not. That is the general opinion.

11134. Could you tell us what that is due to?—It may be in a measure due to the fact that the workhouses are more comfortable now, and, therefore, children have not the same objection to their parents going in, and the parents themselves have not the same objection to go in that they had. The difficulty of making unwilling children contribute is great—I do not say greater than it has been.

11135. I suppose, in the long run, it is really settled by public opinion much more than by a magistrate's order?—The applications for a magistrate's order are comparatively few. Guardians, as a rule, call upon the son or whatever the relation may be, to contribute, and a great deal is collected in that way.

Proposed alteration in period and method of repayment of loans.

11136. Have you any recommendation to make as regards the present system for the repayment of loans? Do you think that the system which is now common, of equal instalments of capital and interest, tends to economy?—Yes, I am inclined to think that is the better plan.

11137. Extending over thirty or more years, say sixty years?—I think the length of the loan is sufficient at present.

11138. Would you extend it say from thirty to fifty or sixty years?—Not for buildings.

11139. Would you for land?—For land it is now extended.

11140. You think on the whole that that system does not tend to extravagance?—No.

Disinclination of guardians to incur capital expenditure.

11141. Supposing the guardians had to pay more in the early years of the loan, would they not consider more carefully than they do now before embarking on any fresh capital expenditure?—I am not sure that I think it is desirable that they should do that. My difficulty very often is to persuade them to embark on capital expenditure at all.

11142. Is it a common difficulty in your district to get them to embark on any capital expenditure?—Yes, I think it is; still my district is exceptionally good in that respect, for they spend a great deal. But I think if they had to repay more in the earlier years, they would embark less on fresh capital expenditure.

Question of "Pluralist" clerks to guardians.

11143. I suppose in most of your unions the clerks give the whole of their time to the duties of their office?—In a great many of them they do, but in many of the smaller ones they do not. In nearly all the larger ones they do.

11144. Could you make any generalisation for our guidance on the matter, as to whether or not you get a higher standard of administration where the clerks give their whole time?—In the smaller unions it would be impossible for the clerk to give his whole time to Poor Law work, as there would not be enough for him to do; and again the smaller unions could not afford to pay a clerk to give his whole time—at least if they did they would get not so high a class of man.

11145. Even at a lower salary they might get a man quite capable, might they not; because in many unions, I am right, am I not, in saying that the clerk to the board of guardians simply provides one of his own clerks who does the work?—Yes, to a certain extent that is the case, where the whole time of the clerk himself is not given.

11146. The clerk to the guardians is also clerk to the magistrates, say, and he holds half-a-dozen offices of different kinds, and so he simply pays a clerk so many shillings a week to do his guardian's work?—That is so as regards the formal work, only you have the better man to fall back upon for advice in any case of difficulty.

11147. Do you mean for legal advice?—Yes, and further—for general advice, and guidance.

11148. And you think that is very valuable, do you? I think it is valuable.

11149. Do you think that it more than compensates for what you lose by the man's mind naturally being occupied with many other things besides Poor Law administration?—Yes, I think so.

Cases which should be compulsorily removed to workhouse.

11150. (*Dr. Downes.*) You have spoken of its being advisable to give power to remove to the workhouse certain cases that are neglected; have you reason to suppose that there are many of those cases?—No, I do not think there are, but one comes across a case every now and then.

11151. Do the district medical officers report them to the guardians when they occur?—Yes, I think they do.

11152. And the relieving officers also?—The relieving officers would also report such cases.

Attendance of district medical officers at relief committees.

11153. Do the district medical officers ever attend the guardians with a view to informing them on the condition of their cases?—Seldom.

11154. Do you think that would be a desirable practice, if it could be arranged?—Yes, I think it would be.

11155. It might be a check on the abuse of outdoor medical relief in some cases, might it not?—Do you mean in regard to the granting of orders?

11156. I am referring to the granting of medical comforts, medical extras?—Yes, I think it might be in that case.

11157. (*Mr. Phelps.*) At Oxford the medical officer always attends, I think?—I had that in my mind.

Laxity as to medical relief and its effect on pauperism.

11158. (*Dr. Downes.*) Do you find any tendency to grant medical relief with less strictness than ordinary relief?—Yes, distinctly.

11159. Do you think that is desirable?—No, I do not. I think that an application for medical relief ought to be gone into quite as carefully as an application for ordinary relief.

11160. Do you think that sometimes it may be the first step towards the ordinary relief?—I do.

11161. Is your district well-provided with voluntary provision for sickness, first of all of the charitable kind; that is to say, are you well-provided with hospitals of various descriptions?—Yes, I should say as a whole we were; but it is a difficult question to answer.

11162. Have you rather more than the average, do you think?—Yes, I should think so.

Transfer of cases from general hospitals to Poor Law infirmaries.

11163. But, nevertheless, I think you have told us that the tendency is for the hospitals to send cases to the Poor Law infirmaries?—That happens when they are overfull.

Sick benefit clubs.

11164. With regard to the provision by thrift for sickness, have you anything you can tell us on that point in reference to Lancashire?—Do you mean by way of clubs?

11165. By way of clubs and societies which provide for sickness?—I do not think there is anything different there from what obtains elsewhere. There are numerous benefit clubs and trade unions which give payment in sickness, and so on.

11166. Have you any information as to whether that kind of provision for sickness is increasing or otherwise?—No, I have nothing that I can rely upon.

11167. Could you point to any source of information on that question?—I do not think I could.

11168. With regard to the provision for the indoor sick, speaking quite generally, are you satisfied with the

Improved provision for indoor sick: effect of Nursing Order.

progress that has been made in your time in that respect?—Yes, I am. I speak as a layman and not as an expert like yourself.

11169. You have from time to time, I think, availed yourself of Dr. Fuller's services?—Yes.

11170. Dr. Fuller, I have no doubt, would communicate to you his opinion of what he saw?—Yes. I think there is reason to be satisfied.

11171. You give a very interesting table of the increase in the number of nurses which were provided; should you consider that the Nursing Order had stimulated that provision?—Yes, greatly; and if I may say so, the circulation of that return has had considerable effect by showing the guardians how their unions stood in comparison with others.

Circulation to boards of guardians of statistics as to other unions.

11172. I gather from that that you attach considerable importance to the circulation of information to each board of guardians which enables it to know what its neighbours are doing?—I do.

11173. Would you extend that to other particulars of information, such as expenditure?—Yes. We do circulate that kind of information to a limited extent.

11174. Do you mean that the inspectors or the Local Government Board circulate it?—The inspectors do.

11175. In the earlier days of the Nursing Order, did you have any cases of difficulty in its administration, any cases of friction, for instance?—Yes.

11176. Do you find that difficulty tending to decrease?—Yes, distinctly.

Insufficiency of night nursing.

11177. One or two places still, you say, have need for more night nurses; has any action been taken in those cases?—None, beyond calling the attention of the guardians to the fact by myself.

11178. That has been done, you say?—That has been done in some instances.

11179. What is their reason generally for not complying with the suggestion?—I think it is a disinclination to increase the staff, and in some instances not realising the importance of night nursing.

Separate Poor Law infirmaries.

11180. You have in your district two separate infirmaries, I think?—I may say that we have three now, because one has just been opened at Highfield for Liverpool.

11181. Are those under distinctly separate administration?—Yes.

11182. Have you any separate infirmaries under a medical superintendent?—One.

11183. And only one?—Yes, that is the Mill Road Infirmary belonging to the West Derby Guardians.

Checks by guardians on cost of medical relief.

11184. What checks on the cost of infirmaries in administration and maintenance are exercised by the guardians? Do any of your boards of guardians have systematic returns of the expenditure at their infirmary, classified under different heads?—Yes, I think they do; but I do not think I could tell you which.

11185. Do you think it would be desirable that systematic analyses of such expenditure should be regularly made?—I think it would be a good thing, but it would be examined by comparatively few.

11186. Even in Lancashire?—I am afraid even in Lancashire.

11187. Where you have a visiting medical staff, who supervises the cost of the drugs and the cost of the sick diets and medical matters of that sort? Is there a resident medical officer who has any authority on the matter?—Do you mean as to the actual prices of them, and so forth?

11188. No, rather as to the reasonableness of the orders given by the medical men?—I do not remember any system of doing that, but I have no doubt it is done.

Revision of diets by medical officer.

11189. Are you aware that under the Dietaries Order it would be the duty of the medical officer to revise the sick dietaries periodically?—Yes.

11190. The object of that being to see that the diets were not continued unnecessarily?—Yes.

11191. Do you find that that duty, for example, is carried out?—Tolerably well, only. It is a duty that one has to call attention to from time to time. There is no actual prescribed form in which the record of that revision has to be entered.

11192. Do you think that that might be one reason why it has not been so fully carried out?—I think it might be.

11193. You have spoken of an outbreak of ophthalmia at a school; may I ask if you know what kind of ophthalmia it was? I ask, because some forms are very trivial and some are more serious?—It was not the form that you can get rid of in a comparatively brief time.

11194. It was a chronic trouble then?—Yes.

Education of Poor Law children suffering from contagious affections.

11195. What steps did the guardians take in that case?—They built an iron house for the isolation of the cases, and Dr. Fuller has been down several times to examine and advise. I do not think they have employed an expert there.

11196. Do they educate the children?—Yes, to a certain extent.

11197. But not very thoroughly?—Not very thoroughly, I am afraid, it is hardly possible.

11198. They had no other course open to them; there was no place to which they could send those children, I take it?—That is so.

11199. Should you think it desirable that under your scheme of classification there should be some arrangement for cases of that sort?—Yes, I think so. At Liverpool the Liverpool guardians are building blocks for scrofulous and for ophthalmic children, for the purposes of isolation.

11200. If there were any classification by workhouses such as you have suggested, how would you propose that the cases should be revised as to their chargeability?—Do you mean as to their chargeability on the county?

11201. I am thinking of cases that have come under my own observation in similar instances—cases that have been originally destitute, but whose circumstances afterwards have altered, and the guardians from whose union they originally came have not been aware of that alteration in their circumstances?—That is a point which would be of importance, but which I have not considered.

11202. It is a point which would have to be borne in mind, I take it?—It would, no doubt.

Need for some accommodation for sick in every workhouse.

11203. I take it you realise that it might be difficult to remove all the sick from the workhouses, because some times cases fall sick that are not capable of being removed?—Yes.

11204. So that some sick provision would have to be made probably in other workhouses than those specially set aside for the sick?—Yes.

Effect of Superannuation Act on difficulty of getting rid of inefficient officers.

11205. On the last page of your memorandum in paragraph 75 (2), you speak of the difficulty the guardians sometimes have in getting rid of an inefficient officer; do you find that that difficulty has been increased by the operation of the Superannuation Act?—No, I do not know that it has.

11206. Do you ever get cases where officers, who have contributed for a long time to that fund and yet cannot be certified as mentally or physically unfit, cannot be got rid of without suffering considerable hardship by the loss of their pensions?—Do you mean officers over whom the guardians have power of dismissal?

11207. I will take those officers over whom they have power of dismissal?—Yes; I have known cases where officers have been allowed to remain on when they have rather outlived their usefulness, in order that they might qualify for superannuation.

11208. I did not know whether you had that in your mind when you wrote that sentence?—No; I had more in mind the case of an officer to whose dismissal the consent of the Local Government Board is necessary. A general charge of inefficiency is not sufficient to bring that about.

Proposed power to Local Government Board to build and administer new workhouse.

11209. You have suggested, I think, in your evidence that the Local Government Board should have power to order a new workhouse to be built, but if they ordered a new workhouse to be built could you suggest any power by which they could cause it to be maintained and administered when it was built?—I think the power would have to be extended to that, so that if the guardians failed to maintain it, the Board would be able to step in and do it for them at the cost of the rates.

Mr. Herbert Jesner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

11210. And administer it?—And administer it. They can do so now in the case of individual officers, if the guardians refuse to appoint.

11211. Do they ever exercise that power?—I have never known of it.

Insurance of paupers.

11212. Among the suggestions that we have received from chairmen of boards of guardians in your district, I see that one of them, the chairman of the Bolton Board, suggests that there should be a reform of the law as to the insurance of paupers; have you had any cases in your district of the insurance of paupers which seemed to call for that?—Generally speaking, the insurance of paupers is carried on largely. A number of inmates of workhouses are insured.

11213. By whom are they insured?—Sometimes by their own relations, and sometimes I understand by those who are not relations at all.

11214. Do you think that is satisfactory?—No, I do not.

11215. (*Professor Smart.*) Are they insurances for the purposes of speculation?—Yes.

11216. (*Dr. Downes.*) Have you any particular instances you can mention to illustrate that?—No, I do not think I have.

11217. (*Mr. Booth.*) Are they new insurances, or insurances maintained in order to cover an old debt?—Very often—I should say more often than not—they are insurances which are being maintained; but that is not always the case, I believe.

11218. (*Professor Smart.*) Do you consider there is any harm in a speculative insurance?—I do not think it is a desirable thing.

11219. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is the insurance usually maintained to cover a debt owing by the person insured?—No, I do not think so.

11220. (*Miss Hill.*) It is for the purpose of burial usually, is it not?—The cost of burial is sometimes paid out of it, but not in all cases.

11221. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Where it is effected by an outsider, it is not for the purpose of burial, is it?—Sometimes where it is effected by an outsider a contribution towards the cost of burial is made, but that is by no means always the case.

11222. It is to cover a debt, very often, is it not?—It may be that.

11223. (*Professor Smart.*) But it might be done as a pure speculation by an outsider?—I believe so.

11224. Do you see any specific objection to that, more than to any other form of speculation? Is there any harm done to the pauper himself, for example, by it?—No, I do not know that there is.

11225. (*Dr. Downes.*) Are you aware that it led to a case of murder in one of the London Imbecile Asylums?—No, I am not.

Burial of paupers by friends.

11226. Have you any statistics as to the number of paupers who are buried by their friends?—No, I have not; I know it is a large number.

11227. Do you think that the proportion is increasing?—I have no information to guide me.

11228. You have mentioned that you have a tuberculosis hospital established by the Poor Law authorities at Heswall?—Yes.

Poor Law Hospital for Tuberculosis.

11229. Have you any tuberculosis hospitals established by sanitary authorities in your district?—I am not aware of any.

11230. (*Mr. Phelps.*) You have had some experience, I think, of the Poor Law in Gloucestershire, have you not?—Yes.

11231. And for some time you were associated with Mr. Henley, were you not, in the Oxford district when he was inspector?—Yes.

Comparision of Poor Law administration in the North and Midlands.

11232. Can you from your experience draw any broad distinction between the Poor Law in the South and in the North?—Speaking generally, in my present district the whole circumstances are much more urban than they were in the Oxfordshire district; and the urban portion compares very much with what the administration was at Birmingham in the Oxfordshire district. The remainder of the Oxfordshire district was mainly agricultural. I have some agricultural parts in Westmorland and Cumberland and a few in Lancashire, but not very many. I do not know that I can draw any broad distinction.

11233. Would you, on general lines, say that the interest in Lancashire is in the main institutional, and in the South is in the main in the matter of outdoor relief?—I think that is so to a considerable extent, partly because often in the agricultural districts the administration of relief comes before the whole Board instead of before a few members of a committee.

11234. Do you think, with regard to the labouring class itself and the poorer class, that poor relief plays a different part in their lives in the North from what it does in the South?—You have in connection with the big towns a very large class of loafers and corner-men who come under the Poor Law in some shape or other constantly, which you do not get in the more agricultural districts.

11235. Would you say that the prospect of receiving relief in old age was as much a factor in the lives of the poor in the North as it is in the South?—I think they look to the Poor Law in the North quite as much as they do in the South.

11236. Would you say that in the case of unemployment they look more to it?—Yes.

11237. Do you think that it really has a perceptible influence upon employment and wages in the North of England?—I hardly know. Of course the cases of unemployment in towns are very numerous, compared with what they are in agricultural districts; one hardly comes across them in agricultural districts.

11238. The Poor Law is never counted upon in the agricultural districts as a substitute for employment, is it?—No.

11239. But in large towns you think it is now?—Yes in large towns it is.

Increase in comfort of workhouses.

11240. You say with regard to workhouses that their comfort has very much increased of late years?—Yes, it has.

11241. We neither of us can remember the passing of the first Poor Law; do you think that, relatively to the standard of living outside, the improvement has been great?—I should say it had been.

11242. Is it greater on the whole than the rise of the standard oustide?—It is distinctly greater.

11243. It has passed the point at which you could say it is no more than parallel?—Yes.

Treatment of "ins-and-outs."

11244. You are familiar with the class of people called ins-and-outs, of course?—Yes; we have to deal with them.

11245. Have you any suggestion to make with regard to their treatment?—I think after a certain time they ought not to be allowed to go on going in and out.

11246. It has been suggested to us that they should be treated as vagrants, after a time?—Then I should want to know how the vagrants are going to be treated.

Religious ministration for workhouse inmates.

11247. Have you any experience with regard to the existence of chaplains in workhouses?—Yes.

11248. Have most of the workhouses in your district chaplains?—There is a considerable number that have not. I think one reason is this. The Local Government Board no longer insists upon a chaplain being appointed; but if a chaplain is appointed it is a permanent appointment. On the other hand, if the guardians want to appoint someone to minister to the Roman Catholics or the Nonconformists, they can make the appointment on such terms as they please and terminate it when they please. They have no such power in connection with the chaplain, and I think that stands greatly in the way of more numerous appointments of chaplains.

11249. What kind of substitute do you find for a chaplain in workhouses?—Sometimes a rota of clergy and Nonconformists who take duty in turn. Sometimes it is done voluntarily, the different denominations being kept distinct. In two cases a chaplain is maintained by offertories at the different churches in the rural deanery, or the archdeaconry in which the workhouse is situate, who maintain and pay a voluntary chaplain.

11250. Do you find all those systems in different places working fairly satisfactorily and well?—I do not think the system of a rota is satisfactory. I think it means that

the inmates are ministered to by those of different denominations, sometimes by one and sometimes by another.

The Creed Register.

11252. There is a religious census taken, is there not, of inmates always ?—There is one always in existence called a creed register.

11253. Do you think that is a trustworthy document ?—If it is properly kept, I think it is reasonably correct.

Voluntary visitation of workhouse.

11254. Have you much experience of volunteer visiting of workhouses ?—Yes, a certain amount.

11255. Is that increasing ?—I do not think it is.

11256. Is it viewed with favour as a rule by guardians ?—There are diversities of opinions upon that.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, on administration.

11257. With regard to the boards of guardians themselves, do you remember the passing of the Local Government Act, 1894 ?—Yes.

11258. Do you think that has made much difference in the composition of the boards of guardians of Lancashire ?—It has certainly ; there has been a difference since then.

11259. Do you find the interest in Poor Law affairs has been extended ?—I think there was a considerable stimulus given to it at the time of the passing of that Act.

11260. Have you any knowledge as to whether the percentage of people voting at elections is larger ?—No, I do not know about that.

11261. Nor whether it grows ?—No.

11262. Do you not think it is a very desirable thing that public opinion should be growing on the matter of Poor Law questions ?—In which direction ?

11263. I mean growing at all—that there should be more people taking interest in them ?—Yes ; and I think there are more people taking an interest in them.

Working men as guardians.

11264. Have you many boards on which working men sit ?—Yes.

11265. Have you formed any opinion as to their contribution to the administration of the board ?—I have known working men do very good service indeed on boards of guardians.

Scheme for dealing with indoor-relief by county authorities and with out-relief by district councils and its effect.

11266. You are in favour of a certain amount of specialisation in institutions, I see ?—Yes.

11267. You would treat the various departments of pauperism in separate institutions ?—Yes.

11268. And you would be inclined to put them under a joint board representing the various boards of guardians —Yes.

11269. Do you think that it would be reasonable to remove vaccination from the work of boards of guardians ?—Yes.

11270. Have you faced the question as to what, if those reforms were carried out, would be left for boards of guardians to do ?—Yes, I have ; and in my memorandum I suggest the possibility of the remaining work of the guardians being done by district councils.

11271. Do you think that the work which would be left to them would be sufficiently interesting and important to keep up the quality of the boards of guardians ?—No, I do not think it would be. I think ultimately they might be done without.

11272. Do you think a district council would be a good body to deal with out-door relief, for instance ?—I think they would do it just as well as the boards of guardians, in fact in the agricultural districts of course they do it now—it is the same body.

11273. Supposing that under any Act of Parliament a special body were appointed to consider old age pensions, then the functions of guardians would be nearly at an end, would they not ?—If the guardians no longer had to do with that and there were a county board of guardians, yes.

The question of disfranchisement through medical relief.

11274. With regard to the question of medical relief, you stated that the tendency you thought was for the infirmaries to take the place practically of voluntary effort ?—I think that is so, in the large towns, at all events.

11275. Do you think, if that became customary, that it would be desirable to maintain the disqualification attendant upon entering a Poor Law infirmary, I mean political disfranchisement ?—I am not at all sure that it would, if that became acknowledged and general.

11276. That is to say, you would draw a distinction between the sickness which required relief in an institution and the sickness which did not require removal to an institution ?—Yes, the latter can be provided for through benefit societies.

11277. You would make the one disfranchise and the other not ?—Yes ; but I would not necessarily extend that absence of disqualification to all the inmates of an infirmary.

11278. How would you distinguish between them ?—I do not know that I could, but I have in my mind that in many infirmaries there are a number of infirm and aged paupers who are placed there simply for convenience.

11279. People, that is to say, who, being inmates of the house, have been moved to the infirmary ?—Yes.

11280. As distinct from people who come in straight to the infirmary ?—As distinct from the acute sick, if you like to call them so.

Possibility of abolishing out-medical relief.

11281. Supposing that that change was made, and that in-door medical relief did not carry disfranchisement, do you think it would be possible to abolish all out-door medical relief ?—No, I do not think it would.

11282. Do you think that voluntary agencies could be counted on to take its place ?—No, I do not think they could be.

Proposed administration of indoor relief by county authorities and out-door relief by district councils.

11283. (*Miss Hill.*) You say in paragraph 62 "the work of a board of guardians is far more important than that of a county council, except as regards education and the care of lunatics, and it might be better to choose a board of guardians for the county by direct election" ; then, I gather from your answer to Mr. Phelps, that you rather think those guardians might be district councillors also, is that so ?—No. Mr. Phelps was asking me as to what would remain for the existing boards of guardians to do in the event of a county board of guardians taking over the management of all the workhouses, and I said I did not think there would be much left for them to do.

11284. Are you imagining a county board of guardians and also boards of guardians for the separate unions ?—No, I thought that, by degrees, when a county board is established, the tendency would be for the others to disappear, their duties as regards hearing applications for out-relief being handed to the district councils.

11285. Then you were not thinking that the duties of boards of guardians in dealing more with people than things required a different quality of men and women to those who were entrusted with the more business work which is handed over to county councils ?—No, because in all the country districts the district council and the board of guardians are one and the same body.

11286. So that you would rather be aiming at the time when the county authorities took over the institutional relief and the district councils took over the out-relief ; is that so ?—Took over the dealing with the applications for relief.

Probable economies of a combination of unions.

11287. (*Professor Smart.*) You note that although the rate of pauperism is low the expense of workhouse accommodation is increasing rapidly, so that what you would consider better administration is not likely to be cheaper administration ?—I think the tendency would be in the direction of being cheaper, from their not having to maintain so many empty beds. In an ordinary workhouse you have to maintain empty beds for a number of different classes ; if you had your different classes in different workhouses you could fill up much more closely.

11288. But with that exception the tendency would be to more expense, would it not ?—No, I do not know that it would be so.

11289. Do you think the economy saved by a union of unions would be so great as to counterbalance that ?—I do not see why the cost should increase any more under a county board of guardians than it would under the existing boards of guardians.

11290. You mention specifically the increasing expense of workhouse accommodation, and you look forward to increasing the workhouse accommodation, do you not ?—No, I look forward more to re-arranging it.

11291. And not necessarily increasing it ?—No, not necessarily increasing it.

11292. This combination of unions is the only suggestion you can put forward for economy, is it not ?—In connection with in-door relief.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

Comparative stigma of out and in-door relief.

11293. I think you said there was a stigma attaching to in-door pauperism that did not attach to outdoor pauperism; do you refer both to the case of aged poor and to the case of widows?—Yes, I think to both.

11294. Do you find in that any argument for old age pensions?—I look upon old age pensions as a form of out-relief.

11295. But so far with an absence of stigma?—There would be no stigma attaching to a person in the receipt of a pension.

11296. You think there is not much stigma attached just now to relief?—I do not think there is.

Origin, necessity and effect of the alternatives: Out-door Relief Regulation and Prohibitory orders

11297. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 8 of your memorandum you refer to the unions that come under the Out-door Regulation Order and the Prohibitory Order; there are a few unions which I do not find in the list of either of those orders, namely, Bootle, Barrow, Lunesdale, and Toxteth Park?—Bootle is under the Prohibitory Order, Toxteth is under the Regulation Order, Lunesdale is under the Regulation Order, Barrow is under the Regulation Order—in fact all the unions in Lancashire except Ormskirk are under the Regulation Order.

11298. Do you find that there is any difference in the administration of unions under the respective orders?—The unions under the Prohibitory Order cannot grant relief to able-bodied men.

11299. In actual practice do you see any real practical difference in the administration of unions that come under either of the two orders?—Where, as in many instances, the union is under the Prohibitory Order, and they also have had issued to them a Labour Test Order, the difference is slight.

11300. Do you see any reason why the distinction should be made between the Prohibitory Order and the Regulation Order?—The distinction arose, as I understand it, from the inability of the original Poor Law Commissoners to get the Prohibitory Order accepted in the northern countries, the manufacturing distrists. They intended originally to have the Prohibitory Order everywhere.

11301. Had it not something to do with the amount of provision that was available for in-door relief?—The Prohibitory Order was only issued in cases where sufficient accommodation had been provided.

11302. Therefore it was regulated partly by the amount of accommodation for in-door paupers?—Yes.

11303. Do you see any real reason why the two orders should remain, and why all the unions should not come under one order?—I think it would be very difficult in large towns where there is a good deal of fluctuating casual poverty to enforce the Prohibitory Order.

11304. In fact where it exists in large towns they do not enforce it, do they? They manage to administer their affairs pretty much on the same lines as those under the Regulation Order?—I thought that in most large towns the Regulation Order was in force.

11305. It is in most, but there a few exceptions, I think?—There are a few that are under a special order, which comes almost to the same thing.

Supervision of Out-Relief by Superintendent Relieving Officer and Clerk to Guardians.

11306. In paragraph 10 you refer to some of the larger unions which employ a superintendent relieving officer and a cross visitor as well as a pay clerk and a staff of clerks in the relief department; I take it that you agree that it is false economy to be under-staffed in the outdoor relief department?—Yes.

11307. And wherever possible you would have a superintendent of the out-relief department?—Wherever the union was large enough to warrant it.

11308. Where there were only two relieving officers, or it may be three, would you think it advisable to give the clerk to the guardians more power with regard to out-door relief, in order to save the expense of an additional officer as superintendent?—I do not know that he would want more power. At present the clerk very often exercises a considerable amount of supervision over the relieving officers.

11309. The relieving officers are really independent of him, are they not, in all matters of relief?—Do you mean as to what they give?

11310. I mean as to their duties. Their duties are defined by orders and of course the clerk has very little power over them so long as they keep within the four corners of the Orders?—That is so, but he is able to exercise a considerable amount of influence over them.

11311. Not so much as a superintendent relieving officer who is specially appointed, I take it?—No, because the clerk has not the time to devote to it, and he could not go about and do some visiting for himself, so as to check what they were doing.

11312. Do you really think that, apart from that, a superintendent relieving officer who is appointed as such has more power over the relieving officers than the clerk has?—Yes.

11313. You really think he has?—Yes because he is their immediate chief under whom they do their work.

11314. In the absence of a superintendent relieving officer, do you think the clerk has equally as much power as a superintendent relieving officer?—No, I do not think he has; his power is not exercised in the same way.

11315. Do you not think it would be advisable that it should be exercised in the same way?—No; I do not think it would be advisable that the clerk should do visiting, for instance, among the paupers.

11316. I was not thinking so much of visiting as of receiving instructions from the clerk, which at the present time on matters of relief they very often resent?—I have not come across instances.

Conditions the Fylde, Wigan, Salford, Manchester, Liverpool Unions.

11317. Have you made an omission in paragraph 11, where you say that the ratio of paupers to population on January 1st, 1905, varied from 8 per 1000 in the Fylde Union to 25 per 1000 in Wigan, and 27 per 1000 in Salford; has not Liverpool 51 per 1000, and ought not the variation therefore to be from 8 per 1000 to 51 per 1000?—The conditions in Liverpool and in Manchester are so exceptional that I did not think they were fair subjects of comparison, because there is a very large non-resident population in both those places.

11318. But you think that Salford and Wigan are fair comparisons with the Fylde district?—I should not place the unions as on the same footing at all; I should not say that the Fylde Union was one which could be fairly compared with the Salford Union. I merely took those as the two extremes.

11319. They are really not the extremes, are they, but they are taken on typical grounds rather?—As I have said, I left out Manchester and Liverpool owing to their being so exceptionally situated.

11320. In the Fylde Union are there not several watering places, such as Blackpool?—Yes, Blackpool is in it.

11321. It is principally residential, is it not?—Blackpool is very populous. It has over 50,000 inhabitants and there is very little poverty there.

11322. Blackpool constitutes more than half the population of the union, I see?—That is so.

Conditions Ormskirk Union.

11323. Take the Ormskirk Union; Southport is in the Ormskirk Union, is it not?—Yes.

11324. Is there any reason why the Ormskirk Union should have a larger number of paupers than the Fylde Union; they are very similar in character, I suppose?—I do not know that I could give you any general reason why it should be so.

11325. Do you know whether the reason is administration?—Not in a marked degree.

Rules adopted by guardians administration of relief.

11326. In any of the unions in your district now are there any rules or regulations in force for the guidance of the guardians?—Several of the unions have what they call Year Books, which contain extracts from Acts of Parliament and Orders of the Board and things of that sort, as a help to guide the guardians.

11327. They have some relief rules in the Manchester township, have they not?—Yes.

11328. Are they still acted up to?—I do not think they are quite as strictly as they have been. I may mention that the Manchester Guardians have just appointed a committee to go into the question of out-relief.

Effect of administration on pauperism.

11329. Do you see any reason why the numbers in Manchester on out-relief should have nearly doubled,

mparison conditions Manchester l Liver-ol.

taking the numbers on January 1st, 1905, as against the average of the previous five years, whilst in Liverpool the numbers have actually lessened ?—I can only say that in Manchester there has been a good deal of distress in the last few years, and that, no doubt, has led to an increase in the out-relief.

11330. Has there been more distress there than in Liverpool ?—I am inclined to think on the whole that there has been.

11331. Is there not more casual labour in Liverpool than in Manchester ?—That is always so.

11332. Where there is a large quantity of casual labour, does not a bad time usually send up the numbers more rapidly than where there is not so much casual labour ?—I do not know.

11333. There has been more agitation in Manchester than in Liverpool with regard to the guardians, has there not ?—Yes, there has been in the last two years.

11334. You cannot account for the difference in numbers, except that there is a difference in administration, can you ?—I think the considerable increase in the Manchester out-door relief is due to a certain extent to change in administration. I think that the rules are not as strictly administered as they were.

option by rds of rdians of es as to inistra-n of relief l effect.

11335. Has any other union rules for its guidance ?—Yes; several have adopted rules. The Rochdale Guardians have recently adopted some rules, the result of which has been a considerable decrease in the out-relief.

11336. Have they adopted the rules put forth by the Poor Law Officers Association, do you remember ?—I do not know whether they did.

11337. That is the only instance, is it ?—Several of the other unions have adopted rules. I am not prepared to say that in all cases they have been strictly adhered to.

11338. Is it your experience where they have adopted rules that it has been beneficial ?—Yes, where the rules have been adhered to.

11339. And has created no hardship to the applicants ?—No, I think none.

11340. Has it been your experience that where rules are adopted, the amount of relief given usually rises per head of those in receipt of relief ?—I do not know that I can say that, but I have often heard it urged that if relief were given to fewer numbers, there would be more power to give a reasonable amount to individuals.

mber of ldren dealt h in rkhouses.

11341. In respect of the children, in paragraph 18, you give the number of unions that adopt different systems of dealing with children. You mention altogether eighteen unions, which leaves twenty unions in your district where the children still remain in the workhouse. Could you give us any idea as to the number of children in those twenty unions ?—I could not, off-hand. Speaking in general terms, it is the larger unions that have removed the children from the workhouses. I should say there are more children that have been removed than there are remaining.

ovision for man tholic Poor w children.

11342. The Roman Catholics having provided institutions for Roman Catholic children will have reduced the numbers that were formerly in the workhouses of some of those unions ?—Yes.

11343. To any great extent, do you think ?—The Roman Catholics now remove the whole of their children from the workhouses, as soon as they have accommodation for them.

11344. Do the guardians pay for them in these institutions in all cases ?—Yes.

itude of ntral Mid-ves Board ards Poor w in-maries as ining ools and effect.

11345. Have you found any difficulty with regard to the rules of the Central Midwives Board, in connection with any of the larger infirmaries in your district ?—There seems to have been a great reluctance on the part of the Central Board to certify workhouse lying-in wards for the purpose of training.

11346. Have there been many certified ?—No. I do not quite know now how many have been, but it is not many.

11347. Could you say if they have actually refused to certify any of them who have made application ?—Yes, they have. One great thing which has caused difficulty is the increase in the number of cases which they now require to have been attended by each candidate which has reduced the number of midwives which it is possible to train.

11348. Has that not created some difficulty with regard to the probationers who are already taking a course of training, and who are now deprived of taking a certificate, from the London Obstetrical Society, as they could formerly ?—That is so, no doubt.

11349. It will act against those institutions getting properly qualified nurses, will it not ?—They will not be able to obtain the qualification in the way they have hitherto done.

Method of administration of relief at Manchester and its effect.

11350. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to Manchester, when I was there six years ago there was a system by which an experienced superintendent with one guardian administered relief: the relieving officer came before this superintendent who sat with one guardian who acted as chairman and entered the case, but it was the superintendent who practically determined how the man was to be relieved. When did that cease ?—I should not like to say that within my experience at all a superintendent has decided.

11351. I do not mean technically. I sat with them two or three times, and it was quite obvious that it was the superintendent, who had the whole case in his mind, who really determined the form of relief which should be given, and the guardian (who was always a different guardian, and only one guardian) registered the joint determination in a book. When did that system cease ?—I do not admit that that is a fair description of the system.

11352. Would you describe the system ?—I should say that the relief was administered by one guardian advised by the superintendent relieving officer and the relieving officer.

11353. When did that cease ?—I do not know that it has ceased.

11354. We understood from Mr. Davy that that had been actually discontinued, and that that particular superintendent relieving officer had been dispensed with, and we were referred to you for further particulars ?—I do not know which superintendent Mr. Davy had in his mind. There has been a change of superintendents in the last two or three years.

11355. Does the same system prevail ?—The same system exactly.

11356. The superintendent and one guardian do the relief ?—Yes, that is to say, the quorum of the Relief Committee consists of three, and two are usually absent.

11357. They are always absent, are they not ?—I think I can say whenever I have been present they have been absent.

11358. Do you at all attribute the very extraordinary rise in pauperism which there has been in Manchester to the change of the superintendent ?—No, I do not. I do not say it might not have had any effect, but I do not attribute the rise to that.

11359. Do you know the circumstances under which that superintendent left ?—Yes: he died.

11360. Who got the appointment after that ?—One of those who had been a relieving officer.

11361. Has there been any other change in the constitution of the Manchester Guardians ?—Its fifteen members used to be elected at large: are they now elected by wards ?—I do not think so,

11362. Are they still elected in the same way then ?—I think so.

Conditions in Bolton Union.

11363. Leaving Manchester, I am told that at Bolton the Elberfeld system has been tried, or something like it ?—It is being tried, but it has not got so far that I am able to give any information about it, I am afraid.

11364. Is Bolton a particularly well-administered union ?—It is a very carefully administered union.

Large board of guardians.

11365. Has it a large body of guardians ?—Yes, there are fifty-seven guardians.

11366. But they are of a rather good stamp, are they not ?—I consider it a distinctly good board of guardians.

11367. With regard to Stockport—— ?—Stockport is not in my district.

Mr. Herbert Jenner Fust.

30 April 1906.

11368. Then you do not know about the workhouse there?—No, only by hearsay.

11369. I thought when you said that the Local Government Board had not sufficient power to force unions to build workhouses, you were referring to Stockport? No, I was not.

Insufficient power of Local Government Board to enforce provision of workhouse accommodation, *e.g.*, at Cockermouth and Wigan.

11370. Have you got any case similar to Stockport in your district?—Yes, I have two in my mind—Cockermouth and Wigan.

11371. Could you give us details of those two?—In the case of the Cockermouth Union, correspondence has been going on with the Local Government Board for a number of years, with a view of getting a new workhouse, or at all events a new infirmary built—and hitherto without success. I have been doing my best ever since I went to the district. I may say the same as regards Wigan. In the case of the Wigan Guardians, they have bought land for the purpose of cottage homes, and they have bought land for the new workhouse and also for new offices for the guardians. Nothing has been done in the direction of providing cottage homes, but plans have been approved for the new workhouse, and it is intended apparently to build a new infirmary to begin with; but it rather hangs fire, and there is a certain amount of opposition still. My point is that if the Local Government Board had the power, they would have exercised it before this in the case of Cockermouth, and I think also in the case of Wigan.

11372. Are those the only two instances you can think of where the power is insufficient?—Those are the only two where the conditions are such that I think the power would have been exercised.

11373. Are they the only two cases in which the workhouse accommodation or infirmary accommodation is actually required?—No, I would not say that.

11374. You would not go so far as that?—No.

11375. There are bad cases, but you do not think they are so bad as that?—There are four workhouses in Westmorland and three of them ought to be pulled down, but they are not so terribly bad that the Local Government Board would interfere.

Controversy as to salaries of officers at Oldham.

11376. With regard to Oldham, there was some difficulty about the salaries of the relieving officers, and the Local Government Board thought they were paying very low salaries; do you remember that case? I think it was about five or six years ago, and the Board sent down an order for the salaries to be raised, but the guardians refused to do that?—That was not in reference to the relieving officers; that was in reference to the collectors of rates.

11377. I thought it was in reference to somebody under the Board of Guardians?—Do you mean where ultimately there was a surcharge, and the guardians had to pay?

11378. It was a case where the salaries were too low; how can you surcharge a thing which is too low?—The guardians refused to pay the collectors of rates the salaries that were fixed by the Local Government Board, and an action was brought against them by these officers to obtain the salaries which had been fixed. The case was fought legally, and decided against the guardians, and the guardians had to pay. When the auditor came to audit the accounts, he surcharged the guardians with the amount of the legal expenses as having been an unnecessary expenditure of union funds.

11379. On a lawsuit?—Yes.

11380. It was a very roundabout way of getting the salaries raised?—Yes.

11381. Is Oldham the only case in your experience of officers being refused the salary fixed by the Local Government Board?—The Local Government Board does not ordinarily fix salaries at all; it is only on appeal that the Board does so in certain cases, and that is the only instance I have known.

Modification of the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order.

11382. With regard to the Prohibitory Order and the Regulation Order, in your experience has the Regulation Order been turned into the Prohibitory Order or the Prohibitory Order turned into the Regulation Order in any unions?—No.

11383. There has never been any change from one to the other?—No.

11384. It is an historic thing entirely?—Yes. I have known a Labour Test Order issued to a union that had the Prohibitory Order.

11385. That is often done, is it not?—I believe it is, but I have not known many instances myself.

11386. Is it ever withdrawn?—I have never known it.

11387. Then the tendency is by the issue of that Labour Test Order to approximate the two Orders?—Yes, that is the effect of it.

Effect of Workmen's Compensation Act on pauperism.

11388. Now with regard to the Workmen's Compensation Act; as I understand it, you have no evidence that the Workmen's Compensation Act has actually resulted in the dismissal of old men?—No, I have not.

11389. You have not inquired into the average age of workmen?—No.

11390. Have you heard it asserted that the speeding-up of machinery in the cotton factories leads to the dismissal of old men?—No. The general reason alleged is that as a man gets older he gets a little less active, and therefore is more liable to accidents than a younger man.

11391. You do not suggest that the Workmen's Compenation Act has decreased the volume of employment, do you?—No.

11392. It is only if two men are unemployed, the younger one gets taken on?—Yes.

11393. Is it not said that in the cotton trade no man is employed as a spinner after the age of forty or forty-five?—I cannot answer that.

Effect of casual labour and lodging-houses on pauperism.

11394. With regard to the amount of pauperism in Liverpool, Salford, and Manchester, do you not attribute that largely to the existence of casual labour?—I think Manchester is influenced considerably by the existence of the large lodging-houses, from which applications for relief come freely in cases of sickness and so on. Perhaps the two things go rather together.

11395. The existence of those large lodging-houses means casual labour, does it not?—Yes, I should say it did.

11396. Liverpool has obviously got an enormous amount of casual labour?—Yes, a very large amount.

11397. With regard to Salford, that is in the same position as Manchester, is it not?—Salford has had a good deal of casual labour, too, since the opening of the Canal.

Condition in Prescot Union.

11398. What sort of place is Prescot, which is another place high in pauperism?—At Prescot the out-relief was very high and they have been overhauling the whole thing. A considerable decrease is taking place in the number of out-paupers.

11399. Is there any peculiar industrial condition at Prescot, or is it similar to Manchester?—There are chemical works and glass works there, and I am told that the employments are such that many men do not reach an advanced age before they are obliged to give up.

11400. Is not St. Helens in Prescot?—Yes.

11401. Has it ever been suggested to you that these chemical works are productive of ill-health?—Yes, in that way.

11402. And that therefore the high pauperism may result from unhealthy employments?—Partly so.

Condition Wigan Un

11403. Then with regard to Wigan, what are the conditions there?—At Wigan the principal occupation is coal-mining. I think the administration of out-relief there has not been sufficiently strict, and they have had no workhouse which they could use as a test.

11404. With regard to the district committees which you mention as giving relief in your district, do they usually meet at the office or in the locality itself?—The practice varies very much in different unions.

Working System of Relief Committe

11405. Do they sometimes meet in the locality itself as against the board of guardians' office?—Yes.

11406. Is that the most usual?—No, I should not say it is; but it obtains to a considerable extent.

11407. You disapprove of the giving of that relief by district committees as against the whole board, do you not?—Yes, but I do not think that in a big union administration by the whole board is possible. At the same time I think there are great drawbacks to the system of relief committees.

11408. Would you approve of the Manchester system instead, that is, of one guardian and a superintendent ?—No. I should prefer a small number, like three. The Manchester system is that of a relief committee,

Joint committees at Liverpool.

11409. I know it is technically a relief committee. With regard to the joint committees which manage the affairs of the Liverpool unions, do you consider that these indirectly elected bodies, formed by representatives from one or two unions, are satisfactory administrative bodies ; I have been told that you lose all control over them ?—That is the system ; as soon as they are appointed they are independent for the period of their appointment.

11410. And they tend to become lacking in control, do they not ?—I have no reason for saying that.

11411. I thought your suggestion of a directly elected county authority was rather on the ground that these were indirectly elected ?—I had not that idea, but I think when you come to so large an area as a county it is better to have direct election.

Proposal to administer relief by judicial officers.

11412. With regard to your proposal of a county authority, would it not be possible to combine that with a semi-judicial official, to take the place of the subordinate local authority and to decide whether a pauper should go to one institution or should be given outdoor relief ?—Do you mean to have the applications for relief dealt with entirely by an official ?

11413. Dealt with entirely by a judicial officer, say, with one or two of the district council sitting as assessors ?—And giving an official vote ?

11414. Yes ?—I do not think I favour that idea.

11415. You do not think that the deciding whether a person shall have relief of one kind or another, or shall have relief at all, is a semi-judicial function ?—I do not know that I do. It seems to me that it would be very much as if you gave an inspector a vote when he was attending a relief committee.

11416. Of course the inspector has got a name which betokens certain functions ; but you give the county court judges all sorts of decisions with regard to the rights of individuals, so why should you not give a stipendiary judge the decision of the right to relief ?—Do you mean that the decision should rest only with the official ?

11417. No, I should give him two assessors ?—Would you give them equal power with himself ?

11418. Yes ; therefore they would be in the majority ?—Then he would not be in the same position as a county court judge.

11419. Could you combine the two ; could you not get the judicial element into it ?—I should be sorry to take the decision out of the hands of the local authority.

11420. You do not favour making it semi-judicial ?—No, I do not.

Proposal to make Exchequer Grants conditional on efficiency.

11421. With regard to the grant in aid, would it not be possible to get control over the provision of workhouse accommodation or infirmaries by making the grant in aid dependent on efficiency, as the police grant is ?—Do you mean if there were a county board of guardians.

11422. Either in the case of a county board of guardians or in the case of the present boards of guardians, would you be in favour of rolling up all the grants into one, which should be given according to efficiency, as in the case of the police grant ?—I think you would have to divide the lunatics from the Poor Law.

11423. Leaving the lunatics on one side, and taking the grants which depend upon the past number of officers and so on, could you roll them all up and give them in relation to efficiency ?—I think so, if the power were in the hands of a body exercising their duty over a large area like a county.

11424. If you had got a County Board of Guardians, would you favour the grants being given in relation to efficiency ?—I am not sure that I would. I think they are a contribution towards the general expenses from personal property which ought to be made.

11425. Do you not think that is the best way of getting control over such things as workhouse accommodation, or infirmary accommodation, or the right number of officers ; or do you see any other way of securing that besides the grant in aid ?—I do not think it would be required.

11426. But you yourself want the Local Government Board to have some control over these county boards do you not ?—I think their control would be very limited

11427. Do you wish it to be very limited ?—Yes, if the administration were in the hands of a body of that kind.

11428. You would trust such a body ?—I think a great deal of the Local Government Board's work might be done away with, if they were just able to influence matters, so that there should not be too much divergence of administration in different parts of the country.

Deterrence of medical relief.

11429. With regard to the infirmaries, it has been suggested to us that the mere fact that the sick person loses his freedom acts as a deterrent to the use of Poor Law infirmaries ; do you think, that is so ?—I do not think it does much.

11430. You do not think that practically the theoretical loss of freedom tells with regard to a sick person ?—I do not think it does to any appreciable extent.

Type of persons receiving relief.

11431. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You said just now that in the towns the population is made up largely of loafers, corner boys and that sort of thing ?—There are a large number of them.

11432. They would not be the people who are getting the out-door relief, would they ?—No.

11433. If they are dealt with at all they are dealt with inside the institutions, are they not ?—A great number of them go into the vagrant wards.

11434. So that they would not come into these figures that we have had put before us by Mr. Booth ?—Some of them from time to time would get some out-relief, but not a large number.

11435. That would be medical relief in the main, would it not ?—There would be some who would have other relief as a temporary expedient perhaps.

11436. Would that last them very long in a place like Liverpool ?—No.

11437. It would simply be until a committee meeting or something of that kind ?—Just to tide over the difficulty perhaps.

Comparison between class of out-door paupers in rural and urban unions *e.g.*, Wigan, East Ward, Barrow-in-Furness.

11438. Would you say that the difference between the problem of relief in a rural district and the problem in an urban district, was this, that in a rural district the people whom you dealt with by out-door relief were the aged people, and in an urban district the people whom you dealt with by out-door relief were widows and children ?—There are a large number of old men in the urban districts.

11439. Take Wigan, for instance, of which we have been hearing something ; the number of people in Wigan over sixty is forty-six per 1,000. Then if you go to Westmorland, and take the place called East Ward, you will see the number of people over sixty is 112 per 1,000. Turning again to Wigan, you will see that 60 per cent. of the relief there is for people under sixty, 36 per cent. of it being for children under sixteen ; and that there are nearly 4,000 people in Wigan in receipt of out-relief. Do not those Wigan figures point to the fact that a large number of women and children were getting out-door relief, whilst in East Ward, Westmorland, where you have 213 people getting out-door relief and only fifty-two getting in-door relief, would the figures not mean that it was largely the old men and old women there who were getting it ?—It would seem so, but as a matter of fact the men out-number the women in the Lancashire workhouses.

11440. That may be so, but I am rather wanting to get at the out-door relief just now. At Wigan you have a very large amount of out-relief, 3,906 as against 728 receiving in-door relief, and, which is a point that strikes me, 60 per cent. of the whole of the relief goes to people under sixty. That is accounted for, I think, by the fact that you have such a small proportion of old people in the union. I wanted to follow up Mrs. Webb's point, and to ask you whether that is not due to the fact that the local occupations kill off the bread-winners, and then of course the women and the children come on the rates ?—I suppose the expectation of life is considerably higher in country districts than it is in a place like Wigan, for instance.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

30 April 1906.

11441. Take Barrow-in-Furness where it has just been pointed out to me the proportion is 72 per cent. under sixty ?—There again that is entirely urban.

11442. If you notice at Barrow-in-Furness 48 per cent. are under sixteen, which must mean that several heads of families have died and so these children have become chargeable ?—It would seem so. But I am afraid I have not considered those figures, and I would rather not express an opinion off-hand upon them.

Effect of administration upon pauperism.

11443. From the point of view of administration, do you say that pauperism rises or falls just so far as the administration is good or bad ?—No, I do not go so far as that ; but I say the administration has a considerable effect upon the amount of pauperism in a union.

11444. Pauperism just now is going down in your district, I think ?—Yes.

11445. How do you account for that ?—There has been a considerable revival in the cotton trade, which always carries other trades with it, and employment is much more abundant and things generally are much more prosperous.

11446. Which of course means the converse, that if trade is very bad pauperism tends to rise ?—Yes.

11447. And that holds in well-administered unions as well as in badly-administered unions ?—Yes, but the tendency to rise is greater in the badly-administered unions than in the well-administered unions.

11448. That would be so, because pauperism would be higher in the unions badly administered, independent of whether there were good or bad trade ?—Yes.

Manchester system of administering relief.

11449. I am rather wanting now to get you back to Manchester. The system there you told us was that a superintendent relieving officer sat with the committee ; that committee is not a committee of one, is it ?—It is a committee of which the quorum is three.

11450. Half-a-dozen men may be members of the committee, I suppose ?—In practice it is one.

11451. What I want to get at is this—what does the Board of Guardians which elects that committee elect—one man or six ?—I have the numbers here ; there are large numbers on each committee.

11452. So that the committee is not a committee of one sitting with an official to determine what relief shall be given ?—No, it is not.

11453. Do you know whether there are any rules or whether there is any order which says that the quorum of a committee shall be three ?—Yes, there is.

11454. If relief is being given in the Manchester Union by one guardian, is that legal ?—It has never been objected to.

11455. Excuse me, I did not ask you that. Is it in accordance either with the rules of the Manchester Board or of the Local Government Board that one guardian should administer relief ?—It is not in accordance with the rules of the Local Government Board.

11456. And therefore this system which we have heard of is an illegal one ?—In that sense, yes.

Proposal to administer relief by judicial officer.

11457. Is there not a danger of appointing a stipendiary magistrate to act in the manner suggested just now, because you may find after you have made the appointment that you have not got quite the right man ?—You may get a stipendiary of a kind who is not sound on the question of relief. I do not like the suggestion at all.

11458. It is better to have many than simply one ? I mean it is better to have half-a-dozen decent people on the off-chance of getting three or four of them to come than to put all the power into the hands of one man ?—Yes.

Manchester system of administering relief.

11459. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Are not the decisions of this Manchester Committee confirmed by the Board ?—Yes.

11460. That makes them legal, does it not ?—I do not think they can be objected to afterwards.

11461. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Their decisions are reported to the Board of course, but that is a matter of form, is it not ; the books are all there, and the vice-chairman signs them ? —It complies with the regulations.

11462. But it does it in a very technical sort of way, does it not ?—It gives an opportunity for anyone to object. The board could not go into all the cases again.

11463. That is what I mean, the board really has not any control unless someone is interested enough to bring up a particular case ?—Unless they choose to exercise it in any particular case.

11464. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Is the relief, in fact, confirmed by the guardians ?—Yes, it is.

11465. So that there is technically an order by the Board of Guardians for the relief given ?—Yes.

TWENTY-NINTH DAY.

Tuesday, 1st May, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc. etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).

Mr. HERBERT JENNER-FUST, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

1 May 1906.

Proposal to make Poor Law area coterminous with Borough area.

11466. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In the urban areas you recommend enlarged districts which are to be coterminous with the municipal authority, or as nearly so as possible; under those circumstances, where you would have one authority for a large district like, say, Manchester, how would you propose to manage the out-relief, generally speaking?—I think it would have to be managed in the same way that it is now, that is to say, there would be a board of guardians for the city who would deal with all the questions with which guardians at present deal.

11467. And then would you have in the various districts of the whole authority certain offices, and would you appoint sub-committees to deal with the out-relief in the different districts?—No doubt there would be relief committees, as there are at present in all the large urban unions.

11468. You would still have the difficulty of having probably to rely upon the guardians acquainted with the particular district for the out-relief of that particular district?—There would be the same difficulties that exist at present.

11469. And you would not propose to get over that by increasing the power of the officials in any particular district, would you?—No, I think not.

11470. In the urban districts the objection as to the times of the meetings of the central authority would not prevail so much as in the rural districts, I take it. Your attention was called yesterday by, I think, Sir Samuel Provis to the fact that if you had very large districts the difficulty of getting the guardians to come to the meetings, and so on, would be very great?—Yes.

11471. That would apply much more in rural districts than in urban districts, would it not?—Yes.

11472. You could quite easily get your guardians together in a large town?—I think so.

Difficulty of securing attendance of guardians in large rural areas.

11473. I suppose in rural districts the difficulty would be less if there were fewer guardians; that is, if you did not have such a large number of guardians, it would be more easy to get a small number present, even if they had a considerable distance to come?—If the county board were smaller in number, that would throw more work upon individuals. The smaller the board, the greater the work thrown on each individual member.

11474. The populations are not so very large in those rural districts as a rule; it is the distance that is the difficulty there, is it not?—Yes.

11475. In regard to those districts, I suppose you would have to depend a good deal upon the relieving officers and officials of that class, if you are not to rely entirely on the guardian of the village, so to speak?—I think you should rely upon the guardian of the village for information, but as little as possible for decision on the case.

The ideal Guardians.

11476. You were asked yesterday on the question whether you had somewhere or other a good stamp of guardian; could you give one generally your view as to what is a good stamp of guardian, as I was rather struck with that expression? Is not variety of profession and occupation a very important matter in a board of guardians?—Yes, I think variety is desirable.

11477. A good stamp of guardian is, I presume, an honest man who does his best to study the problem that he is engaged upon?—Yes.

Conditions in Salford Union.

11478. I want to get a little information about Salford, which was held up to us yesterday as capable of improvement. I noticed two or three things about it which are not altogether discouraging. In the first place, I noticed that the proportion of out-door paupers, as compared with in-door paupers, is not nearly so great as in a great many of your other unions?—That is so. Might I say that in mentioning Salford I had no intention of making any complaint of the administration; I merely mentioned it as being at the other end of the scale from the Fylde union, if you exclude Liverpool and Manchester.

11479. I was a little desirous to know why Manchester was to be excluded and Salford included, the population being very considerable in both cases and the casual labour being also considerable in both cases?—I think the fact of a non-resident population, that is, a population who do not sleep in the town, comes in more perhaps in Manchester and Liverpool than it does in Salford; but it is quite a question of degree.

11480. Would you not say that the casual labour is probably rather greater in Salford now that the canal is there?—Yes. There has been a good deal of distress in the last few years in Salford. I had no wish to find fault with Salford at all.

Effect of increased freedom of workhouse inmates.

11481. You spoke of the loss of deterrent influence in consequence of the greater freedom given to inmates of workhouses nowadays; would you be inclined to reduce that amount of freedom?—At present there is no particular standard. It depends upon the individual boards of guardians.

11482. Something more systematised would be better, probably?—I do not think I would interfere much with guardians' discretion, because it is more a question of a privilege to be granted perhaps to an individual than to a whole class.

11483. And, of course, the individual to whom you refer would not, in consequence of the greater freedom, lose the dislike of being in the workhouse, and the fact of being in the workhouse would be a deterrent to such a

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

1 May 1906.

character just as much as if he had less freedom ?—A deserving character would stand on rather a different footing from a bad character.

11484. And therefore giving freedom is one of the ways by which you can show approval of behaviour and conduct within the workhouse ?—Yes. The position of an inmate of a workhouse, particularly if he is old and infirm, is better than that of the average independent labourer. He is better fed and better clothed, his rooms are better, he is warmly covered at night, and he has every comfort of that kind. The only way, as I understand it, in which you can create a dislike for the workhouse and avoid its being abused, is by regulations and by the discipline of the inmates.

Casual labour's bias towards pauperism.

11485. Would you say that, owing to the state of casual labour as we have it now in the land, one of the great difficulties is, that so many people say, "Well, it is the natural thing; I shall never be able to earn enough to provide for my old age, and therefore I shall probably drift to the workhouse at a certain time in my career" ?—I think that has some effect, but I should not attach a great deal of importance to that. I think they are more apt to drift without thinking what the end of it is to be than to look forward and calculate, "It is no use my making an effort."

11486. There is nothing very much now to deter the casual labourer from seeking relief ?—No.

Diminution of filial responsibility.

11487. Have you had any experience of people telling you that the children were doing much less for their parents nowadays than used to be the case ?—It is generally said so, and there is a strong impression that that is so.

11488. The sense of responsibility is weakened ?—Yes.

Conditions in Prestwich Union.

11489. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to Prestwich as well as Salford, you have to consider both places as parts of a large industrial centre, namely, Manchester, have you not ?—Yes.

11490. It would be unfair to penalise the very high rate of pauperism either in Manchester or in Liverpool, and to judge them hardly, without taking into consideration not only that each has a non-residential population who go to live elsewhere, but also that there are movements amongst their very poor ?—Yes.

11491. So that it is possible that the increase of pauperism at Prestwich, for instance, though it may have been coincident with the change in administration, is partly affected by the incoming population ?—To a limited extent.

11492. That, at any rate, you have to take into consideration ?—Yes, I think that is so.

An adequacy of institutions as a result of enlarged Poor Law areas.

11493. With regard to the question of the area of administration, I rather gather that what you suggest is that it should be such as would justify a complete service of institutional relief in itself ?—Yes.

11494. But that would not prevent there being more than one example of such institutions as needed to be more locally placed ?—Quite so.

11495. So that, in that way, you would get over part of the difficulties of the extended area ?—Yes.

11496. While there might be, for instance, one lunatic asylum, there might be two or three institutions of some other description ?—Yes, I think it would be so inevitably in a large area.

11497. But the management should be under one central organisation ?—Yes.

Facility of locomotion in connection with the Poor Law area.

11498. Then you pointed out that the size of the possible area depends on the means and the organisation of locomotion, to a great extent ?—I think that ought to be considered.

11499. And that the improvement in the means of locomotion and its organisation does render possible a larger area than might have been thought of twenty or thirty years ago ?—I think that is so clearly.

11500. Possibly, in the near future, it will go even still further if we learn how to make a thorough use of roads as well as of the railways ?—I think there is every prospect of it.

11501. If some of the institutions were rather distant, and you had to trust to organised locomotion to make them accessible, would that not probably result in there boing more visiting of friends to their friends in the workhouse, and less cases of inmates of the workhouse going out to visit their friends ?—Yes, I think there would be.

Distant institutions and their effect on inmates' leave of absence, and visits to inmates.

11502. Would not the visiting be organised more than the opposite, that is, those who come into the workhouse would have to be considered by the provision of special means of access, and those that were within the workhouse would have less chance of getting out to see their friends ?—I think that is so.

11503. Would that not be a good thing ?—I do not think it would be at all a bad thing; I think it would be a good thing.

Need and effect of small areas for administration of out-relief.

11504. With regard to the value of small areas, I understand that it is in connection with the administration of out-relief that you regard the smaller area as essential ?—Yes.

11505. And that you think it could be separately organised in the way that you have suggested, so as to give efficiency in both directions ?—I think so.

11506. I take it, that it is more efficiency than economy that you have in view, efficiency being more practicable to attain perhaps than economy; or, should I say that it would be the economy of efficiency that you have in view ?—Yes, I think that is so. I think the natural tendency would be to a stricter administration of out-relief which would tend to economy.

Guardians' discretion as to liberty of workhouse inmates.

11507. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Are there separate rules and regulations for each workhouse now ?—There are general orders from the Local Government Board laying down general regulations, but as regards liberty, a great deal rests in the discretion of the guardians.

Extent of privilege of leave of absence from workhouse.

11508. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You said that the workhouses were not so deterrent now because there was more freedom in seeing friends; does that mean that the inmates go out more often in your district ?—In some instances that has been the case.

11509. What would be the most frequent time the people can go out—once a week, or once a month, or what ?—In one instance, freedom was given to a large class to go every day in and out as they liked.

11510. Would that be to the whole of the aged ?—Yes, I think practically to the whole of them.

11511. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Simply to the aged, or to any other class ?—The really able-bodied class hardly exists in our workhouses, and we have very few of them, I mean those who ought to be earning their own living. I should say it applied to the whole of the remainder, except of course the children and the imbeciles.

11512. It was not limited then to the aged, as it is at Woolwich, for instance ?—Not to any particular class of the aged.

11513. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Was it limited to the people over sixty ?—No, I do not think so.

11514. Do you think the able-bodied were allowed to go in and out too ?—Some who might be classed as able-bodied, but not who would ordinarily be termed able-bodied, were allowed to go in and out. I do not mean that it applied to those who ought to be earning their own living.

11515. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I rather wanted to know whether it was the same rule which is in force at Woolwich, where the aged who are of good character are in a separate institution where they have complete freedom of egress and ingress ?—I do not think that amount of distinction was drawn; I think it was a good deal wider than that.

11516. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) But it would not mean that able-bodied men and women capable of getting their own living were allowed to go in and out of the workhouse whenever they pleased ?—No, certainly not.

Effect on discipline of frequent leave of absence from workhouse.

11517. What was the effect of that on the pauperism of the union concerned ?—I cannot say what was the effect on the pauperism, because I do not think it continued long enough; but the effect on the discipline of the house was rather a bad one.

11518. I suppose they came back drunk ?—They thought they might do as they pleased, and were not to, do any work at all.

11519. These were people who were capable of working, were they ?—Many of the old people can do something

such as cutting up chips for fire wood and that sort of thing.

11520. Instead of doing that, they thought they ought to go out each day?—They took a stroll in the town instead.

11521. Was that because of a new rule that had been made that they could do that?—Yes.

11522. There would not be any objection, would there, to people going in and out if they did the work which was laid down for them to do?—If it is kept within reasonable limits. I think there ought to be a certain amount of freedom given.

11523. This experiment failed, and it failed apparently because of bad organisation, but that does not mean that you are against giving people freedom to go in and out, does it?—No, not altogether.

estion as reasonable ve of ence.

11524. (*Mr. Bentham.*) May I ask to what extent, without increasing your difficulties, you do think it would be advisable to let them go in and out?—I think once a month is a reasonable time.

11525. You would not say it would be advisable to let them out so many hours every day, for instance?—No, I do not think I would.

11526. You think once a month for the able-bodied would be quite sufficient?—I was speaking of the aged and infirm, not of the able-bodied.

11527. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) I was thinking of the aged people who do work about the house—not tasks, but work of various descriptions—the light jobs about the house which the old men and old women do. My question is that for these, at any rate, you have no objection to more frequent going in and out so long as it is organised properly, by which I mean so long as they do the particular work that is allotted to them, and their going out does not interfere with that?—Yes.

11528. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Do you think once a month is often enough for those?—I think, as a rule, it is.

11529. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Would you have any real objection to their going out once a week?—I think that is too often. Constant going in and out gives a good deal of trouble to the officials of a large house.

11530. Would your only objection be the trouble to the officers concerned?—No. It also tends to decrease what I have termed the deterrent influence of the house. The easier you make the conditions in the house, the less objection they will have to going in.

11531. If they are decent people who have got into the position of not being able to maintain themselves because of old age or infirmity, do you think it is quite right to impose such a restriction as that, merely for the purpose of making it more deterrent?—The number of such in our workhouses is, I am afraid, very small.

e adminis- tion of ef by ardians to dents in ir own stituency.

11532. Then about members of committees looking after their friends for out-door relief; do you find that prevails very much in your district?—No, I should not like to say that; but I think it is more difficult to deal judicially, if I may say so, with applicants whom you know personally, than it is for you to deal with applicants whom you do not know anything about. If relief is administered by guardians who represent the districts from which the applicants come, I think the tendency is that the relief is more freely given.

11533. I do not know what happens in Manchester or in Liverpool, but in London a relief committee would be made up of members representing several parts of the district; and therefore, although one man might know the individual applicant, there would be three or four others who did not know him or her?—That would be so in that case.

chester hod of inister- relief.

11534. Do you not think that that is quite enough safeguard about it?—I do not think that in practice it is so.

11535. Not in your district?—I am limiting my observations to my district.

11536. How do they elect the members, say at Manchester—by wards or for the whole district?—At Manchester, if you remember, it was said yesterday that a single guardian sits in committee.

11537. But you told us that was not quite correct—that there was a committee, and it only happened that the other members of the committee were not present, but they ought to have been present?—That is so.

11538. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Did they not get a special order for it?—Not to allow a single guardian to sit.

11539. I thought they had some order which they considered equivalent to a permanent or special order?—No, I think not. I think three is the minimum.

11540. (*Mr. Phelps.*) If the decisions are confirmed by the Board, that would legalise them, would it not?—I suppose it would; but as a matter of fact the Order fixes three as the smallest number.

Relieving officers' security of tenure.

11541. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) The relieving officers are irremovable, are they not, without the consent of the Local Government Board?—Yes.

11542. So that a relieving officer is perfectly free to express his opinion without fear of getting the sack?—Yes.

11543. And a superintendent relieving officer would be free too, would he not, to say what he thought about particular cases, without any fear of dismissal?—Yes.

11544. All those permanent officers cannot, as a matter of fact, be dismissed without the sanction of the Local Government Board?—That is so.

Question of extension of Local Government Board's power to decide disputes as to settlement.

11545. I understood you to say that you were not in favour of arbitration in settlement cases. Instead of two unions going to law to settle to which of them an unhappy person belongs, it is suggested that such questions should be settled by arbitration?—They can be settled by the arbitration of the Local Government Board now.

11546. (*Mrs. Webb.*) And they are already settled so in many cases, are they not?—Yes, if they agree to submit a case.

11547. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Are you in favour of all questions of settlement being treated in that fashion; that is, not giving boards an option of coming to you at all, but saying, "You two unions shall not go to law about this, we will settle it for you"?—I do not think that is possible, because I do not think a case could be agreed upon in all instances.

11548. In the last resort evidence has to be submitted to a court, has it not?—Yes.

11549. Would you be in favour of that evidence being compulsorily submitted to the Local Government Board, and their decision being taken?—No, I do not think I would. I think I should prefer it remaining as it is.

11550. Despite the cost of legal proceedings?—Yes.

The Unemployed Workmen's Act.

11551. Now about the Unemployed Workmen's Act; I understood you to disapprove of that yesterday?—I think I was hardly asked any questions on the subject.

11552. Mr. Loch asked you some questions, and I gathered from your answers that you thought that any relief work ought to be carried out by the guardians?—I mean, that where application is made to the guardians for relief, the dealing with the applicants should be in their hands.

11553. Have you any opinion on the Unemployed Workmen's Act at all? It has been in operation in Manchester and Liverpool and your other big towns this winter?—The effect of it has been to find temporary employment for a certain number to carry out work which would not otherwise have been carried out, at all events for some time, and in that way to diminish the amount of work available for the future. I cannot see that it has acted at all, except as a palliative to enable the difficulties to be tided over.

11554. That is all the Act set out to do, is it not? It did not set out to be a permanent remedy, did it?—There is a power for emigration, amongst other things, which is a more permanent way of dealing with the difficulty.

11555. I suppose they have emigrated some people from your district?—A few, I believe.

11556. (*Dr. Downes.*) Have any of them come back?—I do not think there has been time.

Mr. Herbert Jenner-Fust.

1 May 1906.

Difficulties as to discharge of paupers from district institutions.

11557. With reference to the classification of workhouses, which you suggest, how would you deal with the question of persons who wish to take their discharge; take the ins-and-outs first of all?—I had it in my mind that that class would be dealt with in some more drastic fashion than they are at the present time, by being placed in labour colonies with compulsory powers of detention, or in some other way.

11558. You do contemplate increased powers with regard to that class?—Yes.

11559. Now take the infirm class; how would you deal with them?—There might have to be limitations on their power of discharge. I think it would only be fair that when they were allowed to take their discharge they should be taken back to their own locality, as I think is done now when paupers are boarded out in other workhouses than their own.

11560. Those are probably points which would all need consideration in connection with such a scheme?—They would, no doubt.

11561. This point, whether a pauper acquires a settlement by being placed in another district, would also be a matter for consideration, would it not?—I speak with diffidence, but I do not think that would come in under the present law. Such residence would not be counted for purposes of settlement.

Mr. Gerald A. F. Hervey, called; and Examined.

Mr. Gerald A. F. Hervey.

1 May 1906.

11562. (*Mr. Booth.*) I think you are the General Inspector of the Local Government Board for the Eastern Poor Law District, which comprises the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex (West Ham excluded) and also the union of Wisbech in Cambridgeshire?—I am.

11563-4. And you have prepared for our use a memorandum together with certain tables giving detailed information as to the boards of guardians in your district, the number of paupers, the cost of relief, and so on? (*See* Appendix, Vol. I. (A), No. XXIII.)—Yes.

11565. How long have you been inspector of this district?—Five-and-a-half years.

General conditions as to pauperism, occupation, and administration in district.

11566. It has the reputation of being a heavily pauperised district, and is so, I think, in comparison with other districts in England?—Yes, I believe it is.

11567. Do you consider that that is due to impoverishment owing to industrial conditions?—Yes, on the whole.

11568. Has there been, during your five-and-a-half years, improvement or the reverse in the general pauperism of the district?—There has been a reduction, certainly, on the whole.

11569. Is that partly the result of your urging upon them certain methods of administration?—Of course you must take into consideration the reduction in population.

11570. But that cuts in two ways, and a reduction in the population may tend to make the ratio of pauperism higher without any increase in the actual number of paupers?—That is so.

11571. When you say there has been an improvement do you mean merely in the numbers of paupers, or in the ratio of paupers to population?—I mean in the ratio of paupers to population.

11572. So that there has been actually an improvement in that respect?—Yes.

11573. And therefore a still greater improvement in the actual numbers?—I think so.

11574. During this period has there been an improvement or not in the industrial conditions generally?—I should say that the industrial conditions are about the same.

11575. When we speak of the industrial conditions in your district, that means mainly agricultural conditions, does it not?—Yes.

11576. Apart from agriculture, has there been a spread of such industries as there are at Ipswich, Colchester and other towns in your district?—I should say, on the whole, yes—with the exception of certain trades.

11577. With regard to the population that has left, has it merely concentrated itself in your towns, or has it gone further afield to London, or wherever it may be?—I should say that in Norfolk and Suffolk there would have been a tendency to go into the towns of the district; possibly in Essex there may have been a tendency to come to London.

11578. Or to come at any rate towards London?—Yes.

11579. You have some unions in Essex which have greatly increased in population, have you not?—That is so.

11580. With regard to the administration, the greater number of the paupers are receiving out-relief, as a rule, I think?—Yes.

11581. Is that out-relief given without offering the test of the house in most cases?—In the rural districts the only applicants for out-relief are the aged people—men and women who are mostly past work.

11582. Are there a very large number of guardians in the various unions as a rule?—Yes; in one of my tables I have shown the number of elected guardians for each union.

Large boards of guardians and their effect on administration.

11583. The numbers in many cases are extremely unwieldy, are they not?—They are, certainly.

11584. Too large for good administration, I suppose?—In a large number of cases, yes.

11585. Their numbers are no doubt connected with the number of parishes?—Yes.

11586. Do you recognise that frequently there is more relief given where there is a very small area to each guardian?—Yes; there is more inclination on the part of those boards to give more relief.

11587. On the whole has there been any change at all in the method or principles of administration during your period there?—No; I think in the rural districts matters remain pretty much the same. It is very difficult to get good principles of administration into the heads of farmers and so on.

Endowed charities at Norwich and their effect on administration.

11588. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I notice that you refer to the charities in Norwich which are endowed, you say, to the extent of about £50,000 a year, I think?—Yes.

11589. In your judgment, in a town in which there are a large number of these charities, is there not a tendency to make people lax with regard to the administration of relief altogether? Is not the existence of a number of these charities likely to make people a little slack in dealing with other people's money, generally?—I should say it is the case in Norwich.

Number of qualified applicants under Unemployed Workmen Act.

11590. I see you make certain statements in your memorandum in regard to the unemployed. I presume in all these cases where the people have registered, there has been a proper classification, and inquiries have been made in due course under the Act, have they not?—Presumably, yes.

11591. I notice you say that in Southend 393 men registered themselves, but work was found for only seventy-five; that might mean that after the sifting process there was only, comparatively speaking, a small proportion of the 393 who were considered qualified for work under the Act?—Very possibly.

Electoral system at Yarmouth.

11592. I notice that Yarmouth seems to have a small number of guardians as compared with its population, and even as compared with the other districts, for you say there are only twenty guardians in Yarmouth?—Yes.

11593. Is that because there are only two parishes there?—Yes.

11594. In Yarmouth are they elected ten from each parish?—I think Yarmouth is divided into wards.

11595. Have you any case, as far as you know, of a town something of the size of Great Yarmouth where the election is simply for the town and not for particular wards in that town?—No, I do not think so.

Preponderance of out-relief cases and its causes.

11596. Apparently in your district altogether the proportion of out-relief is very large as compared with the in-door relief and as compared with certain other districts; is there any cause that you can assign for that?—I think that generally the guardians feel that they would very much rather give out-relief than apply the house test; that is mainly on the ground of cheapness.

11597. A great deal of your district is rural, of course?—Yes.

11598. Would you say that the tendency to give out-relief in preference to in-door relief is generally more in rural districts than in urban districts?—I think that the guardians generally feel that it is cheaper to give out-relief than to bring them into the house.

11599. It would not be because of a disinclination to take persons away from their little village, where a good many people would look after them if something were provided for them? Do you think that consideration has made people rather sentimental with regard to moving them?—There is that feeling as well.

11600. That feeling, of course, would not prevail in the same degree in an urban district?—No.

Surcharge in respect of out-relief at Norwich.

11601. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I suppose you have mentioned in your annual reports the circumstances of Norwich, where there is obviously a great deal of pauperism?—Yes, from time to time.

11602. Have you, besides mentioning it in your annual reports, made any special recommendations to the Local Government Board?—Yes, recently.

11603. Quite recently?—Yes.

11604. In order that the Local Government Board may take some action in the matter?—It was in reference to inquiries that I made myself in Norwich with regard to out-relief.

11605. Do you refer to the inquiries into those cases that you have sent us?—Yes, the inquiries were with regard to those cases. I drew the attention of the district auditor to the fact that these people were in receipt of out-relief, with the result that at his audit he made a long report to the Local Government Board on these cases and surcharged the relieving officers.

10606. Then some of these cases which we actually have before us have been surcharged?—Yes.

11607. Do you remember what proportion of them were surcharged?—I think the relieving officers were surcharged with all these cases.

11608. Have they actually paid the money?—No, the question has not been decided at the Local Government Board.

11609. Will the Local Government Board hold an inquiry and decide for itself?—They will not hold an inquiry. They have the auditor's report before them now, and they will decide in time whether they must uphold the auditor or whether they must override the auditor.

11610. If the auditor is upheld, will the relieving officers have to pay?—I think the practice of the board is to confirm the auditor's action and to remit the surcharge.

11611. Which board do you mean, the Local Government Board?—Yes; that is their usual practice.

11612. Do you think it would be salutary not to do that on some occasions?—I think it would have a very salutary effect on many occasions if they made them pay up.

11613. As in this case you are satisfied with the work of the relieving officers, it would be hard upon them if they were made to pay?—Undoubtedly it would fall very hardly upon the relieving officers.

11614. In your opinion, evidently, if it is anyone's fault, it is the fault of the board of guardians?—Undoubtedly.

Question of persons liable to surcharge in respect of out-relief.

11615. Cannot they be made to pay up? Cannot the auditor surcharge the guardians?—That is a question for the office. I do not think such a thing has ever been done.

11616. But there are certain things for which the guardians themselves can be surcharged, surely?—Naturally there are.

11617. All these amounts were passed in pursuance of their resolutions, I take it?—Yes. *Mr. Gerald A.F. Hervey.*

11618. And the cheques, I suppose, were finally drawn for the relieving officers in pursuance of their resolutions?—Yes. 1 May 1906.

11619. Then why should they not be surcharged—but perhaps that is an auditor's question?—That is quite an auditor's question, I should think.

Composition of Norwich Board of Guardians.

11620. Your statement of the numbers on the various boards gives no idea of the composition of the boards; might we, in connection with the Norwich board, have some idea of what its forty-eight members are? You speak of Socialists on the board there; do they form the majority?—No, not by any means.

11621. (*Mrs. Webb.*) What is the political colour of the Norwich board now, do you know at all?—It is pretty equally divided between Liberals and Conservatives.

11622. And they both give out-door relief?—Yes.

11623. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I understand there is a certain leaven at any rate who are opposed to the policy which the Socialists press?—There is a certain leaven.

11624. But they are in a minority?—They are in a distinct minority.

11625. May I ask what classes that minority represents, are there any benefit society men amongst them?—That I could not say.

11626. Could you say whether the endowed charities are represented on the Norwich Board of Guardians—not officially, of course, but by members who belong to them?—That I could not say.

11627. You do not know whether they have infected the board at all?—No, I do not know that at all.

11628. There is a Charity Organisation Society in Norwich I think?—There is.

11629. Are any of its representatives on the board?—I do not think so.

11630. Does the Charity Organisation Society there take any part in the election for the board of guardians, do you know?—That I could not answer.

11631. At the election I gather the Socialist Party practically has its own way?—At the recent General Election, yes.

11632. I am not speaking of the General Election?—The Socialists are a very small minority on the board of guardians.

11633. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) How many are there?—At the present time I think there is only one avowed, but that one has a very loud voice.

11634. He knows what he wants, that is really what is the matter?—And he gets it.

11635. (*Mr. Nunn.*) And there is a mixed body of Liberals and Conservatives who practically follow that one Socialist?—Yes, quite so.

11636. (*Mrs. Webb.*) As aspersions have been cast on the Socialists, may I ask whether there was not a Mr. Herbert Day, who was a Socialist, on the board of guardians?—He is not now a guardian.

11637. But he was a thoroughly good guardian, was he not?—Yes, he was a thoroughly good guardian indeed, and a very good man.

11638. He was a Socialist, and his action, I believe, was not in favour of this lax out-door relief?—No; Mr. Day was a very evenly balanced man.

11639. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I understood from your memorandum that it was because of the action of certain Socialist members at public meetings held in the Market Place that the chairman, who was in favour of strict administration, resigned his seat?—No, not on that account.

11640. That is what I understood you to say in paragraph 13?—The chairman of the relief committee resigned his seat as a protest against the granting of indiscriminate relief.

11641. You say in that paragraph, "The members of the relief committee who were inclined to assist the relieving officers are in the minority, their fellow members being influenced by the action of certain Socialist members,

Mr. Gerald A.F. Hervey.

1 May 1906.

who at public meetings held in the Market Place and elsewhere announced and denounced the names of those members who were opposed to the granting of relief;" and then you follow that by saying, "In September last the chairman of the relief committee resigned his chairmanship as a protest?"—Yes.

11642. (*Mrs. Webb.*) The members of the relief committee were not Socialists particularly, were they?—No.

11643. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Who are the "certain Socialist members" and what are they members of—they are members of the board of guardians, I suppose?—Yes.

11644. And not of the relief committee?—They sit on the relief committee.

11645. Then there were more Socialists than one on that relief committee?—Yes, there have been, but at the present moment there is only one avowed.

11646. Besides the appeal to the auditor, which seem, likely to be successful, what would be your other proposal for checking the pauperisation of Norwich?—I do not see what proposals one can put forward as long as the relief committees are bent on giving relief. At the present time there is no wish on the part of the Norwich Board of Guardians to check the granting of relief.

Co-operation between Guardians and charitable agencies.

11647. Has the question of the exchange of lists with the various charitable agencies and endowed charities been brought before the Norwich Board by any member?—It has not been brought before the board of guardians by any member. I have suggested myself in years gone by that something should be done in that matter.

11648. But it was not acceptable to the board?—It was not acceptable to the board at all.

11649. Have you any suggestions for checking pauperism in Norwich besides those you have given us?—If the relief committee showed any desire to reduce their out-relief and to check their out-relief, the appointment of superintendent relieving officers would help them very greatly; but, as I said before, they have no desire to reduce their out-relief. It is just a question of party politics with them, and that governs everything in Norwich.

Political influence and out-relief at Norwich.

11650. What I understood from you was that the Liberals and Conservatives were about equally balanced on the board, and that there was one Socialist member?—Yes, but I should say again that I am pretty well convinced that the granting of out-relief has a great deal to do with the votes.

11651. Do you think it is done with a view to their future election?—Yes.

11652. And that they are largely influenced by that in the granting of out-door relief?—Quite so.

11653. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Every party is equally interested in it?—Yes, Conservatives and Liberals alike.

11654. (*Mr. Nunn.*) But the real animus and strength of the out-relief policy is derived, as I gather, from the one or more Socialists who have friends outside, who practically put the fire to the fuel in the Market Place?—Possibly.

11655. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Might I venture to suggest about that that this question of granting out-door relief for electoral purposes is a hundred years old in Norwich?—I believe it is.

11656. Before 1835 there were two parties, the Blues and the Yellows, and out-relief was given to 30,000 or 40,000 people by the Blues and the Yellows?—I believe so.

11657. That was long before Socialists existed?—Long before.

11658. It has practically been a historical tradition in Norwich that out-door relief has been given persistently for electoral purposes?—Yes.

11659. Even from the eighteenth century?—I believe so.

Supply of alcohol in workhouses.

11660. (*Mr. Nunn.*) It is quite a misfortune then that the Socialist party has been mixed up with this business, but it has taken quite a leading part in it recently. There is one other question apart from the question of out-door relief that I want to ask, and that is with regard to the supply of alcohol for consumption in the workhouses; does that apply to anything besides spirits?—It applies to beer, wine, and spirits.

11661. Is that in workhouses as apart from infirmaries?—That is altogether in the workhouses but including the infirmaries, because I have no separate infirmaries.

11662. In what way is alcohol supplied in workhouses in those parts of the house where the able-bodied members are?—I have no doubt it is given under the direction of the medical officer to certain old people.

11663. It is really given under his direction then?—Yes.

11664. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Is it given in return for work at the time?—Not the alcohol.

11665. But the beer is?—Yes.

Composition of Ipswich Board of Guardians.

11666. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Speaking of Ipswich, in your second paragraph you say that the board there has deteriorated; in what way has it deteriorated?—There are not so many of the larger and more responsible ratepayers coming forward for election as there used formerly to be.

11667. Are the people who are on the board now direct ratepayers in the main?—I suppose generally speaking they are all direct ratepayers.

11668. They do not compound at Ipswich, I think, do they?—I think not.

11669. But you do not know that for certain?—I do not know it for certain, but I do not think there are any members of the board of guardians at the present moment who would be classed as compound ratepayers.

11670. They do compound for the rates for the smaller property at Ipswich, do they not?—Yes.

11671. There are really no workmen on the Ipswich Board, then?—Not at the present moment. They had one very excellent Labour member a short time ago, but he had to give up his post, because he went into partnership in a masonry business.

The Norwich out-relief policy and its results.

11672. Has the increase in out-door relief at Ipswich been due to a settled policy on the part of the board there?—For years Ipswich had a very rigid system of out-relief administration, but, within the last two years that has shown signs of breaking up.

11673. Is that due to a definite act of policy on the part of the board; I mean consciously, and that they are doing it with their eyes open, because they disagree with the system which their system is giving place to?—I should not like to say that.

11674. It might be that these men who have got to pay in the last resort are spending their own as well as their neighbours' money (because these men, I understand, are all direct ratepayers), but think that the old policy was too strict and that the policy which they have inaugurated is best for the people and for themselves?—It may be so.

11675. The deterioration really only shows itself in the fact that there are rather more paupers there now than previously?—In the fact that there are more paupers, and there is a considerable rise in out-relief.

11676. But that does not necessarily mean that undeserving people are getting it, or that they are doing, as at Norwich, giving it to cases which do not need it?—I think that they are giving more in Ipswich.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, administration.

11677. It is not the Act of 1894 which has led to this, because the present members of the board could have got elected before, as they have all the necessary qualifications?—I dare say they could have done so, but they did not.

11678. Still, the alteration in 1894 did not make it possible for them to get on the board; but the whole effect of your paragraph is to say that it is due to that Act, and that that Act has brought all these dreadful things to pass?—I think that that Act had a very great deal to do with it.

11679. In what way?—In encouraging the smaller people to come on.

11680. How did it encourage them, because they could have got on before, and as a matter of fact in many towns—in many parts of London at any rate—that kind of person ruled the boards before that time. The point that I am trying to put to you is that these people, whom you class as responsible for the lowering of the administration at Ipswich, could have got on before the alteration of 1894, as they had the qualifications?—I suppose so.

11681. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Do you suggest that the electorate has changed?—Yes, the electorate has changed.

11682. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Only by bringing in more of the same kind of people, because the householder workmen had votes before 1894, and it was only the lodger that was brought in by the 1894 Act?—Yes.

Trade depression at Ipswich.

11683. (*Mr. Phelps.*) But under Sturges Bourne's Act there was also plural voting, was there not?—Yes.

11684. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Has Ipswich during the last two years suffered, like every other town, because of the depression in trade?—There have been certainly more unemployed during the last two years in Ipswich than there had been previously.

11685. That would make the administration of the Poor Law more difficult, would it not?—It would make it slightly more difficult.

11686. Then about Norwich; it is of course true as you say that only one of the forty-eight members is a Socialist?—Yes.

Constitution of Norwich Board of Guardians.

11687. It is also true that at Norwich the relief is administered by committees, is it not?—Yes.

11688. Then one man could not be on all these committees, could he?—No. He is on one committee, but that is the largest relief committee.

11689. Is he on the particular committee which is responsible for the cases in your appendix?—That I am sure I could not say. Those cases were collected from various parts of the city, not from one relieving officer's district.

11690. How is the Norwich Board constituted; what is the occupation in life of the people who are on the board?—They are mostly tradesmen of various denominations.

11691. Are there any clergy there?—Yes, there are a few clergy, both Anglican and Nonconformists.

11692. Do these clergy have the giving away of the charities as well?—Not that I know of.

Charities at Norwich.

11693. In whose hands are the charities?—I suppose they are in the hands of the various bodies themselves. I can give you a list of the charities. There is first the Great Hospital of Norwich. That is the greatest charity in Norwich, and I think it has an income of nearly £10,000 a year. The Great Hospital, I might explain, is really a sort of workhouse. It is a huge almshouse which is governed by a master and a matron, something after the style of a workhouse.

11694. How do you get admission there?—By votes.

11695. Who would be the managers?—There is a Committee of Management.

11696. Are they elected?—They are not elected by the people.

11697. How do they come into being?—I fancy they must be appointed by the Charity Commissioners.

11698. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Has not the municipal corporation something to do with it?—Yes, the municipal corporation has something to do with it.

11699. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Are they not nominated according to a scheme which has been approved by the Charity Commissioners?—It is something of that sort I should say.

11700. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Was it not a charity under the old municipal corporation prior to 1835?—Possibly it was.

11701. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) What are the other charities?—Doughty's Hospital, the Childrens' Hospital, Norman's Endowed School, Cooke's Hospital, the Hospital and School for the Blind, the Town Close Charity, the Bethel Hospital, the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, the Lying-in Charity, the Jenny Lind Hospital, the Eye Infirmary, the Loan Charities——.

11702. Is that an arrangement for granting loans?—I expect so. Then there is the Norwich Hospital, the Saturday and Sunday Fund, the Orphans' Home, and the Norwich Magdalen or Female Home. In addition to those, there are a large number of lesser charities, such as local and Nonconformist charities, and private doles, which must account for another £10,000 a year. Those charities I have specifically mentioned have an income of nearly £40,000 a year.

11703. So that it is quite a desirable place for people to live in who want to loaf on their fellows?—Most desirable.

11704. That state of things has not arisen certainly since 1894?—No.

11705. So that any modern legislation is not responsible for the degraded condition of Norwich?—I should think not.

Charities in Cathedral towns.

11706. Has the pauperism of Norwich anything to do with the fact that there is a cathedral there; has the cathedral brought these demoralising charities there?—I should not think so.

11707. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) As a rule, is it not around cathedral cities that there gather these large numbers of charities?—I have no experience of any other cathedral city, except York.

11708. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) We have had the case of York brought before us, and it seems to me that Norwich rather beats York. Ely does not come under you, does it?—No.

Old-age pauperism in rural districts

11709. Now about the pauperism in the rural districts. Mildenhall apparently is at the top of your list; would it not be true to say that most of these are aged people?—In the rural districts certainly.

11710. And that the out-relief is really an old-age pension to them, and they look on it as a kind of pension?—Possibly they do.

11711. Is it not the tendency nowadays in the country districts for them to look forward to the allowance when they get to a certain age?—I do not like to say that altogether.

11712. But it is true, is it not, that right over your district, where pauperism is very high the proportion of aged people to the population is also very high?—Certainly.

11713. And that in the country districts, the longer an agricultural labourer or his wife lives, the greater the chance of him or her becoming a recipient of outdoor relief or going into the workhouse?—Yes.

Norwich charities and their effect.

11714 (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is it not the fact that these charities at Norwich are very ancient?—Yes, very.

11715. They go back to the fifteenth or the sixteenth century, do they not?—Possibly they do.

11716. So it is not a new phenomenon at all?—No.

11717. Do you happen to know whether they are connected now with the municipal corporation?—I do not know I am sure.

11718. I believe the reason why there were so many charities at Norwich was because Norwich was an extraordinarily wealthy centre in the sixteenth century?—Quite so.

11719. So that the present conditions are not attributable either to the cathedral or to the Socialists?—Not a bit.

Guardians' methods of dealing with contracts.

11720. With regard to contracts, has your attention been called to the method of giving contracts by boards of guardians, and have you considered that question?—In what respect?

11721. As to whether they are duly advertised and as to whether due inquiry is made as to quality and price?—The contracts are well advertised, and I think as a whole, speaking generally, great care is taken in the giving of the contracts.

11722. Do you ever attend meetings of the guardians while they are giving out contracts?—Often.

11723. What is the ordinary procedure?—The ordinary procedure is that the tenders arrive in sealed envelopes and are opened by the contract committee.

11724. And reported on?—And reported on; the committee, of course, make certain recommendations.

11725. You have never noticed a board of guardians opening contracts and voting on them without a report, have you?—Yes, I have.

Mr. Gerald A.F. Hervey.

1 May 1906.

11726. In what particular union?—I cannot name, speaking from memory, any particular union.

11727. Would you consider that a bad procedure?—No.

11728. Then you see no advantage in it being reported on by a committee?—No.

11729. You think it does just as well for the board of guardians to open them and decide on the spot?—I think so.

11730. Have you any experience of arrangements made by the clerk to the guardians to withhold the names of the tenderers, with a view to preventing collusion between members of the board of guardians and specific tradesmen?—I think that the name of the contractor is only known at the time of the opening of the tenders.

11731. But it is known then?—At the time of the opening of the tenders, yes.

11732. You have not got instances of the practice which obtains, I think, a good deal in Lancashire, of withholding the names of the tenderers altogether and permitting the guardians only to vote on the quality and possibly on the price?—I think I might say that is the practice which is generally followed.

11733. The practice is, then, that the names are withheld?—Yes, they are withheld generally.

11734. And you get one, two, three, four, and so on?—Yes.

11735. With the price?—With the price.

11736. Is the specific price given, or is it only said that No. 1 is higher than No. 2?—The specific price is generally given.

11737. I daresay you know that some clerks withhold the specific price in order to prevent collusion?—I have never noticed that.

11738. But it is usual to withhold the name?—Yes.

11739. Do you consider that is any safeguard?—I think so in dealing with the rural boards of guardians; they are mostly farmers, and very honest men as a rule.

11740. But you do think it is better to withhold the names?—Yes, I think it would be better to withhold the name.

11741. So you think there might be collusion?—I do not say there would be collusion.

11742. Still you think it is better to withhold the name?—On general principles I think it is better to withhold the name.

11743. You talk about the deterioration of certain boards of guardians, not specifying any particular board of guardians; has that affected the giving of contracts at all, and has the giving of contracts become more reckless?—I think only in regard to expenditure.

11744. You do not suggest that there is more collusion?—No, not a bit.

11745. You think it is merely impulsive expenditure?—Yes.

Effect of Act of 1894 on administration.

11746. We were told by Mr. Davy and by some other inspectors that though the character of the boards had deteriorated since 1894, yet that had been gradually remedied, and the people had begun to know their business and were now improving, so that the deterioration was not permanent; is that your opinion?—Yes, I should say in that one particular direction it is so.

11747. That they are improving?—Yes.

11748. Do you think the effect of the Act of 1894 will be permanent, or do you think the existing condition of things is merely due to the people who get elected being inexperienced, but that they will learn their job?—I think inexperience has a great deal to do with it.

11749. But you still deplore it?—I still deplore it.

Publication of lists of paupers.

11750. With regard to paragraphs 19 and 20, do you advocate the old system of the 18th century of publishing lists of people in receipt of out-door relief, which you may remember was practically dropped?—I should say in one particular instance it would have a very good result.

11751. An instance of one union?—Yes.

11752. Is that Norwich?—That is Norwich.

11753. Do you think the ratepayers would take action, or what would follow?—I think the ratepayers in general would take more interest in the administration of out-relief if the names of the persons were published.

Apathy Norwich ratepaye and its c

11754. With regard to the ratepayers of Norwich, why are they so apathetic; do they realise that it means a rise in the rate?—I do not think the general run of ratepayers think of it at all. They are satisfied to grumble at the increased rating every half year, and that is all.

11755. Do you happen to know that there is much compounding; does that come to your knowledge?—It does not come to my knowledge.

11756. There does not happen to be much railway or Government property there?—No.*

11757. So that there is no obvious reason why the voters should not object as ratepayers to this increased expenditure?—There is no reason at all.

11758. It is not because they do not pay the rates directly?—No.

11759. Nor is it because they are spending either railway or Government money which they do not contribute?—I should think not.

11760. It is simply the indifference of the ordinary ratepayer?—Yes.

11761. In Norwich is there not a good deal of work which is taken to the homes?—Yes, there is a good deal of that.

11762. Does any of the out-relief go practically as a rate in aid of wages to the out-workers?—I have no personal knowledge of that, but I believe that a good deal of it does go in that way. The only knowledge I have of it is in these cases that I have put beforethe Commission.

Out-relie aid of w

11763. Has it ever been suggested that manufacturers who happen to be members of boards of guardians give out-relief to persons taking work from them?—I do not quite follow.

11764. Supposing a manufacturer who gives work out into the homes is a member of the board of guardians, he might recommend the giving of out-relief in order to make it possible for his people to work cheaper; has that been suggested?—No.

11765. You have never heard of that?—I have never heard of it.

11766. The only reason for this lavish out-door relief beyond a definite policy is a political reason?—Yes.

11767. The desire to buy votes practically?—Yes.

11768. Is the relief at Norwich administered by the guardian of the ward in which it is given?—There are two relief committees at Norwich, and they are selected from various wards in the city. The practice is that the different relieving officers take it in turn to go before the various committees.

System of ministrati of relief a Norwich.

11769. But those committees are not necessarily made up of the representatives of the wards, are they?—Not entirely.

11770. Is there any tendency for relief to be given on the advice of the representative of the ward?—I might say that the relief is given entirely on the advice of the representative of the ward.

11771. It is the representative of the ward then that has particular influence rather than any other member?—I should say so.

11772. Has there been any attempt to establish a rota of members, so that the representative of a ward shall not give relief to the persons of that ward?—No.

11773. The system is that the representative is all powerful?—As in pretty well every board of guardians the representative of the particular parish or the particular ward has the most to say.

Absence o rota committee in district

11774. You know that in some boards of guardians they have definitely provided against that by refusing to permit a man to continue to give the relief in his ward for any length of time, and they have a system of rota by which that is distinctly brought about?—I do not think the rota system prevails in my part of the country at all.

---

* Mr. Hervey, in a letter dated 31st July, 1906, supplied the following particulars as to the valuation of Norwich:—

1.	Total gross estimated rental	£550,551
2.	,, rateable value	439,481
3.	Railways—gross estimated rental	20,293
4.	,, rateable value	13,105
5.	Government property	4,403

11775. You deprecate a person giving relief on his own view and knowledge, and you prefer him to do it without knowledge of the person ?—I should certainly.

asons for cessively ge work- uses in tain ions.

11776. With regard to Bosmere and Claydon, Smallburgh, Cosford and Samford, unions which have workhouses which are too large, that arose from the fact that they are incorporated hundreds, did it not ?—Yes.

11777. They were originally very much larger areas, and the workhouses were provided for very much larger areas than they now provide for, under the incorporation of hundreds prior 1835; was that not so ?—Possibly that was so.

11778. The historical reason why these workhouses are too large is not therefore any stupidity on the part of these unions, but because these workhouses were used for very much larger areas originally than they are now used for ?—And for very much larger populations.

11779. Larger areas, and therefore larger populations ?—Yes.

ovision of gs out of ary of rkhouse dical cers.

11780. I notice with regard to medical relief that in the very last paragraph of your memorandum you deplore the fact that medical officers find their own drugs ?—Yes.

11781. Is it usual for them to find their own drugs ?—It is in the large number of cases usual for the medical officers of workhouses to do so.

11782. Is there a definite kind of board of guardians who insist on that, or is it a general policy ?—It is a general practice. The Local Government Board from time to time on the appointment of a new medical officer of a workhouse always urges the guardians to provide their own drugs.

11783. But they do not do that ?—They do not all of them accept the suggestion.

11784. Would it not be better to make that a General Order ?—I think so.

11785. Is there any reason against making it a General Order ?—None that I am aware of.

pply of ohol in rkhouses.

11786. With regard to the supply of alcohol which you also note, what is your suggestion to prevent its continued over supply ?—From time to time I have brought this matter of alcoholic expenditure before the boards of guardians, and several of them have accepted my hints and have themselves reduced it considerably. For instance, last year I pointed out the very heavy expenditure on alcohol at the Thingoe workhouse, and from giving a good deal they now give none at all, except strictly on the order of the medical officer. But at East and West Flegg, where they have such a large consumption for a very small in-door population, they altogether rejected any suggestion of mine.

11787. They are always supposed to give it on the order of the medical officer, are they not ?—Yes, but then the order of the medical officer in the case of East and West Flegg would not, I should say, warrant such an enormous expenditure.

pposed culation ratepayers expert orts on ministra- n of ardians.

11788. With regard to mal-administration generally, whether with reference to the giving of alcohol or to the giving of out-door relief, would it be possible or desirable for a report to be made by a specialist on the administration of a union, and for that report to be circulated to every ratepayer ?—What would be the objection to that ? Supposing you had a special inquiry into Norwich, for instance, why should not the report be circulated to every ratepayer ?—I do not see why it should not.

11789. Would you object to the local inspector making a report, and having it circulated to every ratepayer ?—On the administration of out-relief ?

1179). On any point of the administration ?—I myself should have no objection at all.

11791. Do you think that it would tend to embitter your relations, or would it be better to leave it to another inspector ?—If it had to be done, I think it would be far better that someone not connected with the district should do it.

11792. But on the whole, do you think that it would be a good thing if it were possible to have reports periodically issued to the ratepayers on the administrative procedure of guardians ?—The guardians are the representatives of the ratepayers.

11793. Sometimes the ratepayers do not know what the guardians are doing. Would there be any objection to a carefully drawn up expert report on the administration of a particular union being circulated to every ratepayer ?—None that I am aware of.

11794. (*Mr. Bentham.*) The pauperism generally in your district, I notice, is very high in comparison with the rest of England and Wales. There were forty-eight unions with thirty per 1,000 or over in 1885, and the same number with thirty per 1,000 or over in 1895; but in 1905 there were only forty-four with thirty per 1,000 and over; therefore we may say that the pauperism has been stationary during the last twenty years ?—Yes. I think there is an inclination for it to fall, but it is practically stagnant. Condition of district as to pauperism.

11795. What is that tendency to fall at the present time due to ?—I am sure it is very difficult to say.

11796. Is it on account of more care being exercised, or is it the cost that is increasing ? I notice that the cost increased out of all proportion to the number of paupers ?—That is so generally.

11797. Do you think it is the cost that is drawing their attention to it at the present time ?—It may be that.

11798. You said in answer to a question just now that the very large number of people in Mildenhall over sixty years of age might have something to do with the high rate of pauperism; I see that Mildenhall has 6·1 per cent., which is the highest in your district, I think ?—Yes. Co-relation of old-age and pauperism statistics.

11799. If you will look at Mr. Booth's table I think you will find that 118 per 1,000 is the old-age figure for Mildenhall ?—Yes.

11800. Then if you will take the next highest, which is Hoxne, the rate of pauperism there is 5·7 per cent. and the aged people are 124 per 1,000 ?—Yes.

11801. Then, if you go to Blofield, that is one of the lowest in pauperism, being 2·8 per cent., you find that it has an old-age figure of 132 per 1,000, which is higher than either Mildenhall or Hoxne ?—Yes, I noticed that.

11802. Then take Samford; its pauperism is 2·2 per cent., but its old-age is 111 per 1,000 ?—Yes.

11803. So that two of the lowest in pauperism and two of the highest in pauperism have old-age figures which are practically the same ?—Yes.

11804. All those four are rural unions, I think ?—They are quite rural.

11805. And they are all practically identical, are they not ?—That is so.

11806. If this disparity is not due to old age, can you give us any other reason for it ?—I am afraid I cannot.

11807. There is a very great difference, is there not, between those four unions ?—There is a very great difference, it is true.

11808. If you take the population, it is practically stationary in all the four, I think ?—Yes.

11809. Practically there has been no movement, as far as the population is concerned; and therefore I should think they are identical in almost every respect as far as conditions go ?—Yes, I should think they are.

11810. You have no theory as to why the two, Mildenhall and Hoxne, should be much higher than Blofield and Samford in pauperism ?—I have no theory at all about it.

11811. With regard to Poor Law relief generally, do you find that many boards of guardians have a policy at all on the question of relief; have they, would you say, any avowed policy on which they are acting ?—Do you mean to say with regard to the amount of relief given ? Policy of boards of guardians as to relief.

11812. A policy of any kind, whether it might be in the direction of a more liberal out-door relief, or of a more restricted relief of any kind ?—The general tendency is to give a more adequate relief.

11813. That is only a tendency, and it is not a policy that is laid down, as it were, by resolution of the boards of guardians; and they are not acting upon a certain Scales of relief in rural district.

Mr. Gerald A. F. Hervey.

1 May 1906.

set of principles in giving relief?—No. You will find that pretty well every rural board has a scale of relief.

11814. But no particular policy?—That is so.

Inspector's influence on policy of boards of guardians.

11815. Your influence would tend a great deal in the direction of shaping their policy, would it not?—I dare say it would.

11816. Do you think more could be done in that way?—I have no doubt a great deal more could be done.

11817. Is the district small enough now for you to exercise an influence over them in that direction?—Quite.

11818. You think you could manage it?—Quite.

11819. Do you find there is any disinclination on the part of the guardians to receive hints from you with regard to their methods of granting relief?—No. I have noticed that they have always accepted one's suggestions with the greatest kindness.

11820. One would think that with the very high rate of pauperism there is a very useful field for labour in this district?—Undoubtedly there is

Influence of one man with a policy on a board of guardians.

11821. Do you find that if one person on a board has a definite policy in his mind, he can usually influence the whole board, because the remainder of the members have not any particular policy?—That is so.

11822. Even if it is a bad policy he still has the influence?—He still has the influence, if he is a very talkative man.

11823. And if he has a strong character and has a definite idea in his mind, he can usually carry the rest with him?—Yes.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894, on administration.

11824. I take it that, broadly speaking, you do not object to the change that was made in 1894, by which a larger number of working-men guardians have been elected?—No. No one can object to the election of working-men on boards of guardians.

11825. You think they are very useful members on a board?—I think some of them are. I have come across some very useful members indeed.

11826. Do you think that they are more likely to be led in the direction of a more liberal out-door relief than the propertied members of a board?—Yes, undoubtedly.

Motives of policy of lavish out-relief.

11827. Do you think that some boards of guardians have a policy, which is a perfectly honest policy, of liberal out-door relief, believing that that is the cheapest and best method of relieving the people?—Yes.

11828. Do you think that does obtain sometimes?—Sometimes it does, certainly.

11829. And that, on the other hand, there may be people on a board—irrespective of political parties; who may be members of any political party—who would advocate more liberal out-door relief for other reasons?—Yes.

11830. That is, if a man is unscrupulous he sees that that is the way to get popularity quite easily?—Yes.

11831. And that it is a policy which he can carry out when he becomes a member?—Sometimes.

11832. Do you not find that it is a policy which takes very well with the people themselves, and that very little opposition is taken to it by the ratepayers generally, because of their sympathy with the poor?—That is so.

11833. So that a policy of out-door relief might be advocated by an unscrupulous person, and meet with general acceptance by the ratepayers, and still be mischievous?—Yes.

11834. Do you think that the main reason why the ratepayers do not object to the increased cost is because they think that the poor people are being treated liberally and well, and it is a most unpopular thing to object to that?—Speaking generally, it is so.

11835. Do you think that might be a reason why a board that starts on that policy easily drifts on until it gets into a hopeless state of pauperism and then can scarcely find a turning point?—Yes, that is so. I think that Smallburgh Union is one of those unions.

Poor Law administration at Norwich.

11836. Take Norwich; do you find that there is any party on the board that is, at the present time, openly advocating restriction of out-door relief?—Yes, there is a certain section.

11837. Is it a small section?—Yes, it is.

11838. Is there any conflict against them by any other section of the board which is in favour of the opposite policy?—I would not say there is a conflict; they are simply out-voted.

11839. Which is the strongest party at the present time on the Norwich Board—the party that is in favour of out-door relief openly and avowedly, or those that are against it?—The party that is in favour of out-door relief.

11840. That would be composed of all sections of the board, would it?—Yes.

11841. Irrespective of political views?—Yes.

11842. Do you examine the relieving officer's books in the Norwich Union in a regular way, when you are inspecting the workhouse?—I frequently inspect the relieving officers' books.

11843. Do you ever sit with the relief committees?—Yes.

11844. Do you make a practice of it when you visit Norwich?—I sat with the relief committees twice last year.

11845. Do you find that the committees act pretty much on the same lines when they are hearing cases?—They act pretty much on the same lines, in spite of any protests on my behalf or on behalf of the relieving officers.

11846. Do you think that the Norwich cases, which you state in your appendix, are really exceptional cases, or could you find similar cases in almost every union in your district?—Those are exceptional cases.

11847. And you do not think you could find similar cases in almost every union?—No.

11848. Have you examined the books at any other union with the object of ascertaining that?—Yes, I have.

11849. You could not find any except at Norwich?—No.

The family income as a factor in eligibility for relief.

11850. Is it not sometimes accepted as a principle at a relief committee, that an application shall be considered in the light of the income of the applicant, apart from the income of the rest of the family, that is, that the children's income shall not be taken into consideration when the applicant is an aged person only earning a small matter by charing; and that although there might be a large income in the family, they look upon that as the income belonging to the children? Most of the cases in your appendix are cases of that kind, are they not?—These cases are almost all of that kind. But they should consider what the income of the family is.

11851. They should consider the income of the household?—Yes. In most of these cases, the mother is simply the housekeeper for the children.

11852. Do you say you have examined the books of other unions of your district, and you cannot find similar cases?—I have not come across any.

11853. Have you tried Mildenhall?—Yes. At every board of guardians' meeting I attend, I always sit through the relief cases.

11854. You do not find any there?—No.

Norwich charities a possibility their co-op ating with guardians

11855. With regard to the charities of Norwich, many of which you have named, is there any definite part of this £50,000 a year given in the way of relief in money or in kind?—I have not been able to get any particulars as to how these charities are administered, but I know that there is a good deal of money given as well as kind. The charities are distributed both in money and in kind.

11856. You do think there is some money available for dealing with out-door relief cases from these charities?—Yes, I think so.

11857. Do you think that might meet, to a large extent, the demands for out-door relief in Norwich as apart from Poor Law relief, and thereby reduce the amount of the out-door relief given by the guardians?—I have no doubt that if the administrators of charity and the administrators of out-relief could be brought together, a very great improvement could be effected.

11858. Has any attempt been made to bring them together recently?—There has been no attempt made at all.

11859. Do you think that this is a useful field of inquiry ?—I certainly do. I should like to say in connection with this that Mr. Lloyd, the vicar of St. Giles, Norwich, has been making a study of this question for many years. St. Giles is the parish which has the largest number of small charities in Norwich. He would very much like to come and give evidence before this Commission.

Poor Law electoral areas at Norwich.

11860. With regard to the wards for election purposes at Norwich, do they approximate pretty nearly to the size of the municipal wards, or how are they divided ?—They are pretty much the same as the municipal wards.

11861. Do you think they are the same ?—Yes.

11862. How many wards are there altogether ?—I am afraid I cannot tell you off-hand.

11863. With regard to the surcharge that you referred to, for these cases of out-door relief have you got the terms of the auditor's note with you ?—No, I have not.

11864. (*Professor Smart.*) In speaking about the circumstances of agriculture in your district, you said they were very much the same as formerly: do you mean there is no improvement in agriculture in that quarter ?—There is none in the conditions of the agricultural labourer.

11865. Farming is no better ?—No.

Agricultural conditions in district: success of Scottish farmers.

11866. Is there much derelict land in Essex, for example ?—There is a good deal of derelict land in Essex.

11867. That means that rent has disappeared ?—Yes.

11868. And you see no improvement at all ?—No.

11869. The growing of other crops, for example, has not done anything ?—The improvement there has been in Essex has been effected by the Scottish farmers who come down and make a profit out of the land, which the ordinary Essex farmers have been able to do nothing with.

11870. I have heard occasionally of Scottish farmers returning to Scotland afterwards ?—With money in their pockets.

11871. Have you any experience of boarding-out children ?—No, not without the union, but within the union.

The boarding-out of Poor Law children.

11872. Is your experience all of boarding-out within the union ?—Yes.

11873. I do not think you say much about that in your memorandum, do you ?—No.

11874. Have you any opinion upon boarding-out ?—Boarding-out is, I think, the ideal system of dealing with children, provided you can get good homes for them.

11875. Even within the union ?—Even within the union.

11876. But you have no experience at all of boarding-out outside ?—I have no experience of boarding-out outside the union.

11877. Do you find the results have been good inside the union ?—I would not say that.

11878. Is there nothing you would say definitely on it ?—I have said that boarding-out is the ideal way I think, of dealing with children provided you can always find satisfactory homes.

11879. So far as you have had experience of it in your district, have the results been good ?—Speaking generally, the results have been satisfactory.

Out-relief policy at Ipswich.

11880. In paragraph 2 of your memoraudum you say, "Ipswich has adopted for many years a strict out-relief policy, which worked with the best results." Do you put the emphasis on the word "strict" or on the words "out-relief;" do you mean strict as opposite to lax, or out-relief as opposed to in-relief ?—I mean a strict policy of administration of out-relief.

11881. You do not mean to say they prefer out-relief to in-relief ?—No; what I mean to say is, that whenever possible they have offered the house in preference to giving out-relief.

11882. Then it is the word "strict" you put the emphasis on ?—Yes.

Relief in aid of wages.

11883. In paragraph 27 you say: "The effect on the Poor Law relief of the endowed charities and the wages of the poorest paid class of wage earner is one that seems to me to require more thorough investigation than I have had an opportunity of making." You said in answer to Mrs. Webb that you never heard it suggested that there was any effect of Poor Law relief on wages, and I took that to mean that you had never heard it suggested that there was any causal connection between low wages and Poor Law relief, but perhaps you meant that you had never heard it suggested that Poor Law relief had been given with the object of reducing wages ?—That is what I meant.

11884. Were you referring to agricultural wages there ?—No, I was referring to wages in Norwich.

11885. Wages in Norwich entirely ?—Yes, in connection with the charities.

11886. And not agricultural wages ?—It had nothing to do with agriculture.

11887. Do you not think it has any connection at all with agricultural wages ?—No.

Cases of improper out-relief: Action of district auditor.

11888. In paragraph 16 you refer to the extraordinary cases in which relief was given according to the nett income of the applicants. Was that done in any way by way of principle, or had the guardians only drifted into such an extraordinary system ?—I think they have got into the habit of distributing out-relief as a sort of largesse, and they do not like to refuse anybody who comes along.

11889. I should like to emphasise these two cases; the first a case where the total earnings are 40s. 9d., the relief given by the guardians being 3s; and the second where the total earnings are 51s. 6d., the relief given by the guardians being 5s. weekly. One would think that no board of guardians would be willing that such a statement as that should be placed before the public ?—They have stopped it now, since I brought these cases to the notice of the auditor.

11890. But you do not know whether his decision was confirmed or not ?—That remains for the decision of the Local Government Board.

Supply of alcohol in workhouses.

11891. Then about alcohol; do I understand that alcohol is given to a large extent as medical relief or altogether as medical relief ?—A good deal of beer is given by the guardians. In the rural districts they do not believe in robbing a poor man of this beer, as they say.

11892. You suggest that it is sometimes g ven as a substitute for drugs; that is alcohol pure and simple, I take it ?—Yes.

11893. And it is cheaper in the case you mention ?—It is undoubtedly cheaper to the medical officer.

Large consumption of alcohol in East and West Flegg Workhouse.

11894. Are we to understand that in a very small workhouse, apparently with thirty-six inmates, the consumption of alcohol is not less than £2 3s. 10d. per head ?—Yes, that is in East and West Flegg.

11895. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) And there is none given to out-door paupers there at all, is there ?—None.

11896. (*Dr. Downes.*) There are only eight people in the infirmary in that place, I believe ?—Only eight.

11897. (*Professor Smart.*) What answer was given when you complained of that ?—No answer at all, although I wrote to the guardians specially on the subject.

11898. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) There are thirty-six in the workhouse and 331 receiving out-door relief I see from Mr. Booth's return, and yet the whole of the alcohol is distributed amongst the thirty-six of the workhouse and nothing is given to the out-door people ?—That is so.

11899. (*Professor Smart.*) Most of that would be as beer, I presume, and not as alcohol pure and simple ?—Most of it as beer.

11900. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is there any intelligible reason for it ?—There is none whatever, because these old crocks do no work. There are only eight in the infirmary, as Dr. Downes has just remarked.

11901. So it cannot be given as medical relief ?—No; it is simply given because the guardians like them to have it.

11902. (*Professor Smart.*) East and West Flegg is a purely agricultural parish, is it not ?—Yes.

11903. (*Mr. Patten MacDougall.*) Has the auditor drawn attention to that ?—I think he has; anyhow I have.

Mr. Gerald A.F. Hervey.

1 May 1906.

11904. (*Miss Hill.*) Did I understand you to say that no effort had been made by the charities themselves in Norwich to get any sort of organisation or reform?—None whatever, as far as I have ever heard of.

The organisation of charities at Norwich.

11905. Is the Vicar of St. Giles' taking any steps about it actively, besides studying it for years, do you know?—I believe he has formulated a wonderful scheme with the intention of bringing together the administrators of the charities and the administrators of out-relief.

11906. That seems to be what is wanted to begin with?—That would be a very good thing to begin with.

11907. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Have you any experience of co-operation of that kind anywhere between charity and poor law?—No. Norwich is the only city in my district in which there are any charities.

11908. You have not any at Ipswich?—No.

Type of rural guardians.

11909. Take for the moment the case of rural unions; what type of guardian do you find in the small rural unions?—There are the clergy and the farmers.

11910. You do not find many of what are called country gentlemen, do you?—Very few.

The letting of country houses and its effect on administration.

11911. Do you think that the tendency to let country houses has had a great effect on administration?—No, I do not think it has. I do not think that many of the country houses in Norfolk, for instance, are let to strangers.

11912. It is not a general movement at all, then?—No.

Out-relief to aged in rural districts: Scale in Norfolk.

11913. From what point of view do the guardians in a country district regard the giving of relief, do you think? They are mostly farmers, are they not?—Yes.

11914. And they give it to their labourers in their old age, I suppose?—Quite so.

11915. Do they regard it as practically a subvention to themselves?—Possibly.

11916 On what sort of scale do they give it? What would be the scale of relief in a country union in Norfolk for an old man and his wife, for instance?—It would vary, but on an average I think it would be about 4s. 6d.

11917. 4s. 6d. for the two?—Yes.

11918. How much of that will they have to pay as rent?—Perhaps 1s.

11919. Have you investigated or visited in any of the unions the particular cases receiving out-door relief?—I have never visited them.

11920. You do not know how far boards of guardians are careful with regard to the surroundings in which their cases live?—No, not from my own observations.

Need for power of compulsory removal to workhouse of certain classes.

11921. Do you think that compulsory powers are needed for the removal of cases to the workhouse? Have you come across cases which ought to be compulsorily removed?—One now and again hears of cases of that sort who should be removed to the infirmary, but who prefer to stick to their own cottages and their own messy ways.

11922. And who live in a great state of dirt?—Yes.

11923. You have come across some?—Yes.

11924. But not many?—Not a great many.

11925. You do not think, then, that it is a pressing matter?—No, I do not think it is pressing.

Indoor administration at Norwich.

11926. Now, coming again to Norwich, I see that at Norwich the administration of the workhouse is particularly good?—Yes, it is.

11927. To what do you attribute that?—They have a first-class master there who understands his business as an administrator.

11928. Is he supported by the Board?—He is supported by the committee.

11929. There is no sign of bad administration in that department?—No.

11930. You say that classification is very good; what kind of classification have you in your mind?—The paupers there are divided into three classes, first, second, and third.

11931. According to desert?—Yes. Class 1 will get very much better quarters and live with a great deal more comfort and so on than Class 2, and Class 2 will be better off than Class 3. That creates competition to get from one class into the other, where they get better treatment, more leave, and so on.

Classification of workhouse inmates and its value.

11932. Are they classified according to their conduct before they come into the workhouse, or according to their conduct in the workhouse?—According to their conduct in the workhouse.

11933. So it is a test?—Yes.

11934. Does that not have rather a curious result?—What do you mean?

11935. Might you not have a man whose character outside was undesirable, but who for reasons of policy behaved himself well within the workhouse?—That is quite possible.

11936. Do you think that classification is really valuable?—I think it is most valuable.

11937. In what way?—I think it tends to elevate these poor old people as much as you can elevate them.

11938. I can quite see that it makes for the good discipline of the house?—Of course it is good for the discipline of the house.

11939. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is no regard ever paid in that classification to conduct prior to entering the house?—I do not think so; there may be some exceptional cases perhaps.

Classification of workhouses and its difficulties.

11940. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Have you any views with regard to the classification of workhouses in the counties, and do you see your way to recommending any such classification?—In the country districts, do you mean?

11941. I am referring to the specialisation of workhouses for special classes of cases. Do you think, for instance, that you could take Norfolk as a unit for the purpose of dealing with the feeble-minded and the epileptic, collecting them from all the individual workhouses in the county and putting them together in one institution; do you think that would be possible?—It would be quite possible.

11942. Do you think it would be desirable?—It is very much advocated.

11943. Do you think it would meet with great opposition from the various Boards?—It all depends how much it is going to cost them.

11944. The question of the distance from the home of the pauper would not be material, would it?—I do not think it would.

Tendency to economy in indoor relief and its causes.

11945. Do you find that kind of economy a very strong motive with your boards of guardians?—Very.

11946. Do you find it difficult to get them to build a new infirmary or to improve their workhouses?—Most difficult.

11947. Do you think that they are more economical on that side than they are on the side of giving relief?—Yes.

11948. Can you explain that difference at all?—The general idea is that workhouses will be done away with, and therefore they deprecate the idea of spending more money on them than is necessary.

11949. Do you find that the Norwich people are prompt to improve if you point out an improvement that is needed in their workhouse?—Most prompt.

11950. Then you have no criticism to make in that respect?—No, none at all.

Poor Law treatment for phthisis at Norwich.

11951. Do they classify their inmates according to their complaints; have they wards for phthisical patients, for instance, in the infirmary at Norwich?—They have adopted for phthisical cases out-door treatment.

11952. Have they an institution for that?—They have no institution, but they have out-door shelters.

11953. In the grounds of the infirmary?—Yes, they have revolving shelters which they put in the grounds of the infirmary.

11954. What number of patients roughly can be accommodated in that way?—I think they have four shelters.

11955. Are the guardians satisfied with the results at present?—Yes. I was talking to their medical officer

some time ago and he said he was very satisfied with the results.

11956. They do not work it in connection with a seaside resort, do they ?—No.

The boarding-out of sick paupers in workhouses belonging to other unions.

11957. (*Dr. Downes.*) You tell us on the first page of your memorandum that Bury St. Edmunds, Woodbridge and Hoxne board-out their in-door paupers in the workhouses of Thingoe, Ipswich and Hartismere; do they send their sick to those workhouses ?—Yes.

11958. Has any difficulty arisen with regard to sending the sick ?—None at all.

11959. Is the distance great to any one of those institutions ?—The Thingoe workhouse is situated in Bury St. Edmunds itself, so there is no difficulty there. For Hoxne, the workhouse is situated at Eye, and they may have to send their paupers as much as ten or twelve miles.

11960. Has there been any difficulty in that case ?—There has been no difficulty that I ever heard of.

11961. Who removes the sick person, the union that sends the case ?—Yes.

11962. Do you know how they do it ?—By an ambulance.

11963. Have they got an ambulance ?—Yes.

11964. Do they send a nurse ?—I do not think a nurse is sent.

Consumption of alcohol in Billericay Workhouse and its causes.

11965. In paragraph 6 you speak of the crowding of the Billericay workhouse, and on referring to your return of the consumption of alcohol I find that Billericay stands rather prominently there. Billericay with 225 inmates of the workhouse spent £125 on alcohol, while the adjoining union of Chelmsford with 313 inmates only spent £22, and Braintree, also a neighbouring union, with 232 inmates spent £10. Is there any reason why Billericay should use such an amount of alcoholic liquor ?—I think Dr. Carter, the medical officer there, is a strong believer in the administration of alcohol.

11966. You think it is due to the personal element of the medical officer then ?—I think it is due to the personal element there.

11967. Do you think that reacts on the crowding of the workhouse; does it form an attraction ?—No, I do not think so.

Procedure for authorising supply of alcohol in workhouses.

11968. Is there any special Order or anything in force at East and West Flegg which enables the guardians to give alcohol ?—Not that I know of.

11969. The General Order, the Dietaries Order, as you are no doubt aware, forbids the guardians from giving any fermented or spirituous liquor unless in pursuance of a written recommendation of the medical officer of the workhouse ?—That is so.

11970. Is all that is given at East and West Flegg given in pursuance of an order by the doctor ?—Yes.

11971. That order has to be renewed every twenty-eight days, I believe ?—That is so, according to the General Order.

11952. Is the General Order carried out there ?—I believe it is.

11973. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Would that apply to the beer given at Christmas ?—No, I do not think that would apply to the Christmas beer, but then you see at East and West Flegg they give such a great deal of beer that it would be hard to discriminate which would be Christmas beer and which would be the ordinary beer.

11974. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) How does it come about that it is never ordered for any of the out-paupers there ?—I suppose the different medical officers probably have different views.

11975. Then it is not the same man who attends to the out-paupers there ?—No, it is not.

Supply of alcohol in East and West Flegg Union and its causes.

11976. (*Dr. Downes.*) Is this expenditure at East and West Flegg due to the personal influence of the medical officer there ?—I do not think it is due to the personal influence of that medical officer. I think it is the wish of the board that the medical officer should allow these people their beer.

11977. But he is not bound to give it if the board wish it, is he ?—He is not bound to give it, but he is not the sort of officer who would object.

11978. He does not resist them ?—No.

11979. He has to give definite reasons in every case why he is giving the alcohol; does he do that ?—Yes, I think he does. I have spoken to him several times about it; but he is agreeable to recommending it to all these people, as he wants them to have something to "buck" them up. He says, "If I took off their beer now they would die."

11980. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Can you recover some of the certificates of the medical officer ordering that alcohol should be given in these particular cases at East and West Flegg ?—We could call for his book.

11981. (*Dr. Downes.*) There is a formal book called the alcohol book, I think ?—Yes.

11982. The first column is for the name of the inmate, and the second column for a statement of the reasons which in the opinion of the medical officer render such allowance requisite for the health of the inmate ?—Yes.

Effect of charities on pauperism at Norwich.

11983. With regard to Norwich, in paragraph 8 you say, "Mr. Preston-Thomas said that he knew of no reason, except such as is to be found in difference of administration, why Norwich, with its extraordinary amount of charities, should have something like twice as much pauperism in proportion to population as Ipswich." Do you agree with the opinion of Mr. Preston-Thomas ? Apart from administration, you are not aware of any reason why Norwich should have so much more pauperism than Ipswich, are you ?—Very possibly the charities may have a great deal to do with it, by attracting people to the town.

11984. But apart from those ?—Apart from those I know of nothing.

11985. In fact the two towns are very fairly comparable in other ways, are they not ?—Yes.

11986. As regards the old-age problem, I notice that in this return the numbers of the old people are very much the same ?—Yes, that is so.

Number of Poor Law nurses in Suffolk and other counties.

11987. In your nursing return there is a considerable difference shown between Suffolk and the other counties. Suffolk, with 729 inmates in the infirmaries, seems to have appointed only thirty-six nurses on day duty and ten on night duty, and the proportion on night duty seems extremely small in that case. Can you give any reason for the small number of night nurses in Suffolk ?—Speaking generally, I do not think there is a great necessity or a larger supply of night nurses. I have found that guardians supply a night nurse when the necessity has been brought before them by myself or Dr. Fuller.

Relation between the supply of night nurses and the number of deaths in a workhouse.

11988. In your next return, of deaths, there is a large number of deaths shown in some of the workhouses where they have no night nurses. Take Bosmere and Claydon; there were thirty-three deaths occurring in 1905, thirty-one in 1904, and twenty-six in 1903; that is a considerable number of deaths, and there is no night nurse there ?—It is true there is no night nurse there, but I think those were very aged people who died. I do not think they had been long ill.

11989. Do not aged people require looking after at night if they are ill ?—Yes; I agree that they require looking after at night; but I do not think there is much difficulty there.

11990. I do not know whether it has any bearing on it, but I have also noticed that the number of lady-guardians in Suffolk is only fourteen as against thirty-three in Norfolk and twenty-six in Essex ?—That is so.

11991. Do you think that the influence of lady-guardians may have some effect on the other counties ?—Very possibly it has.

11992. At any rate, I take it you regard it as desirable that where there are dying people there should be night nurses ?—Certainly.

Readiness of Guardians to supply nurses

11993. Do you find that the guardians are increasingly ready to provide special nursing for their sick ?—Yes.

11994. Do you find less reluctance now than you did formerly ?—In the last two or three years they have been very ready indeed to fall in with that proposition.

Mr. Gerald A.F. Hervey.

1 May 1906.

11995. So that what deficiency there is you would think is tending to right itself?—I do think so.

Difficulties as to appointment of superintendent nurse

11996. In a great many cases they have not appointed a superintendent nurse, although apparently the number of nurses would require it under the Order; do you find an objection to appointing a superintendent nurse in some cases?—There is a great difficulty in some cases in getting a superintendent nurse appointed. I think that that difficulty is generally owing to the influence brought to bear by the master of the workhouse.

11997. Because of the possibility of friction arising?—Yes.

11998. Have you had any cases of friction recently?—Yes. I had to hold an official inquiry at Braintree a short time ago in reference to some friction between the master and the superintendent nurse there.

11999. What was the outcome of the inquiry?—The outcome of the inquiry was that the master was severely censured.

12000. The master was to blame in that case, then?—Yes.

12001. Is the difficulty as to friction tending to right itself, or is it increasing, do you think?—It is tending to right itself. I find no friction whatever in the workhouses in which there are modern masters and matrons. I have several masters and matrons in my district who have been assistant masters and so on; they have a good idea of discipline, and they know how things should be managed, and in their institutions there is no friction.

12002. They understand managing by departments?—Yes, they do.

Attractiveness of Norwich Workhouse.

12003. (*Mr. Chandler.*) In paragraph 5 you say "The question has arisen whether too much is not being done for the workhouse inmates"; have you any views on that question yourself?—I had Norwich in my mind at the time I wrote that. My reason for saying that was because in recent years the workhouse has been made rather a society resort. They have had large entertainments there, and every year they have a very large sale of Brabazon work, and the workhouse has been more or less thrown open to the general public.

12004. That is, the ordinary monotony of a workhouse inmate's life has been somewhat relieved?—It has been very much relieved.

12005. It is not a question of allowing liberty to go out occasionally that you had in your mind, then?—Not altogether. I think it is an extremely well-administered workhouse; but one can go too far even in administration.

12006. Do you think they have gone too far?—The idea has occurred to me that it has been so, and it has also occurred to the chairman of the workhouse committee whether they are not doing a little too much in the way of administration.

Figures as to unemployed and paupers at Norwich.

12007. In reference to Norwich—I hesitate to mention it, as so much has been said about it; but still it is your largest town—I see in your paragraphs relating to the unemployed, you state that the Norwich distress committee registered 1,442 men, the number of dependents being 3,069; that makes a total of 4,511 beings who had to depend either on the earnings of the wife, I suppose, or on the charities, or on Poor Law?—Yes.

12008. That seems to me rather a high percentage?—Yes, it is rather.

12009. Yet in spite of that I noticed that during the last decade the population has increased by 11,000 odd, but the number of paupers who are in receipt of relief has decreased by 140. Would that not appear to be rather favourable to Norwich?—Yes, it would certainly appear to be very favourable to Norwich, if it were only continuous.

12010. If it were continuous many of the strictures that have been made upon Norwich would be removed?—Certainly.

Entertainments at Norwich Workhouse.

12011. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) With reference to your answer to Mr. Chandler about the entertainments and the sales of Brabazon work, are the entertainments social entertainments paid for out of the rates?—No.

12012. They are altogether charitable, are they?—Yes.

12013. And so, of course, are the sales of the Brabazon work?—Yes.

Local Poor Law Acts district, and difficulties as to their repeal.

12014. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In paragraph 3 of your memorandum you refer to some special Acts which are in force in two or three unions in your district, and you say they are obsolete. What had you got in your mind when saying that they are obsolete? They are still in force, are they not?—They are not regarded in any way nowadays.

12015. But they do define the constitution of the union, do they not, the area, for instance?—Yes, in the case of East and West Flegg.

12016. And the same, I suppose, with regard to Forehoe?—Yes, Forehoe *is* an incorporation.

12017. With regard to East and West Flegg you say the workhouse is very bad; there was a proposal, was there not, some years ago to deal with the union on the ground of the badness of the workhouse?—Yes; Mr. Bagenal, I believe held an inquiry on the subject.

12018. Did the guardians not promise to do something?—I think the guardians promised to do something; they promised to provide more adequate accommodation for their sick.

12019. To erect a new infirmary, was it not, or to make new infirmary wards?—I think it was to provide better accommodation within the workhouse.

12020. Has that been done?—Yes, it has.

12021. There would be some difficulty, would there not, in getting rid of these local Acts, because they could only be got rid of, I presume, upon the application of the guardians themselves?—I suppose so. That took place at Bury the other day.

12022. Would the guardians be willing to apply in these other cases for the repeal of their local Acts?—I do not think so now at all.

12023. Neither in the case of Forehoe, nor in the case of East and West Flegg?—Certainly not in the case of Forehoe, because Forehoe has recently spent a large sum of money on renovating its workhouse.

12024. You might get rid of the local Act, and yet retain the same area as a union constituted under the general law, might you not?—I suppose so.

12025. The guardians you think would not favour the getting rid of their local Act?—I do not think they would.

Decrease of pauperism agricultural districts.

12026. (*Chairman.*) I see that the result of the last decade has been satisfactory in your district, as there is an actual decrease of pauperism of 7 per cent., though there has been an increase in population of 8 per cent.?—Yes.

12027. Looking down the tables that you have furnished the Commission with, I see that there is an almost universal decrease in the percentage of pauperism in the agricultural districts?—That is so.

12028. Does that not rather imply that according to their lights, your boards of guardians are administering the Poor Law as well as they can?—I believe that they are.

Advantage more definitely laying down principles relief.

12029. Is not some definition of the principles which underlie and govern out-door and in-door relief required to be put before the guardians, so that they may know what is the standard of administration to which they should try to attain?—Yes.

12030. The tendency, I assume, of these agricultural boards is to do much what their forefathers did, and to take care that the parish which they represent has its full share of the poor rate?—Yes.

12031. That is the general idea?—Yes.

12032. Assuming it were possible to define more clearly what should be the principles which every board of guardians should keep in mind, and that some such public policy was enunciated by the Local Government board or was in an Act of Parliament, it would have a good effect, would it not, upon the guardians?—I should think it would.

12033. It would make them think?—Yes, it would, certainly.

Conditions Norwich Union.

12034. Has there been any great change in the industries of Norwich of late years?—I think not.

12035. There is a good deal of boot-making there, is there not ?—Yes.

12036. Have they brought in machinery which has caused any great displacement of manual labour ?—Not in recent years, I think.

12037. I notice that although the out-door relief is in your judgment too lavish, and although there are no doubt charities to the extent of £50,000 a year in Norwich, yet Norwich was the only place in your district where apparently there was a large number of unemployed and also a considerable number of under-fed school children ?—That is so.

12038. Does that not pretty clearly indicate that the system of Poor Law administration and the distribution of charity has not tended to relieve distress, as might have been anticipated ?—That is so.

12039. And that in consequence of these large public and charitable funds not being administered in the way best calculated to be to the advantage of the community, there was a greater demand for extraneous assistance both in the shape of employment and in the shape of food for under-fed children than in any of your other districts ?—Quite so.

Fall in number of vagrants and its causes

12040. There is a very curious figure in your return of the total number of vagrants relieved from 1898 to 1905. You begin in 1898 with a figure of 86,628, the next year it falls to 57,422, and the year afterwards to 39,672. That is a very remarkable fall, and it looks as if there must have been some combined action taken; do you know if anything was done at that time by boards of guardians ?—No.

12041. That was before you were in the district, I assume ?—That was just the year when I joined the district.

12042. Can you account for that very remarkable fall in those figures ?—No, I cannot, indeed. One of the extraordinary things that one cannot account for is the way in which these figures fluctuate.

12043. Were you aware of these figures ?—Yes, I have been aware of them all along.

12044. I see that the figure goes up from 39,672 in 1900 to 74,476 in 1905 ?—Yes, that is so.

Effect on pauperism of large influx of industrial population.

12045. (*Dr. Downes.*) That covers the period of the war, does it not ?—1900, of course, was the war year. During the war the number of vagrants was diminished and they increased afterwards. If you look at the next table you will see that the vagrants in the eastern counties are very small as compared with the numbers in the rest of England.

12046. (*Chairman.*) In the south-eastern part of the county of Essex, Romford, Orsett, and Rochford have increased very rapidly in population ?—Yes.

12047. But I see there is beginning to be an increase of pauperism in those districts on the whole ?—That is so.

12048. I assume that when a large population of mostly the working classes come into new districts, they diminish the rate of pauperism, because they do not as a rule bring their old people with them ?—That is so.

12049. But after a time, when they become settled, and normal conditions are established, the poor rate would go up ?—Yes.

Absence of complaint as to burden of rates.

12050. In those districts there is a heavy school rate as a rule because they come with their children; have any complaints been made to you in those districts as regards the heavy burden of the rates ?—Not at all.

12051. Not in Romford even ?—Not even in Romford.

Persons liable to surcharge in case of illegal relief.

12052. (*Miss Hill.*) Referring to the case of surcharge which you have mentioned, is it obligatory that the result of the surcharge should fall on the relieving officer ? You said that in those objectionable cases in Norwich where a surcharge had been made, it was the relieving officers who would suffer if it were put in force ?—The auditor has surcharged the relieving officers with the amount of the relief.

12053. Is it the relieving officer and not the board of guardians who is usually surcharged ?—That is a matter for the auditor.

Deterrent effect of surcharge enforced by Local Government Board.

12054. It would be naturally very difficult to enforce it as against the relieving officer, would it not ?—That is entirely an audit question which it is for the Board to consider. If in this instance the decision of the auditor is upheld by the Local Government Board it would have a very good effect indeed, but if, on the other hand, the auditor's decision is reversed it would have the very worst effect.

12055. (*Chairman.*) Assuming the auditor's decision is confirmed but the charge is remitted, would that have any effect ?—Yes. If the guardians know that by administering relief in this manner carelessly, they are liable to be surcharged by the auditor, they will take very great care that they do not overstep the bounds.

12056. (*Miss Hill.*) But if it is remitted, it will not particularly matter to them. Although one can imagine that it might be deterrent to them, I should not have thought that it would be deterrent all over the country ?—I quite agree that there are some instances where a surcharge has been made in which it would have had a most salutary effect indeed if it had not been remitted.

12057. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I take it the point is that a surcharge which is confirmed by the Local Government Board has a different effect to a surcharge which is not confirmed by the Local Government Board ?—Yes.

12058. Quite irrespective of whether it is remitted afterwards or not ?—Quite so.

THIRTIETH DAY.

Monday, 7th May, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, C.G.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*)

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*)
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. ARTHUR B. LOWRY, called; and Examined.

Mr. A. B. Lowry.

7 May 1906.

12059. (*Chairman.*) You are now the General Inspector of the Local Government Board for the Counties of Kent, Sussex and part of Surrey?—I am.

12060. From your memorandum, which we take as your evidence-in-chief (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXIV. (A–B)), it appears that you have only very recently been appointed to your present district?—That is so.

12061. Previous to that appointment, in what district were you?—I was assistant inspector in London.

Decrease of pauperism in Kent and Sussex.

12062. You are, therefore, hardly in a position to describe to the Commission any particular characteristics of your district; but you have given us some useful statistics, from which it appears that there is a steady decrease in the pauperism of Sussex?—Yes.

12063. There has been a decrease also in Kent?—Yes.

12064. Is the decrease in the actual number of paupers or on the increased population?—In Sussex it is an actual decrease in the numbers; in Kent it is not; there is a slight increase in the actual numbers, but the population is growing more rapidly than that of Sussex.

12065. The infirmaries are mostly associated with the workhouses?—Yes, in every case.

Workhouse children attending public elementary schools.

12066. In most of the unions the children are in the workhouse, but they go to the elementary schools?—Yes.

12067. Although in the workhouses the arrangements for keeping them separate from the adult population, in your judgment, are generally effective?—Yes, I think I may say so.

Percentage contributed by various occupations to indoor pauperism.

12068. In paragraph 6 of your memorandum, you give the occupations, and in paragraphs 7 and 8 you give the percentages of pauperism in the various occupations?—The percentages in the workhouses and asylums.

12069. It does not include out-door relief?—It does not include out-door relief at all. I was relying on the census returns only.

12070. If it only relates to the workhouses, will you take the head of general labourers. In Kent, from the point of view of occupation, there are 5·1 per cent., but in the workhouses there are 27 per cent.?—Yes, they are 27 per cent. of those who are in the workhouse.

12071. Going to Sussex, the percentage of general labourers to the population is 4·1, and the percentage of pauperism they contribute to the workhouses is seventeen?—Yes.

12072. So that in both cases the percentage of indoor pauperism of this particular class is very much larger than their percentage to the general population?—That is so.

Casual labour and pauperism.

12073. What would these general labourers be engaged in: any kind of casual work?—That is what it amounts to, I think.

12074. Are they men who are not continuously employed?—Yes, I think so, chiefly.

12075. They would include, I suppose, a very considerable portion of people who are not continuously employed?—I think undoubtedly so.

12076. You have one or two seaport towns in your district?—Yes.

12077. At Chatham, Sheerness and Rochester, there would be a certain amount of casual employment I suppose?—There are a considerable number of casual labourers in all those towns, and in Dover also.

Conditions in Dartford and Erith.

12078. (*Mr. Loch.*) In your memorandum you refer to the increase at Dartford; is that due to any special cause? There is an increasing population which is very marked?—The increase in population is due to the growth of industries, in the town of Erith especially.

12079. In Erith there has been some great fluctuation, has there not, in regard to industry?—Very considerable.

12080. Could you say what it has been?—From what I have heard I gather that when the war was over there was a considerable depression, especially in what I might describe as the Ordnance manufactories there, and a great many people left the town. The population was down for a time in 1902 and 1903. At the present time it has recovered entirely, and the population is now presumed to be higher than it has ever been.

12081. In 1895 the pauperism, on the 1st January, was 2,009, and 1905 the pauperism, on the 1st January, was 2,432. Is that due to that special industrial trouble?—I think the practical explanation is probably this, that in 1905 there were labour yards open in the union, and in 1895 there were not. Of course, you might go behind that and say that the reason the labour yards were opened was that there was this distress owing to the industrial depression.

12082. Therefore, this itself is not the pauperism, so to speak, of the residue; it really represents the policy of the administration as it then stood in 1905?—I suppose it might be put like that.

12083. Judging from your experience of the district since you have been there, do you think that there is a permanent pauperism growing up in Dartford in consequence of the industrial evils?—I am told there are more loafers than there were, men who make no attempt to leave the district at all to get work elsewhere.

12084. The interest of the point is that possibly there is a close connection there, more close almost than anywhere, between the industrial character of the place and the pauperism?—That is so.

Conditions in Milton Union.

12085. Have you seen much of the Milton union?—Not very much. I have visited it comparatively lately.

12086. Is there anything distinctive in the administration there?—I should describe them as a very businesslike board of guardians indeed.

12087. What district does that union include?—It has as its centre the towns of Milton and Sittingbourne, which are to the east of Chatham.

12088. As to the nature of the population, is it a union where there is a large agricultural district, or mainly industrial?—There is a good deal of agriculture in the union, and there are large brickfields. That is the chief industry, apart from agriculture. I should say that agriculture is the predominant industry.

12089. The success of the whole of the district, although I see that pauperism is slightly going up, is due really to administration?—I do not know of any other reason.

12090. Is it a small board?—Not very; it has twenty-five members.

Conditions in Bromley Union.

12091. In the case of Bromley, according to the figures here, the rise is very great; 1,387 is the number of paupers on January 1st, 1895, and 2,613 on January 1st, 1905. Is it the character of the place that is altering?—No, I do not think it is that. I should say that it was owing to badly administered labour yards last year that that came about. I may mention that on the 1st January, 1906, the figures for Bromley are 1912, the total indoor and outdoor, comparing with 2,613 in the year before. That represents a decrease of 700, owing to improved administration in their labour yards, I think.

12092. Was there a great industrial depression in Bromley?—There was considerable depression in the building trade, I think.

12093. In both these instances which one has picked out, you rather lay stress on the fact that there was special provision made by way of labour yards, or something akin to that?—Yes.

Labour Yards at Bromley.

12094. Do you think, in a manner that has been provocative of pauperism rather than a sedative?—I hardly know enough about them to say so, but, judging from the experience of Bromley, that is the view I am inclined to take. In the winter of 1904-5 they had a very light task at the labour yard, merely wood chopping, and they got a very large number of men in, but this year they were very much more strict, and they took a line which I am afraid is not strictly legal, that is to say, they paid by results.

12095. Is that a suggestion which you would approve in trying to manage that form of Poor Law relief?—No, I think not, certainly.

12096. Would you have any suggestions yourself to make, on that score, as to preventing this form of relief falling off and becoming useless?—You mean as to the best administration of the labour yards?

12097. Yes?—I have my views on the subject, but not derived from any considerable experience, and I do not know that they are worth troubling the Commission with.

Administration in Milton Union and its effects.

12098. (*Mr. Chandler.*) You regard the board of guardians at Milton as people with businesslike abilities, I think you say?—Yes.

12099. Do you know if they have ample accommodation in their workhouse?—I think I may say so.

12100. Have they any rules for the administration of out-door relief?—I do not think they have drawn up any formal rules there.

Increased pauperism in spite of strict out-relief policy.

12101. The instance of Milton presents rather a unique example; there are more in the workhouse than there are out-door paupers?—That is so.

12102. Do you attribute that, in any way, to the method of administering relief there?—I noticed at the meeting I attended there not long ago, that there is a very strong determination on that board of guardians to enforce repayment from relatives in every possible case. I daresay that has something to do with it.

12103. That has nothing to do with reducing the number of out-door paupers; it would, of course, increase the receipts of the guardians?—Would it not reduce the number at all? I should have thought it would have that tendency.

12104. You think it has a tendency to prevent applications?—That would be one effect.

12105. In spite of that administration, and the fact which we have here, that there are less out-door paupers than in, the pauperism is steadily increasing there?—From 1885 I see there is an increase in the percentage from 1·8 to 2 now.

12106. My point was that the strict administration of out-door relief which has brought the percentage of out-door pauperism down has not absolutely prevented the steady increase of pauperism in Milton, has it?—Apparently not.

Canterbury Charities.

12107. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Are there many endowed charities in Canterbury?—I think there are a considerable number of endowed charities in Canterbury.

12108. Is there any special method of administering them?—I am afraid I have not gone into that question very carefully, but there is, I think, a relief association connected with the Charity Organisation Society.

Chichester Rules for administering relief.

12109. You say at Chichester the guardians have drawn up rules of administration which are more stringent than the Prohibitory Order. Can you tell us in what way they are more stringent?—The first rule is this: "An able-bodied person shall be relieved only in the workhouse, either alone or together with such of the family as may be resident with him, or her, except in the case of a widow with one child or more dependent on her, and during cases of sickness of any member of the family." Then there is another rule: "Out-relief may be granted only to such aged and infirm persons as (*a*) are deserving at the time of application; (*b*) have no relations legally or morally bound to, and able to, support them; (*c*) are desirous of living out of the workhouse and can properly be taken care of." Then: "No out-relief shall be given to women who are deserted, or whose husbands are in prison, or undergoing penal servitude, except under special circumstances." Then there is another rule: "No permanent out-relief shall be given to persons who have been resident in the union less than two years"; and a further rule: "Out-relief shall be allowed only to those persons who satisfy the guardians their destitution has not been caused by their own improvidence or intemperance. Those that cannot satisfy the guardians in these respects shall only be relieved in the workhouse." I think it may be said that those rules are more stringent than the regulations of the Prohibitory Order.

12110. Do you think the guardians carry them out pretty fairly?—When I attended a meeting there, I am bound to say I had occasion to make the remark that I did not see the use of having rules unless they were adhered to. The remark was effective at the time. I fancy it might have been made by one of the guardians, if I had not been there.

12111. It would require a good deal of careful investigation to carry them out?—Yes.

Case papers.

12112. Have they case papers there?—No, they have not. It is a small union, and very compact, and they have a good relieving officer.

12113. You think they are able to make it effective?—I think so.

12114. Are there case papers used in any unions in your district?—Yes, in some of the unions, certainly. I am afraid I cannot give you a complete list of the unions where they may be used. I can only tell you where I have noticed they are in use. Those are: Eastbourne, Blean, and the Isle of Thanet. As I say, there are very likely more, but I have not come across them. I have not made particular inquiries on that point.

Conditions in Brighton Union.

12115. Are there any particular difficulties at Brighton? Do you think it is a specially difficult place, from the point of view of pauperism?—Brighton always seems to me very greatly to resemble London. I do not know that I can say more about it than that.

12116. It would not have the staple industries that London has?—No.

12117. So in that respect it would be even worse?—Quite so.

12118. Do you know whether the guardians there work with the Charity Organisation Society much?—I do not think they are in very close touch with them.

Mr. A. B. Lowry.

7 May, 1906.

Question of amalgamating smaller Unions in the District.

12119. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) As regards the size of some of the unions, the population seems very small, for instance, Romney Marsh. Have you any recommendation to make with regard to re-arranging the unions in your district?—I think in the particular instance you have selected there would be considerable difficulty: Romney Marsh is a very clearly defined district, with local characteristics of its own, it is a sort of kingdom within a kingdom really.

12120. Do the same remarks apply to Canterbury, Bridge, and Blean; they are all adjacent, are they not?—I think the reason for such anomalies as you observe there are historical; I have mentioned it in my memorandum.

12121. Do you think it desirable to have a re-arrangement?—Has a rearrangement ever been suggested?—Yes, I believe some years ago there was a suggestion.

12122. Do you know why no action was taken?—No, that is not within my cognisance.

12123. A request was made to the Local Government Board?—Yes.

12124. But for some reason, which you cannot tell us, no action was taken?—That is so.

12125. Would it be a fair question to ask which union was opposed to the re-arrangement?—I think it was opposed both by the Blean and the Bridge Unions. I am not quite sure about my facts, but the proposal was that Canterbury should take some of the most wealthy parishes from each of those unions.

12126. Would it have been possible to have formed Bridge and Blean and Canterbury into one union?—It would have been possible, of course, but I think it would have made rather an unwieldy union.

12127. Speaking generally, you do not think it is desirable to enlarge the unions, having regard to the great change in facilities of communications since the 1834 Commission Report?—I do not express any opinion against enlargement in general. I will tell you, if you like, the points of consideration which influenced my reply. The reason is that the Blean Union contains two fairly important towns, one Herne Bay and the other Whitstable: they are both growing, and they are both some distance from Canterbury. It is a union that might be said to be large enough to be self-supporting.

12128. What I was really thinking of were the improved facilities of classification and the like. You have some anomalies there, have you not? For instance, you have the City Lunatic Asylum side by side with the County Asylum?—I quite agree with you that there are curious anomalies in connection with those unions.

12129. The result is that in a certain case, at any rate, the ratepayers suffer, do they not?—I suppose they do

12130. And practically the poor suffer too, because so much goes in administrative attention that they do not get the attention they deserve?—It may be so.

12131. That applies to some of the infirmaries, does it not. Perhaps it is too detailed a question to ask, but some of the infirmaries in your district are not of a very high level, are they, as regards the nursing?—Some of them have not got a very large number of nurses, certainly, and some of the buildings are not very modern or up to date.

12132. Am I wrong in saying that at certain of the infirmaries too much pauper assistance is given?—It has not struck me as being abused at all.

Time devoted to their duties by Clerks to Guardians.

12133. Could you tell us anything about the Uckfield Union. Does the clerk there give the whole of his time to the duties of his office?—I think not.

12134. Have you formed any opinion as to the desirability of clerks giving their whole time? My point rather is this, in your experience does it or does it not lead to improved administration when the clerk gives his whole time to his office?—I can hardly say that my experience has taught me that. It almost stands to reason, does it not?

12135. That is my opinion. I think it does, but a good many of the inspectors when I have asked a similar question have said that on the whole they are disposed to favour the existing system?—On the ground that you are more likely to get a competent man in a small union.

12136. And in consequence of their influence in other directions. For instance, we are told a good many clerks are also clerks to the magistrates, therefore when the guardians have reason to apply to the magistrates for orders, and the like, their case is stated very fully?—I understand.

12137. That is only one answer that was given by one of the inspectors. Do you hold any general views on the subject?—I should agree with it thus far, that in some of these smaller unions the work is not enough to justify paying a large salary.

12138. Practically the work is done by a particular clerk, who does the work of the union under the general supervision of the clerk of the guardians?—I should not be prepared to say that. I should certainly say that most of the clerks to the guardians in my district have a very great knowledge of and give a great deal of attention to the work of the guardians.

Nursing of Out-door sick at Chichester by Workhouse Nurses.

12139. (*Dr. Downes.*) Do you know whether they have any special arrangements for nursing the outdoor sick at Chichester?—Yes, they have special arrangements there.

12140. Could you tell us what they are?—The arrangement is, put generally, this, that the nurses in the workhouse take it in turns to go out for certain periods (I forget exactly what the periods are) and attend to the sick cases amongst those receiving outdoor relief. During that time they do no nursing in the workhouse itself.

12141. How long has that been in operation?—I am afraid I cannot give you the date. It is three or four years.

12142. Is it working satisfactorily to your knowledge?—Yes, as far as I know.

12143. Who supervises the nurses when they are on this outdoor work?—I am afraid I do not quite know. I suppose it would be the district medical officer.

12144. Is there a superintendent nurse?—Yes.

12145. Does she have any duties with regard to the outdoor sick?—I am afraid I do not know.

12146. (*Mr. Phelps.*) You have not been in Kent in the hop-picking season?—I have not.

12147. You have no experience of the pressure put on the guardians at that time?—No.

Conditions in Faversham Union.

12148. Have you heard anything about the administration in Faversham?—Yes.

12149. Mr. Davy gave us some details about that. You notice that the outdoor relief there has gone up from double figures to treble figures. Can you give any explanation of that?—Of course all that I know about it is purely hearsay. I have some figures here on the subject. I have the detailed figures giving the number in receipt of out-relief since 1871. I take it that you would not like me to read them all out.

12150. Perhaps you would kindly put it in as part of your evidence?—I will certainly. (*See Appendix Vol.* I. (A), *No.* XXIV. (C)).

Influence of Chairman of policy of Guardians.

12151. I am right in saying that that striking reduction in the outdoor relief was mainly due to an individual's influence?—I believe so. In the year 1876, I think, the chairman determined that outdoor relief should be gone into carefully. From that date there was a steady decrease

12152. Do you notice that in going round the Boards of guardians that personal influence still has a considerable effect?—I think the personality of the chairman has a very great deal to do with the proceedings of the guardians, certainly.

12153. In the rural districts in Kent is the chairman commonly a country gentleman, or is he a farmer?—I should say more often a country gentleman than a farmer.

12154. That is still the case, is it?—Yes.

Administration in Gravesend Union.

12155. Take a special case, the town of Gravesend. Is the town of Gravesend under a special Act?—No, there is no special Act there.

12156. You do not know the history of how it came to be so small a union?—No.

12157. There they only have eight guardians?—Yes.

12158–9. Is that a well-administered board?—I am sorry to say I have never attended a meeting of that board yet, but their results are pretty good, judging by the figures.

12160. You have been at Eastry ?—Yes.

ailors in Eastry workouse.

12161. Did it strike you at all at Eastry there was something wrong in the system which put people used to a sea-faring life in a country workhouse ?—The point did not strike me very particularly.

12162. It struck me very much in going over it once. You know the Newhaven Union ?—Yes.

dministration in Newaven union.

12163. The Newhaven Union is one of the lowest in percentage in your district, is it not ?—Yes, it is.

12164. It has very adequate buildings, has it not ?—It has a very good infirmary.

lerk to uardians as "wholemer."

12165. There the clerk devotes his whole time, I think, to the affairs of the board ?—Yes, he does—and those of the rural district council, of course.

12166. He has no private practice at all ?—No.

12167. Perhaps you could hardly say whether the results are due to his assiduity ?—The present clerk has only been in office for a few months. His predecessor, as far as I am aware, did not give his full time.

12168. You said with regard to Romney Marsh what is quite true, that it is a kingdom within itself; is the same true with regard to the Hundred of Hoo ?—I should say not to the same extent.

12169. Do you think the workhouse and infirmary there are worth maintaining as separate institutions ?—No, certainly not.

12170. Have you any knowledge with regard to the provision of chaplains in the workhouses you visit ?—No, I have not any statistics about that.

arge umbers of ricultural upers in ent and ssex.

12171. (*Miss Hill.*) I see that you say that the largest proportion of people in the workhouses in Kent and Sussex have been employed in agriculture. The number of people employed in agriculture is larger than those that you call "retired ?"—I have given the figures of those described as "retired," but I do not state that the greater number of them were engaged in agriculture. In the Kent workhouses the greater number are general labourers.

12172. (*Chairman.*) You do state, I think, as Miss Hill points out, that the proportion connected with agriculture is 18 per cent. in one and 28 per cent. in the other ?—Yes.

12173. (*Miss Hill.*) 18 per cent in Kent and 28 per cent. in Sussex ?—Certainly.

emand for ricultural bour in ent and ssex.

12174. There are 27 per cent. general labourers in the workhouses in Kent, so that those who are now employed in agriculture must be almost exclusive of the sick and the old. There is a very good steady demand for agricultural labourers throughout those two counties, is there not ?—Certainly. These are described as people "retired."

12175. Therefore they would probably be either old or sick ?—Either sick or broken down.

12176. One is struck, I think, with the fact that in those counties, so very near London, there is a very decided demand for labour in the agricultural parts. Is that not so ?—That is so certainly, and there are many people still employed in agriculture above the age of 70.

12177. In fact, they are rather valued, are they not ? Yes, I think they are.

ders in ce at ighton.

12178. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to Brighton, you say that the provisions of the Out-Door Relief Regulation Order and the Prohibitory Order are not binding on them. What is there in their local Act which absolves them ?—I do not know of anything in their local Act which prevents the orders being applied to them.

12179. Why are they not under one or the other ?—I am afraid I cannot say. I do not know.

12180. Is it with reference to their local Act ?—I suppose it is because there was a local Act in force there.

12181. You cannot tell us anything about it ?—No.

ocedure as contracts.

12182. With regard to contracts, have you often attended meetings of boards of guardians when they are giving out contracts ?—I have been present at one or two when contracts have been under consideration.

12183. What is the procedure ?—The procedure varies, as far as I can see.

12184. Can you give us instances ?—Do you mean instances with the names of the unions ?

12185. I do not so very much mind the names of the unions, but I want to know how they vary in procedure. For instance, are the tenders opened at the board itself, or are they reported upon by a committee ?—In one instance, certainly—I am sorry to say I cannot remember what union it was—a report did come up.

12186. Was the name of the tenderer always given before it was voted on ?—I think so. The report of the committee, I may say, was accepted as it stood.

12187. With the name of the tenderer ?—The name of the tenderer was in.

Duties of an assistant inspector.

12188. Would you mind describing to us what were your duties when you were assistant inspector ? How did they differ from the duties of an inspector ? Were you engaged more in visiting institutions as an assistant inspector ?—As an assistant inspector of course one is at the disposal entirely of one's chief.

12189. Of course, but what, as a matter of fact, does he ask you to do ?—As a matter of fact, what he asked me to do was chiefly in visiting the institutions. That was what I may describe as the formal part of my work—what I did from day to day. Anything else I did was by his special request.

12190. What sort of things would he ask you to do by special request ?—Enter into any particular complaints that might come to the office, and on one occasion at his request I went round to the various unions and made various inquiries in connection with the administration of outdoor medical relief.

12191. Did you ever make a special investigation of the conditions under which out-door relief was given ? No; only incidentally, of course, one came across that question in connection with the medical relief. That was all.

12192. Were you ever asked to cross-visit at all to test the cases ?—No.

12193. You were never used as a superintendent relieving officer to make a special investigation ?—No.

Previous official experience of inspector.

12194. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) How long were you an assistant inspector ?—Two-and-a-quarter years—from July, 1903, to November last.

12195. Then you went straight on to this district ?—Yes.

12196. You were previously assistant inspector for London, were you not ?—Yes.

12197. Previously to that, had you had any experience of the Local Government Board ?—Yes, since 1892.

12198. What were you at the Local Government Board ?—From 1892 until 1903 I was what is called a second class clerk—a higher division clerk—in the office, and during that time, from the beginning of 1899 to the middle of 1900, I was the official private secretary of the Parliamentary Secretary; from June, 1900, to July 1903, I was private secretary to the President.

Agricultural labour in Kent and Sussex and its nature.

12199. With regard to your present district, have you discovered anything about agricultural labour there, especially in Kent and Sussex ?—Have I discovered anything ?

12200. Anything special about it ?—No, I do not think I have discovered anything that is not generally known.

12201. Is it the fact that farmers want a large amount of labour at certain periods of the year ?—Certainly.

12202. And at other times they do not want the labour at all ?—Certainly, there is a greater demand for labour at some times than others. Just at present there is very abundant labour required in tying hops, and so on, and, of course, it is notorious that in the fruit-picking and hop-picking season there is a very large demand.

Casual labour and pauperism.

12203. There is a good deal of casual labour in your district, is there not ?—Yes, a certain amount of casual labour actually resident in the district.

12204. So that may account for a good number of these people who are down as having been engaged in agriculture becoming chargeable ?—That may be so. Of course, those figures are necessarily rather doubtful. One knows that a man who has never done any work at all will call himself a general labourer.

Mr. A. B. Lowry.

7 May, 1906.

12205. I was rather thinking of agriculture just then. It is true that there is a good deal of downright casual employment in agriculture?—Yes.

12206. My point is that when the farmers say that they want labourers it very often means that they only want them for a particular period?—I suppose that may be so.

12207. Now about Bromley; is it not true that the character of Bromley, from a residential point of view, is changing and has been changing the last few years?—That may be so. I have not really known Bromley until the last six months.

Unemployed at Dartford.

12208. You said there were more loafers there than there were previously?—I was speaking of Dartford.

12209. What do you mean, quite, by "more loafers" there?—I was simply repeating what I had been told. I have been told there are more men standing about at the corners.

12210. What you told us is true, that during the war there was a big demand for all kinds of labour, and that demand fell when the war ceased?—Yes, speaking of Erith particularly.

12211. That is in the Dartford district, is it not?—Yes.

12212. That would account for a good lot of men hanging about, would it not?—No doubt.

12213. They would not necessarily be loafers because they could not get employment?—No.

Possibility of discriminating between deserving and undeserving paupers.

12214. You think it is possible to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving?—I do not think I have said so, have I?

12215. Do you? I will ask you?—It is rather a wide question, is it not? We each of us think we can individually discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving.

12216. You have told us that the Chichester guardians have adopted a certain set of rules?—Yes, I quoted to you the rules of the Chichester guardians.

12217. In which "deserving" comes out. I would point out that your department has issued various circulars in which guardians are invited to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving?—Yes.

12218. I will put it to you whether you think it is possible that boards of guardians can discriminate between deserving and undeserving poor?—I think it is one of the most difficult tasks they ever undertake.

12219. Would you think it is practicable, if you were on the board of guardians, administering relief?—If I were on the board of guardians, administering relief, I think I should go into the question as little as possible.

12220. As little as possible?—Yes.

12221. What would you do with the people, then?—I should endeavour to administer relief according to the law.

12222. The law, of course, is the law as laid down by the Department very much?—Yes.

12223. It is Department-made law?—Yes.

12224. We are told by their various circulars and Orders that we are to discriminate; therefore, in carrying out the law, boards of guardians must so discriminate, must they not?—I have not seen any Order requiring guardians to discriminate.

12225. Well, circulars; I will not limit my question to Orders?—There is, of course, a real distinction between a circular and an Order, as, no doubt, you are aware. A circular may contain a recommendation, but it is not binding like an Order.

12226. Still, it is the recommendation of the Central Authority on Poor Law?—Yes.

12227. And, therefore, Guardians are entitled to look to it with some amount of respect?—Certainly.

12228. Do you think that in the main the guardians in your district, where you have become acquainted with them, do carry out their duties as administrators of the Poor Law in an efficient manner?—Generally speaking, I should say yes.

12229. You said just now that it was very difficult to discriminate, but do you think that so far as it is possible to discriminate, on the whole, the boards of guardians do discriminate in an intelligent manner between deserving and undeserving?—I think they do their best, certainly.

Aged and d serving poo Mr. Chaplin circular.

12230. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to that question of deserving and undeserving, is there not a very clear distinction, which is brought out by the Commissioners of 1834, between out-door relief and workhouse treatment? The 1834 Commissioners precisely stated that, as regards out-door relief, it was a mistake to make any distinction between deserving and undeserving; they do not say that with regard to workhouse treatment. Is not the recommendation with regard to deserving and undeserving usually confined to workhouse treatment?—The recommendation which I think Mr. Lansbury has in mind was in the Circular of August, 1900.

12231. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Yes, Mr. Chaplin's Circular?—In that I think it was implied that the aged and deserving poor should not be compelled to enter the workhouse.

12232. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to other classes, has that not always been the distinction between outdoor relief and workhouse treatment? It has always been recommended that no attention should be paid to deserving or undeserving characteristics with regard to outdoor relief, whereas it has been suggested that in treatment within the workhouse there should be some distinction made between deserving and undeserving?—Certainly, differential treatment has been recommended in the workhouse.

12233. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) No one would suggest, would they, as to all these people on the list here who are getting out-door relief, that the guardians have not taken into account whether they were well behaved, respectable, decent people or not? I do not know anything about 1834; for the moment I want to know how it works out in practice?—You are asking me, in fact, whether the guardians have satisfied themselves that all these people in receipt of outdoor relief——

12234. Not all of them, but on the average they are decent, respectable people?—I have no doubt the guardians are of that opinion.

12235. The question of deserving and undeserving, as far as out-door relief is concerned, depends on the point of view. If persons are, in the judgment of the guardians, decent, deserving persons, and it is practicable to give them out-door relief, they give them it in preference to taking them into the workhouse?—Certainly, in the majority of unions they do.

Nature of agricultural labour in the district.

12236. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to the irregularity of employment in this district on the land, would it not be mostly connected with fruit farming?—Fruit farming and hops, I think.

12237. Is not the irregular labour that comes in mostly migratory labour that comes and goes according to the season?—I should think it is, for the most part. A certain amount of it comes from the towns in the district.

12238. Otherwise these people would not be likely to be found in the workhouse, would they?—No. They would presumably be in the workhouses of the unions in which they had their settlement.

12239. The same explanation might affect the urban districts?—Yes.

12240. What is usually called agricultural labour is about as regular there as anywhere else, is it not?—I should think so.

Mr. HERBERT PRESTON-THOMAS, recalled: and further Examined.

Effect of small electoral areas on administration.

12241. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I notice that in your last examination it rather came out that in the unions which were cut up into small wards with a small number of persons in each ward, the individual guardian tended to be more influential in the distribution of relief; is that so?—That is so, I think.

12242. That is what you would rather deplore, is it not?—Since you put one or two questions as to that particular point, I have got out a statement of the population of each union, and roughly divided that up by the number of guardians, and I see generally that what I should say are, for the most part, the most efficient boards are those in which individual guardians represent on an average the largest number of population, and, at the other end, that those representing the smallest population are those who do not conduct their business as efficiently as the others; but that general rule is subject to such very considerable exceptions that it is very difficult to generalise. Of course, one masterful person in a small board of guardians may be very useful indeed, and may bring the people to proper principles and good procedure; on the other hand, it may be just the other way, that the influence of the particular guardian who has most influence is not satisfactory as regards the conduct of business.

12243. On the whole, you would deprecate relief being given on a guardian's own view and knowledge?—Very strongly.

dministration in lymouth nion.

12244. Could you tell us why it is that the Plymouth has been such an inefficient and bad board of guardians for so many decades, because it has been almost a historical question, and it has gone down the whole of the last century as a bad board of guardians?—It had been exceedingly unsatisfactory. At present it has some difficulties to contend against, difficulties principally of its own making. It ought long ago to have built an infirmary, and its workhouse is at the present moment crammed; and the result is that many cases which they ought to test with an order for the workhouse they give outdoor relief to. In some cases I think they ought to refuse absolutely, but they give outdoor relief as they have no room in the workhouse. They have now got plans approved, and are going to advertise for tenders for a large infirmary, to hold 300 patients. I hope they will build it. We once got to this stage before, some five or six years ago; then they threw up the whole thing, and have been struggling with an over-full workhouse ever since.

12245. What is it in the constitution of the board or the character of the place which brings about this perpetual inefficiency in administration?—I have heard it said that it was much better when their guardians were elected for only two parishes instead of the union being cut up into fourteen wards. Now there is a tendency to insist on the guardian being somebody who lives in the ward, and there are some wards where there are few eligible candidates. I have heard that stated as a reason. Whether it is so, I cannot say for certain.

fect of the ective inciple on e policy of t-relief.

12246. Do you think there is much giving of out-door relief before elections for election purposes?—I do not know any case of that sort so precisely that I could say "yes" to that. Generally, I think the giving of outdoor relief freely is rather a platform of the election. Before an election comes on I often hear taunts at the board: "Oh, yes, you give this because an election is coming."

12247. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) To whom would it be given? It could not be given to people who were going to vote, that would disqualify them?—No, but the general tendency is to give it, not to the actual people who are going to vote, but their relations, friends, and so on.

12248. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I have also heard that in many of those cases there is an understanding between the persons who put the voters on the list that relief shall not disqualify?—I do not know of any cases of that sort.

12249. That is often said?—I have heard it said.

12250. With regard to East Stonehouse, which is an efficient union, that has rather a peculiar constitution has it not?—Yes, it is a very small place wedged in between the two big towns of Devonport and Plymouth. It is very poor indeed, and it has a very small number of guardians.

12251. They are elected at large, are they not?—I believe so.

12252. They have been persistently efficient, in a way?—Particularly efficient.

Administration and method of election of Guardians in East Stonehouse Union.

12253. And that also goes back a long time. You have the East Stonehouse Board of Guardians efficient for a long time?—Yes, they have a high standard of administration.

12254. What sort of persons are on the East Stonehouse Board of Guardians? Are they of a superior status to the ones at Plymouth?—No, I do not think I could say that.

12255. Have you noticed any relation between efficient administration and the amount of compounding for rates?—No, I have no information as to that.

Effect of compounded, Government, and Railway property in Union, on administration.

12256. Have you noticed any relation between efficient administration, and the amount of Government or railway property?—No. Of course, one's natural assumption would be that where the union funds are in a large degree derived from Government property and railways, and therefore the rates do not fall so heavily on the ratepayers themselves, there would be greater laxity.

12257. That is an assumption?—That would be an assumption. I cannot say it is justified in any case in my district.

12258. Is there not Government property at East Stonehouse?—Yes, a good deal.

12259. Yet it is efficient?—It is efficient, and so is Devonport. There is a very considerable amount of Government contribution in Devonport, yet the administration is fairly efficient, but in Devonport the circumstances are peculiar; it is a particularly prosperous place, and the composition of its residents is such that you would not expect many paupers.

Procedure of guardians as to contracts.

12260. With regard to contracts, have you any experience or views with regard to the giving out of contracts by boards of guardians, as to what procedure leads to efficiency and integrity?—There is, of course, a great tendency to restrict the contracts to local people, and sometimes I do hint to a board of guardians that (if the result is to increase the cost) that means a present to such and such tradesmen from the rest of the ratepayers. That is the course taken by a large number of unions. On the other hand, some of the best administered unions accept tenders without regard to the place of business of the tenderers. In the union of Exeter nearly all the contracts are given outside, as it happens, at the present time. The guardians are absolutely fair. They give the contract there to any reputable firm who sends in the lowest tender.

12261. With regard to the procedure in giving contracts, have you sat with boards of guardians giving contracts?—Often.

12262. What is the ordinary procedure? Are the tenders opened at the board and decided off-hand, or are they reported on by committees?—In the small unions, like many in my district, the usual practice is for the whole board to deal with the tenders. On the other hand in many unions they are referred to a committee for report.

12263. Do you happen to remember whether the names are withheld?—In a good many cases they are; in some, not.

12264. Do you regard the withholding of the names of the tenderers as at all an important check on any possible collusion?—I take it that the person who wants to communicate his name can really do so pretty easily.

12265. Through his price?—Yes, somehow.

12266. Do you think those various little dodges which they practise to prevent collusion between their members and outside tradesmen, are really operative in preventing corruption or not? If you were preparing standing orders for a board of guardians would you suggest them or not?—I am not sure. I think there is no device of standing orders that an ingenious tradesman and a collusive guardian or official cannot drive a coach and horses through.

Mr. H. Preston-Thomas.

7 May 1906.

12267. That is what I wanted to find out. With regard to conditions of employment, have you noticed that the degree of pauperism at all corresponds with particular conditions of employment like casual labour, agricultural labour, or any other condition of employment?—I should not say so.

Effect on pauperism of casual labour, unhealthy trades, etc.

12268. You think it is quite independent of that?—I think it is mostly independent, unless there are some conditions of particularly unhealthy employments.

12269. What, for instance?—For instance, only the other day in Redruth, where there is a fairly good board of guardians, but a high rate of pauperism, I obtained from the clerk a return of the cases which have come on the rates owing to miners' phthisis. It is very striking. The whole number of outdoor paupers in the union of Redruth is about 1,400, and at the present time 83 are women who have become chargeable in consequence of the death of their husbands through miners' phthisis, and no less than 250 children are dependent on them. That is a total of 333 out of those 1,400 outdoor paupers who have been pauperised in consequence of this disease, contracted in gold mines in the Transvaal, or in tin mines in Cornwall. It is the mineral dust in both that causes it, but it operates much more fatally in the mines in the Transvaal, and while some die out there, others come home to die. Some contract it in Cornwall and die there, but a small proportion only who have not worked in South Africa. That is a special instance in which conditions of employment very considerably affect the amount of pauperism.

12270. You do not know any other? Would you consider casual and irregular work caused people to be less provident?—Yes. I do not think I could mention any other.

Effect of housing conditions on pauperism.

12271. With regard to bad housing, it has been brought to our notice by some of the inspectors that bad conditions of housing, insanitary conditions of housing, lead to pauperism. Is that your experience at all? It leads to the sickness which leads to pauperism, does it not?—No doubt that would be so, speaking generally. I could not bring any particular instance of that. I could not indicate any particular union with only a small number of paupers as being better housed than its neighbour with a large number of paupers.

12272. You have not inquired into that?—No, except that I have very often sat with the rural district councils, and have had incidentally some information about it.

Comparative efficiency of *ad hoc* and *ex officio* guardians.

12273. With regard to the constitution of boards of guardians, have you noticed any distinction in efficiency between the board of guardians which is made up mostly of district councillors and the board of guardians which is *ad hoc* and urban?—No, I think not.

Possibility of discriminating between deserving and undeserving.

12274. With regard to the question of deserving and undeserving, do you think it practical or desirable to make any distinction between deserving and undeserving with regard to outdoor relief?—I think that you must, and you always do. Of course, I know perfectly well it has been said by high authority, by economists, and so on, that the Poor Law has nothing to do with the deserts of the applicant; but, as a matter of fact, when an applicant comes who has borne a good character, has lived an industrious life, and has perhaps brought up a family creditably, but has had misfortune, and then a drunken fellow who has spent all his life in public houses and at street corners, I cannot imagine any board of guardians in my district who, as a matter of practice, would not treat the scamp differently from the industrious man.

12275. You would think it right, on the whole?—That is an ethical question.

12276. Would you do it if you were a member of the board of guardians?—Yes, I certainly should.

Rateable value in Dulverton and Axbridge.

12277. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In Dulverton the rateable value per head of population amounts to £8 14s. Can you say to what that is due? Is it because of any exceptional property in the union, such as railways or waterworks?—No, I cannot say why it is. I know that Dulverton is the highest union in rateable value per head of population; this may be because there is a very small population, and there is a very large acreage. Dulverton is Exmoor and scarcely anything else.

12278. Axbridge is also high. It is £8 per head?—Axbridge is very high. That is a very flourishing place, and it has Weston-super-Mare; that accounts for most of the rateable value. Also it has the Cheddar Valley in it, which is some of the best pasture land for the production of butter and cheese. I think those two facts mainly account for it.

12279. Is Weston-super-Mare a watering place?—Yes, a very popular watering place for Bristol.

12280. Do you know what proportion of the population lives in Weston-super-Mare out of the total population of the union?—Rather less than one-half.

Relation between old age and pauperism statistics.

12281. In paragraph 3 of your memorandum you attribute the high rate of pauperism to the large number of aged people?—Yes.

12282. You say there is a higher rate of old age, *i.e.*, people 65 years old and upwards, in your district than the average in England and Wales?—Yes.

12283. When we examined the unions in this respect we found that Taunton, with an old age of sixty-six per thousand, has a pauperism of seventeen, while Redruth, with the aged people sixty-three per thousand, has a pauperism of thirty-six, which is more than double?—Yes.

Effect of administration in Taunton and Exeter.

12284. By what would that discrepancy be accounted for?—Mainly by differences of administration. As to Redruth, I have already mentioned the prevalence of miners' phthisis as a special case of pauperism; and the number of deserted wives and families is also rather large owing to the miners' habit of going abroad for employment. As to Taunton, when I had the honour of giving evidence here before, I explained that for a great number of years the administration there had been exceptionally good. That was the one union in which I found a careful administration; and those are two exceptions to the general broad rule that a high number of old people means high pauperism and *vice versa*.

12285. Would you say the same of Exeter, which has aged people sixty-six per thousand, just the same as Taunton, and a pauperism of twenty-six?—Exeter ought to be lower still; but Exeter has improved very much of late years, and it will go on improving. Taunton is quite an exceptional case from its long-continued good administration.

12286. You attribute the low rate of pauperism in Exeter, I think, to the good administration?—Clearly.

Effect on ministrat of reducti in numbe Guardian

12287. There has been a change there, has not there, in recent times, by a local Act in 1900 which reduced the number of guardians from thirty to twenty-two?—Yes, there has been a change of that kind.

12288. Has that been conducive to better administration?—Certainly; the board was too unwieldy before, and that has improved it; but the chief change has been in the principle of administration of the board generally.

Effect of elective p ciple and politics o administr tion of o relief.

12289. Are the elections at Exeter fought on political lines?—Yes.

12290. Does the question of outdoor relief play an important part in the election?—I think not.

12291. You think not?—Certainly not conspicuously.

12292. Therefore the guardians do not get returned on the promise of liberal outdoor relief?—No, I think not. I am bound to say, although they are elected on political lines, they drop their politics in the board room.

12293. After election?—After election they quite drop their politics.

12294. That is usual, is it not?—Not always. I know one board of guardians, not in my present district, where the two parties, Liberal and Conservative, sit on different sides of the table, and most things are done by party vote.

12295. That does not obtain in any of your present unions?—Certainly not.

Classifica in the Workhou

12296. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Have you any workhouses in which an attempt has been made to classify the inmates?—To a limited extent.

12297. On what kind of basis?—In Devonport nothing fresh was done by the guardians, but there is an exceptionally good master and matron who have arranged

matters. They have got on each side three sets of people; they have the really good, quiet, best class of inmates; then they have the pretty good; and then they have the worst. They divide them as much as possible. They keep them apart in dormitory and day-room. They have three day rooms each side and three dormitories, and so on; and they give them as much chance as possible of associating only with their own class.

12298. Is the distinction between them based upon their conduct in the workhouse, or before they come into the workhouse?—When a man comes in he is classed by what they know of him, and what the relieving officer says of him. He may remain where is he put, but, on one hand, if his conduct or his language is bad and offensive to other people, he would be degraded; and, on the other hand, if put originally in a low class, and it was found his language and conduct were decent, he would be put up.

12299. Is there a distinction made between them in the matter of dietary?—No, none.

12300. Or the leave to go out?—Not in Devonport, I think. In Exeter there is a special class; they have certain privileges both as to leave and as to having a little extra tobacco, and so on; and they have nicely furnished rooms to themselves, the old men and the old women.

12301. It has a good effect upon the discipline of the house, has it not?—I think so.

12302. It is an object of ambition to get into Class 1, moderate ambition, at any rate?—Ambition is very dead in most of these people, but they like to be treated better, most of them.

12303. What do you think is the effect on class 3?—I should think it had not very much effect on them. The people that are in class 3 are habituals, and they would not be improved, probably, by association with a better class of people, nor are they deteriorated by keeping among each other.

orkhouse
ovision
r married
uples.

12304. In the majority of your workhouses is there provision for married couples?—Yes; but it is generally not used.

12305. Not used?—No; generally one of the two has got tired of nursing the other. Sometimes one has to be in the infirmary. In a few unions they live comfortably together, but it is curious to see the large number of cases where they refuse. They have said all they have to say to each other, and perhaps are wearied of each other.

12306. Have you come across unions in which a great deal has been said about the cruelty of separating married couples?—One constantly takes up newspapers where there is great nonsense about that.

12307. You think those complaints are unfounded?—So far as my district is concerned the guardians know perfectly well that it is a legal claim, and they do not attempt to avoid the claim, as far as I know.

12308. Have you any instance in your eye of old couples living comfortably together in married quarters?—Yes, I came across one the other day. They have one room, and there they seem to be happy. I go in and see the old couple time after time when I inspect the workhouse and they always say how comfortable they are. It is not very uncommon.

dvisability
master and
atron of
orkhouse
ing man
d wife.

12309. In the majority of the workhouses you visit I take it the master and matron are married, are they not?—Yes.

12310. Have you any instances in which they are not?—I think hardly any now.

12311. You think on the whole that is the best system?—The best system. I am sure that if there are an unmarried master and an unmarried matron, it is likely to produce one of two things, either quarrels or scandals.

12312. I can quite fancy that in a small workhouse in the country. Do you think, if you take a large workhouse in a town, that it is common to find both with the administrative ability requisite to carry it on?—I have very few towns; and I think that my unions are fortunate in their workhouse masters and matrons. One case occurs to me now, a master's wife, who was the matron, died, and the daughter was appointed a little time ago. If I went through the list of my unions I might find other instances where master and matron are not man and wife, but it is a rare exception.

12313. Do you find any difficulty arising in these modern times between the master and the matron and the nursing department?—Yes.

Friction between master, matron, and nurses.

12314. You do?—They fight a good deal.

12315. Have you any suggestion to make on that head of anything that could be done?—I should like to see, I confess, the nurse made rather more mistress of her own house in the infirmary, because sometimes you get an interfering matron who treads on the nurses' toes, and then you get quarrels. I have had to compose a good many quarrels in one way and another, but it is very difficult. It is really a question of people, and not of regulations, I think. Some people will quarrel in those circumstances.

Nursing of outdoor poor.

12316. Have you any experience of organised nursing of the outdoor poor?—No, there is no organisation. In my district there are a great many nursing associations and nursing societies to which guardians subscribe on condition that the nurses shall be available for outdoor paupers, and that works excellently. That is spreading; each year we get more and more development. In Devon we have lately started a nursing association with the express object of promoting that sort of thing. It is a county association, and is working very well; and I am quite sure the outdoor poor will gain by it enormously.

12317. Practically, then, charity and the Poor Law co-operate in the matter of nursing?—They co-operate.

Possible co-operation between Poor Law and Charity.

12318. Do you think that co-operation might be extended?—It always seems to me that the one complement that you want to the Poor Law is, in every place, some organisation to deal with what ought not to be Poor Law cases. There are lots of people who are ready to subscribe money if they can be certain that the money is not wasted, and you want some organisation in every union, in every district, to take off the rates people who ought not to go to workhouses, and whom it would be kindness to prevent from going to workhouses, or indeed from being pauperised otherwise, and who would not come within hard and fast regulations. I should like to see that very much. Of course in London you have got various societies which help in that way.

12319. You stated just now, in answer to Mrs. Webb, the type of cases which you thought might fairly be given outdoor relief. Should you prefer a system by which all those cases were dealt with by charity?—Yes, if it were practicable to deal with all those cases by charity. As to its practicability, I am not sure.

12320. You would draw a distinction as to practicability between towns and country perhaps?—I cannot say.

Proportion of inappropriate cases in Workhouses.

12321. Do you find at all in country workhouses a large proportion of people whom you would prefer to see out?—No.

12322. Do you, in town workhouses?—No.

12323. You do not think that class is a large one?—No.

12324. What are called aged deserving poor do not in your district come into the workhouse?—They do not exist; there are no such people who could keep themselves outside, in my opinion. Speaking generally, the people are all there because they cannot live outside, and cannot live on any such payment as they would receive from the rates.

Possibility of modernising old Workhouses.

12325. (*Dr. Downes.*) In paragraph 34 of your memorandum you speak of some satisfactory instances where they had modernised workhouses to meet modern requirements. Are those exceptional cases, or do you think that sort of thing may be done very frequently?—It is done to a large extent. Guardians always wish to save themselves from building, and if they see how to do anything in the way of useful alteration they are generally ready to do it. I have specially mentioned here the case of Okehampton, and it seems to me that if you could everywhere get the sort of man that we had there, he could convert an enormous number of workhouses into much better institutions than they are. There was one guardian there who had been a London builder; he knew the whole trade, he knew every detail, and he was uncommonly clever at devising alterations. The question was as to whether they ought not to build a new

Mr. H. Preston-Thomas.

May 1906.

workhouse, or at any rate, a new infirmary, but he said, "Put it all into my hands and I will make a good job of it for you." So, with extraordinary cleverness, and at small cost, he converted the whole of that old, awkward, straggling workhouse, into I will not say something quite equal to the best of the modern workhouses, but everything is now quite satisfactory, and when the architect of the Local Government Board went down with me some time ago, he was perfectly surprised at what had been done. I must say that one difficulty I had to face was this, that this man, like most geniuses, was somewhat self-willed, and was not at all inclined to put himself under official restriction. If he had had to make all his plans according to strict rules, and submit them to official criticism, I do not think we could ever have got it through. However, it was all arranged comfortably and done at very small expense, and if you could get a genius like that, you would be able to improve a good many of your workhouses.

12326. I do not understand quite in what capacity he was acting, as guardian or builder?—Not as builder except *en amateur*. He had been a London builder, he was a guardian, and his brother guardians put the whole thing into his hands, knowing he was an expert, and they gave him a pretty free hand, and as far as anything official was concerned, he was not interfered with.

12327. You would point to that as a satisfactory example of a building brought up to date for the special requirements?—Singularly satisfactory.

Inadequate salaries of Medical Officers and possible remedies therefor.

12328. You agree it is most desirable if it can be done, with a view of saving money, that that sort of thing should be imitated as far as possible?—Certainly.

12329. A little further down you speak of the services of the medical officers, to whom you pay a very satisfactory tribute, and then you speak of their being scantily paid. Can you suggest any remedy for that state of things?—I cannot. The general principle, I suppose, has been to leave the question of the amount of payment of all officers very much in the hands of boards of guardians. I am not prepared with any suggestion in variation of that practice.

12330. Should you be in favour of some such system as applies in the case of the Public Health service? There I think, grants are given, are they not, provided that the salary is satisfactory?—That is so. I confess I do not like that system of grants; but that was the practice also with regard to poor-law appointments till the Act of 1888. Up to that time half the salary was paid. I believe that before that time the Local Government Board did not exercise any more control than they regard themselves as having now, as to the amount of salary. Quite apart from any question of repayment, I think sometimes they should say, this salary is plainly insufficient, and it must be higher. They might have greater power of control in palpably insufficient cases.

12331. Is not some such power exercised in the case of public health appointments? If the salary is not considered satisfactory the grant is not made?—Yes, and the district has to pay the salary.

12332. Was that the case under the Poor Law up to 1888, or was it not the fact that the grant was made, whatever the salary?—The grant was made whatever the salary, I think.

Existing system of providing drugs and results.

12333. Was there any control at that time over the salary?—There was no more control.

12334. On the question of expensive drugs, have you had any difficulty or allegation of injustice to the sick poor through expensive drugs not being supplied?—No.

12335. How do the guardians generally arrange for the supply of drugs?—The practice varies. Sometimes they are supplied from the workhouse stores; sometimes they are supplied, I think, by the medical officer who sends in a bill, generally with regard to drugs like antitoxin and that class of drug, which is expensive.

Difficulties of providing adequate nursing in small workhouses.

12336. With regard to the insufficiency of night nursing in some of the workhouses, is that tending to right itself or can you suggest any remedy which might be desirable?—It is tending to right itself very slowly by more nurses being appointed, but I do not think you can say, as regards very small workhouses indeed, that there shall be never less than two nurses, and unless you can say that, I do not see that you can get efficient night nursing. I think that is inherent in the nature of things. If you have only a very small number of patients to deal with you cannot really appoint enough nurses to be always ready for any emergency.

12337. That is a difficulty with small workhouses on account of the smallness of the staff?—Yes; large workhouses have night nursing.

12338. With regard to the suggestion that such workhouses should amalgamate with regard to nursing, you have a point I think with regard to visiting by their friends?—Yes.

12339. Would the railways serve sufficiently to overcome that difficulty in your district?—I do not think so. Our unions are nearly all large in area, and there is nothing that more conduces to the comfort of the sick than being near their friends. They are very much visited. I should not like at all to see anything which would diminish the opportunities of their friends and relations visiting them.

12340. Balancing the better nursing they might get against the visiting of their friends, you rather incline to keeping them in the neighbourhood of their friends?—I do.

Proposed State Pensions for Law Nurses.

12341. I think you alluded to the difficulty of the Superannuation Act as regards nurses. I think that the age under the Superannuation Act is rather high for a nurse to look forward to for her pension, and you suggest that it might be desirable if she could claim a pension payable by the State. Have you thought out any details of such a project?—I stated in my evidence (question 4593), that, "If it were possible to introduce a system under which any trained nurse could, after twenty or twenty-five years' service, claim a pension of £25 or £30 per annum, payable by the State, the difficulty experienced by so many women of providing for themselves after middle age would be to some extent surmounted," and the service would be made more attractive. It is now so little attractive that it is very difficult indeed to get nurses with any amount of training at all.

12342. You have not considered any details or difficulties of the scheme?—No; I only say that the total number of nurses is about 6,000, that the number of those who, having twenty years' service would retire on a pension of, say, £30 a year, is so small that it would not be a serious disbursement of the State, and that as the Local Taxation Commissioners contemplate that the payment to local authorities should be increased, that is one of the forms in which payments in respect of the administration of the local authorities could be made with great advantage to the system.

12343. I do not know whether you are aware that there are voluntary associations for pension funds for nurses?—Yes, I have heard of that. I believe they are not very well supported, are they?

12344. I do not know; statements have rather led me to think otherwise. I have no personal knowledge of them. Would any arrangements such as those, if they were sound, financially, meet your point?—I should still adhere to my broad principle that, after twenty years' service, a nurse should have a pension of £30 a year, and that the State should pay that.

12345. Referring to the question of friction between the master and matron, do you find that tending to decrease?—I am doubtful.

Starcross special institution imbecile children.

12346. Do you inspect the institution at Starcross?—Yes.

12347. It is for imbecile children, is it not?—Yes.

12348. What is the accommodation at Starcross?—270.

12349. Is it sufficient for the needs of your district?—It is generally full, but then it goes rather outside my district. It is not only for my three counties, but I think for two besides.

Retention of imbecile children in Workhouses.

12350. Do you find the imbecile children retained in the workhouses?—Too much so.

12351. Too much so?—Yes. Starcross is a place where they will only take improvable cases, and the difficulty is to place the wretched children who are not improvable, who have horrible tricks of various kinds, and who have to associate to a certain extent with the other children in the workhouse, who learn from them their tricks.

12352. Do the guardians retain those cases because they have nowhere to send them ?—Yes, various boards have tried to find places for them, and cannot.

12353. In the suggestions from chairmen of boards of guardians I see from East Stonehouse there is one that there should be increased power to detain infectious and contagious cases. Were they referring more particularly to lock cases there ?—I should think so.

12354. Have you heard of any difficulty at East Stonehouse with regard to such cases ?—Yes, it is a matter of common report that such cases are not detained sufficiently in the three towns.

12355. Are there any special hospitals, apart from the Poor Law, for such cases in the three towns ?—I think not now ; I believe the special ward of that sort in the Royal Albert hospital was closed, some few years ago, and that created considerable difficulty.

12356. I believe the law officers of the Crown held years ago that there was no power to detain those cases ?—That is so.

12357. Should you be in favour of that power being given to boards of guardians ?—I am not prepared to express an opinion on that. That opens a large question.

12358. At Redruth, where there is so much miner's phthisis, a large proportion of the relief given is out-relief ?—Yes.

12359. Are there many cases of phthisis on the out-relief lists there ?—Not a very large proportion, but there are some.

12360. Have you any special provision in your district for phthisis ?—There is one hospital, which a good many boards of guardians subscribe to, and they have the right to occupy a bed there, for £75 a year. It is at Didworthy, and is a special hospital for the application of the open-air treatment to phthisical cases ; that has done wonders, certainly. In several of my workhouses wards have also been established, for instance at Plymouth, where they keep phthisical cases in a tremendous draught of air, which is always blowing through the room. People who have been brought up in the notion that you must bottle up all lung cases think it is very dreadful, but it is perfectly astounding to see the way in which these patients improve ; and this curious thing happens : they weigh them week after week ; and in cold weather the weight increases as a rule steadily, then you get a week of muggy weather, which you sometimes have in the valley of the Tamar, and suddenly down go all the weights. The relation of the progress of the patient, as tested by the weight to weather, is very remarkable.

12361. I take it that that sanatorium to which the subscription is £75 would be intended for cases in which there is a reasonable prospect of arresting the disease ?—The managers will not take patients unless they anticipate an improvement.

12362. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) I noticed there are 150 children boarded out within the union ?—About that.

12363. Do you inspect them at all ?—No.

12364. Their inspection is confined, is it not, to the relieving officer and medical officer ?—And sometimes to a committee ; a committee may be appointed for the union.

12365. No definite instructions are given to that committee, are there ?—Certain requirements are specified in the boarding-out order, but there are no definite instructions as to matters of detail.

12366. Is there any change you would like to see in that system, seeing, taking the country as a whole, what a very large number of children are boarded out within the union ?—I am not quite satisfied with the way in which that particular branch of the Poor Law is organised, but I do not know that I have any suggestion for its improvement. I think we want to know more about it. I should like very much to see an absolutely independent inquiry made (say by this Commission) of 200 or 300 children in different parts of the country, boarded out, to see how they do fare, and whether they are well treated or badly treated. All the people who take them want to make money out of them. The worse they treat them, the more money they make. I have had several cases in which it has not seemed to me a satisfactory way of disposing of the children.

12367. (*Chairman.*) Cases of cruelty ?—Yes, cases of cruelty, or cases of neglect I should say rather than cruelty. In some instances, cases of cruelty.

12368. (*Miss Hill.*) Do these remarks relate to children boarded within the union or outside ?—Within the union.

12369. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With their own relatives ?—No, not with their own relatives.

Question of size of Inspector's district and possibility of his exercising sufficient influence in it.

12370. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) As regards outdoor relief, having regard to the size of your district and the enormous number of claims on your time, is it possible for you to keep a watchful eye over the out-relief, and the methods under which it is given, and the condition of the people to whom it is given, and the adequacy or inadequacy of the amount ?—Not the details as to individuals, but I am meeting all the boards of guardians in my district. I must meet each of them once a year, and to some of them I go, if there is reason, repeatedly ; so I am now able to form an opinion of the class of their administration, and I have obtained returns as to the scale of their allowances. I look at the relieving officers' books, as to the scale of allowances and so on. I might, no doubt, know much more ; but I think I have a fair knowledge of them all.

12371. Do you think if you could give more time to a particular board, you could improve the level of administration in any way ?—I think the influence of an inspector on a board cannot help being rather in the interests of good administration, or at any rate of the administration which he considers good ; and the oftener he is able to be with them and to influence them, the better effect it ought to have.

12372. Would you say that your present district is the right size or too large ? Some inspectors have told us they think their districts are exactly the right size ; a good many have said that ?—My district is a very wide area indeed. At first I found a difficulty in it, when I went there some eight or nine years ago, especially as the pauperism was very considerable, and their methods were not so good as they have become in most places since ; but now by knowing where to go—I go, for instance for a month in Cornwall and work all round there, and I go for a fortnight, perhaps, to North Somerset and do that—I am able to do it. I think it is a district that is fairly workable by one man.

12373. You do not think an assistant inspector would be of advantage ?—I have not found the need of an assistant inspector.

Inspector's allowance for subsistence when absent from home.

12374. (*Chairman.*) You go to a certain county and make that your headquarters for a certain period, I understand ?—Very often.

12375. I assume you have a house where you permanently live ?—Yes, at Exeter.

12376. Are you given any allowance for the lodgings which you have to take ?—Yes, whenever I am away from home, I receive the usual allowance per night.

12377. Would that cover the expense ?—That reasonably covers the expense.

Question of provision of drugs by Medical officer.

12378. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) With reference to what you were saying to Dr. Downes, is it not a condition that is necessary, so far as outdoor medical relief, that the medical officer should supply the drugs ?—In some cases, but not in all.

12379. Is that a very few or a considerable number ?—I should say now that the guardians supply expensive drugs in a greater number of cases than the cases in which the medical officer supplies them.

12380. Do the guardians do it by orders on a dispensing chemist, where one is available, or is there a dispensary at the workhouse ?—Generally by orders on a chemist.

12381. I notice here you say the medical officers are very scantily paid in some cases. I thought if they had to provide their own drugs too, it would be rather serious from the point of view of the people receiving relief ?—Of late years the Local Government Board have always tried, as far as possible, on the appointment of a new medical officer, to get the guardians to supply the expensive drugs. Ordinary drugs the medical officers supply.

7 May, 1906.

Allegation of guardians dispensing relief to their own tenants.

12382. It is commonly stated that there are boards of guardians on which the guardians sit, who practically give outdoor relief to their own tenants. Have you ever seen that in your own experience?—No.

12383. You have never been able to prove such a case?—No, I have no case of that sort in my mind distinctly.

Lack of co-operation between hospitals and Poor Law infirmaries.

12384. As regards any co-operation between the general hospitals and infirmaries in large centres of population, has any such scheme been established at any large centre like Plymouth or Exeter, or where the county hospitals may be?—No, I think not. There are certain cases which are regarded as more fitting for the one, and others more fitting for the other, but I do not think there is any special co-operation between them.

12385. Are they so regarded by the subscribers or the guardians?—By both, I should say.

12386. I suppose practically if a person arrives at a hospital with an order or recommendation, if he belongs to the class that might go to the Poor Law infirmary, they are bound to take him in, are they not?—No doubt they are bound, but they might in some cases represent to the subscriber that this is a sort of case more fit for the Poor Law. I happen to be on the governing body of the county hospital at Exeter, and that is what we should do.

12387. When it is brought to your knowledge?—Yes.

12388. Have you an outdoor medical department at Exeter?—Not under the Poor-Law.

12389. Nor at Plymouth, so far as you know?—As to Plymouth, I am doubtful.

Question of out-relief to wage-earning women.

12390. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) There are a good many special industries carried on by women in your district, are there not?—A good many, especially about Yeovil, in Somerset.

12391. Is there any tendency to supplement the earnings by outdoor relief?—I think not.

12392. I notice both in Honiton and Yeovil, which are both centres of women's work, the outdoor relief stands very high?—I do not think that those two things are connected.

12393. You do not think the guardians give outdoor relief like that?—I do not mean to say that some of the women in Honiton to whom they give relief might not supplement it by a little bit of pillow-lace making, and so on, but I should not go further than that.

12394. You would not say for instance it is like the gloving in Leicester, which is said to be very largely supplemented by outdoor relief?—I do not think so. I am not aware that gloving is really very badly paid. The pay is not kept down by the granting of outdoor relief in addition to wages at all, I should say.

Effect of discontinuing out-relief in individual cases at Exeter.

12395. In paragraphs 13 and 14 you explain that you made some enquiries about the cases at Exeter, after they had been cut off from outdoor relief, with a view of seeing whether they suffered any hardship. Would it be possible to get any return of those cases to illustrate the point?—I scarcely think it would be a subject on which you could have a formal return.

12396. It is so exceedingly interesting; you say many of them who are receiving relief are now maintaining themselves?—Yes, that is the fact. I have not the least doubt of my information. I had it partly from the clerk of the guardians, who happened to be the relieving officer at one time, and partly from the clergymen of the different parishes, and others; but I doubt whether you could get any return that would be complete or worth having.

12397. You do not think if we sent down a special investigator we might get some report on it?—It is conceivable. Only recently I was talking to the clerk about it, and he said it is very remarkable indeed, and there are plenty of such cases. Some who were on the list are still living there; others have moved away from Exeter, gone to their relations, elsewhere, and so on.

12398. It would be important to ascertain?—I am quite sure if you thought proper to send down anybody there, the clerk would be in a position, with his special knowledge from having been himself a relieving officer, to help as much as possible to get the information you want.

12399. You speak in paragraph 25 of the inadequacy of the inquiries. Do they use case papers in many unions in your district?—They scarcely use them at all in my district.

Infrequenc of case-pa system in the distric

12400. Do they use them at Exeter?—They do not actually use case papers, but the relieving officers give very full particulars of the cases from their notebooks. So they do in a great many other unions, but we have scarcely come up to the case paper standard yet.

12401. And, of course, the particulars in the notebooks perish, they are not kept?—Yes. Case papers are very valuable, but we have been rather behindhand in Poor Law matters, and we are scarcely up to that refinement yet.

Evils of re stations.

12402. Are pay stations much used?—A good deal; the distances are so great.

12403. What do you think of them; are they desirable?—I would much sooner do without them. There are one or two abuses that are likely to come from them. Sometimes the people send for their allowances, and pay a penny, or some small sum for getting them. Sometimes children are sent to get them, and it is an uncommonly bad object lesson for a child to see the piles of shillings and half-crowns that are distributed all round for doing nothing. But on the whole it seems to me that pay-stations are a necessity unless you increase the staff of relieving officers to a point that the guardians would not like at all.

Economy rural guardians.

12404. I noticed when you were here before, on the subject of increasing the number of relieving officers, you said that the farmers objected to spending the rates so much?—Yes.

12405. Does that apply all round? Do they object to out-relief, and do they try to restrict it?—No, not enough; but there is antagonism to a particular salary of, say, £100 a year, as a new charge on the rates. That is one certain sum that they must object to. It is a little different to them when the question is whether they shall be generous, as they call it, to this or that individual applicant for relief, and what they call their generosity, which is often very bad for the community, in particular cases outweighs their desire to be economical.

12406. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Does the clerk of the Exeter guardians give the whole of his time to the duties of his office?—Yes. He is Superintendent Registrar besides, but nothing else.

Migration labourers from the country a its effect.

12407. (*Mr. Chandler.*) You speak of the depopulation that is proceeding so rapidly in the agricultural districts. I gather that the class of people that would be leaving those districts are the labourers, the poorer class?—Yes.

12408. Should I be right in assuming that the majority of them are attracted to the dockyard towns, Plymouth and Devonport?—Yes.

12409. Largely there?—Sometimes. A good many of them go to London. It is the able-bodied and the young that go, and leave the old and incapable behind.

12410. That is, the larger towns attract the agricultural labourer?—That is so.

12411. That accounts, I suppose, largely for the increasing pauperism in Plymouth?—I think not. It is the able-bodied people who go to Plymouth, and the able-bodied are not the people who furnish pauperism; there is not much able-bodied pauperism in Plymouth, although perhaps there is more there than elsewhere. I do not think the pauperism is dependent upon that. If a town is rapidly increasing, the people who come to it are the able-bodied, and not the class who appeal to the rates for relief.

12412. Has there been a distress committee formed in Plymouth under this Unemployed Workmen's Act?—Yes; they formed it because they had to form it.

12413. Was there no need for it?—There had been no very exceptional distress there.

Effect of discharges from dock yards.

12414. Do the discharges which frequently take place in the dockyards in large numbers tend to throw work on the guardians?—I asked that question of the Town Clerk of Devonport when I was seeing him about the Unemployed Act some time ago, and he said, No. For instance, a number of men, mostly Northerners, come for a special job; they do the job, and then they go away. People talk

of these discharges as if they were sudden convulsions, but they are anticipated. The men know that they are not to be there for ever, when the dock is made or whatever it is is built.

12415. You think the majority of them leave the district and go back to their own places ?—The majority of them do. Of course there are some inferior labourers (not the skilled labourer or the tough navvy), who are the hangers-on, who do throw themselves on the rates.

istance of fusal of ork by amps.

12416. You gave us an instance when you were here before of a case at Wellington, where a gentleman offered six tramps employment, and only one of them accepted. Can you tell us what class of employment it was ?—It was quite unskilled labour, as I understand, it was mostly moving timber.

12417. Rather heavy work ?—Rather heavy work ; but a great many of the tramps that one sees in the tramps' wards are men who look capable of doing heavy work.

12418. (*Mr. Loch.*) In paragraph 11 of your memorandum you say with regard to Taunton, "The effect has been largely to encourage friendly societies and industrial assurances" ; could evidence be got on that point of a very direct description ?—I took that statement from a paper that was read by the clerk to the Taunton guardians at one of the Poor Law conferences. I think that the clerk who read that paper would be able to give any information that the Commission might desire on the subject.

ules for re- f formu- ted by Poor aw Con- rence.

12419. In the paragraph just above that you refer to certain formulated rules of relief ; there were, I think, four points in those rules, the first being that able-bodied persons should not have relief except in the house ?—Yes, that is so. Perhaps I may read those rules which were settled by the Poor Law Conference after discussion with all the unions in the district. When they were adopted by the Poor Law Conference, they were circulated, and certain Boards of Guardians have adopted them, some *en bloc* and some with modifications. These are the rules :—"(1) An able-bodied person shall be relieved only in the workhouse, either alone or together with such of the family as may be resident with him, or her, except in the case of a widow with one child or more dependent on her, and during cases of sickness of any member of the family. (2) Out-relief shall not be given for more than four weeks on the first application, and then only after the case has been visited by the relieving officer, the date of whose visit shall be recorded in the Application and Report Book. During such period full information shall be obtained by the relieving officer and the guardians of the parish to which the applicant belongs with regard to the character and circumstances of the applicant." That, you see, brings in the guardians of the parish ; they are to have a hand in it too, as well as the relieving officer ; and that has its advantages. "(3) Out-relief may be granted only to such aged and infirm persons as (*a*) are deserving at the time of application ; (*b*) have shown signs of thrift ; (*c*) have no relations legally or morally bound to, and able to, support them ; (*d*) are unable to obtain sufficient assistance from charitable sources ; (*e*) are desirous of living out of the workhouse and can properly be taken care of. (4) Out-relief when given shall be adequate to the needs of the case, regard being had to the circumstances of the locality. (5) In no case of application for relief by adults under seventy years of age not having children dependent upon them shall out-relief be given unless a certificate of temporary or permanent disability to work is produced from a medical officer of the district. (6) Relief shall not be given for more than three months without revision, previously to which the relieving officer shall make full inquiry into the circumstances of each case ; and in order to facilitate this, the revisions shall be spread over the whole year." That introduced an important reform, because they had been in the habit of bringing up the cases thirty or forty or fifty at a time for the whole union, perhaps, all on one day, or half of the union all on one day, so there was no chance of inquiring into individual cases, and "renewed," "renewed" was simply put as fast as the chairman could write the word and initial the cases. Here it is secured that there shall be some sort of real re-examination of each case. The seventh rule is, "All persons applying for relief shall, except for good reason, appear before the board, unless a medical certificate is produced showing that they cannot attend."

12420. You have rather broadened the Poor Law position in those rules in some ways, because you take in relations who are morally liable ?—Yes.

12421. How would you raise the money from them in a particular instance ?—You cannot. All you can say is, "If your relations are to have relief, they must be relieved in the workhouse." Then people will be ashamed of having their relations relieved in the workhouse, whereas they would not be ashamed in letting them have a quiet 2s. 6d. or 3s. or 3s. 6d. a week, which they think is known to nobody and is no disgrace to the family. Then, to go on with the rules, the eighth rule is, "No out-relief shall be given to women who are deserted, or whose husbands are in prison, or undergoing penal servitude, except under special circumstances. (9) No permanent out relief shall be given to persons who have been resident in the union less than two years. (10) Out-relief shall not be given in respect of any idiot or imbecile." I am sorry to say they do not carry that out nearly enough. "(11) Where money has been received from any club or society on the death of a person, out-relief shall for a time be refused to any applicant dependent on such person, if such money has not been properly expended." Those are the rules ; they are rather a counsel of perfection, of course.

Effect of refusal of out-relief on relations not legally liable to maintain.

12422. To revert to the question of the relatives ; apart from offering the house in the way you have described, does the clerk try to raise money from the relatives who are only morally liable ?—No, I think not.

Possibility of more generally securing maintenance by relations not legally liable.

12423. Would it be *ultra vires* to do that ?—I have heard this done—the relieving officer has been instructed to say to a brother, "Here is your sister; you do not want her to be in the workhouse, surely ?" The relieving officer has made inquiries, and now and then the brother has consented to keep his sister. I have actually known cases of that sort ; I will not say they are numerous.

12424. Do you think there is scope for an extension of the normal work of the Poor Law authorities in this direction, that is to say, that, as a rule, if there are rich relatives the clerk should write to them ?—I think it might be well for communications to be made somehow, but I am not sure wehther they should not be more or less informal communications.

12425. You know that in dealing with cases of distress outside the Poor Law, when they are long-continuing cases relations who are only morally liable, frequently do a very great deal in response to persuasion ?—I have understood that.

12426. So that apparently if we were to accept the limitations of legal responsibility in regard to the Poor Law, we should be omitting to take advantage of that feeling which is equally strong in favour of helping relatives ?—Quite so.

Co-operation between charities and the Poor Law.

12427. You have referred to concurrent charitable work which might be of service to the board of guardians ; would you prefer the guardians to take up the line that I have just been referring to, or would you prefer that cases in which the relations are morally liable should be left to charitable persons to deal with ?—I should be inclined to leave those cases to charitable persons to deal with. Assuming that there were some such society as I vaguely contemplate in your area to deal with meritorious cases, I should imagine that the first thing the society would do, would be to say, "Mary Smith has got a very well-to-do brother, why should we not try him ?"—and they would put some pressure on him. I should leave that to the society, rather than try the direct pressure from the guardians.

Participation of guardians in work of enquiring into Poor Law cases.

12428. There is another point on your rules, which is that the guardians themselves are to take part in the work, that is to say, you would treat them not merely as a board, but as so many individuals who are interested in the same subject, and who would therefore personally work at it ?—Yes, being the representatives of that parish and having local and personal knowledge, they might properly correct and supplement that of the relieving officer. I am all against guardians having to act as both witnesses and judges in their own cases. But it is not a bad thing that guardians should at the same time take a personal interest in cases and should give their view to their colleagues as well as the relieving officer giving his view.

Mr. H. Preston-Thomas.

7 May 1906.

12429. Do you find, as a matter of fact, that the guardians do trouble about individual cases in the manner you describe?—Yes, they do, a good deal.

12430. Spending time upon them outside the duties of the board itself?—Yes, certainly.

12431. Are you under the impression that that is done generally in the country?—I think it is so in the country districts, and in some town districts as well. I have been surprised very often to see how guardians look almost on themselves as if they were in charge of a street or of a certain place, just as the people at Elberfeld do.

Possibility of organising charity in co-operation with the Poor Law.

12432. Are you inclined to suggest then that, parallel to the Poor Law authority, there might be something like an organisation of charity as a recognised system?—I think I should like to see that. I have not heard of any plan for establishing that, but it always seems to me that for the meritorious cases you want something beyond the hard and fast rules of the Poor Law, and that when you have got that you could make the rules of the Poor Law rather more hard and fast.

12433. Might I put one or two points by way of suggestions to you. For instance, do you think that the inquiry officer appointed by a board of guardians, working somewhat on the lines you have mentioned, might make the inquiries, and that the cases might be afterwards considered by such an organisation of charitable relief as there might be created?—I think that would be an advantage.

12434. Of course you see the expense of it would be much less?—Yes.

12435. Do you think that a society working in this fashion might have a kind of status and recognition as doing this type of work? I ask the question, because, whilst boards of guardians are elected from period to period, and therefore in a manner there must always be a board of guardians, charitable people, who are under no such rule, may disappear in the course of two or three years society and all. It seems to me very difficult to make a suggestion with regard to charity, unless something of that continuity of work and responsibility which is assumed to apply to boards of guardians may also be assumed to apply to charitable institutions?—The difficulty that strikes one at the first blush as regards giving them a special status, or constituting them in any formal or official way, is that the essence of charity is largely its spontaneity, and that you do not want to regulate that. If charity is put in the leading strings of Acts of Parliament and official regulations, I am not sure that charity will not lose one of its chief features.

12436. But suppose it were simply recognised as having a certain object, and that it had a certain assistance, we will say, through the inquiry officer or the relieving officer, and there were no other regulations practically, so that they had full elbow room for development; then do you think that it might work out?—Then, I think it would work out well.

Possible utilisation by Charities of Relieving Officers' enquiries.

12437. Would you see any difficulty in the relieving officer making these inquiries for such a combination as I have suggested at the present time without further order or instruction?—I should not like to put a relieving officer under the control of any other body except his immediate masters. I fancy I must have understood wrongly that your original question was limited to this, that having made up a *dossier* of certain information about a special case, the relieving officer had come to the conclusion, and perhaps his guardians had come to the conclusion, that it was a meritorious case, but a case more for a charitable body to deal with than for them; and that then he should be able to hand over the information that he had got up to that time, or that the guardians should communicate it, to the charitable society, and it would be of use to them for the basis of their action. I should not be inclined to go further than that.

12438. I was contemplating a step further, namely, that when they had the case in their hands, there might be further details wanting which they could not well get without the assistance of some officer, and then in that case the relieving officer might, to that extent, overlap in this new organisation of relief which I have suggested?—I should be rather shy of giving them any control over the relieving officer. He has got his own masters, and whatever further information they want for their own purposes they must get for themselves; at any rate, that would be my view.

12439. You would not allow a case to be referred back for particulars to be obtained by the relieving officer?—If they like to ask any question of the guardians I would allow them, of course, to do that, and leave it to the guardians to deal with the question as they like, whether by saying to the relieving officer, Find out so-and-so, or otherwise. But, as a rule, I would stop there, and if the case is to be transferred, and they take the case up, or at any rate were prepared in the first instance to take it up, I should tell the relieving officer that he had done his work as to that case.

Proposal to utilise voluntary effort for Poor Law work.

12440. You clearly are of opinion then that the charitable organisation and the Poor Law organisation should be side by side, but independent one of the other? That would be my opinion.

12441. Therefore you would be against what is called the Elberfeld system, so far by which unpaid voluntary visitors should be doing work under the authority?—Yes. I did not mean to blend them in the way you suggest.

12442. (*Chairman.*) Would you be opposed to the idea of unpaid people working under the recognised Poor Law authority?—I prefer the regular work of the relieving officer, supplemented by any information that an individual guardian can give.

Validity of principle of ineligibility of relief.

12443. (*Mr. Loch.*) There are one or two other points arising out of your evidence which one would like to take up. Do you think that the principle of Poor Law relief, or the so-called principle, that the condition of the recipient should be less eligible than that of the independent labourer, is practically accepted in the rules we have referred to, or is it set at naught?—I think it is practically accepted.

12444. That is to say, what is done in the matter of out-relief does not make the position of the recipient better than his neighbour's position?—That is so.

12445. Therefore you could accept that still as the basis, so to speak, of the administration?—I accept that still as the fundamental principle of Poor Law administration.

Proposed increased supervision or inspection of out-relief.

12446. With regard to insuring that inquiry should be made up to a certain point—and those rules, of course, lay great stress on inquiry—do you feel that the details of investigation are sufficiently controlled by the present organisation of the Poor Law administration? The inspectors evidently have their hands very full, and it has been suggested to us that they have not the time to look into all these details?—If it were possible for the inspectors to take a larger personal share in the supervision of the work, it would probably make relieving officers work better. It is absolutely impossible if the inspector has nearly fifty unions, as he generally has, for him to take any large share as to seeing what the work of individual relieving officers is. I consider, speaking generally, that the present system is good, that there has been a wonderful social improvement under it, and that the Poor Law Act has been on the whole an extraordinary success. I do not regard it as some people do. It has failed upon particular points, but on the whole I think it is an uncommonly good Act, and a good system.

12447. Would you think it would assist you in the policy which you have described here, if you had at your disposal an assistant who could pay special attention to the matter of investigation, with a view to raising the methods of it to a higher pitch? There is, of course, in the rural unions no chance of having cross-visitors or anything of that kind?—No.

12448. That is out of the question, so if there is to be anything equivalent to that, it must be in a different way?—It must. There would be no doubt increased efficiency if there were more supervision.

Type of Relieving Officer and effect thereof of Superannuation Act.

12449. As to the relieving officers themselves, do you find that the appointments that are made are often made simply owing to the fact that members of the board know an individual applicant for the office, and he is appointed apart from his capacity for the particular work?—No doubt local knowledge and local influence have a great deal to do with it. On the other hand, I think as a rule the relieving officers are a very good class, and that we get men who do their work surprisingly well.

Question of prescribing qualifications for Relieving Officers.

12450. Do you think that the class is being improved as time goes on?—Certainly—there is no doubt about that. I feel quite sure that the Superannuation Act is giving us a much better class of officers from year to year. There is a very large number of candidates for each appointment of the sort, and on the whole we get very good men now.

12451. Do you think it would be of any service if the Local Government Board were to issue in a kind of Order all the conditions which a man of that type should fulfil, so that persons not fulfilling those conditions should, as a general understanding, not be appointed?—Do you mean that each candidate should possess certain qualifications?

12452. That he should possess certain qualifications as to ability and education, and certain moral qualifications too?—I have been rather surprised to see that men who have had no previous knowledge of the Poor Law, and who have had no work akin to that of a relieving officer, have over and over again, in a very short time, by the help of the various manuals that there are for instructing relieving officers, and by the help that they get from the clerk to the guardians, become very efficient officers. Of course in theory one would suppose that a man ought to pass an examination, at any rate in the elementary principles of the Poor Law or in the elementary principles of relief, and in his duties; but as a matter of fact, he does get to learn them very quickly, and learns them well. So, if you ask me whether I have met with a general need for such a test, I can only say that it has not been apparent.

Scales of out-relief.

12453. With regard to outdoor relief, is that given according to scales?—Yes.

12454. Do you agree with that system?—It is a rough and ready system. The scale is generally a basis rather than a hard and fast rule, and it is departed from in particular instances. In the case of some scales, where they are very small indeed, I have tried over and over again, and with some success in nearly all the instances, to get the scales raised. It is desirable perhaps that you should have a particular scale as a sort of basis to work upon.

Dearth of Nurses and pensions as a remedy.

12455. To turn to another question, the question of the nurses, of which we have heard, the want of nurses is very great, is it not?—It is very considerable indeed.

12456. Your proposal is that they should be able after twenty years to get a pension of £30?—Yes.

12457. And you think, I gather, that that would actually create a demand for those posts?—I think that would attract an immense number of people to the nursing profession and to the workhouses. I think, also, that a good deal might be done by facilitating the training of nurses in workhouses. At present, I believe, the rule is that you cannot train nurses sufficiently, at any rate, to attract an immense number of people to the nursing profession and to the workhouse. I think, also, that a good deal might be done by facilitating the training of nurses in workhouses. At present, I believe, the rule is that you cannot train nurses (sufficiently, at any rate, to qualify them for the post of superintendent nurse), unless there is an infirmary with a resident medical officer; and various other points are laid down. I should like to see it made rather more easy to train nurses. In two unions of my district they do train nurses, and I believe they train them excellently. There is no rule about it, but the medical officer and the superintendent nurse in each case have put their heads together. They do not mind taking a good deal of trouble, for which they are not specially paid, and so they train excellent nurses who, in their little way, are meeting the demand. I wish that practice could be more extended, if possible.

Need for facilitating training of nurses in Workhouses.

12458. But I suppose the extension of it does not lie actually with the poor law, except so far as the conditions can be adapted to those laid down by some other body, a *quasi* medical body?—I suppose so.

12459. Would you be prepared to say that terms might be arrived at by which a year at a hospital was required, and possibly two elsewhere; not in an infirmary, perhaps, but generally in poor law work?—My own notion has been rather not so much to insist on the hospital training as to insist on some training in workhouses where a good training can be given. Workhouse nursing—I am speaking, of course, of country workhouses—is rather a special business, and I believe the nurses who are trained for it in these two workhouses are admirably suited for their duties.

12460. Do you not run a great risk of creating another type of nurse for a possibly less acceptable professional position, namely, that of a poor law nurse?—It may be, but then at present you get them without any training at all. You have to take some young woman who has perhaps attended one or two people in illnesses, and you have to appoint her because you cannot get anyone else to appoint. That happens every day. Then the appointment is submitted to the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board has to say, "You must try her for three months, and if we get a favourable report at the end of the three months from your doctor, well and good—we will sanction the appointment." That happens constantly. We are obliged to have those, simply because there is nobody else to come forward as a candidate; but they have had no experience.

12461. I take it for granted that your own suggestion might be adopted of a pension, whilst at the same time trying to find a basis which would satisfy, if it were possible, the medical claims and keep the nurse in the rank of nurses generally?—It might possibly be desirable from that point of view to insist upon some hospital training; but I am not sure.

Sanction of Local Government Board to appointment of nurses.

12462. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is the sanction of the Local Government Board essential before a nurse can be appointed?—Yes.

12463. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to obtaining the money from relations and others, do you think that the present method of taking the case into the county court is quick and sharp enough? Would it not be better to take it before a magistrate, and bring it under the system of the Bastardy Acts?—I have heard complaints that the present system is cumbrous.

Unsatisfactory procedure for recovery of maintenance.

12464. Is it the clerks who complain?—Yes.

12465. Is there any very large amount raised in your district from relations of normal cases—I do not refer to lunacy cases?—I should rather put it that there are a very large proportion of cases in which people who ought to pay, undertake to pay and do not pay, but get into arrear, and then the guardians wipe off the debt.

Publication of particulars of arrears of maintenance.

12466. Could it not be pushed to a better position by the guardians being required to make an annual report of some kind, and to give some return on those matters, so that it would then become a public question?—Are you thinking of a return showing the arrears which they have lost?

12467. Yes, a return as to the non-payments by relations?—Some of them do publish statements showing exactly the amounts in arrear. There is one of my unions where I think it has had some effect. It is a badly administered union, which I think I have brought before the Commission on a previous occasion. It is the union of Clutton which has every circumstance in its favour, and yet has an extraordinarily high amount of pauperism. There they took to publishing the arrears. In some cases the arrears were so great that of the amount payable in a particular half-year there would be only about a quarter paid. This incited them to some reform, with the result that I had a letter from the clerk only the other day to say that I should be glad to hear that in a large number of cases, in fact in most of the cases, they were now getting the contributions properly.

12468. That was the result really of their publishing a report and seeing how they stood?—I think so, and also of attention having been called to it publicly at their meetings.

Proposal to make Boards of Guardians publish annual reports.

12469. Do you think it would be a good thing if under statute Boards of Guardians had to make an annual report?—I do not know that many people pay very much attention to annual statutory reports.

12470. You, on the other hand, have sometimes effected the changes that you have to bring about in your district largely by the circulation of information?—Yes, I think so.

Mr. H. Preston-Thomas.

7 May 1906.

12471. It was with that idea that I thought the local reports might also serve?—It is possible. I always send them the statistics of their union once a year, and those are always pretty freely discussed, and I think they very often lead to some amendment.

Need for consolidation of Poor Law Statutes and Orders.

12472. Do you think it would be of service to have a very simple statement, as far as it could be made simple, of the statutes and orders, for circulation to new members of the Boards?—I think something of that sort is very much wanted, when you consider the extraordinary complexity, and the thousands of pages of statutes and of orders that the Poor Law and the regulations under it are now comprised in. If they could possibly be boiled down, it would be a great advantage.

12473. Then you would be in favour of consolidation, if possible?—Yes, if possible.

Operation of Unemployed Workmen's Act in the district.

12474. Now I want to ask you about the Distress Committees and the policy of the Unemployed Workmen's Act. Do you think it is a good or a bad policy to start a concurrent committee on statutory lines with that of the Poor Law guardians for the relief of distress in a district?—I can only answer that in this way: I have only one such committee in my district, and my experience therefore is very limited indeed. That one committee I do not think would have been constituted but for the fact that being a borough council it had to be constituted. I do not think it would have been necessary. As a matter of fact, that particular council had off their own bat some six or eight years ago created something of the same sort of department for dealing with distress, and they had £300 or £400 remaining as a balance which they had not expended. When this new plan came in, they did not think there was very serious distress, and they did not make any effort to raise subscriptions, but they applied their £300 and they gave some work. The whole thing was not on a big scale, and I do not think it enables me to speak as to that point.

Operation of Relief to School Children Order in the district.

12475. With regard to another point of relief on new lines, namely, the order respecting underfed children, are you in favour of development on the lines laid down in that order by which the child becomes in a manner the claimant to relief and the father has to pay or may be prosecuted?—The Under-fed Children Order has scarcely been utilised at all in my district, and I have not had occasion therefore to express any opinion or to try and influence the guardians on the subject. Speaking generally, I believe no representations have come from the school authorities, and therefore that Order has not been particularly operative in my district. As a matter of fact, the people who do not feed their children in the country are generally drunken people, and people of such habits that any chance of getting any recovery of the cost from them seems to me to be almost out of the question.

12476. The Order therefore has not been turned to account in places like Devonport, Plymouth and so on?—No.

12477. Practically it is a dead letter?—I have not heard of any representations being made under it.

The ethics of old age pensions as compared with out-relief.

12478. In regard to old people, do you think that they should have any kind of statutory right to old age relief, on the lines adopted in Denmark and elsewhere?—It has always seemed to me that old age pensions are outdoor relief without its restrictions, and I have never understood myself why it is supposed to be a disgrace to have an allowance fom the rates and not a disgrace to have an allowance from the taxes.

Need for harder work for "ins-and-outs" in the workhouse.

12479. With regard to another difficult point, the ins-and-outs, would you be prepared to alter the law as it now stands in regard to their continued detention in the house, or their punishment for continual recurrence to the house, or in any other way?—I have found very considerable use in the last modification of the Order, under which they may practically be detained for a week. That I think in most of the cases has dealt with the matter satisfactorily. The way to deal with people who might support themselves, but who go to the workhouse and worry everybody, is to make them work uncommonly hard in the workhouse, so that they shall not want to go there again. That is what I always tell the masters.

12480. Then practically the cure would lie in strict workhouse administration?—I think so.

12481. And not merely by prosecution, for instance, under the Vagrancy Act?—Yes. I think the work in the workhouses is made far too easy. The work in the Swiss workhouses and in their forced labour institutions is an entirely different thing from the labour, in the first place in workhouses, and in the second place in prisons, in England.

12482. Of course you know that the difficulty is in providing suitable work in town workhouses, at any rate as they are managed now?—Yes; but in the Swiss institutions they devise lots of industries in which the people are made to work hard all day. If there was more hard work in workhouses, I sometimes think that we should not have any loafers there. We have not very many of the able-bodied loafers now, but still there is a certain number of these men, who go to the workhouses because they can get enough to eat and they can get properly lodged, and yet have to do very little work for it.

12483. Then you would be inclined to reorganise the workhouses, even in the towns, so as to meet this need?—I think something might be done by taking example from abroad in that way, though I must say I have very few workhouses where we have able-bodied loafers.

Evil of other than Poor Law expenditure being defrayed out of the poor rate.

12484. To turn to another point, the financial side, do you think that it would be a good change if the poor law authority collected the poor rate only, and that the poor rate should not include the police and other items?—I think that would be very useful indeed. People are always complaining of the increase in the poor rate just at the time the relief of the poor, indoor and out, is going down. The decrease of the cost of poor relief, indoor and out, in the last seven or eight years in my district has been very great. The out-door relief has gone down £29,000 a year, but balancing the increase on the indoor relief and so on, there is a saving of, I think, speaking broadly, about £10,000 a year; and yet I constantly hear people say on my boards of guardians, "There is always an increase!" "Another increase of the poor rate!"—and so it is an increase of what is called the poor rate, but it is not in the least an increase in pauperism or in the cost of the relief of the poor.

Effect of lunatic gra

12485. To take the point of the grants from the Exchequer, are you in favour of the 4s. grant for lunatics?—No: I think it is most wasteful. I believe it creates lunatics.

12486. Would you be in favour of continued Exchequer help in some form towards poor relief?—Yes, but I do not like that form of it at all.

Proposal t transfer all imbeciles, etc., to ju diction of county council.

12487. Would you be prepared rather to make a grant for general purposes to some authority, like a county authority, to distribute subject to good report: or would you have any other suggestion for dealing with this 4s. grant, and also with the other statutory payments that are made to the Poor Law authorities?—I should like to turn all the imbeciles over to the county to deal with. We have tried over and over again to discriminate between imbeciles who are mischievous and a nuisance inside workhouses, and imbeciles who are not mischievous and are not a nuisance: and the statute has tried to discriminate between them. The magistrates and boards of guardians disregard the statute. It provides expressly that no imbecile shall be in a workhouse if he cannot be kept separate from the sane inmates, unless it is unnecessary for his convenience or for their convenience that he should be so kept. That is generally disregarded, and very offensive and mischievous imbeciles are not kept apart. I do not care so much for the imbeciles themselves; I am thinking of the other people in the workhouses. We always hear about the interests of the imbeciles and whether they will or will not be improved in the workhouses. I am sorry for the sane inmates. It is very hard if I have to go to a workhouse in my old age that I should have to associate with idiots offensive in body and mischievous in mind and playing all sorts of tricks. They make the lives of some of the people miserable.

12488. Would you propose to entirely separate lunatics, imbeciles, and idiots from poor relief?—Yes; I would give them over to the county council entirely.

Question of grants from county council in aid of Poor Law expenditure.

12489. With regard to the other statutory grants that are now made for officers, would you be prepared to give those up, or would you make the grants in some general form with a view to improvement in administration?—I should like them to go from the county council. It is rather a question as to whether you should put on that particular pressure of a money fine, if people do not do what you like. I do not quite approve of that. The money fine that I mean consists in not allowing a grant when a particular officer is not paid what you want to have him paid. My remedy would be for the Local Government Board to decide, with rather more authority than they have hitherto exercised, as to that one thing. It has always been thought that the amount of payment is almost entirely a matter for the guardians, but I should prefer that, in a great many cases where it is plainly insufficient, the Local Government Board should say, "We refuse to sanction because the salary is too small."

Proposed intervention of Local Government Board in cases where salaries of Poor Law officers are inadequate.

12490. Would you be in favour, in the case of the medical men, of something like a tariff based on the number of beds in an infirmary, so as to get a basis that might seem fair to them?—Yes, if any fair basis could be got which the Local Government Board might adopt broadly in considering whether they should approve or refuse.

Small percentage of pauperism at Penzance and its cause.

12491. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I see that you instance the case of Penzance as being a union where the ratio of pauperism is comparatively small; and I rather gather that you attribute that, at any rate to some extent, to the fact that there the population is a fishing population. Is one correct in deducing from that that there is more of a spirit of independence and more of a sense of duty still remaining there as between parents and children, and children and parents than in other parts of your district?—It is very difficult to give a reason for it; Penzance is exceedingly puzzling in that respect. It is the westernmost union, and it is dependent on two things mainly, on fishing and on flower and vegetable growing. In one parish that I know, Sennen, they have not had a pauper on the rolls for many years, simply because there the widow has shares in a boat, and the sons have shares in a boat, and they have certain arrangements as to the catch. It is the one place where the gray mullet habitually come, and where they can get a haul that may even be worth some hundreds of pounds. There are certain arrangements which prevent the creation of paupers, and then also the people are very keen on supporting their relations. There is more dislike to poor law relief there than elsewhere. Besides, in the union generally there is a large amount of work for very old people in the gardens, and also on the strawberry beds at one time of the year. They fix the school holidays there with reference to the strawberry picking time, and so on. There are various things which largely influence the pauperism there; but it is a very curious case, and I do not feel able to explain it entirely.

12492. Is the dislike for, and aversion to, pauperism a decreasing and diminishing factor? I gather that it may be from what you tell us of the laxity of the administration?—I would not say that it is a diminishing factor. They keep very much to themselves and they keep to the traditions of years. They have a notion there, more than in most other places, that they ought not to be paupers. I am afraid I cannot explain why it is, but there it is.

Comparative merits of administering relief by committees or by whole boards.

12493. As regards the boards of guardians, I do not think from what you tell us that you approve of the administration generally; can you tell us whether, as a rule, the relief is administered by the board sitting together or in committee?—Partly one and partly the other; generally, I think, in committee.

12494. Is it your opinion that when they are sitting in committee matters are managed more satisfactorily than when they are sitting in a body?—That is difficult to say. It is really impossible when there is a large number of cases for the full board to deal with all of them. As a matter of convenience, having regard to the time which the guardians can devote to the work, they must have committees; and when you get committees you do not quite get equality of administration, because you will get one committee on which the strongest man will be for out-relief and you will get another committee on which the strongest man will be against it, and in committees it is the strongest man that governs the committee as a rule.

12495. I think you are also of opinion that at present they do not pay the attention that they ought to the advice of the relieving officers; but from what you have said to Mr. Loch I gather that that probably is a matter which is being remedied, owing to the fact that the class of relieving officers is now much improved?—I think it is improving, certainly. The particular case that I had in my mind where they are not paying sufficient attention to the relieving officers is Plymouth, which is a case where the business is not transacted on strict lines at all, and where the procedure leaves much to be desired. I would not say much against most of the unions in my district. I think on the whole they have been getting the relief steadily down, and that after their lights they do a great deal as a rule. But there are two or three where the relief is badly administered, and I should say Plymouth is one of them.

Mr. H. Preston-Thomas.

7 *May*, 1906.

Disregard by guardians of Relieving Officers' advice at Plymouth and elsewhere.

12496. If the relieving officer were a thoroughly efficient official, his duty would be to give a full and particular account of each individual case when brought up for relief, and the guardians I imagine would be inclined to follow the suggestion which he made as to the amount of relief to be given, would they not; and would that not be the best method of administration?—Yes, and that is very largely done. In Plymouth, which I have been speaking of, they have not got enough relieving officers, and I have been advising them for some time to appoint one or two additional men, but they have not done so yet.

Proposed register of workhouse nurses.

12497. As regards the nursing in the workhouses, has it ever occurred to you that in order to meet the difficulties of getting nurses and to improve the qualifications of the nurses, it might be a good thing to have a register of nurses for workhouse purposes?—I have not heard it suggested.

Comparative unpopularity of workhouse nursing.

12498. I gather that in England the nursing in workhouses is by no means popular on the part of the nurses, and that they do not like the workhouse work?—There is an enormous demand for nurses in workhouses, in hospitals, in districts, and for private nursing and Army nursing, indeed the demand is greater than the supply, so that they naturally do not take to what is the most unpleasant sort of nursing—the nursing that has no interesting cases in it, which consists mainly in keeping old people alive and clean. That is the most unpopular of all the different classes of nursing, and I have heard it complained of as monotonous.

12499. You would not, I take it, agree with the view, which I think has been stated by some of the superintendents of the Queen's Jubilee nurses, that training in a workhouse or a poorhouse is sometimes the most efficient training that can be got, because of the great variety of cases and of the numerous chronic cases which they have to look after and care for?—I am speaking rather of my small workhouses, and I know little of the large infirmaries which have some hundreds of inmates. They got lots of chronic cases, and have to deal with bed sores, paralysis, and so on; but as to variety, I should say that there is very little.

Method of recovery of maintenance and loan relief.

12500. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Did I understand you to say that you had complaints on behalf of the clerks as to a difficulty in recovering relief from relatives?—They have said that the proceedings are somewhat cumbrous.

12501. Did they at all explain why?—I am afraid I cannot say.

12502. You are, of course, aware that the amount is recoverable summarily before Justices; and, therefore, it ought to be a simple process, ought it not?—I think sometimes they have a difficulty in recovering it in the County Court.

12503. That would be as to the amount of relief given on loan and not as to the amount recoverable from relatives, would it not? Relief given on loan is recoverable in the County Court, but contributions by relatives are recoverable summarily?—Then I am afraid I must have misunderstood that.

Removal of imbeciles from workhouse.

12504. On the question of imbeciles, you are aware perhaps that there is some difference of opinion about whether they should be all taken out of the workhouses? Some of the witnesses who have come before us have said

Mr. H. Preston-Thomas.

7 *May* 1906.

that some of them are very useful in the rural workhouses for doing certain work, such as cleaning, sweeping, and so forth, and that there would be some difficulty in getting that work done if the imbeciles were all cleared out; would you agree in that view?—I quite agree that some imbeciles do useful work, but I think that that fact is not to be held to outweigh the discomfort which the general presence of imbeciles in workhouses causes to the people who are not imbeciles.

12505. It might mean, I suppose, more paid officers?—It might.

Difficulties as to making the county the area for indoor-relief.

12506. To turn to another matter, it has been suggested by one of the witnesses that it might be desirable to have very much larger areas for the administration of relief; for instance, that the county might be taken as the area for the purpose of indoor relief, and that a separate authority might be elected for the county to administer indoor relief, whereas outdoor relief should be administered perhaps by district councils, the charge being borne by the smaller area; would you have any view upon that matter?—I do not know whether it contemplates the suppression of some workhouses.

12507. That scheme contemplates the classification of workhouses, so that a particular class could be sent to one workhouse and other classes to other workhouses?—That, of course, involves some people being sent a considerable distance from their own homes, and it involves the splitting up of families, for one member of the family might be sent to one workhouse and another to another. Then I suppose in some shape, form, or kind, it would go to the county authority. Now, what with all their functions at present, I believe the country gentlemen are complaining that the county councils are beginning to have too much to do, and that their back is not unlimited for the burdens to be placed on it.

12508. It is suggested that that difficulty about distance could be got over, because the facilities for locomotion are now so great; does that seem to you a sufficient way of meeting it?—I think not; because the people who visit are people who cannot pay much for locomotion, and the distances in many cases would be very considerable. I have known many cases where a woman's daughter comes to see her in the workhouse, being brought in on market day by some kindly farmer, who lives near her, in his market cart. I happened to be at Helston on their last Flora day. That is a very old institution, which has been going on for a century or two. They all dance round the streets, and on on. The whole neighbourhood goes to Helston to see this dancing and singing and there are cheap excursions of all sorts. That day I was at the workhouse, and it was thronged by people who had come in from distant parts of the union to see their relations and friends. They told me it was always so, and that the people took advantage of such opportunities. You would not have them coming like that if the workhouse was not in their own town, but thirty or forty miles away.

12509. Would you think there would be any difficulty in getting a proper visitation of institutions, if it were under an authority with an area so large as that, say, of a county?—I think it might be a difficulty.

12510. (*Chairman.*) The objection that you urge as regards consolidation and convenience would not apply with equal force to towns as to rural districts?—No.

Advisability of making union and borough boundaries coterminous.

12511. I assume you see no objection to the boundaries of municipal boroughs and the boundaries of boards of guardians in municipal boroughs being made coterminous, if possible?—No. I believe the policy of the Local Government Board has been as much as possible to make those coterminous.

12512. And to have, if possible, only one board of guardians in an area?—Yes.

12513. Is Stonehouse a separate township, or is it part of a municipality?—It is a separate town.

Effect on pauperism of system of small farms in Cornwall.

12514. Is any part of your district composed of very small farms?—There are a great many very small farms in Cornwall.

12515. Do any of the farmers become paupers?—No, I think not.

12516. Do you think these small farms have any effect in reducing the amount of pauperism?—Only to a slight extent.

12517. The farmer's sons and their families would take the place rather of the labourer, would they not?—Yes. Sometimes I have heard this of a farmer with a very small holding, whose father or mother is in the workhouse—that he has made a plea that he really cannot afford to pay anything, because, although he is a farmer in name, yet his farm is only twenty acres, and he can only just manage to squeeze a living for himself out of it and no more; and he has been let off.

12518. But you would not say that the system of small farms in Cornwall makes any appreciable difference so far as pauperism is concerned as compared with the larger farms in other parts of their district?—I should say it may have a tendency that way, because the very small farms are generally worked by the man and his family, and they will never as a general rule get on the poor rate, whereas the big farms are worked by labourers who may get on the poor rate.

THIRTY-FIRST DAY.

Monday, 14th May, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. HENRY LOCKWOOD, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Henry Lockwood. 14 May 1906.

12519. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) What has been the effect of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund upon guardians of poor unions?—I am not sure that the existence of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund has any considerable effect on the system of administration of guardians of poorer unions, but of course they benefit by the repayment of salaries and grants in respect of indoor relief and other charges. It is possible that guardians of poorer unions have been induced to spend more money both upon salaries of officers and upon indoor relief than they would have done had it not been for the assistance they received from the fund.

12520. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Would you favour the inclusion of more unions within the area of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund? Might we have your views as to the difficulties likely to be made from such areas with respect to their inclusion for Poor Law and for other than Poor Law purposes in the county of London or Metropolitan Poor Fund area?—This is a big question and it is difficult to say, if one begins to include some outside unions, where one could stop. If, for instance, the unions of West Ham and Edmonton and the parish of Willesden were included in the Metropolitan area for Metropolitan Common Poor Fund purposes, there would be added something like two millions of additional population, including an appreciable proportion of potential pauperism; and without going into the question very much more minutely than I have been able to do at present, I should be inclined to say that the contributions to the fund likely to be received from these three administrative areas would be considerably less than what they would be entitled to receive, and consequently the effect upon the rates of what are regarded as richer unions and parishes already contributing to the fund would be considerable. As regards difficulties likely to be met from such areas, I have not as yet had time to consult those able to give an opinion on the subject, but I hope to do so.

12521. Would you extend, and if so in what manner, the operations of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—As to this I would refer the Commission to a Report of the Local Government and Museums Committee of the London County Council on the subject of suggested legislation, for further equalisation of rates. This report includes, *inter alia*, suggestions for increased allowance in respect of in-maintenance and of expenditure on building, and I should be disposed to agree with those proposals. I gather from the report that the Committee hesitate to suggest outdoor relief being made a charge upon the fund, and with this hesitation I entirely agree.

12522. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, as I understand it, this fund is raised for the purpose of assisting the poor unions. Does it ever happen that your board refuses to sanction the increase in an officer's salary to come out of this fund, and then recommends boards of guardians that if they consider an increase is necessary, such increase may be paid out of the local rates?—The history of the establishment of the fund will be found on page cv. of the Local Government Board's Annual Report of 1905. It was originated, undoubtedly, with a view to assisting poorer unions. It does sometimes happen that the Local Government Board refuses to sanction increase in salaries to be charged to the fund, and recommends guardians that if in the case of certain "assistant officers" they consider an increase is necessary, it should be paid out of the local rates. It has been more than once suggested by myself and my predecessors that in certain particular cases, an exceptionally meritorious officer might be awarded a salary in excess of the general scale, and that with a view to avoiding difficulties in respect of the fund, the increase might be paid out of the local rates. It is held, however, that, for other than certain assistant officers, this would not be possible without legislation, and a Bill with a view to giving effect to the suggestions aforesaid was prepared some four years ago; but owing to opposition on the part of some of the poorer unions and parishes, who were under the impression, wrongly, as I conceive, that they would be losers by such an arrangement, the Bill was blocked and it never passed into law.

Salary of Receiver of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12523. Who is the responsible head of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, and what is his salary?—The salary of the Receiver of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund is, I believe, £400 per annum. This is expended mainly on the clerical staff that have to deal with the distribution of the fund. The total expenditure charged upon the fund for the year ended Lady Day, 1904, was £1,578,000.

Power to combine London Unions for special purposes.

12524. With reference to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, is it not a fact that the explanatory clause in the Act of Parliament expressly declares that the President of the Local Government Board has the power to unite boards of guardians for anything which they may individually have the power to do?—The Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867 did empower the Local Government Board to unite boards of guardians and form districts for practically any purposes connected with Poor Law administration.

Receipts and expenditure of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12525. (*Mr. Loch.*) Will you explain how the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund is levied and distributed?—I would venture to suggest that particulars as to the levying and distribution of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund should be obtained from some other source better acquainted with details than I am. For figures of levying and distribution, in the Board's Annual Report for 1904–5 at page 502, Appendix (h) will be found a table setting out the various items of cost incurred by guardians and chargeable to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, and on page 508, Appendix (h), Table No. 113 shows the nett amount received from the fund by each union and parish

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

for each year ended Lady Day, from 1835 to 1904, and on page 510, Table 114, is set out the nett amount contributed to the fund by the several unions and parishes for the same period. The rateable value of each union is given at page 504, Table 110.

12526. Can you show the items on which the fund is expended, and the amounts distributed on each item to the several unions in that period, during twenty or thirty years, showing also the increase per cent.: and can you also show the increase per cent. of population, or decrease, in the union areas?—I regret that I have been unable to get material to answer your question, though I can supply a card giving the population increase or decrease for each union area since 1881.

Check on items of expenditure chargeable to Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12527. Will you explain whether the board exercise any check on the growth of expenditure under the heads of medicine and medical and surgical apparatus, salaries of officers, rations of officers, maintenance of pauper children, and maintenance of indoor paupers: or whether the expenditure on these heads as returned by the unions is accepted without special scrutiny?—As to checking of growth of expenditure under the head medicine and medical and surgical apparatus, the Receiver of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, I believe, queries any unusual expenditure on particular items observable in the half-yearly claim, including, no doubt, any such under the head of medicine, etc. The same applies also to claims for maintenance of pauper children or indoor adult paupers which are controlled to a large extent by the certificates of accommodation for each institution, whether workhouse, infirmary, or school. With regard to salaries of officers so far from expenditure on these heads being accepted without special scrutiny, I think I may say the scrutiny is minute, exhaustive, and, I might even add, vexatious on occasion. Many examples illustrating the careful and minute scrutiny could be given if desired.

Scale of certain officers' salaries chargeable upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12528. Will you explain whether there is any limitation of salaries for the several classes of officials employed in the unions, in the service of the Poor Law, and, if so, what are the limits: whether additions or gratuities are made by the guardians in addition to such grants from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund: whether such additions or gratuities are reported to and approved by the Local Government Board and what system is adopted by the Local Government Board in approving of salaries paid out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—The limitation of salaries is confined to clerks, assistant-clerks, relieving-officers and superintendent relieving officers. I hand in a table giving particulars as to this (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (B)).

Return of cost of salaries, etc., in certain London unions.

12529. Can you furnish the Commission with a return of the salaries, and their increments, showing, (*a*) payments from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund: (*b*) payments by the guardians from other sources, either of the London unions generally during the past ten or twenty years, or of certain unions; for example, Lambeth, St. Pancras, Poplar, St. George's, Hanover Square, St. Marylebone, St. Olave, Woolwich, St. George-in-the-East, City, Battersea, Kensington, Camberwell?—I regret I am not able to supply the return asked for, not having the material necessary for its preparation.

"Rations," registration and vaccination fees, and vagrants as charges upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12530. In regard to rations of officers, is there any necessity for the continuance of this system?—In each institution it seems desirable that the rations of officers should be supplied to them by the guardians as the most convenient arrangement.

12531. In regard to "registration fees" and "vaccination fees and expenses," should not these items be chargeable to some other authority and the work they represent transferred?—Speaking for myself, I think vaccination fees and vaccination matters generally might very well be managed by some other authority than the guardians. Vaccination questions very often involve acrimonious discussion, and a good deal of ærated oratory and waste of time at guardians' meetings, and it has not infrequently been the case that guardians have been elected not for any special qualification they might possess for Poor Law administration, but rather on account of their views for or against vaccination. As regards registration fees, for census purposes the borough area is taken. Those concerned with population and health questions agree, I believe, that the borough might well be the authority to undertake registration matters, but it would be necessary, I presume, to compensate for loss of office in a good many cases in consequence of the transfer. Most clerks to guardians, for instance, are superintendent registrars in London, and their position would have to be considered.

12532. In regard to expenses under the "Homeless Poor Acts," might not this item be repealed?—It seems not unreasonable that the expenses should continue to be a charge upon London generally.

12533. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In regard to "Maintenance of Indoor Paupers," does the system work satisfactorily? Considered in relation to the population in different unions, does it represent a fairly equal administration, for example, of the City, Hackney, Poplar, Camberwell, Bethnal Green, Whitechapel?—I am not sure that I quite understand this question, though it may be observed that Hackney, Poplar, Camberwell and Bethnal Green all receive from the fund on balance, whereas the City of London on balance contributes very largely to the fund—at the rate, in fact, of £160,000 per annum. The other receives on balance as follows: Hackney, £21,000, Poplar, £44,000, Camberwell, £25,000, Bethnal Green, £400,000.

Salary and staff of Receiver Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12534. What is the office and the staff which now manages the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund? What are the salaries paid for the office?—The £400 per annum, as already mentioned, is paid to the Receiver of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, but I am not aware how that sum is distributed.

Report of Committee London County Council on Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12535. (*Chairman.*) I gather from your evidence with reference to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund that you are disposed to concur with certain recommendations that were made by a Committee of the London County Council to the effect that it might be possible to extend the operation of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund further as regards indoor relief, but not as regards out-door relief?—That is so.

12536. Was any action taken on that report?—As a matter of fact, I believe it has been referred back to the Committee.

Question of inclusion of West Ham and Edmonton in benefits of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12537. Do you think it would be possible to keep the West Ham and Edmonton areas outside?—I can only say this: that I have consulted Dr. Hilleary, who is the Town Clerk and clerk to the guardians of West Ham, and also the clerk to the guardians of Croydon, and I have seen one or two representative persons of Richmond, and, as might be expected, they say that before being prepared to give an opinion one way or the other, they would like to know a great deal more of what the results of their inclusion might possibly be. As a matter of fact, I think the disposition of those who are likely to be affected by it is to remain where they are; but they naturally gave no opinion until they had information, which I was not able to give them, of what was intended. When you speak of West Ham, I do not know whether it would be intended to include only the borough of West Ham, or the union of West Ham. That is a question which would have to be considered, and would have a very considerable effect on results.

12538. You think those districts will be able, without very serious detriment, to bear the burden of their own rates?—I should hope so. I may say Edmonton is not in my district. I have just remembered that an acquaintance of mine, who happens to live in the Edmonton union, in the Hornsey borough, was quite certain that it would be financially to the disadvantage of his part of Edmonton if it came into London.

Effect on policy of Guardians of exclusion of out-relief from Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12539. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, would you tell us whether you think that the principle of putting out-relief on the local rates administered by the guardians, and the indoor relief on the Common Fund, really has operated to produce economy in outdoor relief?—I think it has. I am inclined to think that in fact one might say it was in the nature of a bribe.

12540. We were told by those inspectors who had to do with outdoor unions, which are on the same principle, that it had not actually changed the administration much, and the instance of Poplar within the Metropolitan area would rather go to that conclusion?—I think in the case of Poplar the outdoor relief, which has risen by leaps and bounds in the last few years, has been more or

less exceptional. I understood your question to refer to the principle generally.

12541. I was wondering whether that principle was sufficiently strong to counteract a growing policy in favour of outdoor relief?—I do not know about counteract, but I certainly think it would tend to, I should say, reduce the amount which they would be prepared to expend upon it.

12542. You think it has actually done so?—I think so. Taking London generally, I put it in this way: that I think there are certain localities where there would possibly have been more outdoor relief if it had been a charge upon the whole of London.

ffect of etropolitan ommon oor Fund on st of indoor lief.

12543. Do you think that throwing all sorts of classes of people into the workhouses has actually resulted in a more extravagant maintenance of workhouses?—I do not know that the actual inclusion of different classes in the same workhouse has resulted in extravagance. I think, as I have said in previous reports, that where you get the various classes mixed together—the aged, infirm, and the so-called able-bodied—it is so very difficult to draw strict lines between the conditions of the two that the able-bodied are more disposed to indoor relief than they would otherwise be where they could be separated and dealt with under separate conditions.

12544. What I wanted to arrive at was this: Do you think the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, in the encouragement that it has given to workhouses, has prevented the sort of test workhouse which you had in Poplar, at Kensington, and at other places, prior to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—Kensington was established as a test house, and so was Poplar, in old days, after the establishment of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12545. After the increase of the equalisation?—The Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was established in 1867.

12546. Then there was another considerable increase, was there not?—The equalisation of rates, I think, was applied rather to the sanitary authority than to the Poor Law authority, though they benefited to some extent, of course.

12547. You do not think it has had any effect in making workhouse maintenance more liberal and more luxurious?—I think possibly it has. Unquestionably I think it may be accepted as a fact, or something likely to be the result, that, as you increase the number of pockets into which you can dip for a particular purpose, so there is less restraint imposed upon those who have to spend the money.

12548. Considering the effect of this, we have, perhaps from the point of view of economy, to balance the decrease in out-relief by the increase in the lavishness of workhouse maintenance?—I think that is not an unreasonable suggestion.

12549. Do you think that is borne out by the facts at all?—Yes, I think I may say it is.

estion of creasing arge upon ndon as a hole in spect of in-aintenance.

12550. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In answer to a question put by Mr. Nunn you refer to the report of the Museums Committee of the London County Council, and in that report they make a suggestion for the abolition of the 4d. per head payment from the county grant?—And include it in one sum.

12551. And substitute an additional 5d. per head for all inmates from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—Yes, I think they did that. I think they proposed that. I should not myself have seen any considerable objection to increasing the charge in respect of in-maintenance.

espective ntributions om Metro-litan ommon oor Fund d from unty uncil wards in-aintenance.

12552. Would it make any difference to the boards of guardians, whether it came as a county grant or through the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—I do not suppose it would. They would not care where it came from, so long as they got the extra payment.

12553. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There is this difference, is there not, that by the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund the payment to the Guardians of 5d. per head per day is limited?—Limited by the certificate of the workhouse to ages.

12554. It does not include the children?—No.

12555. Whilst the money that comes from the London County Council takes them all, does it not?—Yes, that would be so. You are speaking, not of the lunacy allowance, I take it, but the 4d. allowance from the London County Council, which was established in 1888, and that is based upon the average number of inmates for the five years prior to 1888, so it is an unchangeable sum up to the present moment, that is to say, each Union gets the same amount each year.

12556. (*Mr. Bentham.*) If the 5d. a day was provided from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund instead of the County Fund, what effect would it have on the administration of the Union?—I do not know that it would have any.

12557. It would be different, they would get it on all their inmates for the whole year, 5d. a day per head?—I am assuming in any case, whatever additional allowance might be made, there would still be the check of the certificate of the workhouse. That was provided in order to prevent overcrowding. At the present moment, the 5d. that they receive from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund is not paid in respect of any inmate over the number for which the workhouse is certified.

12558. And the County Grant is made irrespective of that?—Yes, it is based, as I say, upon the average number of the five years prior to 1888.

12559. Would that mean that the guardians would immediately set about increasing their accommodation in order to get a large certification?—No, I do not think it would be worth their while to do that. They would still have to pay for the buildings themselves, and in any case they would have to get the assent of the Local Government Board before they could do it.

12560. When the number is in excess of the number for which the place is certified, they would get no payment, would they?—No.

12561. Then it would clearly pay the guardians, would it not, to increase the accommodation for that number; or would it not?—It would depend a good deal upon what the accommodation was going to cost. I am sorry to say it has become exceedingly costly in London and the neighbourhood.

12562. You do not think the effect of the change on the Board would be very great?—No, I do not think it would.

Checks on amount of salaries chargeable to Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12563. You have referred to the limitation of salaries to the various officers. Is there any limitation to the number of officials in any particular department?—No fixed limit.

12564. A board may have as many officials as it thinks proper, with no limitation as to amount paid, except those that are mentioned in the scale of salaries handed in by you?—The limitation there was intended to apply to salaries, not to officers.

12565. With no limitation with regard to salary, except as applying to those officers mentioned in your scale of salaries?—There is this limitation, as I explain; that every increase of salary however infinitesimal, has to be scrutinised by the Local Government Board in connection with its possible effect upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12566. Do the board often refuse to sanction the salary of officers that is proposed by boards of guardians?—Very often.

12567. You think the check is quite sufficient in that respect to prevent any extravagant payment of the officers that are not mentioned in the Schedule?—I think there is no doubt about that.

12568. Do the Local Government Board often refuse to sanction the appointment of an officer that is applied for?—You mean the creation of a fresh appointment?

12569. Yes?—They always ask for full particulars before they assent to it.

Clerks to Guardians giving whole time to duties, *et per contra.*

12570. In your answer to a question put by Mr. Loch you say: "Most clerks to guardians, for instance, are superintendent Registrars in London, and their position would have to be considered." Are they allowed to take positions for which they are paid by the guardians, other than registrarships, in addition to the salary that is already mentioned in the scale of salaries handed in by you?—I do not recollect a case in London in which a clerk to guardians holds any other office.

12571. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) They used to be assessment

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

clerks ?—Yes, but not now ; there are only three left, I think, in London.

12572. (*Mr. Bentham.*) A clerk is not permitted to take the position of clerk to the Assessment Committee, is he ?—Yes, but it happens now that the Assessment Authorities in London are the boroughs, except under certain circumstances, I think, where the borough is not wholly coterminous with one or more unions.

12573. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There is the case of the City of London too ?—Yes.

12574. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Any clerk may hold the position of superintendent registrar ?—Yes.

12575. Or even the registrarship of births, deaths and marriages ?—I do not know whether I have mentioned it, but, as a matter of fact, registrarships of births and deaths are, to a large extent, held by officers in the clerk's office of the guardians ; so that there again there will be another group of persons who would be dissatisfied with the transfer of these appointments.

12576. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the clerk, may I ask whether it is at all common for him to be a practising solicitor doing other work ?—I do not think it is common. I do not say that he never does.

12577. Are there many who do not give their whole time ?—They give their whole time, properly speaking : but where a clerk is a solicitor it is always expected that he will conduct all the legal business of the guardians.

12578. I understand that Mr. Cutter of Woolwich is not pledged to give his whole time ?—That is possible, but I really could not say.

12579. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Would he be allowed to practise privately ?—No, I should say not.

12580. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Could we not have exact information on this point ?—I can only say that I think not. I take it that if the Board became aware of it they would question the propriety.

Question of making special extra remuneration to officers a charge upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12581. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Gratuities are not paid, are they, out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—No.

12582. But the board very often tells the local board that they may give a gratuity if they think an officer deserves it ?—Yes, it is in the interests of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund to save that.

12583. If the officer is really entitled to it, do not you think the better policy would be to put it on the Common Poor Fund. If the man deserves the extra money, it seems rather hard on the poor unions that they should pay it ?—Yes, but I have already referred to that point. I have said : "It has been more than once suggested by myself and my predecessors that in certain particular cases, exceptionally meritorious officers might be awarded a salary in excess of the general scale." One not unfrequently hears that a workhouse master has been very efficient and done this, that and the other, which has saved the local rates very considerably. In a case of that sort it has always seemed to me that the local rates might fairly be burdened with the smaller additions to the salary.

12584. You do not think they ought to go on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—No, I think that there are certain instances in which it might reasonably be expected that an addition to the salary for special services might be a charge on the local rates. However, you will no doubt remember that the Bill for that purpose was blocked, I think it was in 1901.

Effect of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund on indoor relief.

12585. I think I understood you to say to Mrs. Webb that you thought in all probability to some extent some boards of guardians went in for the in-relief policy, because of the Common Poor Fund. Do you think that that holds very much in the metropolis ?—I think this : that inasmuch as the cost of in-maintenance is, for the greater part, repaid from the larger fund, there would be a disposition to give in-door relief : where the local purse had to bear the whole cost perhaps the same inducement would not exist.

Statistics as to relief in certain London Unions.

12585 (A). (*Mr. Loch.*) As regards the administration of Poor Law relief in St. Olaves, Hackney, Camberwell, Poplar and West Ham during the last ten years, can you state : (*a*) the numbers in and out, (*b*) the out-relief arrangements, (*c*) the cost of in and out-relief year by year ?—I hand in a statement (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (C)) giving the numbers in and out, the out-relief arrangements, the cost of in-and out-relief year by year, from 1896 to 1905, in Bermondsey, Hackney, Camberwell, Poplar and West Ham.

12586. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) The increase of in-maintenance is rather striking right through the table that you give us : Bermondsey, Camberwell, Hackney, Poplar and West Ham. There is a tremendous increase all the way through there. Even in Bermondsey, where the numbers are not very high, in-maintenance has gone up very considerably ?—Yes, that is the fact, that for the last twelve years—I think there is some slight difference now—but certainly between, we will say, 1894 and 1901 or 1902, the ratio of increase was greater in indoor than in outdoor.

12587. Do you think that that has anything to do with the Common Poor Fund ?—In that way I think, that it is paid for by a large purse. The guardians get repayment in respect of it.

12588. The point I want to get at is : a board is not necessarily more economical because it spends its money on in-door relief ?—Economical ?—to that extent, no.

12589. Would it be possible, without very much trouble, to do all the unions in London in the manner that Mr. Loch has asked you to do these five unions—because that paper is rather instructive ?—It could be done, but I assure you it required a very considerable amount of work to get out the return I have handed in. To supplement the information would, I fear, involve more time and work than I should be able to apply.

Question extending area for Metropoli Common Poor Fun

12590. There is one other matter, namely, extending the metropolitan area, that I wish to ask you about. I notice you point out that if Willesden, West Ham and Edmonton were to come in, they would probably only bring in poverty, as it were : is there any objection to bringing in Wimbledon and Croydon, and other well-to do districts, to balance these others ?—No. As I think I said, it is a very important question. When one begins extending, one has to decide where one is going to end. I have already answered one member of the Commission that the representatives of two or three of the adjoining unions of London, before giving anything approaching an opinion on the subject, have asked to get full particulars of what would be involved, probably, financially by their inclusion.

12591. Your objection would be met if you brought in richer areas balancing the poorer ones ?—That would be so.

Check of Local Governme Board on appointme of additio officers.

12592. It is true, is it not, that the Local Government Board occasionally object to the appointment of new officers ?—You mean the individuals ?

12593. Yes ?—They have sometimes.

12594. And also to the creation of the offices ?—Yes.

12595. That is to say, if a board of guardians were wanting to employ a large number say, two or more relieving officers, the board has, at times, objected to that ?—Yes, they certainly would want all particulars in support of the proposal.

12596. Is not there on record any occasion where they have definitely stopped the appointment of officers as being, in their judgment, unnecessary officers ?—I have no doubt there have been cases of that sort. I do not call a particular one to mind at the moment.

12597. But there are many cases, are there not ?—Yes. I have just been reminded that in the case of the City of London they were proposing to increase the clerical staff there, and the Board objected.

12598. I think there was another union too, but that does not matter. There is not any possibility in London of the appointment of too many officers ?—That is so.

12599. The whole thing is safeguarded very jealously, first by your own Department, and then by the people who control the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, so that it is really a very difficult thing to get officers appointed at all, other than quite the ordinary ones ?—That is true.

12600. I notice you are not in favour of abolishing rations ?—No, it seems to me that, for administrative purposes, it would be difficult. I am talking of officers all residing in a large workhouse.

Definition o " the Metro polis," and possibility o its extensio

12601. (*Mr. Phelps.*) First of all, what is the Metropolis ?—The Metropolis is the area included in the Metropolis Local Management Act of 1867.

12602. It is the creation of an Act of Parliament ?—Yes.

12603. There is no reason why it is stopped at one point for one thing and at another for another ?—No.

12604. There is no reason for not extending its area ?—No, except possibly the difficulty in administering so large an area.

12605. Administrative difficulties ?—Yes.

12606. With regard to the principle of contribution, it is mainly confined to contribution for cases of indoor relief ?—Yes, and salaries.

12607. What principle is involved in that. I see the policy of it, but what principle is involved in it ?—I do not quite understand. The object, of course, was to relieve the poorer unions.

12608. Why should it be confined to cases of in-door relief ?—I think the reason of that was, in the first inception, it was felt that it was better to so confine it, as it might otherwise tend to an undesirable increase in out-door relief.

12609. That is what I call the policy of it. There is no other reason for it ?—Not that I am aware of.

12610. Do you think it would be possible to make the administration of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund a test of good administration ?—In what way do you suggest.

12611. A contribution should be refused where the cubic space was not up to a certain standard, or to workhouses that were overcrowded ; that the distribution of it should be made a method of testing administration ?—There is a provision now for that, but the process of applying it is so cumbersome and roundabout that I think it has never practically been applied. In terms of 33 and 34 Vict. Cap. 18 Sec. 1 (4) the Board are entitled, under certain circumstances, to withhold the grant for a certain period. The difficulty of applying the provision in the Act has arisen through the several preliminaries and conditions held to be necessary for the preparation and enforcement of an Order.

12612. That has not been acted on ?—No.

12613. Is there a great lack of uniformity, should you say, in in-door administration in London ?—I do not know that there is.

12614. It is not a crying difficulty that meets you as an inspector ?—No.

12615. A great deal has been said about the law of settlement ; you do not think there is any difficulty in that way ?—No.

12616. It would not be worth while to try and use this fund as a means of insisting on uniformity ?—I think the fund might very possibly be used in that direction, only means would have to be provided for simplifying the methods.

12617. It has been suggested to us from many quarters that something in the way of a central authority for London Poor Law might be established. It seems to me that this fund might possibly be the nucleus of it ?—Yes.

12618. Do you see, on the surface, any great objection to that ?—To one central authority ? I think there are a good many.

12619. That this fund should be administered by a body which had a certain amount of control over the administration of London ?—That would be a body which would have control over so much of the relief as is included in the repayment from the common poor fund ; that is to say, indoor relief.

12620. Yes ?—I think that is possible ; in fact, it is a point that my colleague and I have considered more than once ; but there have been difficulties in finding an existing authority who could carry it out.

12621. (*Dr. Downes.*) I do not know whether you have referred to the amount of work that the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund entails at the Local Government Board ?—No, I have not. One could spend an hour in describing it, I think ; there is an enormous amount of it.

12622. Sometimes on very small items in themselves ?—Very much so. I had in fact written out a description of what had to be done where it was a question of the increase of the salary of an assistant engineer of 2s. a week, but I thought it would weary the Commissioners to hear it. It is common knowledge that an enormous amount of work is involved in checking salaries in connection with the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund specially.

12623. Are you aware whether the number of paupers in a union has been at any time taken as the basis of regulating the salaries of clerks ?—Yes, there is a system under which it is endeavoured to somehow assimilate the salary to the amount of work probably involved by the figures showing the population and pauperism and so on.

System of basing clerk's salary on number of paupers in the Union.

12624. So assuming a very large increase in the number of paupers, possibly as the result of lax administration, if that basis were taken the clerk would have a greater claim on the fund ?—That is so.

12625. I think some time back you held an inquiry as to the increase of the borrowing powers of the Metropolitan Asylums Board ?—Yes, in 1902, I think.

Proposal to increase borrowing powers of the Metropolitan Asylums Board and apathy of ratepayers.

12626. It was on the 11th March, 1902, as a matter of fact. The object of the inquiry, I believe, was with a view to doubling the borrowing power of the Metropolitan Asylums Board ?—That is so, it was a very large amount ; I forget what the borrowing powers were.

12627. At that time it was one-tenth of the rateable value of the district ; the rateable value of the district at that time was just short of £40,000,000 ?—Yes, it is £41,000,000 now. I remember that very well. I remember also in connection with that inquiry a question arose as to how the usual practice in an inquiry of that sort should be carried out of posting notices of the approaching inquiry on every church and chapel door in the district, that would mean the whole of London ; and we came to the conclusion that we ought to be able to manage without that, and it was ultimately arranged that each board of guardians and each Borough Council should have a certain number of notices of the inquiry sent to them with a request to post them outside their own public institutions, their own offices, and so on, so that there can be no question at all that full information of the approaching inquiry was available. I certainly anticipated from what I had read and what I had heard at meetings of boards of guardians, that there would be very considerable opposition, so I had taken perhaps more than usual care in getting up the case. On the day of the inquiry there were present the clerk, two of his assistants. I think two or three representatives of local papers, and one gentleman from Fulham, and the reason of his appearing to object was that he was under the impression that the main object of the increase of borrowing powers of the Metropolitan Asylums Board was to establish opposite a factory on the Thames at Fulham a small-pox ambulance station. He was the only person who appeared to oppose.

12628. So that, although a question of borrowing £4,000,000 or thereabouts was concerned, that was the whole of the public interest that was shown ?—Yes, and as I have already said, notwithstanding there was a full opportunity of knowing what was going to happen. There is no doubt it was fully advertised.

Apathy of ratepayers in regard to new Poor Law schools for Poplar.

12629. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is it not true that a Local Government Board inquiry was held in Poplar with regard to the Shenfield Schools which are so much discussed now ?—It was in connection with the Shenfield Schools, but the inquiry was similar to that just mentioned to enable the guardians to increase their borrowing powers.

12630. Was that advertised well ?—Fully.

12631. What amount of interest did the local ratepayers take ?—I remember there were half-a-dozen or so ratepapers present as objectors.

12632. There was no real interest taken ?—Apparently not.

Question of altering method of assessment in London.

12633. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) As regards the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund have you ever thought it desirable that one authority to assess the whole of London, including the City of London, should be established ; one authority to do the whole of the assessment work in London ?—I cannot say I have ever thought that. It is a subject to which I have not up to the present applied my mind.

12634. The poorer unions of London have thought the City of London does not pay its full share because of the basis of the assessment ?—Yes, occasionally, but I fancy one would hear something to the contrary on the part of the City of London itself, which contributes £160,000 a year to the fund.

12635. (*Mr. Loch*). With regard to salaries chargeable to the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund have you thought whether, instead of the present system, a system might be

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

adopted by which on the local rates paying so much the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, or some other fund, should pay a proportionate amount thus throwing salaries back in this way on to the rates to a certain extent?—I have already in part replied to that question in reply to Mr. Lansbury. I have more than once suggested that something of that sort might be done.

Question of dividing cost of salaries between local rates and Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

12636. Your phrase is: "An exceptionally meritorious officer might be awarded a salary in excess of the general scale." My suggestion is different; I ask whether, as a rule, as a matter of habit, a system can be adopted by which local rates should pay a certain amount and the central fund a certain amount?—I think if that system had been adopted when the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was first instituted, probably a good deal less might be expended at this present day than is expended. I am hardly prepared to say we could go back on that now.

Question of making grant from Metropolitan Common Poor Fund conditional on general efficiency of administration.

12637. Mr. Phelps suggested that the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund might be used as a fund more or less guiding and controlling expenditure and management, and you refer, I think, to the Metropolis Poor Law Amendment Act of 1870. The conditions under which the Local Government Board can interfere are very precise; for instance, the maximum number of paupers to be maintained in their workhouses is one point, and there are others as to the proper work being done with regard to drainage, sewers, ventilation, etc.; those are all specific points, but would it be possible to adopt a line on a more general line, saying that only upon a satisfactory report, in regard not only to the fulfilment of those points, but the general administration of the union, the grant should be made?—I do not know whether that is provided for in the Act; I think there must be certain specific things in default, must there not?

12638. Yes, it is quite specific here: "The provision of proper drainage, sewers, ventilation, fixtures, furniture, surgical or medical appliances, or directing the appointment of any officer, or prescribing the maximum number of paupers to be maintained in any workhouse or asylum," and so on; particular points like that which may or may not be called into question at all?—True.

12639. Do you think a report on what one may call the administration on these points, and on others generally, might take the place of this detailed statement?—I take it that would require legislation, and I should imagine that it would not be easy to get an Act passed to give the Board power of that sort.

12640. Granted the legislation, taking the question on its merits purely, you would be inclined to say that would be a good line to take?—On a report?

12641. On a report in regard to the union and its administration including the matters laid down here, do you think the question of granting or not granting out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund in that manner would raise the administration?—Of a workhouse or a school?

12642. Yes, or out-relief or any other matter that comes under the guardians?—The Common Poor Fund only comes in in-relief. I can imagine cases in which the knowledge that the grant might easily be withdrawn would have a good effect on the administration of a particular union; beyond that I do not know that I can go.

12643. That is what I am referring to; but supposing the question were, taking the broadest sense, the system of control, and the question of out-relief was included, would you still hold to the opinion that that might be one thing upon which a report would be required?—I think outdoor relief must in any case be left, to a considerable extent, to the discretion of the local authorities, so long as they continue to exist.

Effect of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund upon Indoor Relief.

12644. With regard to the indoor relief, is it not true that though the action of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund may have tended to increase it, or the expenditure upon it; is it not true that in all the large urban centres there is now a continuous increase of indoor relief, and a larger expenditure upon it?—I think that is so; I think you will find that in all populous places.

12645. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) As to the power of the Local Government Board to combine unions under the Metropolitan Poor Act, I think your answer to Mr. Lansbury's question goes a little further than you intend, does it not. That would lead to the inference that unions might be combined under the Metropolitan Poor Act for the purpose of outdoor relief. That is not so, is it?—I did not mean that.

Power to combine London Unions for certain purposes.

12646. It is only for the purpose of indoor relief, because the Act requires as a condition that there shall be an asylum?—Yes; I did not intend it to have the meaning you suggest.

12647. I wanted to make that quite clear, because I thought that was your intention. With regard to indoor expenditure and the effect upon it of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, it is this, is it not, that putting it generally the guardians get a daily allowance from the fund, for each inmate, namely 5d. a day?—Yes.

Fixed amount of contribution from Metropolitan Common Poor Fund towards maintenance of each indoor pauper and its effect.

12648. So that supposing they increased the expenditure by making the living in the workhouse more luxurious, the cost would not fall on the Common Poor Fund, but on the guardians themselves?—The excess over that would not fall on the Common Poor Fund.

12649. It would make no difference in the amount they get from the Common Poor Fund?—No.

12650. Because the amount from the Common Poor Fund is fixed, a certain amount in respect of each inmate?—Yes.

12651. Therefore the fund itself would not have any influence in determining whether the life in the workhouse should be more comfortable or not?—To this extent, that supposing the cost of an inmate is, we will say 10d. a day, they get half of it back at all events.

12652. It does not depend on what they spend, the amount they get from the fund is fixed?—It is.

12653. Consequently anything additional they spend on making things more comfortable falls on them, and not on the Fund?—That is true.

Effect of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund indoor re

12654. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I quite understand Sir Samuel Provis' point, that you do not encourage luxurious living *per se*, but might not you, by including certain classes within the workhouses who had formerly been outside, indirectly alter the character of the workhouse and make it into an asylum, rather than a test for able-bodied?—My point would be, although the sum is fixed, still in as much as the guardians get that amount they are helped to that extent, and it would have possibly that effect, I think.

12655. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) If you increased the class that comes into the workhouse you would want more accommodation, would you not—if you created a wider class?—That is so. You would require more accommodation per head for certain classes, than for others.

12656. And the provision of accommodation falls on the locality and not on the Fund?—That is true.

12657. Gratuities are given for special services, are they not?—Yes.

12658. The special service therefore is rendered to the particular union, is it not?—That is so.

12659. Would it be right to bring that as a charge entirely on the Metropolis?—I am not sure that it would.

12660. With regard to the area, at present the unions are the unions which are wholly included in the Administrative County of London, are they not?—Yes.

Difficulti as to ex ing area Metropo Common Poor Fu

12661. There is no overlapping now, since the London Government Act of 1899?—No.

12662. So that you have got, for all purposes of local government, one area. Would it be open to some objection to extend the area of London for Poor Law purposes, if it were not extended for other purposes as well?—I think there would be great difficulty attending that, certainly.

12663. Therefore if any action were taken with a view of extending London for Poor Law purposes, the extension should be for all Local Government purposes generally?—I think it would be most difficult to bring them in piecemeal for one purpose and not another.

12664. (*Mr. Phelps.*) The area was originally chosen for the purpose of the Fund long before the administrative county was formed, was it not?—It was the area under the Metropolis Management Act.

12665. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) As regards the method of administering out-relief, do committees rotate? Are

tem of
ini-te r-
out-reli f
London.

e supervi-
n, qual fi-
ions, an i
aties of
ieving
cers.

there any out-relief rules? What is the number of relieving officers?—There is no rotation of committees as a rule. The majority of guardians in London administer relief by committees. The number of relieving officers, of course, varies considerably, as do the out-relief rules.

12666. (*Mr. Nunn.*) What are your views as to the (1) training, and (2) best form of supervision for relieving officers? In regard to (2) would you prefer (*a*) cross-visitor; (*b*) superintendent of relieving officers, both union officers; (*c*) inspector or inspectors of out-relief; (*d*) any other method?—The present system of appointing assistant relieving officers, though it has its drawbacks, affords fairly good opportunities for training for the office of relieving officer. It would be, no doubt, advantageous to the officers and to administration generally, if both relieving officers and their assistants took note of the methods adopted by the Charity Organisation Society. I have often wondered that no enterprising firm of publishers have re-issued separately so much of the Consolidated Order, Article 215, etc., and other Orders of the Board, setting out the duties and responsibilities of relieving officers; and evidence of acquaintance with these might well be made one of the conditions of appointment. With regard to supervision, the appointment of superintendent relieving officers is decidedly useful in my opinion. The usefulness necessarily depends a good deal upon the qualifications of the particular officer. With regard to cross-visiting, it may have its advantages. On the other hand, it may tend to some extent to lessen the authority of and occasion difficulties for the relieving officer. I cannot resist this opportunity of stating my opinion that a good relieving officer is worth more than the maximum salary to which he is now entitled. There is, in my opinion, no comparison whatever between the responsibilities and difficulties of a relieving officer and those of a master of a workhouse. There are many excellent masters of workhouses, no doubt, but in view of the duties appertaining to either office it has always seemed to me that, in salary and emoluments, a workhouse master has very much the best of it. A relieving officer is practically on duty the whole twenty-four hours through. He has frequently to act in difficult cases on his own responsibility; his duties take him into uncleanly houses and rough localities, he is on duty always and liable to be called up at any hour of the day or the night, and I venture to suggest that even if the maximum salary is not increased, the periodical increments might be higher, so that the maximum might be reached earlier than under the present system.

sibility of
al
vernment
ard
aining more
cise rules
out-relief.

12667. In view of the disregard of their own rules for the administration of outdoor relief by many boards, do you think it would be desirable for the Local Government Board to frame rules which, being orders of the Local Government Board, would be binding upon relieving officers and be accepted as law by boards?—I doubt if it would be possible to frame rules having the effect of orders of the Local Government Board to be binding upon relieving officers as it must so frequently happen that the latter must act on their own responsibility, and in circumstances which no general rule could be made to satisfactorily provide for.

ouping of
ndon
ions
cording to
portion of
-relief.

12668. Can you group the London boards according to their outdoor relief policy?—As to grouping the boards according to out-relief policy, I have taken the figures attached to Mr. Booth's map, and grouped the boards as follows; percentage of out-relief to total relief under 20 per cent., Bethnal Green, Kensington, Marylebone, St. George's-in-the-East, St. Giles, Strand, Westminster Whitechapel; between 40 and 50 per cent., Greenwich, Hammersmith, Lambeth, Mile End; over 50 per cent., Camberwell, Hackney, Islington, Lewisham, Poplar and Wandsworth.

mber of
ses which
n be dealt
th by one
lieving
ficer.

12669. Do you suggest any means, including more time or smaller number of cases for relieving officers, in order to produce more efficiency in the administration of relief?—As to efficiency, one finds, of course, that one man can deal with a higher number of cases than another who may be slow and not specially efficient, and it is consequently not easy to state an exact rule as to the number of cases, but Mr. Fothergill, a very well-known relieving officer of Birmingham, who was a witness before the Aged Poor Commission of 1895 recommended, I think, that the proportion to a relieving officer should not exceed 150.

12670. Can you describe the methods in use amongst relieving officers in London, for (*a*) extra union, and (*b*) extra metropolitan, enquiries, into their cases?—It is generally considered undesirable that relieving officers should leave their district, and extra union and extra metropolitan enquiries are usually made by the relieving officer of the particular outside district or by the general relieving officer appointed for the purpose.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

Method of inquiry into non-resident cases.

12671. Will you give us an analysis of the average amount and description of the relieving officers' daily work in London?—It is not easy to prescribe definite rules which would meet every case but there should be an arrangement under which a relieving officer is bound to be at a certain place, whether his home or the relief office, at certain times in every day, say one hour in the morning, and one hour in the afternoon, so that applicants may know where to find him; though of course a relieving officer can never be truly said to be off duty. The rest of the day must be apportioned by the officer in the best way he can between his clerical work and his visiting the persons on his books, which is the most important of a relieving officers' duty, and if properly done must necessarily take up a good deal of time. The time expended over different cases depends a good deal upon the idiosyncrasies of the case. In going the rounds with relieving officers I have in some instances been able to get all the information I wanted in less than 10 minutes. In other instances dealing with a prevaricator or economiser of truth a full half hour has sometimes been occupied, not to say wasted, in the endeavour to get at an essential fact.

Relief to widows with children.

12672. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to widows with families applying for relief, is it the rule in the Metropolis to give out-relief where there are no children—or, to put it in another way, is it the rule to give relief to able-bodied single women and widows without children?—It is not the rule, I should say, in the Metropolis to give out-relief to widows (able-bodied) where there are no children, and still less so to able-bodied single women with or without children.

12673. In the case of widows with children, what is the policy you would recommend, or which you think would be most successful in dealing with these? Would you take the children from them, or give them sufficient outdoor relief to maintain their children at home?—My views concur with those of the House of Lords Committee of 1888, who say: "We are of opinion that in those cases where the home and other circumstances of the widow are such that her family cannot properly be cared for, the latter system (that is, taking the children into the guardians' schools) is best, but we recommend that careful discrimination be exercised, and that the children should be left with their mother where she is a good character and able, with an outdoor allowance for such children as she cannot support from her earnings, to bring her family up respectably."

Effect of strict medical out-relief on infant death-rate.

12674. (*Mrs. Webb.*) It has been suggested that a strict administration of medical relief (outdoor), and its adjunct in food, etc.—so far as women are concerned—has the effect of raising the infantile death-rate in this class. Can you suggest to the Commission any evidence for or against this hypothesis: and any indication of the manner in which the question would be investigated?—I believe that Sir John Gorst, Mr. Theodore Dodd, and others have stated their impression that a strict administration of medical relief has had the effect of raising the infantile death-rate, but I am not in a position to suggest evidence on the subject.

12675. It has been suggested that the long and irregular hours, low earnings, and insanitary conditions characteristic of the "sweated industries," especially increase the destitution, and thus the pauperism, of certain London unions. Can you supply any evidence for or against this hypothesis?—I should like to show the Commission a box of exhibits of work and to hand in a list of articles (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (D.)) produced by persons of various ages in receipt of relief which show that relief is given to persons employed in what are called "sweated industries," but beyond this, I can offer no direct evidence on the subject.

Effect of Mr. Chaplain's circular as to adequate relief.

12676. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the adequate Relief Order of the Local Government Board, should it be considered a temporary Order, that after the advice contained in it has been given, might be withdrawn as covered by

Mr. Henry Lockwood.
14 May 1906.

the existing Laws and General Orders? What has been the effect of the Order in London or the administration of the present system?—The Local Government Board in 1900 issued, not an Order with regard to adequate relief, but a Circular, and so far as adequate relief was concerned, there was nothing in it that has not appeared from time to time in previous instructional and official circulars. The effect of the circular in London has been to occasion the belief in certain quarters, that it was intended to encourage the giving of outdoor relief.

Circulation of lists of paupers.

12677. To what extent is the Order of February 14th 1878, for the circulation of lists of pauperism, carried out in London, and with what success?—The Order of February 14th, 1878, regarding lists of paupers, was optional, and, speaking generally, the circulation is in any case, I think, confined to members of the Board. In most cases the lists of applications are printed or typewritten for the use of the relief committee, and in St. George's, Hanover Square, and one or two other places, quarterly lists are printed and circulated among the guardians.

Grouping of London unions according to percentage of out-relief.

12678. (*Chairman.*) The classification of outdoor relief, according to the percentages which you have given us is not a geographical classification. You have put the amount of relief given, but the result is not geographical?—I must point out, that unfortunately in my answer to Mr. Nunn's question, I have left out some percentages. It should be under 20 per cent.:—Bethnal Green, Kensington, Marylebone, St. George's-in-the-East, St. Giles, Strand, Westminster, and Whitechapel: from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent., Chelsea, City of London, Hampstead, Paddington, St. Georges, St. Pancras, Southwark, Stepney and Woolwich: from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent., Fulham, Holborn, Shoreditch: and between 40 per cent. and 50 per cent., Greenwich, Hammersmith, Lambeth, Mile End: and over 50 per cent., Camberwell, Hackney, Islington, Lewisham, Poplar and Wandsworth.

Preponderance of indoor relief in London and its causes.

12679. The peculiarity of London pauperism compared with the rest of the country is that the indoor relief is so much greater in proportion to the outdoor relief?—Yes.

12680. You have been a good many years in the Metropolis: how do you account for this? Is it due to the pressure of public opinion upon the guardians or do you think it is at all attributable to the question we have just left, of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—I think that the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund certainly does operate in that direction.

12681. It has tended in that direction?—I cannot help thinking it must have.

12682. If you look at it from a ratepayer's point of view, a reduction of outdoor relief may be satisfactory, but if it is accompanied by a more than corresponding amount of indoor relief, although the number of paupers may be less, the expenditure is greater?—True.

12683. Is it in consequence of the agitation against outdoor relief that there has been this steady diminution or reduction in London until recently?—I do not mean to say there has been an agitation, but the general view is that outdoor relief should be kept within, we will say, reasonable limits.

12684. And the theory which is advanced, and I think is supported in many cases by facts, is, that an increase of outdoor relief is generally accompanied by an increase of indoor relief?—Yes, very frequently it is.

12685. In the returns of outdoor relief, are those who are in receipt of medical relief always distinguished? It is the practice to lump them together, is it not?—Yes.

12685a. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) In Whitechapel is it a fact that the foreign Jews apply to and are assisted by the Jewish Board of Guardians, and that this fact, to a large extent, relieves the Whitechapel board of a considerable amount of pauperism which they would otherwise be obliged to face?—The Jewish Board of Guardians relieve those of their own faith, but the Whitechapel guardians give a certain amount of out-door medical relief. They work in co-operation with the Charity Organisation Society. In 1904, 120 cases were assisted by the latter body. In this connection, I hand in (1) a return being an extract from Appendix, Vol. III., Royal Commission on Aliens, Tables 31 and 32,* and also (2) census of foreigners, 1871. (For census table see Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (E)).

* The returns as to poor relief granted to aliens in the various unions of the Metropolis during the year 1901, have not been printed in the Appendix. For returns see Vol. III. of report of Royal Commission on Alien Immigration. [Cd. 1741-1-1903.]

Jews receiving Poor Law medical relief and also other relief from Jewish Board of Guardians.

12686. (*Chairman.*) If you look down the medical column of the return which you have just handed in you will see how very large a proportion of those aliens got medical relief. Is not the practice that when they have got the certificate or order for medical relief, they go and get substantial relief from the Jewish Board of Guardians?—That is done to a certain extent I believe.

12687. That would account perhaps for the large number of persons asking for medical relief?—Of aliens, yes: in the three East End unions, Stepney, St. George's and Whitechapel.

12688. Does that practice prevail with many people who are not aliens?—No, I think not.

12689. Not to anything like the same extent?—No, I do not know that it does.

Increase cost of in-relief London.

12690. The cost of in-door relief has gone up enormously in London?—Yes.

12691. The increased cost is much greater than the increased number of persons relieved?—Yes, I think that will be found to be so.

Relation between dynamic out-relief in-relief.

12692. Do you think that the attempts to reduce outdoor relief have increased the amount of indoor relief?—I do not know that one can be sure of cause and effect, but in the case of Bermondsey you will see that the outdoor relief has appreciably diminished in numbers within the last three or four years, but the number of indoor has appreciably increased, but with regard to that increase in indoor, there is this to be considered: that there was a new workhouse which the guardians built under mild pressure from the Board, and they have also provided no less than three children's receiving homes, with a total capacity for 250 or so, I think; so that in that particular case the rising of the indoor relief concurrently with the reduction of outdoor relief was brought about by exceptional circumstances. They had a very crowded workhouse and so on, and they consequently were giving much more outdoor relief than they would have done had the indoor accommodation at the time been adequate.

12693. That is an exceptional case?—Yes.

12694. I want to put the other theory before you, that the reduction of outdoor relief may have tended to an increase of the indoor relief?—As a general rule, I think that is not found to be the case.

Reasons increase of relief.

12695. This great increase in expenditure, I assume, is due to a more kindly and humane feeling dominating the Poor Law policy and the actions of the guardians?—I think so. There is a point I do not think I have mentioned before, that in indoor relief is of course included infirmary relief, and of recent years opinion as to what should be the proper proportion of nurses, for instance, has changed, and an increase of that sort in the staff means a very considerable increase in the cost of administrative buildings and administration.

12696. I want so far as I can to keep to outdoor relief. Do you think as regards outdoor relief there is a different or higher class applying for medical relief, than used to apply?—I do not know that there is.

Decrease outdoor relief in Bermondsey and its causes.

12697. (*Mr. Lock.*) Could you give the figures, in regard to Bermondsey, as to the amount of increase of indoor and outdoor relief?—You will find that in the table I have handed in. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (C)). They about balance one another in ten years.

12698. The 2,264, in the course of the period from 1896 to 1905, becomes 3,251, and the 3,486 in receipt of outdoor relief was reduced to 2,756?—They about balance one another.

12699. That decrease in Bermondsey in the outdoor relief is due to the cross-visitor, is it not?—Not so much to the cross visitor. It was due to the appointment of a superintendent relieving officer, who does act as cross visitor, and the establishment of the Case Paper system there.

12700. That was the influence, really, of the change of feeling on the part of the board?—I think the change of feeling on the part of the board resulted in the appointment of the superintendent relieving officer and the other matter also.

12701. Would you say there was an exaggerated outdoor relief before that date, and that this action of the board and of the visitor points that out?—I think there was an unnecessary amount of out-relief given previously to that.

12702. Did the Local Government Board at all give any advice about the question?—I do not think the board did. I personally occasionally did.

12703. Was it due to your intervention at all that the change was made?—To some extent, but I do not wish to take too much credit for it.

12704. Was it due to the fact at all that the rates were rising?—Yes, certainly, partly to that.

12705. You could not say what the rates were and how far the rates had risen in that time?—I am afraid I could not.

lation tween ict out lief and lant rtality.

12706. With regard to your answer to a question by Mrs. Webb, as to the relation between outdoor relief and a possible effect on the infantile death rate, did you read Dr. Milsom Rhodes' Report on that question?—No, I did not.

12707. You have possibly examined the figures yourself?—I cannot say I have. To tell you the truth, I rather hoped I might escape having to answer that question, as it is a medical one.

12708. You know the allegation was based on out-relief pure and simple, and not on medical data. The amount of outdoor relief was supposed to be a sign of the degree of infantile mortality, so that it really was based on the amount of normal outdoor relief, and not medical relief entirely. You have not examined the figures yourself?—No, I confess I have not.

ffect of lministra- on on t-relief.

12709. With regard to your answer to a question put by Mr. Nunn, would you say that these groupings of outdoor relief to total relief are in the main, a question of administration?—I do not know that one could say in the main. I think undoubtedly administration has a great deal to do with it, particularly in unions having a much larger percentage of poor people than others.

12710. Would you say it was due to administration in Bethnal Green?—I should say it was.

12711. Would you say in Marylebone it was due to administration?—Marylebone is a fairly well-to-do parish.

12712. Would it be due mainly to administration?—Possibly, yes.

12713. Would you say the same of Westminster?—Yes.

12714. Then practically this system of a restricted outdoor relief may be adopted in either rich or poor districts?—Restricted?

12715. That is to say, under 20 per cent.?—Bethnal Green, Kensington, Marylebone, St. George's-in-the-East, St. Giles', Strand, Whitechapel, are under 20 per cent.—it is possible but difficult.

lien paupers t Bethnal reen.

12716. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would not the foreigners come in in Bethnal Green?—To a certain extent; they are only beginning to arrive there.

12717. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) There are 4,000 on the list?—I did not know that.

12718. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would the number of 4,000 in Bethnal Green have an effect on the result?—I think some effect.

12719. How much?—I could not say how much.

12720. Would it be infinitesimal?—It would not be considerable, certainly.

ffect of estricting ut-relief.

12721. Would it not show that these unions in different parts of London, some rich, some poor, adopting a policy of restricted outdoor relief have been able to do so without any evil results, to your knowledge?—To my knowledge, certainly, without.

12722. Would you imply by that that there were evil results from this policy which are unknown to you?—No, I do not want to imply that.

12723. Therefore, practically this policy of restricted outdoor relief may apply to any of these districts without harm to the people?—I think it might.

12724. It does?—It does in these four parishes you have mentioned.

12725. Does it not in other unions?—I do not know that it does not; I do not know why it should.

12726. The policy, as it stands, is satisfactory from your point of view?—I think so. I think, as I said before, it is desirable to keep outdoor relief down as low as possible.

Adequacy of relief and of inquiry as to income.

12727. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I think you have said that you considered the inquiry on the cases generally is sufficient but do you apply that to outdoor relief cases in general?—I think I would in general. There may be exceptions, but I think as a rule there is plenty of information supplied.

12728. So that the guardians really have adequate information to go upon?—I think, speaking generally, yes.

12729. The reason I ask you is this: I have here a list of fourteen cases in which the total income after the relief was counted and after the rent is paid, varies from 1s. 3d. to 3s. 6d. a week. That is to say, that is on the relieving officer's statement that is given to the guardians. Do you consider that the guardians gave that knowing the full circumstances of the case and considering it adequate to the needs?—No, I am afraid they leave a good deal to the imagination in cases of that sort.

12730. They assume that they have not got full information?—Yes, in many cases of that sort, I think so.

12731. Two shillings a week to live upon, even after rent is paid, is cruelly inadequate?—That is an observation one has made oneself often. One feels there is something behind it which they cannot get at.

12732. You think in all those cases there is some income coming in, or do you think that these people are really suffering?—The income is possibly supplemented to a certain extent.

12733. In the cases I have mentioned, I have gone through what the relieving officer says very carefully. As in many of them there are no children, it is impossible to see where the resources could come from. I think these are only specimens of a very much larger number?—That may be so.

12734. Really the guardians are acting in these cases on the assumption that they have not information on the cases?—I suppose it is difficult to combat the suggestion, it is so.

12735. Do you know whether the relieving officers enquiring into these cases ever verify the statements of the applicants?—Yes, I believe they do.

12736. I have looked through about 200, and I think that in not more than a few of those is there any verification?—That is not in Bermondsey.

Adequacy of inquiry as to relatives liable for maintenance.

12737. I do not think it is fair to mention the name of the union. There is, I believe, a return which they are supposed to make where the relations are liable for maintenance, they are supposed to inquire into the circumstances, but my experience shows that that return is always filled up by information from the applicants, the old father and mother themselves, and that reference is hardly ever made to the relations?—I do not think that is satisfactory.

12738. Do you think that is general in London?—No, I should think it is not.

12739. You think that would be exceptional to the particular union?—I should hope so.

12740. Is there any means of compelling adequacy of out-relief, or is it left entirely to the discretion of the guardians?—I think it is left entirely to the discretion of the guardians.

Inadequate out-relief.

12741. It would be the case, would it not, that these old women, receiving from 1s. 3d. to 2s. a week to live upon, would be far better off in the workhouse?—One does not know, possibly in some cases they would.

12742. Supposing that that is their real income, assuming that a person has only 1s. 3d. to live upon?—Their material circumstances would be better in a workhouse than outside.

12743. In three at least of the cases, the condition of the home is described by the relieving officer as being in a filthy state, and one as having no furniture at all. The guardians sometimes take no notice of the recommendation of the relieving officer I find; is that so, do you think?—I hope not.

Effect of decreasing out-relief.

12744. Referring again to the question of the increase of indoor relief in Bermondsey, the connection that is generally asserted is that it is the policy of outdoor relief which gradually teaches a lesson of unthrift, and it takes some little time for that to act upon the number who go into the workhouse?—Yes, I think you may say that, outdoor relief being easier to get, naturally persons are more disposed to take that form of relief and become dependent upon others than if they had to go through the difficult process of going into the workhouse.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

12745. When that policy is reversed, the people do not at once learn the reverse lesson of maintaining themselves?—Unfortunately not.

12746. So it is natural that at first the tendency would be to fill the workhouse?—Yes.

12747. It would take some time for it to become effective?—Yes.

Connection between increase in medical out-relief and increase in number of aliens.

12748. (*Dr. Downes.*) On the question of medical relief and aliens, I do not know whether you are aware that there has been a rise in the number of medical Orders for outdoor relief of late years in some of the unions of London. Do you know if there is any connection between that and the relief of aliens?—I am not sure, but I may say that in St. George's-in-the-East it was noticed that the numbers of Orders had gone up considerably, and it was suggested that in that particular case the officer concerned was giving undue favour to Jews, and with a change of officer the increase diminished; but, so far as aliens are concerned, up to the present they have been confined almost to one comparatively limited part of London. They are spreading into Bethnal Green and Mile End now, but, with regard to these particular cases here, I take it, in every one of those cases, Mile End, St. George's, Stepney and Whitechapel, there was a good percentage of Jews amongst them.

12749. In the last return that I have of the outdoor medical relief for London there are over 17,000 people on the permanent list. I notice at Bethnal Green there are none on the permanent list, but at Camberwell, which comes next alphabetically after Bethnal Green there are 2,666?—That is so.

12750. Is there any reason why Camberwell should have such a large number on the permanent list?—None whatever.

12751. Do you think it desirable in London to have large lists of people on permanent relief?—No, I think if I were a guardian myself I should try and persuade my colleagues to have no permanent list at all.

Publication of extracts from Orders of Local Government Board.

12752. You speak of the desirability of selections from the orders being issued to relieving officers. In the case of relieving officers outside the Metropolis, I think those extracts have been issued. I do not know whether they are in the Metropolis?—That was in 1896, I think. Those were confined to outside London only, why, precisely, I do not know, unless it was conceived that they know enough in London without it.

12753. It has been done outside London, but not inside London?—Yes.

Medical relief of aliens in Poplar.

12754. Could you tell me what happens to the alien in Poplar who wants medical relief, having regard to the table which you have handed in?—He has to go without, I suppose.

12755. (*Mrs. Webb.*) There is no rule that relief should not be given to aliens?—Not that I know of, this is a fact reported by Mr. Harper, the statistical officer of the London County Council.

12756. Ought not that to be "No aliens," simply?—I copied his return as I got it.

12757. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do you pay much attention to the question of the outdoor relief in a district?—Yes.

12758. Do you follow up the cases?—I cannot say I follow up the cases.

Proposed assistant inspector of out-relief in London.

12759. Do you think it would be a good thing if, for the purpose of London, there was an assistant inspector appointed specially for outdoor relief?—It might be useful, certainly.

12760. You would rather welcome such an assistant?—Yes, I think he would be useful.

12761. Do you find that boards of guardians are very much guided by tradition?—Yes.

Out-relief policy in City of London.

12762. Taking the City of London, the City of London Board has for a very long time adopted the outdoor relief policy, has not it?—I do not know that one can say that, they have not a very large number; their percentage is based upon the comparatively small number of persons sleeping there. The last time I was at their relief meeting was about two months ago, and I should not say from recollection that their method of dealing was one which could be called a lax one.

Administration in rich and poor unions.

12763. Some of your unions comprise populations which are partly rich and partly poor, and some are in the main poor?—Yes.

12764. Do you notice any difference of administration classifying it in that way?—No, Bethnal Green may certainly be said to be a poor parish, so may Whitechapel, so may St. George's in the East. There the outdoor relief is low. On the other hand, proportionately the outdoor relief in St. George's, Hanover Square, is high, there they have spots of poverty within the union, but taking the union as a whole, the rateable value per head must be considerably greater than most East End parishes.

Proper number of cases for relieving officer.

12765. When you say in your return that the proportion of paupers to relieving officers is 316, does that mean individuals or cases?—That means individuals. You would have to divide that by about four to get the actual cases.

12766. In that case it would be about 80?—Yes, something about that.

12767. Eighty different homes or centres of population?—Yes.

12768. Do you think that is a fair number for a man to have to look after?—As I think I have said, a good deal depends on the man. It is almost impossible to say what is a fitting number for a relieving officer to have to deal with. A witness before the Aged Poor Commission of 1895 recommended 150.

12769. That was cases, not individuals?—Yes, You may have a case which is a man with a wife and six or seven children. He could deal with that family at one visit without very much harm.

Inadequacy of relieving officers' salaries.

12770. You think that the remuneration of relieving officers, is, as a rule, inadequate?—Yes, I really do.

12771. Is that because you would wish to see a different stamp of man filling the office?—I do not want to go so far as that. I think many of our present relieving officers are very good men indeed.

The class of men desirable as relieving officers.

12772. Dismissing the present from one's thought, would you wish to see a state of things in which a very different class of people had the office? For instance, would you think it might be a career for University men?—Yes, it might be, I think.

12773. What I want to get at is this: Do you think it a good thing for a relieving officer to be nearer in class to the cases, or removed from them?—I think it is not altogether disadvantageous. I mean, I can think of certain relieving officers who do their work as well as any University man could, both in inquiring and visiting, and keeping their books, and so on; they are sympathetic, but, at the same time, they are careful in their inquiries and do all their work very well.

12774. And you do not think that it would be an unreasonable objection that the men should be so far removed from them that he would approach them more in the way that the Charity Organisation Society's visitors do?—No, I think I have said in my report somewhere that the methods of the Charity Organisation Society might be taken note of by relieving officers, whatever class they belonged to originally.

12775. Do you think you might look forward to a time when a salary of £400 a year might not be uncommon for a relieving officer?—I do not know what the Receiver of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund might say to that.

12776. I am only asking the question?—I have already stated my opinion, and it is all summed up in that: I think a relieving officer, a good man, is worth more than he gets at present. I am hardly prepared to go so far as to say what he ought to get.

12777. Supposing you were creating an ideal system. Would you prefer to see a class of relieving officers very different from the present class, or would you think the present class would be the best?—I have known so many good relieving officers that I do not want to say anything which would seem disparaging to them as a class.

Considerations by guardians of condition of home of applicant for out-relief.

12778. I do not want to suggest that either, from my own experience of them. Do you know any board of guardians who have strong rules with regard to the character of the houses to which they send out-relief?—I cannot say that I do.

12779. Who have a standard with regard to the size of the rooms or the number of rooms?—I cannot call to mind any set of rules in which that is one of the articles; but I would not say that there are not one or two where

it may be so. If it were not the rule, I would make that a condition in many instances.

12780. Is the advice of the relieving officer taken on a thing of that sort often?—I think it is in most cases, though in some cases not, but in the majority of cases I should think they would not give relief where the house was in an insanitary condition.

12781. They have a fairly high standard of house?—Yes, I think, so as a rule.

12782. Would they give it to a man in a common lodging house?—Some do, but as a rule I do not think it is given.

12783. Is the opinion of the medical officer generally followed in a matter of that sort; take the cases of a man with phthisis?—Yes.

12784. He would say he ought to be treated in an institution, and the man may decline to come in, or be unwilling to come in?—I think it would be followed.

12785. If he could point out that it would be a danger to a family?—I think so. I do not think there is any reluctance on the part of the guardians as a rule. I think they are only too willing to act on it.

12786. Would they enforce the suggestion?—I am not sure that they could. They would endeavour to.

12787. On the whole, you think the opinion of the officer has a fair weight with the average board of guardians?—I think on the whole it has; there are exceptions, of course.

Circulation of lists of paupers.

12788. (*Miss Hill.*) You have referred to an order of February 14th, 1878, as to the circulation of lists of paupers. That, I suppose, was a permissive, and not a compulsory order?—It was permissive.

12789. There are certain boards of guardians where it was done more extensively than it is now. It that not so?—Yes, I think it has dropped out to a considerable extent.

12790. It is no longer issued, as it was in some cases, to those whom you consider legitimately interested?—Not generally; it is in some cases. In Marylebone, for instance, it is.

12791. It is no longer issued in Marylebone, is it?—I was told it is so issued, by Mr. Dudman, the clerk, only a few days ago. I gathered that as a matter of fact it is sent to all the clergy. I was given a list of those to whom it was sent.

12792. It continues to be sent to the clergy there, does it?—Yes.

12793. I do not think it is so much circulated in Marylebone as it used to be?—It is sent quite regularly to the clergy.

Effect of administration on relief.

12794. Did you know Marylebone at the time that the out-relief was smaller than it is now?—I think the out-relief began to go up just after 1894.

12795. That surely was a question of administration and not of increased poverty?—I think that is very possible. They had a certain section on the new Board who were in favour of out-relief rather than of restricting it.

12796. And the indoor relief went up with the outdoor relief?—Yes, I believe it did.

12797. That would be a case distinctly where the rise in pauperism was due to administration and not to conditions?—To a considerable extent, I think.

Relation between uncertain relief and death rate.

12798. With regard to this question of whether the strict administration of medical relief has the effect of raising the infantile death rate, that is a difficult thing to prove one way or the other?—Very, I should think.

12799. Does it occur to you that there is a considerable danger in increasing either the death rate or illness from from the supply of various uncertain sources of relief, so that people are depending less on their own resources?—Yes, I think there may be.

12800. It has often seemed to me that the danger was far greater of all those various sources of relief coming uncertainly; I do not know whether your experience would point in the same way?—I think one might take that as a reasonable conclusion, in any case, without knowing much about the infantile death rate.

Rules for out-relief adopted by London guardians.

12801. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Could you tell us in what unions in London rules are in operation for the guidance of the guardians in distributing out-door relief?—I could not tell you off-hand, but in a great many.

12802. You could not give us the names of the unions?—I had intended getting that, but it is a thing one cannot always carry in one's mind. It does not always follow that they are followed. Poplar has some excellent rules for outdoor relief, I remember.

12803. You could not give us the names of the unions: it might be useful at this point?—No, I am sorry I have not been able to get them; but in a great number of the handbooks that the Guardians issue you find printed rules.

12804. In answer to a question put by Mr. Lansbury you say: "It is not the rule, I should say, in the metropolis, to give out-relief to widows (able-bodied) where there are no children, and still less so to able-bodied single women with or without children." It is not the rule to do so; but it is not often, in practice, done?—I think not, except in this way: you may find an able-bodied single woman in a family, who will possibly be living with her parents, and consequently share in the temporary relief.

Out-relief to able-bodied women.

12805. But it is quite the exception?—I think so.

12806. Do you find it often the case that persons who are living with relatives, where the united income of the household is sufficient for the support of all its members, whether such relatives are legally liable to support the applicants or not, are given relief?—It does happen, no doubt, but I think as a general rule guardians recover what they can.

Relief in cases where income of household adequate.

12807. I do not mean with regard to recovery. Is relief given in a case where the united income is sufficient for all, because of the destitution of one person in the house—that is, destitution in the sense that the person has no property in his own rights, as it were, but is dependent on the other members of the household?—One could not say it is never done, but I should think it was the exception. If a case of that sort happened to occur when I was present I should suggest it was not a proper case for relief. I do not think it is done very generally.

12808. Have you examined cases with the object of ascertaining whether that is so?—No, I have not.

12809. Do you often sit with the relief committees when they are hearing applications for relief?—Yes.

12810. Does this point never arise, that the income of the family is given, or the income of the occupants of the house is given, and in other cases that the relieving officer has no information with regard to the occupants, because they are not legally liable?—I think that may occur.

12811. The guardians in those cases would give relief without insisting upon knowing the incomes of those living in the house?—They would sometimes, but I do not think they would as a rule.

12812. Does that account for your not knowing that it is often done?—Yes, it may be.

12813. In fact, the information is not there, although the guardians have rules to the effect that relief shall not be given when the total income is sufficient?—Yes.

12814. They do not intend to give it?—Yes.

12815. You do not know whether relieving officers have instructions not to get such information?—I do not know that.

12816. Not to ascertain the wages of those not legally liable?—I do not know that they have instructions not to inquire.

12817. Do you think it is the practice not to do so?—I should think not.

Proper allocation of a relieving officer's time.

12818. You have said, I think, that you are unable to give an analysis of the average amount and description of the relieving officers' daily work in London?—I may tell you that I think a good rule is this: that the relieving officer of each union, or each of the relieving officers of every union, should have certain stated hours at which they should be either at the relief station, or at their homes, so that people should know, at two periods of the day, where they can be found. For the rest of the time a relieving officer should be going round his district, except at such times as he is making up his books.

Comparison of status of relieving officers and workhouse masters.

12819. You have also said, I think, that "There is no comparison whatever between the responsibilities and difficulties of a relieving officer and those of a master of a workhouse." Of course, you attach far more importance to the position of the relieving officer than that of a workhouse master?—Yes. My views are expressed in that answer as well as I can do it.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1903.

12820. Are the workhouse masters better paid than the relieving officers ?—I think they are, because, you see, in addition to their salaries, they have comfortable apartments, they have their food provided for them, they have no rent, rates or taxes to pay, and they have no trouble of that sort.

12821. You think, taking their salaries and emoluments, they are much better paid than relieving officers, as a body ?—I will not say much better, but they are better, because a relieving officer in London only reaches his maximum of £200 after twenty years.

12822. You have not stated the salaries that are given to workhouse masters ?—No, I have not, but I could get you certainly some typical cases by to-morrow morning, with regard to some of the larger workhouses. (Table handed in. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (F)).

Relieving officers holding other offices.

12823. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Do you know whether, in London, the relieving officers hold other offices besides that of relieving officer : for instance, are they registrars ?—In some instances, not many. I think you will find that the registrars, to a great extent, are in the clerk's office.

12824. Are they vaccination officers ?—Very rarely, I think. I do not think there is one at the present moment, but I am not quite sure.

Methods of improving out-relief administration.

12825. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Supposing you had a certain amount of money to spend on relieving officers in each union, would you be inclined to recommend the appointment of a superintendent at a good wage, or to recommend the levelling up of the salaries of the relieving officers. Which would you regard as more important, the appointment of a superintendent or the levelling up of the relieving officers' salaries ?—I should like to answer that by saying I should like both.

12826. Which do you consider the more important ?—I think to have a good superintendent to start with.

Superintendent relieving officers and their proper qualifications.

12827. You would propose that the superintendent should be of a rather different class of man from the relieving officer. What sort of man have you got in your mind ?—I do not like to say that, because the present superintendent relieving officers are much of the same stuff, they have been promoted from one to the other.

12828. Supposing you were to appoint a superintendent relieving officer, what type of man would you take ?—I could think of two of the present superintendent relieving officers, who would do as well as anyone I could think of.

12829. They have been relieving officers ?—Yes, both of them in point of fact.

Qualifications and examinations for relieving officers.

12830. Would you suggest that superintendents should be qualified by some examination as to their knowledge of Poor Law, like a sanitary inspector is for instance ?—I think it would be useful. There is an association now who are inviting persons who are proposing to become relieving officers to acquire useful information about what they will have to do before they take it up. But there is no examination and no regulation of that sort, at present.

12831. Would you suggest there should be an examination for relieving officers of about the same sort of level that there is for sanitary inspectors ?—I think it is very desirable that guardians should be assured before they appoint a man that he has some knowledge of what the duties and responsibilities will be.

12832. That would prevent jobbery in its grosser forms, would it not ?—Yes.

12833. There is a handbook for relieving officers by Hadley, which was published in 1902 ?—I did not know of that. When I made my previous answer I was thinking of one that was published some time ago by one of our clerks. No doubt any persons who wish can always acquaint themselves generally with the outlines of what a relieving officer's duties are.

12834. To return to the question of examination, you would definitely suggest that it would be desirable that there should be some sort of qualification in respect of the subjects of the same sort of level that you have in the case of a sanitary inspector ?—I will not say I suggest it, but I will accept the suggestion.

Effect of industrial conditions on pauperism.

12835. You are of opinion, I think, that irregular hours, low earnings, and insanitary conditions result in destitution ?—Yes, I think they do contribute to it.

12836. Would you say that also with regard to casual labour apart from insufficient wages—merely irregularity of labour ?—Yes, irregularity of labour must, I think, tend to predispose a person to fall out of the ranks of work, and so possibly require assistance from others.

12837. In regard to that question, would you necessarily say that the extent of relief given in the union is an index of the amount of destitution suffered ?—The amount of out-relief given ?

Difficulty restricting out-relief absence o charities.

12838. Yes, supposing you were to withdraw the out-relief, might not you have destitution ?—I think as to that I should like to say that my views concur with that of the Royal Commission on Aged Poor in 1893, in which they say that out-relief is liable to abuse. I should say that wherever restricted administration of out-relief is adopted, it must go hand in hand with charity and assistance from outside.

12839. If you had a district in which there was no charity or very little charity, you could not apply the restricted out-relief ?—I think it would be risky to do so.

London Relief Committee Administrati and its methods.

12840. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Guardians in London do not rotate, that is they do not go from one district to another as a rule ?—No, in Croydon they have district relief committees, and when they were established it was made a condition that guardians non-resident in the particular district of the committee should take part in the proceedings, but as a matter of fact the condition after a time came to be disregarded. In London they do not rotate.

12841. From your experience, sitting at committees or boards where they are giving relief is it true that as a rule the guardians take the advice of the relieving officers ?—I think they do as a rule. It would be too much to say invariably.

12842. I mean from your own observation ?—I should say they do.

12843. Where they have a superintendent relieving officer, he, as a rule, takes the committee, and not the clerk, does he not ?—At the relief committee either the clerk or his assistant sits where there is not any superintendent relieving officer ?—You are thinking perhaps of the Relief Order Book ?

12844. Yes ?—It happens in your case ; your superintendent relieving officer does so.

12845. I wondered if he did everywhere else ?—No, in a good many places either the clerk or the assistant clerk takes that book. Particularly where the relief is done by district committees, it by no means follows that the clerk himself is present, but as a rule they have a member of the clerks staff there to enter up the book as required by the District Relief Committee Order.

12846. Would not it be better if the superintendent relieving officer did attend all the meetings so that he would get to know really practically all the cases ?—I am under the impression, taking the superintendent relieving officers as a whole, that they do attend.

12847. That is all I want to know ?—I misunderstood your question, I thought you were referring to the Relief Order Book.

Informati as to inco of relative not legally liable for maintenar

12848. You do not know of any case where the relieving officers do not get full particulars as to the income of friends and relations and all the rest of it ?—I do not, but apparently there are cases in which they do not, but I was surprised to hear it.

12849. You have never dropped across any during the years you have been inspector ?—Possibly now and again I may have. I do not think it is the rule, I can honestly say that.

12850. You have never found a board of guardians or committee deliberately telling a relieving officer not to get certain information ?—No, I never have.

Best type man for relieving officer.

12851. Now as to University men for relieving officers. Would you think that men who have had some experience of ordinary life would be the best kind of men to act as relieving officers ?—I tried to get out of giving a definite answer to that question. I think it really does not matter very much what class the man comes from, so long as he has intelligence and energy.

12852. I suppose you know all about the training at Oxford ?—Is there anything special about the training at Oxford that would adapt a man especially for a relieving officer ?—I do not know that I know very much of the training at Oxford.

Charities in East End of London.

12853. With regard to the general question of out-relief, we heard something just now about charities. Do you know of your own knowledge what charities there happen to be in, say, Bethnal Green, Poplar, St. George's-in-the-East, or Whitechapel?—No, I do not, but I said in answer to somebody else's question, the Charity Organisation Society publish annually a very useful book, a digest, in which I think information is given regarding pretty well all the charities existing in the district.

12854. In districts where there are no charities you cannot co-operate?—No, certainly not.

Population and proportion of aliens in Whitechapel.

12855. That brings me to this, on the question of conditions in comparing unions; have you studied those figures with regard to population in Whitechapel and Poplar, because they are the two unions that strikingly show differences of policy. I have just done it. I make the Whitechapel population in 1871 according to your figures a total of 76,046. Of those, there are aliens, 8,063, leaving a Gentile population of 67,983. In 1901 that populaiton had only increased to 78,768, but the aliens had increased from 8,063, to 29,188, leaving a total Gentile population of 49,580; but the figures for Poplar are these: In 1871 the total population was 116,277, aliens 1,070, total Gentile population 115,207, but during the thirty years the total population has gone up to 168,822, and the aliens have increased from 1,070 to 2,000 roughly, leaving a Gentile population of 166,718, which was an excess over Whitechapel of 117,000 Gentiles? —Quite true.

12856. I want to put it to you whether it is fair to compare a union where you have only one third of the Gentile population, with a union like Poplar?—No, I think the circumstances are not really quite fairly comparable, though of course the percentage of the pauperism in Whitechapel—we have not worked that out—on the Gentile population, would conceivably be lower than that of Poplar.

Percentage of pauperism to Gentile population in certain unions.

12857. I want that done, if you do not mind. It is the next question I am going to ask you: Whether you can give us a table to show us the percentage of pauperism to the Gentile population in 1871 and 1901 of St. George's in the East, Whitechapel, and Poplar. I have worked it out myself, and the net result is rather astonishing. We are still ahead, I know?—I will try to get that for you. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (G)).

Conditions in Whitechapel Union.

12858. Did you know Whitechapel in 1870?—I believe Whitechapel then was in a parlous condition, owing to injudicious charity thrown into it from other parts of London.

12859. Did you know anything of the conditions of Whitechapel?—I cannot say I did.

12860. You could not tell us the amount of population that lived there?—No.

12861. It is obvious, is it not, that if the population is practically stationary there must be something to account for it, and what I want to ask you is whether it is not a fact that huge warehouses have been erected all through there, and that the district railway has cut out a very big slice of the area where potential paupers used to live?—I cannot speak of that from my own knowledge, but I think it is the fact from observation. Going about in Whitechapel one has noticed in the course of some years past that there has been a disappearance of the old small tenement houses, and warehouses and other buildings have been erected in their places.

Housing schemes and their effects in Bethnal Green: numbers of aliens.

12862. I am leaving out St. George's in the East, because we shall get the percentage of pauperism later on with regard to that. I understand that you put Bethnal Green rather in the same category that you put Poplar in?—As regards the condition of the people, yes, except that I should qualify that, that they have not in Bethnal Green the same amount of casual labour that you have in Poplar.

12863. Is not it also true that the county council cleared, one of the very vilest slum districts that there was in London, namely, the Boundary Street area?—Yes, they did.

12864. Is not it true that they wiped out a considerable amount of potential pauperism?—I am not sure as to that. The clerk to Bethnal Green tells me that the effect of that clearance for the time being was to scatter the poor who lived in the Boundary Street area in other parts of Bethnal Green and, only to some extent, outside the parish.

12865. I am going to deal with that, because that is an answer that has been given me before. It is about ten years ago that that area was cleared. It was the first act of the new county council when it came in?—It is rather more than ten years ago, I think.

12866. Do you know Bethnal Green Road?—Yes.

12867. Have you been down Bethnal Green Road lately? —I have not been there since Christmas.

12868. My point is this, that coming up from Spitalfields where the Jewish Ghetto is, is it not the fact that the whole of that has overflowed into the northern part of Bethnal Green?—You mean to say there is a considerable increase of Jewish population?

12869. Yes, during the last six years?—I believe it is common knowledge that there has been.

12870. Have you heard that there has been a great agitation there because Sundays now in Bethnal Green are really just like any other day, because of the tremendous amount of business carried on by the Jews there?—I cannot speak to that of my own knowledge, but I have not the least doubt, if you say so, it is true.

12871. I will ask whether you heard of another clearance in Bethnal Green Road, which took place three years ago, Pondsbury Gardens. Did the clerk tell you of that?—No, he did not.

12872. Where a whole block of slum property was swept away. Did you hear of the riots that took place because a notice was put up that no English tenants need apply; they filled the whole of the property up with aliens?—I confess I have not heard of that.

12873. If that is true, does not that cause a strict administration of relief?—Assuming those facts to be correctly stated, it would mean that there would be an increased number of the population less likely to gravitate to Poor Law relief than the Gentile population would.

Casual labour and pauperism.

12874. You have already said that casual labour, the hours and conditions, would affect pauperism?—I think so.

Unhealthy conditions in Poplar.

12875. On the question of medical relief, do you know the Hackney Wick district of Poplar—the marsh district? —Yes.

12876. Do you think that those conditions would probably be conducive of disease among the people, which would compel them to get relief somewhere or other?—I should say it was not a very healthy district; beyond that I could not say whether how far the conditions would conduce to pauperism.

12877. With regard to the Adequate Relief Circular there has been considerable agitation, not only in London, but in the country, for old-age pensions. Is not it true that that circular came out really as a kind of suggestion that guardians might meet the demand for old-age pensions by giving outdoor relief to the aged deserving poor?—I have no knowledge that that was the object of it, I think that there was some special reference to old people being forced into the workhouse, but, with that exception, there was nothing more than the circulars of the Poor Law board have always advocated, that if you do give relief of any sort it ought to be adequate.

Mr. Chaplin's circular and its interpretation in Camberwell and Poplar.

12878. From your knowledge of Camberwell and Poplar, which are the two big outdoor relief boards in London, is it not true that that policy is a policy which has for its object not so much the relief of destitution as the relief of poverty in old age?—I do not know that I have heard it said in so many words that that was the object of the guardians.

Relief to aged persons not actually destitute.

12879. It does amount to that really?—It may very possibly be so.

12880. That is what it amounts to, does it not; a person does not have to be actually destitute in either of those unions to get outdoor relief?—No, I think not.

12881. It is true, is it not, that the department laid it down that respectable decent persons were not to be driven into the workhouse?—Yes, they did.

12882. And, if a board of guardians acts on that and gives adequate relief outside, so far they are doing what the board has said was a right thing to do?—That is so.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

12884. I am only speaking of aged people; I am not thinking of able-bodied people at all?—The order did apply specially to aged.

12884. The circular was definitely to discourage the breaking up of homes and driving respectable decent people into the workhouse?—I should like to have the circular to refer to, in answer to that. I do not want to go beyond what the circular said. On referring to it I find it says: "The board consider that aged deserving persons should not be urged to enter the workhouse at all, unless there is some cause which renders such a course necessary, such as infirmity of mind or body, the absence of house accommodation, or of a suitable person to care for them, or some similar cause, but that they should be relieved by having adequate outdoor relief granted to them."

12885. If a board of guardians act on the principles laid down in that circular, obviously there would be an increase of pauperism in their district. People would not have so much objection to getting adequate outdoor relief that they would to having adequate indoor relief?—They certainly would not, I should think.

12886. Therefore, Poplar and Camberwell, in that respect, were definitely carrying out the desire of the President for the time being of the Local Government Board?—I think that they had begun, before that, to give a good deal of out-relief.

12887. I know, but they only intelligently anticipated what the central body would do?—You are perhaps entitled to put that construction on it.

Figures as to out-relief in Poplar and Camberwell.

12888. (*Chairman.*) Assuming that Camberwell and Poplar had the same ideas, let us see what the result is. Taking Camberwell, I find from your figures (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (C.) that in 1902 the outdoor relief was 4,695?—Yes.

12889. What was it in 1905?—4,685.

12890. Now let us look at Poplar in 1902?—It was 2,555.

12891. And in 1905?—7,059.

12892. Though the policy may have been the same, it bore somewhat different fruit?—Apparently.

12893. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You have taken just the year that hits Poplar very badly. You will only want to do the fair thing, I am sure. We shall come to the reason for that being 7,059. As you are aware, that was caused by the fact that we had 500 able-bodied men, with their wives and children, included in that. The proper year to take would be the year before 1901, and 1904 should be the other year?—That large figure includes a considerable number of persons other than the aged.

Out-relief in aid of sweated labour.

12894. It is not the aged. The real figure should be 3,484?—Yes.

12895. (*Chairman.*) You have with you a box of exhibits produced by persons of various ages in receipt of relief, which shows that relief is given to persons employed in what are called sweated industries?—Yes, but I am afraid I have been rather anticipated by the exhibition got up by the *Daily News*. I should, however, like the Commission to see the contents of the box.

12896. Assuming this was a question which the Commission thought of further investigating, in what parts of London would you advise us to push our investigation as to the relation of sweated industries to poor relief?—Enquiries might be made in Bermondsey, Bethnal Green, Westminster, Holborn and Whitechapel.

12897. You have given, not only your general impression, but an impression which, to some extent, was supported by facts?—Yes. These particular facts came from Bethnal Green only.

12898. Is there at all a profuse system of outdoor relief there?—No, not at all; on the contrary. That is the remarkable part about it.

12898a. Bethnal Green is a union which gives very little outdoor relief?—That is so.

12899. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is it not the fact that in these sweating cases the members of the family work together, the children and all, and each earns very little?—Yes, they supplement the relief. It is a question of cause or effect; I do not know quite which it is.

12900. (*Mr. Nunn.*) With regard to the answer you have already given me as to the training of relieving officers, would you be inclined to say that a relieving officer required not merely a training in the actual Consolidated Order, Article 215, but that he would be better for a training in the general principles and the history of the Poor Law?—Yes; he might with advantage know something of those certainly.

The proper training for relieving officers and superintendent relieving officers.

12901. He would hardly find that in the General Orders or in the Manual, would he?—No, I am afraid he would not.

12902. A superintendent of relieving officers especially ought, one would suppose, to have received a certain amount of training in the principles and history of the actual law on the subject?—He ought to have received a certain amount of training in the general principles certainly.

12903. As a matter of fact, I suppose the superintendents are drawn from the ranks of the relieving officers, as a rule?—Yes, that is so.

12904. So that, as a matter of fact, even the men who are at the top of the tree in regard to relieving-officership, are men who have practically not had a training?—They have not had a training beyond that of their experience as relieving officers.

Possibility of Local Government Board issuing more precise rules as to out-relief.

12905. Then with regard to the possibility of rules being framed for boards of guardians, I believe the Local Government Board does prescribe within certain limits certain schemes of classification or certain divisions within the house?—Yes.

12906. Might it not be on all fours with those Orders and Regulations to make perfectly definite orders with regard to outdoor relief, giving a classification of applicants and a classification of the amounts desirable for them?—I do not know that I can go beyond the answer I have already given. I think it would be so very difficult in the case of outdoor relief to frame anything but very general orders.

12907. Have not certain boards of guardians made regulations which relate to their own administration of outdoor relief?—Yes, they have.

12908. And which do not really interfere with the responsibility and exercise of discretion on the part of the relieving officers?—That is so. But then circumstances vary so much in different localities, that any rules of the Central Department with regard to outdoor relief, would have to be general. On the other hand, I am really not fully acquainted with all the details of the document mentioned by Dr. Downes this morning, which was issued to country unions; but I am bound to say that I do not see any reason why many of the details which it may contain, should not apply equally to London.

Publication of extracts from Orders of Local Government Board.

12909. Might that document be put in?—Yes (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (H)). I think it is not so much a circular, properly speaking, as a statement of the duties of relieving officers and medical officers as embodied in various extracts from the General Orders.

The training of relieving officers.

12910. I suppose you cannot throw any light on this question, why that document was not sent to the London relieving officers?—No, I do not know why.

12911. The London relieving officers have an association of their own, I think, which arranges for courses of lectures?—Yes.

12912. Does it do anything in the way of training by going through case work with the officers?—Not that I know of.

12913. So that its work is purely theoretical?—Yes, I think it is.

12914. Have you ever heard of any case in which an officer went definitely to train with another relieving officer of established reputation, before he undertook the work?—No, the only case of the sort that comes to my mind, is that of Hampstead, where lately, I think, an assistant has been appointed, the idea being that he would in due course have sufficient experience and knowledge to succeed the present relieving officer. But I do not know that it is a common thing that persons have been appointed with that distinct object.

12915. When an ordinary relieving officer or an assistant relieving officer is appointed, is it understood

that he will get a certain amount of training from his superiors?—It is understood so, but I cannot say that that it is by any means always the case.

Prestige of relieving officers with boards of guardians.

12916. In answer to a question that was put to you a short time ago, I think you said that your opinion was that boards of guardians, as a rule, accepted the advice of their relieving officers?—Did I say that? If so, perhaps I said rather too much there. I think they would act on their advice in a case in which there was doubt, and in which they thought the relieving officer's advice would be useful.

12917. I suppose that statement has to be accepted with this modification, that the relieving officer knows the board that he is dealing with, and the general atmosphere of the board, and that his training and previous experience would suggest one answer to, say, the guardians of St. George's-in-the-East, and another answer to a board like the Poplar Guardians, his advice being given according to what the general trend of opinion and the general action of his board were?—I think, human nature being what it is, one must assume something of that sort.

12918. It would be useless to give the same advice to both those boards, would it not?—Perhaps so. I do not know, positively of course, but I do not suggest that he would give the same advice to both.

Difficulty of restricting out-relief in absence of charities.

12919. With regard to another question that was raised by a previous Commissioner, it was said that without the co-operation of charity, it would be very difficult indeed to restrict the outdoor relief in London unions, and I think you agreed with that?—Yes, I did.

12920. But, as a matter of fact, London unions differ from those in the country, in this, I think that in every union in London there is a considerable amount of charity being given away?—In the majority of unions, I should say there was.

12921. And in every district there is a Charity Organisation Society which more or less focuses the charity of the district?—Yes; so that the agency for co-operation is already existing.

Co-operation between guardians and charities and its difficulties.

12922. On the other hand is there not a slight tendency on the part of boards of guardians to regard relief as their work, and to regard any suggestion of co-operation from the outside as an interference with their functions?—I think I said in my reply that I should be glad to see boards of guardians in closer co-operation with the Charity Organisation Society and with other charitable agencies in their locality. I think it is the fact that in some instances they rather demur to interference, or they do not think it worth while to co-operate, because they think they can do without extraneous help perhaps.

12923. It is not only, I think, that they consider it an interference with them in what they have a right to do, but that they are afraid that they may be regarded as neglecting their duties if they hand over any supposed functions of theirs to a charitable society?—I think probably that opinion also operates in some cases?

12924. Whereas, on the contrary, Mr. Goschen and other others who have followed him at the Local Government Board, have been of opinion that certain cases were much more suitable for private charity, and that guardians would be wise in referring such cases to private charity?—Yes. I think that is a view which certainly has been held by several people.

12925. So there would be no dereliction of their duty in handing over such cases at all?—No. I take it that in the great majority of cases, where an applicant is referred in the first instance to the Charity Organisation Society, or to some similar agency, that is done with a desire of preventing his coming on the rates and in the hope that he might be assisted otherwise.

Advantages of case paper system.

12926. In further reference to the grouping of London boards, I think you have said that the case paper system tended in the direction of restricting outdoor relief?—Yes, I think so. It is difficult to say precisely why, but it does seem to act in that way automatically.

12927. It gives the guardians a memory, for one thing?—Yes, that is one advantage of it.

12928. If they have rejected a case before, and it comes up again, they have all the facts before them if they have adopted the case paper system?—Yes. The advantage of the case paper system is that you have, as it were, the life history of each individual accessible. As I have said on previous occasions, when endeavouring to show the advantages of the case paper system, if you have an inquisitive guardian, and he asks a question about a case which has perhaps been heard three months before, in the ordinary course the Application and Report Book would not give the particular information asked for, and in order to get information of that sort, you would have probably to get another book and to send to another office, and so on: whereas with the case paper system the whole thing is self-contained, and everything that has happened is there on the file. In that way I think it leads to careful administration, or helps towards it at all events.

12929. I think also in unions where the case paper system is in force, the guardians have introduced a great many more questions and get fuller details than were given under the old application and report book system?—In some instances they have; at the same time I think that the information required by the application and report book is really sufficient for all purposes, only, in my opinion, it is not in such a convenient form.

12930. For instance, I think most boards of guardians have adopted special forms for describing the relatives who are liable to assist?—That is true.

12931. And in that way also, greater facilities have been given for taking account of those relatives?—True.

12932. Do you find it increases the interest that the relieving officers take in their work?—Yes, that is another result that I think it has. It is only natural that where, as originally established, the relieving officer has to continue to use this ponderous application and report book, and the case papers are, so to say, a mere addition, that he does not welcome with great enthusiasm a double set of entries; but where the case paper system is est b-lished, and where as, in a case like Paddington, you are able to curtail the amount of entries which the officer is obliged to make in the application and report book, I think you will find that most of those who have adopted the system will, as a rule, say they are glad of it. It has not increased their clerical work considerably, and on the other hand, it enables them, as you have suggested, to furnish and keep a fuller and more convenient record of the cases than the old system did.

Inquiries as to non-resident out-relief cases.

12933. I think in a good many unions of London there is some difficulty found, is there not, in getting relieving officers to take up inquiries for relieving officers of other unions?—I was not aware of that. As a rule, I should have said that they were willing to help one another; but there may be exceptions.

12934. You have not found any unwillingness, at any rate?—Really I am not aware of it. I do not know but that there may be individual cases in which they say "I will do what I am appointed to do and no more"; but I should have said—there may be exceptions, of course—that as a rule they were willing to help one another.

12935. Do you know that Paddington has appointed a relieving officer whose special duty it is to make extra-union inquiries?—Yes, but I was not aware that it was because of a difficulty of that sort. I thought it was probably because they considered that they would get more particular information through an officer of their own.

12936. Thinking that their own officer would be more interested in the case, and would therefore get better information?—Yes, better information than could be got secondhand, as it were, from another board's officers.

12937. Which system do you think is the best?—It stands to reason that an officer working for a particular board of guardians is likely to get more complete information about a case which he would have himself to report to his employers, than would be the information acquired secondhand from somebody else's servants.

12938. On the other hand, going into a strange union he would be going amongst people he does not know, and he would not be so much *au courant* with all the sources of information as would be an officer of that union?—No; but I should imagine that the man so appointed, although he was making the inquiries himself, would probably, in most instances, get the assistance of the local officer if he could.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

12939. Do you think the ideal system would be for each union to have its officer for extra-union inquiries, who should consult with the officer of the union in which he was making the inquiries?—It depends rather on what the extra-union inquiries were to include. Do you mean merely inquiries relating to the non-resident poor?

12940. That he should get all information—any details possible about any particular case?—Yes, I think perhaps it would be a good system. My own view is, with regard to all cases, that you cannot have too much information and I think you will be more likely to get full information by relying upon a man employed by yourselves than relying upon somebody else's servant to give it you.

12941. Do you think that that would be more expensive than the present supposed method of employing the relieving officers of the union?—There would be an extra salary required, of course, if you appoint a man for that purpose.

12942. There would be a saving of the other officer's time. Do you believe it would be more expensive?—I think, to that extent, it would.

Desirability of appointing relieving officers as superintendent relieving officers.

12943. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I want to get clearly your views as to the relieving officers. I think you rather regard it as desirable that theirs should be a profession with prizes, so to speak, and that a superintendent should be the goal of the ambition of an ordinary relieving officer?—I do not know that I should go so far as that, because, taking London, for instance, you can only have 28 superintendent relieving officers.

12944. Everybody does not necessarily get to the top of his profession, but there are certain prizes for some of the men, and if there were prizes in the profession of relieving officer, that would give them more interest in their work, I take it?—Yes; I think that is a fair way of putting it.

Training of relieving officers.

12945. In answer to Mr. Nunn you have said that the "present system of appointing assistant relieving officers, though it has its drawbacks, affords fairly good opportunities for training for the office of relieving officers." May I ask what you consider to be these fairly good opportunities for training?—I was thinking of the appointment of an assistant to a relieving officer who had already had some experience. By working with the relieving officer the assistant by degrees himself acquires experience and knowledge.

12946. But he starts without any training at all?—He would usually do so.

Relieving officers as "whole-timers."

12947. Do you think that in order to make it more of a profession, it would be desirable that the whole time of a man should be given to the work?—Yes. I think that if the relieving officer does his duty thoroughly, he cannot have much time to spare for any other things.

Women relieving officers.

12948. Are there any female relieving officers in London?—No. There are two women appointed for relief purposes, one in Southwark and one in Camberwell, but they are appointed especially for lying-in cases and children. There is no instance, in London at all events, of a woman being appointed as a relieving officer to do the duty generally.

12949. Do you see any objection to their being appointed relieving officers?—I do not know. A relieving officer is on duty at all hours of the night and day, and he has very frequently to go into rough neighbourhoods, and so on. I think there might be circumstances in which it would be difficult for a woman to make the necessary inquiries. At the same time as regards maternity cases, children's cases and so on, I see no reason myself why a woman should not be appointed.

12950. Still, nowadays women are engaged in work in which they have certain difficult duties to perform?—Yes, that is so.

12951. Woman sanitary officers, for instance, have difficulties of the kind you suggest; would they have anything more serious to face under the Poor Law?—Yes. A sanitary officer has possible dangers to face in the way of microbic attacks, and so on, whereas a relieving officer who wishes to make special enquiries in a low neighbourhood has often to deal with a class who are not over particular as to what they may say or do, the risks implied should preferably, I think, be incurred by men than by women.

12952. There are a good many women in London, are there not, going in and out of localities which are considered low?—Yes, there are. However, that is my view of it; I think if I were a guardian I should hesitate to appoint a woman to undertake the whole duties of a relieving officer.

12953. In regard to the parishes in which the percentage of out-relief is under 20, it is a fact, generally speaking, is it not, that those are localities in which the population is gradually getting put away from them, that is, they are the more central localities and gradually the population is getting farther east or west as the case may be?—That hardly applies to Bethnal Green, but it would apply to St. Giles's, the Strand and Westminster.

Conditions London Unions with low percentage of out-relief.

12954. And also to Marylebone?—You would know that better than I do. There are certain parts of Marylebone, it is true, where there have been clearances, and the poor have been pushed over the border into Paddington. I am thinking of the clearances for the Great Central Railway.

12955. The population of Marylebone has actually decreased?—I had forgotten that; but it is not a very considerable decrease, is it? Obviously in that case it does apply to Marylebone.

12956. It strikes one that it applies to a good many of the localities in London; Strand and Westminster, I think you have mentioned?—Yes. Whitechapel, I think, is stationary, in respect of population and so is St. George's-in-the-East.

12957. I do not know at the moment whether the Bethnal Green population is stationary or has decreased. I think you said in reply to Mr. Nunn just now that in every district in London charity is being given away; is that quite the case all over London?—Did he put it to me that charity was being given away in every district? I meant to say that there were agencies for giving it away.

12958. Church agencies and charitable agencies of one kind or another?—Yes.

Charities in East End of London.

12959. Is that the case in the East End?—No. I ought to have made a reservation there. I do not suppose, for instance, there would be as much charity given away in Poplar as there is possibly in Marylebone.

12960. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Does that answer quite hold, in view of all the newspaper funds, and the enormous sums that have been collected in that way?—I take it you are thinking of such funds as the Distress Fund of the *Daily News*?

12961. Yes?—Those are more or less spasmodic; I was thinking of the permanent charities.

12962. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I understood you meant permanent charities which would be administered either by committees or by the clergy or by some agency of that kind; these are not considerable in the East End, are they?—If I had the Charity Organisation Society's Digest on Law to refer to, I could tell you, but I cannot carry it all in my head.

12963. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is it not the case that the Society for the Relief of Distress and the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association make their grants to the clergy in inverse proportion to the wealth of the district in which they are working; and would that not act compensatorily?—It would to some extent, but I confess I am not very well up in that part of the question.

Relation between sweated industries and out-relief.

12964. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) With regard to the question of the sweated industries, I suppose it might follow that if there was a great deal of sweating in a particular locality, there would not be a large amount of out-door relief consequent on that, because if a whole family were working at one of those sweated industries, they would earn enough amongst them to keep them off the rates?—I suppose that would be so.

12965. That is what we are finding a good deal at the Sweated Industries Exhibition just now. I do not want to ask any question about your box of exhibits particularly, but I notice the phrase with regard to a good many of them "making the shoes," "making the boots," of course that "making" does not mean a very large amount of work, in fact in some cases it means nothing more than just putting certain pieces together?—Yes; they get the materials, and sew them or gum them together.

Preponderance of indoor relief in London and urban centres.

12966. (*Mr. Booth.*) The chairman has referred to the peculiar fact that there is so much more in-relief in proportion to out-relief in London. That is not a London question alone, is it—I think it is applicable to all crowded urban centres ?—I do not know about that, but, speaking from memory, it does not follow. When I was in the eastern counties district, the out-relief in Ipswich was always low as compared with the in-door relief—whereas at Norwich it was very high.

12967. I do not consider either Ipswich or Norwich as a great and crowded urban centre; it is the central portion of Liverpool and the central portion of Manchester and such cities that I am thinking of ?—Very possibly it would be so in those cases.

12968. This peculiar fact is due to something which is in connection with this crowded condition, and as Mr. Russell Wakefield said it very often appears in a district in which the people living are actually being gradually crowded out. The main contrast with regard to in-door and out-door relief is, I think, to be made between rural and urban districts ?—Yes, I think that is so.

12969. There are certain reasons for that, the greatest of which is the proportion of the old ?—Yes, certainly.

Effect on out-relief of large number of aged in rural districts.

12970. In many country districts there are twice or even three times the number of old people in proportion to population that are to be found in the London parishes, I believe ?—I should think that would be so.

12971. That would make a very great difference, because confessedly, out-relief is largely a question of the old ?—Yes, that is true.

12972. That appears to me to be the main reason, because in the crowded parts of the great urban districts there are comparatively few old people ?—I should think that is so certainly. Then of course in the country districts there is the question of distance to be considered as well.

12973. Altogether, out-relief is more applicable to the conditions of the people there ?—Yes.

12974. And in addition to that, I think that the old, especially the old women, are not so helpless in the country as they are in the towns, and that there is every advantage for out-relief in the scattered country districts and very few advantages apparently for out-relief in the great urban centres ?—I think that is the case.

12975. Broadly, I believe, that is the explanation ?—No doubt that is a factor.

Relief of aliens.

12976. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the aliens, do boards of guardians realise that it is their duty to give relief to persons who are destitute, quite irrespective of the fact whether they are aliens or not ?—I think certainly they do. I think it is improbable that a case was ever refused merely on the ground that the person was an alien.

London guardians' procedure as to contracts.

12977. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Will you please describe the procedure of the London boards of guardians as regards the acceptance of tenders for supplies, specifying differences of practice in respect of the following points:—(*a*) Are tenders in all cases called for by effective public advertisement ? (*b*) Are the tenders in all cases referred to officials for report ? (*c*) Are the tenders in all cases reported on by a Committee before being considered by the full board ? (*d*) Are the different tenders for each article set out in the agenda of the board, so as to enable comparison ? And (*e*) Is there in London any system by which the names or prices or distinguishing marks of samples are withheld from the guardians until after they have voted, so as to prevent collusion or local favouritism ?—Tenders in all cases for work costing more than £50 are advertised for, and I think for the most part by effective public advertisement. The tenders are not in all cases referred to officials, but generally, in a good many instances the tenders are referred to a Committee after they have been opened, are further reported on, and later considered by the full board. I will hand in an example of what appear to me good methods in regard to contracts. In Kensington, the contracts for linen drapery were distributed among seven different firms the clothing among two firms, and leather and shoes among four. In Lambeth, again, the orders are distributed, The orders for drapery and linen goods are distributed among several firms. I will hand in a list of tenders in which there are columns giving the total quantity to be supplied, and the lowest contract prices followed by columns giving the names of ten different firms for drapery and some twenty firms for cotton goods (See Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII.(I.)). The lowest tenders in each case are shown in dark block figures. There is no universal system of withholding prices or distinguishing marks on samples, but generally speaking something at least is done with the object of avoiding collusion or favouritism. I am not sure that these efforts are always successful. Opportunities, however, for chicanery and manœuvering by no means cease with the consideration and acceptance of tenders. Where guardians are frequently cheated is in the sending in of goods which are not really up to sample. I had an interesting illustration of this on my visit to a dispensary recently. The dispenser showed me in a bottle the sample tendered for of nitrate of potass; he also showed me a sample of the article that had been sent in. The latter, he explained, was of an inferior description known as commercial nitrate and used principally in the manufacture of fireworks.

Goods supplied not up to sample.

12978. Can you supply the Commission with the range of prices paid by the London Boards of Guardians for the same commodities, giving the lowest and the highest rates for certain articles, such as meat, flour, tea, sugar, arrow-root, coffins, men's boots, calico, and so on ?—Descriptions of meat, &c., in tenders vary so much that it would be impossible to furnish a return which would be of use for comparison.

Variation in prices paid by London guardians.

12979. (*Chairman.*) There is no prescribed procedure for tenders, is there ?—Not beyond this, that there are certain forms, and the Order requires that the tender should be opened at a meeting of the board of guardians.

12980. Are you referring to the Order that was issued in 1877 ?—Yes.

12981. On the whole, are you fairly satisfied with the methods of dealing with tenders ?—The methods vary to a certain extent, but, as I have said, in reply to Mrs. Webb, it is really in the supply that the guardians are apt not to get what is their due. I think in most places endeavours are made to prevent collusion.

Goods supplied not up to sample.

12982. That is to say, to see that the deliveries are not under sample ?—Yes.

12983. Would it be useful to have a stereotyped procedure, or are not the differences so great as to make that justifiable or advisable ?—I do not know that you could very well have a stereotyped procedure. I think there are objections even to that. The practice of having the tenders opened, as required by the Order, and then letting them be considered by a committee in a way that prevents the whole of the tender or the whole of the supplies of a particular class of goods going to one man or one firm, operates in the direction of preventing—I can only use an unofficial term—dodgery in the tendering. But it is a difficult question.

Existing system of dealing with tenders on the whole satisfactory.

12984. Have you, whilst urban inspector, been compelled to make any special investigation into any particular cases ?—No; but you can see that there may be a good deal of suspicion about these things, and naturally they are not done in a way that renders detection at all easy.

12985. On the whole, would you let things go on much as they are ?—I think you must rely to a great extent upon the intelligence and care of individual boards of guardians, and upon the integrity of their officers.

Supply of goods not up to sample and remedies therefor.

12986. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In such a case as you have referred to in your replies to Mrs. Webb, where the goods supplied did not correspond to the samples, would the guardians send them back ?—In most cases they would certainly; but, on the other hand, occasionally there may be carelessness, the officer concerned may not be sufficiently vigilant, and therefore for some time the guardians may be paying for something which they are not really receiving.

12987. The officer would usually be the master, I suppose, or perhaps the medical officer or the dispenser, in the case of drugs ?—Yes.

12988. There is a provision in the Order, is there not, that supposing the goods do not correspond with the sample, the guardians may buy goods elsewhere and charge the contractor with the difference in price ?—Yes.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

12989. Do they ever do that?—It has been done, and the marvel to me is that it is not done more often. I think if it were known that guardians were pretty sure to act on their right in that respect, that the persons supplying goods would be more careful than they are.

Advertising for tenders.

12990. (*Professor Smart.*) You have told Mrs. Webb that tenders in all cases for work costing more than £50 are advertised for; what does that £50 apply to—is it £50 for one order or £50 for a single line?—It is for one order. The Order is, "The guardians shall require tenders to be made in some sealed paper for the supply of all provisions, fuel, clothing, furniture, or other goods or materials, the consumption of which may be estimated, one month with another, to exceed £10 per month, and of all provisions, fuel, clothing, furniture, or other goods or materials, the cost of which may be reasonably estimated to exceed £50 in a single sum, and shall purchase the same upon contracts if entered into after the receipt of such tenders."

12991. Then that £50 might be spread over a great many different tradesmen?—Yes.

12992. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I daresay you have heard of the Mile End libel case?—Yes.

Possibility of collusion between guardians and contractors.

12993. Have you any knowledge whether the state of affairs which was brought to light by that case is at all characteristic of other boards of guardians? You will remember that the system at Mile End was one in which the tenderers, who were in collusion with some of the guardians, gave a low price for articles of which there would be very little required, and a very high price for articles of which there would be very much required?—Yes.

Mile End Case.

12994. Do you suppose that that state of affairs exists anywhere in London now?—I do not myself think it does to any great extent. That particular method of getting the better of guardians I think has had one or two examples which has probably made contractors or tenderers careful of repeating it. I knew a case quite recently where in the advertisement for leather goods—boots, and so on—it was estimated that there might be three leather aprons required for the next year. There the guardians had the blind habit, as I think it is, of contenting themselves with taking the lowest tender for any particular class of goods without going into details. The tenderer had put down the leather aprons at a penny a piece, and when this was discovered, the guardians promptly ordered fifty; so he got no good out of that, at all events.

12995. The system really can only be successful when there is practical collusion?—I think that is so.

12996. What I rather want to get at is whether, in your opinion, there is among the boards of guardians in London or elsewhere a considerable amount of foolish acceptance of inefficient and uneconomic tenders?—I think I can say in London it is an exception to find other than careful endeavours to prevent chicanery of that sort. You might like now to look at this list of tenders, which shows how one board of guardians deals with its tenders. (*Producing table.*) It is the list I promised to put in.

West Ham Case.

12997. Do you know of any other legal case like the Mile End case?—There is a similar case now being considered in West Ham, but that is the only case within my own knowledge which has occurred for many years.

12998. Is that case going into the courts?—An inquiry is being held as to why an excessive amount of coal was used in the infirmary; but it has not got so far as the courts yet.

12999. Is the inquiry being held by the Local Government Board?—Yes. In that case it is merely a question as between the officer and the board.

13000. I believe it was only through the mere chance of this libel case, which was produced by an elector, that the whole thing at Mile End came to light?—That is quite true; it was quite accidental.

13001. These scandalous practices had been going on for a long time, and yet they had not come to light?—That is so. I am afraid that where you have a determined rascal so to say, it is a very difficult thing to find means of catching him, unless you have a very careful and vigilant board.

13002. It was a very scandalous business, because the jury refused to say that it was a libel?—It was a very bad case, no doubt.

13003. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Referring to the table that you have handed us, may I ask whether the tenders included in it were opened in the presence of the guardians and ordered to be printed for the next meeting of the board?—Yes.

Procedure to contract and possibility of collusion.

13004. Would they be opened and read to the board at the time?—No. The practice there—and I think myself that it accords with the spirit at all events of the order—is that the tenders are opened at the board meeting, then, as you see, they are handed to the clerk, by whom the original tenders are kept, but copies are sent to the printers to be printed with, as you see, the lowest tenders marked in thick figures for easy distinguishment by the guardians. Then these supplementary forms are brought up at the next meeting of the guardians, and are read out by the chairman, and in nearly every instance the lowest tender is accepted.

13005. They are only formally opened at the first meeting, so as to meet the letter of the order?—Yes. The object in that case was not to take blindly the lowest tender, but to select from each tender the particular goods which the tenderer had offered to supply at the lowest prices.

13006. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Are we to take it that the names of the tenderers are known to all the guardians before the tender is accepted?—Yes.

13007. Do you think it is usual for all the tenderers' names to be known before the tender is accepted? (*Mrs. Webb.*) In Lancashire it is not usual; in Lancashire it is usual to withhold the names of the tenderers?—There, as you see, after the tenders have been opened the names are printed at the head of each column. But the knowledge of the names does not make any difference, I think, because you see the tenders have already come in and they cannot alter their prices.

13008. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I can see cases in which it might make a very considerable difference, particularly if the lowest tender is not accepted. Are there certain things supplied to your guardians for which only a very few firms up and down London tender?—Leather is not on that table, but I think there are comparatively few people who tender for leather and boots.

13009. Would it be possible for there to be anything in the shape of collusion between four or five firms who might arrange as to the price, one giving the lowest price in one parish and another in another, so as to divide the tenders up between them?—I have heard it said—I only say heard, because I do not wish to render myself liable for libel—that certain meat supplying firms had a system which is similar to what is called the knock-out at an auction, and that they did not interfere with one another—that there is a ring, in fact; but it is quite impossible to prove that.

13010. In other directions, in borough council work, it is very easy to have a great deal of that, because there are certain things as to which there are only three or four firms up and down London who supply them; I did not know whether that applied to the guardians?—It does to some extent, I think.

13011. (*Mr. Loch.*) Have you ever considered whether it would make any considerable difference if the tenders were made not on behalf of one board of guardians only, but on behalf of a group of boards of guardians? Would there be a great reduction of cost, do you suppose, if there was a general tender, instead of it being a case of tenders to each union separately?—Do you mean that there should be a central depot from which they should be supplied?

13012. Yes?—I think there is something to be said for that. I do not know what the various persons concerned in the various trades would say to that; probably they would think they would be losing so much custom.

13013. I am only considering it from the point of view of economy?—I should think on the whole it ought to be more economical, but I would not give more than a general answer to the question.

13014. (*Chairman.*) This list of tenders that you have handed us is only a specimen sheet, I take it, and you do not know what action was taken in those cases?—No, except that, as I say, the block figures are in every case the lowest tender. You see a star there; where the two lowest are the same they are starred, and then it is the

fact, I believe, that they are apt to give the contract to a local man if he is one of the lowest.

Clearance schemes and their effect on housing, etc.

13015. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Can you give any information as to the effect in general on unions of clearance schemes, *e.g.*, the Boundary Street scheme referred to by Mr. Lansbury); the closing of insanitary areas under the Public Health Act; the increasing depopulation of certain areas adjacent to the City of London by reason of increased office and warehouse accommodation, railway extension, etc.; the immigration of aliens into certain East London unions, especially Whitechapel, St. George's-in-the-East, Stepney, Bethnal Green; and the effect on Kensington of the rebuilding of the Cadogan estate?—It is not easy to give very direct evidence of the result of clearance schemes, but in the case of Boundary Street, the clerk to the Bethnal Green Board tells me that the effect for the time being was to scatter the poor who live in the Boundary Street area in other parts of Bethnal Green, and to some extent outside the parish. There must of necessity have been greater competition for other empty tenements in the parish, when it may reasonably be assumed that the rents of those tenants were for the time being raised. Those whose circumstances made it impossible for them to seek residences in cheaper districts outside Bethnal Green had to pay the increased rents, and those who were already verging on pauperism this last straw probably drove to the Poor Law authorities for help; in other words, for relief in aid of rent. The dwellings put up in the Boundary Street area by the London County Council could not by any stretch of imagination be regarded as supplying the accommodation for the same class of person that existed there before the reconstruction. That area before demolition was covered by houses in which the very poorest lived. The London County Council tenements are now occupied by better class artisans. The migration of aliens into Whitechapel, St. George's-in-the-East, Stepney and Bethnal Green has no considerable effect on pauperism, the applications for the most part being confined to those for medical relief, and where this is offered on loan the Jewish aliens usually, I understand, decline. As to the Cadogan estate, the clearances that have been going on for some time in Chelsea are said to have pushed the poor down into Fulham and across the river to Battersea, and these and others squeezed out from Westminster have migrated, I am told, as far as Tooting and Clapham.

Effect on pauperism of dwellings on unhealthy sites.

13016. What evidence can you give as to the effect on pauperism of the erection of working-class cottages on low-lying sites which had been used for deposit of house refuse, street sweepings, etc.? Such sites have, I believe, been built on in East and South London?—I have no direct evidence as to the effect on pauperism of working-class cottages on low-lying and indifferent sites. The London County Council bye-laws are sufficient, I believe, now to prevent building on sites of the sort suggested.

Effect on an area of increase of rents.

13017. Can you give instances of the increase in rents in any unions, and the effect of such increase on the possibility of thrift, assistance by poor to relatives, the diminished housing accommodation per family, and the consequent loss of vitality?—In the information I have been able to get on this subject there is no evidence as to the effect of increased rent on possibilities of thrift, consequent loss of vitality, and so on.

13018. Can you give evidence as to the effect on the proportion of pauperism of the migration to the suburbs of the well-to-do classes and of the more energetic of the artisan and clerk class?—I cannot give direct evidence as to the effect on the proportion of pauperism on migration to suburbs, &c, but I may mention a case in my own parish, St. Pancras, where (in the north-eastern part) houses originally built to accommodate one family and rated, I believe, for £50 to £60 a year, are now occupied by a family on a floor. The original occupants have been able, owing to increased facilities for locomotion, to get out into suburbs where the rates are lower, and the families who have taken their place are of a poor class who have to settle where they can. St. Pancras has suffered to some extent too from the Strand improvements. A good number of the displaced poor have come into the southern part of the parish, and from among them, I am told, come a considerable number of applicants for relief.

Effect on pauperism of migration from London to suburbs and of clearance schemes.

13019. (*Chairman.*) I take it that these clearance schemes have, in certain cases, moved pauperism from one parish to another?—Yes.

13020. Is the Law of Settlement in practice in London, and do Metropolitan guardians fight one another over questions of settlement?—Yes, they have to get these questions settled. They inquire into the settlement in pretty well all cases.

13021. Then in the case of these clearances, if the people so moved apply for relief within the year, they will have no settlement?—True.

13022. Have there been many cases of that kind?—I do not know that there have been very many, but there have been some, certainly.

13023. Would you say the displacement by these clearances is a matter for serious consideration in some of the parishes?—I think it becomes so in the course of time.

Question of abolition of law of settlement.

13024. Have you any opinion about the Law of Settlement; would you like, for instance, to abolish it?—That is a big question. I think the Law of Settlement might be abolished for London, and you might make London one area for all that purpose.

13025. Of course if you had one administration for London the Law of Settlement would be abolished?—Yes, it would.

13026. Is there much money spent on settlement questions?—Here and there a good deal is spent on them.

13027. Have any boards of guardians come to any arrangement to accept each other's cases without fighting?—Some of them have. On the other hand, there are complaints made when they determine to fight cases, where a good deal of money has been spent on a case that might just as well have been settled by the Local Government Board or between themselves.

13028. Is the tendency towards amicable agreement?—Yes, I think it is.

Clearance schemes and their effect on housing, etc.

13029. (*Mr. Booth*) With regard to the effect of the clearance in Bethnal Green, you have told Mr. Gardiner that the poor who were living in the demolished dwellings having been scattered, to some extent, over the rest of the union, it may be assumed that the rents of those tenements were raised. That might well be so, without raising the rent paid by any particular lodger class; because the effect in that case would be, I take it, that the poor would crowd into the tenements, and, therefore, although the landlord gets somewhat more, the individual tenant does not necessarily pay more?—That would be so.

13030. The house would contain perhaps three families instead of two, and, therefore, the landlord would get a little more rent, a little more trouble, and a little more destruction; but it does not at all follow that the rent paid by the people who were turned out for the clearance would be any heavier than it was in the demolished dwellings where they were living under similar conditions of crowding?—That would be so. I was quoting the clerk to the Bethnal Green union there. I do not pretend to know very much about the case myself, and those are the views he communicated to me.

13031. I do not think it at all follows that those people who were settled in other parts of the Bethnal Green union did, in fact, pay any increased rent, or that, therefore, that particular clearance would increase their liability to come on the rates?—I agree.

Checks on building on unhealthy sites.

13032 (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Could you give me the date when the by-laws were passed enabling the County Council and the boroughs to refuse to allow a particular site to be built on?—I ought to have remembered that, but I am afraid I have not got it with me.

13033. Is it within the last five or six years?—Yes.

13034. Do those by-laws apply outside London?—No. I am speaking of the London County Council area only.

13035. Is there any power of appeal to the County Council? Supposing a site is thought by a borough council to be an unhealthy site, because it has been used for the deposit of refuse, and the borough council refuse to allow that site to be built on, is there any appeal to the London County Council?—I am afraid I cannot answer you straight off. I did not inquire into that.

13036. It is very important both for outside London

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

Clearance schemes and their effect on housing, etc.

and for inside London, so might we have that information subsequently?—Yes.*

13037. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I think you are of opinion that when these new buildings are put up it is very seldom that the original inhabitants of the site are lodged in the new buildings?—Yes. I do not speak from personal knowledge, but I have always understood from those who ought to know, and probably do know, that in a great number of cases the original inhabitants are not; that is to say, that on a cleared area are erected buildings which are later on occupied by a class superior to the class who were evicted.

13038. You get in a much higher class?—A higher class, certain.

13039. That being so, do you not think it might be much better if those sites were kept as open spaces—the poor would not suffer by that?—Speaking of open spaces generally, the more we have the better, I think.

13040. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) But then the rates over the rest of the union would rise very much?—Yes.

13041. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) And the cost would be very great, would it not?—Yes.

13042. The London County Council, for instance, in Boundary Street accommodate 5,000 people I think in the new buildings?—Yes.

13043. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) If I might suggest, the loss would not be entirely that, because frontages to open spaces are so valuable that the surroundings would rise in value at once?—That would be so. The assessing authority would probably put up the rateable value of the accommodation so left, but I doubt whether that would compensate for the greater cost of providing for the people removed further out.

13044. It is generally argued from the point of view of the poor people who are turned out, that you must house them again, and that it is such a hardship not to provide these new buildings for them; but, as a matter of fact, you only house a better class, and you do not improve the district as you might if the land were turned into an open space?—That would be so, but I should doubt whether the frontage would compensate for the cost.

13045. My point is distinctly this, that these clearances are made with a view of benefiting the poor people of the district, but that when you put up these improved dwellings you do not benefit them at all, but if you keep the land as an open space, you would benefit those who remained in the surrounding streets?—But still the others would have to be provided for elsewhere.

13046. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In a poor district you could not raise the rents of those that were left without doing them a real injury?—I am afraid I have not the solution.

13047. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The object of clearing a site is not to benefit the poor people, is it, but it is really to get rid of an insanitary area?—Yes, that is the object.

13048. (*Mr. Loch.*) Did you see the report of the London County Council when the Boundary Street area was first cleared, showing where the people went?—No, I did not. I was promised a report on that subject, but I have not had it yet.

13049. The result of it is really, I think, to support the view you have expressed that the people were scattered mostly in the immediate area, and only to a slight extent went into far distant areas?—That is what I understand—that they were not pushed out very far.

13050. Have you at all followed this question, how far, when an area is cleared, the pauperism of the area is continued in the new district to which the people go?—Taking the case of the clearance of that area in Marylebone for the Great Central Railway, I have always been given to understand that the persons so displaced have found their way into the eastern parts of Paddington. It is a common complaint in Paddington that they have had a large number of poor people from the cleared area.

13051. But the Paddington pauperism, though slightly affected by it, possibly, has not gone up very much, has it?—No, I do not think it has.

13052. Practically, if they were paupers in Marylebone they are not paupers in Paddington, or if they were paupers to a certain extent in Marylebone, they are possibly to a less degree paupers in Paddington?—Yes; but still the fact remains that the poorer persons have left the area to which they might have been chargeable previously.

13053. They have left it certainly, but my question had to do with the fact, whether or not that clearance implied simply an extended pauperism, and that, I take it, is the idea underlying these questions?—Yes. Dislocation of any kind may possibly have an effect detrimental to a certain number of persons, but I do not know that you can say that clearance necessarily increases pauperism.

13054. Would you say that the question really had not been worked out as to whether clearance was on the whole beneficial or not beneficial from that point of view?—I do not think it has been worked out from that point of view.

Possibility a Central Poor Law Authority London.

13055. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Referring to Mr. Davy's evidence as to London's difficulties (Davy, Question 3425), would not these point, unless there were something to qualify, to the need of a central single administration? Would it not be easier to have general principles if you had a commanding central London authority? As to outdoor relief, if you had certain principles laid down, could you not administer the relief by committees?—It is not easy to see how this central body should be composed. Public opinion in these days is all for direct representation and does not favour nomination for any purpose, and there are objections also, I think, to increasing the number of central authorities. With regard to the administration of outdoor relief by a central authority, I have some doubts if you would get much nearer uniformity of administration if you depended on committees. Uniformity would be more likely to be secured by the appointment of paid almoners or distributors, but, even with such an arrangement, absolute uniformity would not be assured. It would be necessary, I take it, in any case, to have a certain number of local relieving officers; though if they were all appointed by and subject to the control of one central authority they might be shifted about from place to place, and men who were not really up to the mark would not be continued in office.

13056. If you got a central London authority you could then separate ages and classes, have detention works, organise labour colonies, and send suitable people to them; and would you not get better guardians, more economical administration, a general equalised rate disbursed by those who pay, and consequently greater satisfaction?—A central authority controlling all the Poor Law institutions in London could, no doubt, use them for classification purposes in a manner impossible now; and could provide and organise branch workhouses for the able-bodied, but I am not at all sure that you would get better guardians or more economical administration. The general equalised rate would not necessarily be disbursed by those who pay, the representatives of the paying areas would be in a minority, and the "greater satisfaction" would be confined to those who benefited as recipients from the equalised rate.

13057. In any general scheme for managing the whole of London would not the outer limits (West Ham, Edmonton, and the wealthier district of Croydon) have to be included?—The possible inclusion of West Ham, Edmonton, and other suburban districts is one which would require very careful consideration, and in respect of which the views and interests of the localities proposed to be included would have to be considered.

Possibility one Londo Authority indoor reli

13057*a*. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Have you considered the proposals which have been made for an *ad hoc* Poor Law authority for indoor purposes, out-relief being administered according to definite principles by district relief committees representative of union areas, appointed by *ad hoc* authority? Do you consider that London (that is, the Metropolitan Police area) should be considered one community for administering the Poor Law, and, if so, would you be in favour of a board specially elected for the purpose, or would you hand the work over to the county council, which could be assisted by groups of voluntary workers? Allowing for a central body administering

* Mr. Lockwood subsequently sent the following answer:—"The London County Council in 1901 adopted a bye-law of the Metropolitan Board of Works empowering them to prevent the erection of buildings on unhealthy sites."

London as a whole, would you be in favour of putting all indoor charges, costs of administration, and buildings entirely upon the fund if such a central committee were set up to control such administrative buildings, etc.?—I confess I hardly see how it would be possible to arrange for the Poor Law administration of London by any existing bodies. If the care of infectious cases and imbeciles were transferred from the Metropolitan Asylums Board to the London County Council, the former might pehaps take over Poor Law administration for London generally; but in that case a considerable augmentation of the present number of members might be necessary. The number of institutions for which a Poor Law central body would be responsible would be considerably greater than those for which the Asylums Board is responsible at present. As regards handing the relief work over to the County Council, that body has already, it seems to me, as much to do as it well can, and it is certainly a question whether the administration of relief by voluntary workers would tend to the uniformity of practice which is admittedly desirable.

13058. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would it lead to better, more equal, and more economic administration if there were a single Board for London in charge of all the Poor Law institutions, supported by a single rate for the purpose leviable on the whole country? Have you any evidence as to (*a*) The accommodation now available for paupers in London (1) in workhouses; (2) in infirmaries; (*b*) The margin now available for increased demand; and (*c*) The possibility of the better utilisation of the accommodation, if there were one control able to utilise all institutions. How might such a controlling body be constituted, and what is the possibility of economy in staff, salaries, additional buildings, etc.?—I will hand in a statement (see Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (J)), showing the accommodation now available in (1) workhouses, (2) infirmaries, and the margin available for increased demand, from whence it will be seen that there is or was on the 10th February of this year spare accommodation in workhouses for 1,596. and in infirmaries for 816. Assuming one control to be desirable for all institutions, the question of how it should be constituted is one which I confess I have not so far had time to exhaustively consider; though I am inclined to doubt whether in any case there would necessarily result any considerable economy in staff and salaries, though assuming it were possible by a grouping of institutions to accommodate the surplus in the existing vacant space, there would, for the time being, be avoided expenditure on additional buildings; and while on this subject I will call attention to the fact that in the column "boarded-out" in the return I am referring to it will be found that a good many London paupers are boarded-out in country workhouses, and so long as there is spare accommodation of this sort, London guardians should, I think, be encouraged to avail themselves of it rather than to embark on the provision of costly new buildings.

Accommodation in London workhouses.

Possibility of Central Authority for London.

13059. (*Chairman.*) I gather you are not very favourable to the idea of a single administration for London?—I think I may be allowed to say perhaps that I have hardly had time to form a judgment upon it, but on balance I am a little doubtful.

13060. Looking at the merits and demerits of a scheme of that kind, whilst it now would tend, I think, in certain directions to greater uniformity and possibly to greater economy, would you not lose the services of a good many people who are now doing their work very well as guardians if you were to adopt such a plan?—I suppose the idea is that if you had a central authority you would get all the best of the present working guardians upon it, I do not know that that necessarily follows. I may say that in any case a new central authority, whatever else happens, will have to be directly elective and representative. I am thinking of the general tendency of public opinion in such matters.

13061. Then your idea of a central authority is against a body something like the London County Council or the Metropolitan Asylums Board administering poor relief all over London?—I have done my best in my previous answers to give some sort of reply to the questions on this point. It seems to me that it is not desirable to multiply the number of central authorities. We have already the Metropolitan Asylums Board and the London County Council; and, as I have said, if one could with an existing authority do that which would tend to uniformity, I think it is a desirable thing; but I should doubt whether it is desirable to set up a completely new authority, which would be, and must, I imagine be, directly representative to administer the Poor Law.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

13062. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Would you make that distinction as against the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which is indirectly representative?—The Metropolitan Asylums Board is an existing authority, and it occurred to me that it is an anomalous authority to a certain extent, since a great deal of its work has nothing to do with Poor Law at all, and yet it is composed entirely of delegated guardians and nominated managers.

The Metropolitan Asylums Board and its administration.

13063. (*Chairman.*) But it does its work very well, does it not?—I think it does. It is accused of extravagance but where you have to make provision for infectious disease under any circumstances you cannot expect it to be done very cheaply. They are constantly hauled over the coals for keeping expensive establishments for small-pox and so on, when there are no small pox patients: but that is in the nature of an insurance, and you must have accommodation ready to hand, and they have to consider what would happen if they had not the means of meeting a sudden outbreak.

13064. Have you attended the meetings of that body?—I have hardly ever attended the meetings of the body themselves, but for a long time, I attended pretty well every meeting of the childrens' committee when certain classes of children were handed over to them.

13065. Do the members of that authority pay as much individual attention to their duties as boards of guardians do?—I think they do.

13066. And do they become as much interested?—I think so. I can speak from personal experience of the committee that manage the five classes of children's establishments. Nothing could have been more careful or regular or minute than the attention they paid to the work.

13067. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In answer to Mr. Gardiner you say: "If the care of infectious cases and imbeciles were transferred from the Metropolitan Asylums Board to the London County Council the former might perhaps take over Poor Law administration for London generally." Do you quite mean that? Supposing the Asylums Board parted with their infectious cases and imbeciles, they would have nothing to do, and they would cease to exist, would they not?—They would have the children still.

Proposal to transfer care of infectious cases and imbeciles to London County Council and London indoor Poor Law Administration to Metropolitan Asylums Board.

13068. But the treatment of the ophthalmic and defective children is quite a small matter?—Yes, but if the body continued to exist, they might, in exchange for the duties relating to infectious disease and imbeciles, take over the Poor Law.

13069. Supposing it was decided to have one central body for London, the Asylums Board would cease to exist, would they not, because the guardians would cease to exist, and they are elected by the guardians?—To tell the truth I was thinking there rather of indoor administration. I ought to have expressed it more clearly. They would be elected by the guardians, and the guardians would continue to do the out-door local work, and the in-door institutions in fact would be managed by the Asylums Board.

13070. So that practically the boards of guardians would only administer out-door relief; that was the theory you had in your mind?—Yes, that is what I had in my mind really.

13071. Looking to the large number of institutions that there are and must be in London for in-door relief, do you think that there are too many for any one board to manage?—I had my doubts, and therefore I have said that a considerable augmentation of the present number of members would be necessary. What I had in my mind in that answer was that there would be still guardians who would be associated with members of the central body in visiting and looking after the institutions.

Need for and difficulties as to one central Poor Law Authority for London.

13072. Of course if you had one body which dealt only with indoor relief, you would not get uniformity in your out-door relief, which is perhaps the more important of the two?—Yes.

13073. Supposing it was suggested that you should have one body to administer the out-door relief, do you think that it would be practicable? For instance, must they not work through committees?—Unless you change the whole system, and have it all done by your officers,

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

I do not know how you are to do without local committees.

13074. You must have committees to administer the out-relief, must you not, in the localities where the poor are?—Yes, unless, as I say, you have paid dispensers of relief who would be appointed for certain districts and sit as magistrates do; but the difficulty then, I think, is that you would not necessarily get uniformity.

13075. With regard to the question of economy, is it not a common experience that if you have a very large area and a very large rateable value the expenditure tends to run up?—I am afraid it does. I think that what one reads and what one sees in one's demand note relating to the London County Council rate, for instance, suggests that the rate does not tend to diminish.

13076. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Might I suggest to you that it is not the London County Council that has increased the rates, but that it is the borough councils?—It is the two together. I am thinking of my last demand note, and in that the contributions to the several authorities are all set down separately, for instance, London County Council, £63,909, rate 8·84d., the same for education purposes £71,428, rate 9·88d.

13077. But all the things are mixed up in that demand note, and if you analyse it you will find that the borough councils and the boards of guardians have increased the rates?—I was content to read just what I saw. I only read it as a ratepayer, and I did not go behind the figures.

13078. (*Chairman.*) I think, looking at the analysis, it is the education rate that has risen so very much, is it not?—Yes, it is.

13079. (*Miss Hill.*) The rise in the assessment values conceals the rise in the rates very much, I think?—Yes, it does.

13080. (*Mr. Loch.*) You speak on the whole with satisfaction of the Metropolitan Asylums Board. Suppose, as you suggest, all the cases of lunacy and mental defect were brought under one head and placed under the County Council, that would be a logical first step, would it not?—Yes.

13081. But that would leave the Metropolitan Asylums Board practically without anything to do?—Yes, if they lost their infectious cases as well.

13082. Do you think there might be formed, on the lines of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, a Board of Supervision for London which would more or less have inspectors at its disposal and would bear the brunt of deciding all London questions in the first place as the responsible authority?—No; my views are rather those indicated in Sir Samuel Provis' question, that it would be difficult to arrange for out-door relief, at all events without local help.

13083. I have not made any suggestions as to out-door relief, nor as to the removal of institutions under one head; the only suggestion I have made is that there should be a board of supervision for London?—But I do not quite understand what they are to do.

13084. They would be the responsible advisers under this scheme of the boards of guardians in all their work, and probably any system of assessments for the common purposes of relief on the lines of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, or the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, or any other lines, would be connected with their work?—Would they be a separate body, separately elected, or would they be composed of delegates, as the Asylums Board now is.

13085. My suggestion is that they should be composed of delegates as the Asylums Board now is, with nominated members?—And that they should be a central advisory board.

13086. Yes?—You would have to consider what powers they would be invested with. I think that no one would be any the worse if they had the advantage of the advice and assistance of persons experienced in Poor Law administration, who could give their advice generally rather than specially in their own particular boards.

13087. At the present moment there is no single body responsible for London, except it be yourself and the Local Government Board behind you?—That is the case.

13088. There is no local body responsible for London business in the matter of poor relief otherwise?—That is so.

13089. There is, is there not, a responsible authority for the other administration of London—the London County Council, for instance, and in a manner the Metropolitan Asylums Board for Infectious Diseases?—Yes.

13090. Does it not follow that the question of London as a whole, from the point of view of poor relief, is sufficiently important for the supervision of a board?—I think it is worth considering, but I confess that it never occurred to me in that light before.

13091. Do you think it makes any difference in the problem as it appears to you if the question of local administration by the guardians, subject to this change, remained the same; or, to put it otherwise, if the workhouses and infirmaries still remained in the hands of the local boards of guardians? As I understand it, your difficulty is that you cannot see how they can be dealt with apart?—I say it more of out-relief. I think a central authority might perhaps manage the institutions.

13092. The out-relief is found to be the difficulty as a separate part of the administration?—I think it would be.

13093. Would you find a difficulty on another score, that is to say, in the same body not controlling the local indoor relief as well as the out-door relief, and not being able to say as a matter of course "This applicant is offered the house"?—There would be a difficulty, I confess.

13094. Do you see your way out of that difficulty?—No, I do not, off-hand.

13095. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The guardians could send the case, could they not?—It would be just like the case of an out-relief union?—I did not quite understand Mr. Loch's last question.

13096. (*Mr. Loch.*) If you have one single board administering both out-door and in-door relief, that board might at any moment say to an applicant "The house will be offered to you," and the house will be so offered; but if you have two authorities, one for out-door relief and one for in-door relief, you would make that a difficulty, because the indoor relief board might say, We wish to arrange the admissions to our own institutions?—In other words the out-relief should be managed by members of the same body, and there should not be two bodies.

13097. That is the question?—You could not manage very well if you had two separate bodies dealing respectively with in-door and out-door relief; you must have them members of one body.

13098. Unless the understanding was that any one sent by the out-door relief body must be admitted into the house?—Yes, but I do not know that that could be conveniently arranged for.

13099. You have not thought that out at all in detail, have you?—No, I have not.

13100. Could the out-door relief body, that is the guardians, who are dealing with out-door relief only, give an order in the case of a particular applicant for his admission to a particular workhouse governed by another body?—There would be an awkwardness about that.

Margin accommodation in London Workhouses

13101. With regard to the sufficiency of accommodation that exists in London in some instances and is wanting in others, details of which you give us in your table (see App. Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (J)) are there cases where a certain number are boarded-out so as to make room in the workhouse?—Yes; but as you see there are a large number boarded out from Islington at the same time that they have a considerable number in excess of their certificate in the workhouse.

13102. Then the figure of total inmates, for instance, is a figure irrespective of the fact that they may have other paupers who are boarded elsewhere?—Take Islington for instance. The certificate of accommodation for St. John's Road, Islington, is 2,129, and the number of persons in the workhouse on this particular day was 2,489.

13103. That gives an excess of 360?—Yes.

13104. Then besides that they have a certain number boarded-out?—Yes, they have boarded-out eighty adults and fifty-eight children.

13105. Take the converse case, where there is less than the number certified. Is the "less than certified" obtained by the fact that a certain number of persons are boarded-out from those unions, so as to get a number less than the certification? Take for example, Chelsea, which has 107 less than certified, and Fulham, which has 131 less than certified?—No.

13106. Besides those, are there people boarded-out from those unions?—The only cases in which they are boarded-out from the unions are given in the column headed, "Boarded-out."

13107. Does that column represent the committees or the bodies that receive the boarded-out paupers?—The meaning of it is this: Here is Hackney, which is the first that appears in the boarded-out column. Hackney have a workhouse certified for a total accommodation of 1,401, and they have got 1,573 inmates, and they have boarded-out at Westminster, 34, in the Strand Union Workhouse, 148, in the City of London, 47, and in St. Giles', Bloomsbury, 107.

13108. In no case to which the column headed "Less than certified" applies, are there any boarded-out paupers?—No.

13109. So that practically for a considerable number we are now indenting upon the country unions for maintenance?—Yes.

13110. Do you think that apart from that, the margin of room in the workhouses and infirmaries is large enough even when there is no excess?—I think I made out that there were 1,500 odd vacancies; that is, there was room for 1,500 additional inmates.

13111. Taking them workhouse by workhouse, is there anything like sufficient accommodation to meet a sudden demand?—No.

13112. What do you suggest then, in order that that demand might be met if it came suddenly upon the unions of London?—I have often wondered what one could possibly do in order to meet it.

Need for extra London Workhouses or London able-bodied paupers.

13113. Would you be prepared to create institutions outside London, especially to take the surplus or to take the aged out of London, or anything of that kind?—I do not think you can take the aged out of London. My idea is that it would be a very desirable thing if one could have a separate institution to deal with the so-called able-bodied, and also with what are called the young sixties.

13114. Would you be prepared to adopt that as a line, namely, to take all the juniors who are adults out of the existing workhouses and give them separate accommodation?—Yes, I think there is a good deal to be said for that. If you could take them outside London you could get sites cheaper, and, as I think I have said, you would be able to provide quite sufficiently for that class of person at very much less cost than has been necessary of late years in London.

13115. Have you made a calculation of the number that class would represent?—No, I have not.

13116. So that one cannot tell exactly what the accommodation would be, even on the present basis, that you would have to apply in this way?—No.

13117. There has been no report, has there, in regard to London pauperism, endeavouring from this point of view to solve this difficulty?—No, there has not at present.

Insufficient margin of Workhouse accommodation in London.

13118. In the last two or three winters has it not been constantly said that the Poor Law guardians were so pressed for accommodation that they could do nothing but adopt an outdoor relief policy?—It has been said.

13119. And that, so far as these figures go, in your opinion, is fairly true?—It is true, I am afraid, to a certain extent. I have for a long time desired—and I have repeated it more than once—to have, if one could, means, whether by imposing conditions of detention or otherwise, whereby that class, not the wholly able-bodied alone but the different classes who are included under the head of able-bodied, should be dealt with separately.

13120. If there were a supervising board for London such as I have suggested, would this be one of its duties?—Yes, I think it might very well be one of its duties.

13121. But there is no endeavour now, as it were, to deal with London as a whole from this point of view?—No, none. *Mr. Henry Lockwood.*

14 May 1906.

13122. Take Hammersmith, there we have the entry "Workhouse not yet occupied, infirmary not yet occupied"; what is to happen at Hammersmith?—Their indoor poor are boarded-out either at Fulham or at Risbridge and other places in the country. Hammersmith arrangements for indoor relief.

13123. Supposing there were a great deal of distress at Hammersmith suddenly arising, what would they do?—They would have to relieve it the best way they could.

13124. By outdoor relief?—Yes.

13125. What is the pressure that is now being put upon them to get their workhouse and infirmary on foot?—There is this pressure—the Local Government Board have recently asked them when they may expect the workhouse and infirmary to be ready for occupation, and they have had the reply that this, that, and the other are necessary before they can be occupied. I do not think that one can say that Hammersmith have been unduly dilatory in completing their accommodation.

13126. When was Hammersmith formed into a separate union?—About four or five years ago, I think.

13127. When it was formed did Fulham take over their buildings?—Yes, and kept their inmates.

13128. Did they take any steps to begin building as soon as the separation of the two unions was effected?—As soon as they could get a site they did, but they took some time to find a site.

13129. After the separation?—Yes.

13130. Though there was separation before them, they had not found a site at the time the separation took place?—No; and you could hardly expect them to do it.

13131. How long after was it when they found a site?—I should think many months; it took a long time.

13132. Is there any hardship to Hammersmith consequent on their paupers who are in receipt of indoor relief all being out of the district?—There is the hardship to the inmates themselves, I suppose. Those who are away in the country consider it a hardship, I expect.

13133. Is there any evidence to show that they do so consider it?—No, I do not think there is beyond complaints from individuals.

13134. Then if this is a case in which practically the whole of the indoor relief is dispersed and there is no hardship; does not the argument fall to the ground that it is an evil to disperse the indoor people?—I did not say it was an evil, but I thought that possibly it might be objected to; I mean there is a theory that you should not send old people too far away from their union or parish of settlement, and so on. Difficulty as to sending aged paupers to a distant Workhouse.

13135. As a matter of fact, either there has been no hardship expressed, or we do not know in fact that there is hardship?—That is so; but then, of course, this has been regarded as more or less a temporary arrangement.

13136. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Hammersmith and Fulham formed one union before Hammersmith was taken away, I think?—Yes. Hammersmith arrangements for indoor relief.

13137. And after the union was dissolved the existing state of things went on for some time, that is, the bulk of the Hammersmith poor remained in the Fulham workhouse; is that not so?—Yes, of course; I thought that was understood.

13138. (*Mr. Loch.*) But besides those, there are 175 at Bosmere, eighty-five at Dunmow, and thirty-seven in London; so that there is a considerable population besides, and one does not know really from this table what the classification is, that is, whether the old people have gone to Bosmere or have stayed at Fulham. Do you happen to know that?—Yes. I think most of the old people are at Fulham. They naturally deal with those boarded-out in the way which shall be least inconvenient to the persons so dealt with.

13139. Is the Fulham infirmary now being used by the Hammersmith board?—Yes; and they are continually having notice that they must remove their poor at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.
14 May 1906.

13140. Is there any limitation of time within which Hammersmith must make provision?—Yes; and the time has had to be extended, because there was only one alternative, and the Fulham people could not adopt that and turn the inmates into the street; and so they have grudgingly kept them on.

Difficulty as to procuring additional buildings at Islington.

13141. Have you had any difficulty of that kind in London in endeavouring to extend the accommodation available in workhouses, namely, long dilatoriness before any change is made?—Yes; the Islington people have been a long time.

13142. How long ago was it since you brought the question before Islington?—The question of their school has been revived from time to time for seven or eight years.

13143. They are boarding-out in the country, are they not?—Yes.

13144. And not merely the children?—Not merely the children.

13145. Have they come to any final decision as to what they are to do?—They have. They are about to build two additional blocks, on the site of what is called the St. John's Road workhouse. I may say that in all this, one, of course, feels that the cost of provision in London in these days is so enormous that one has some hesitation in pressing the guardians to embark on expenditure of this sort.

13146. Does that not imply that the question must be considered as a whole, with a view to making it more possible for them to do it by some such plan as you yourself have suggested?—If you mean so that the whole indoor accommodation might be available for all classes, yes.

13147. Or some members of a particular class may be sent to the country?—Do you mean that that could be better managed by one authority?

13148. Nay; I meant that if they saw that that could be done, possibly they would be more willing to make these changes and make the accommodation sufficient?—I do not know that that would affect them.

Hammersmith arrangements for indoor-relief.

13149. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) In reference to the question Mr. Loch has just raised, about the Hammersmith infirmary cases being boarded-out in the Fulham infirmary, could you tell me whether those Hammersmith folk are included in the figures in Appendix IV?—The column "boarded out" shows that 350 are in the Fulham workhouse and infirmary.

13150. Does the table mean that part of those 350 are really included in the 290 inmates of the Fulham infirmary?—I do not think the Hammersmith inmates can be included in that number, because it seems too low a figure for that.

13151. So probably that infirmary is overcrowded?—It is not necessarily overcrowded. I am glad you drew my attention to that; there is an error, I am afraid, there.

Proposals to abolish settlement in London.

13152. (*Dr. Downes.*) A suggestion has been put forward that London might be made one union for the purpose of settlement; Would you be in favour of that?—I think I should.

13153. Do you think there would be any danger of the paupers selecting their workhouses?—Yes; but then I think it would be an incentive to careful administration if people found that paupers were flocking where they could get relief easily, and so on.

13154. It would mean that there would have to be uniformity of administration to some extent to prevent abuses of that kind?—Yes, and I think it would tend to that.

Use by guardians of temporary accommodation in times of pressure.

13155. With reference to Mr. Loch's question as to the accommodation in case of pressure, I think that temporary accommodation has been made use of. I may mention the example of West Ham; is it not a fact that the guardians there had some school buildings handed over to them?—Yes, and very useful they were. But supposing there was a severe winter in London—and I am afraid it is bound to come sooner or later—though admitting undoubtedly, as you suggest, that provision can be made in that way, I am afraid it would be found very difficult to make sufficient provision for all London. There are not very many places that would be available for the purpose, but I think the difficulty might be partly met in that way.

13156. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do you think that there is much room for classification in the workhouses in London?—Do you mean classification as between the different classes in one institution?

Existing London workhouses insufficient for system of classification of paupers in workhouses.

13157. I am rather thinking of devoting particular workhouses to particular purposes?—The fact is that when you come to compare the total number of inmates boarded-out with the vacancies, you will find that the former more than counterbalances the latter; so that I am afraid it would be difficult to find means of classification in existing London workhouses in the manner you suggest. That is why I have referred more than once to the desirability, as it appears to me, of providing for the so-called able-bodied in some new and comparatively cheap institution oustide London.

Legal position of pauper boarded-out in workhouse of another union.

13158. There is one technical question I want to ask you. Supposing you have a man boarded-out at Bosmere, and he discharges himself, what is the process?—The process is that he has to be brought back at the expense of his union. That has been the difficulty. The guardians have been told that in this boarding-out business they have no right to send a man away without his consent.

13159. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Not if he objects?—I know, that is the way it has been put.

13160. You do not have to get his consent in the first instance, do you?—No, but if he objects to remain he can go home.

13161. And he need not find his own way back?—No. In every case it is insisted upon in the agreement that they shall bring him back again.

13162. (*Mr. Nunn.*) If he objects do you say he goes to his own home in that case and supports himself?—No, he goes back to the workhouse. If he is chargeable, he is entitled to relief in the workhouse of his union or parish.

Co-operation between Poor Law and charities.

13163. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) What co-operation exists between Poor Law and charities in several unions?—Not a few boards of guardians have amongst their members those who are members also of the Charity Organisation Society. An excellent practice prevails in a certain number of boards, and I wish the number were greater, of referring applicants for relief through the guardians representing the society to the Charity Organisation Society where such a course seems desirable. The arrangement works very satisfactorily where adopted, and saves a quite appreciable number of persons from becoming chargeable to the rates. In the report of the Whitechapel Guardians for the year ended Lady Day, 1905, is given a return of cases assisted by or through the agency of the Charity Organisation Society, whence it appears that 113 persons were so assisted during the year in various ways.

13164. Would you favour any degree of departmental control (not necessarily Local Government Board control) of voluntary charities? Can you in that case make any suggestion for their control, that would (*a*) secure some differentiation between Poor Law and charitable functions; and (*b*) tend to the dispauperisation of the working classes? In particular, have you any criticisms or suggestions with regard to the almost identical terms upon which admission may be obtained to London hospitals and London Poor Law infirmaries?—I have no suggestions to make as to departmental control of voluntary charities. As to the terms upon which admission may be obtained to London hospitals and London Poor Law infirmaries, a system of investigation and differentiation has, I think, been established in the case of the Royal Free, the Westminster, the Middlesex, and the London hospitals. The co-operation of the Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East Guardians with the Charity Organisation Society may be regarded as specially well organised, and, as I have observed in reply to a former question, co-operation in a greater or less degree is practised by a good many boards in London.

Allocation of sick cases as between hospitals and Poor Law infirmaries.

Co-operation of guardians with charities in various London unions and possibility of extending it.

13165. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are the boards of guardians in London acquainted with the resources of charitable relief in their unions; and how far is there co-operation with charities?—I am not sure that boards of guardians in London, taken as a whole, are as well acquainted with the resources of charitable relief in their respective unions as

they might be if they studied the excellent and informing digest published annually by the Charity Organisation Society. In some instances, Chelsea, for example, the relieving officers are supplied with a list of the charities and benevolent associations extracted from the digest in question, and if this practice were universal it would be no doubt advantageous, provided guardians and their officers would duly make use of the information so supplied in dealing with cases.

13166. (*Chairman.*) There appears to be a certain amount of co-operation between guardians and charities, but I gather from the answers you have just given that a good deal more might be done to secure more thorough co-operation?—Yes, I think so. Mr. Nunn adverted to that just now. I think there is in certain boards a disposition to regard with some resentment what they consider to be interference, and consequently an indisposition to ask for co-operation and assistance.

13167. If you want to make two separate bodies working, different systems combine, how would you suggest getting more thorough co-operation between them? Would you suggest that the authorities should be more organised, so that they could sit more as a whole in the locality and approach guardians in that way?—I did not quite understand the preliminary part of the question.

13168. Assuming that you get more cordial co-operation than now exists, have you any practical suggestion to make as to how that could be best done?—I am afraid I have none. The only action in that direction that I could suggest would be to repeat what I have already said. I think that the board might very well issue a circular—such a circular, as far as I know, has not been issued for many years now—calling attention to the desirability of co-operation. But, as I have also said, I think in that case it would be necessary that the observations of the guardians should be asked for after a period, because, those sort of communications are apt to lie on the table and to be forgotten. I think, however, very great good might come of a circular of the kind indicated.

13169. Are there many big endowed charities in London, do you know, which co-operate and work with the guardians?—I cannot say that I do know of many of my own knowledge.

13170. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to co-operation, I take it that what is intended by that phrase is not that they should co-operate to deal with a case, but that they should co-operate in considering the method by which the case should be dealt with?—I have always understood co-operation to mean this, that it should be co-operation between the guardians and the Charity Organisation Society or any other similar association in the Poor Law area concerned, to whom cases could be referred which the guardians thought were better suited for that assistance than for coming on the rates. The object of that co-operation, as it has always appeared to me, is to save the persons from being pauperised.

13171. That is to say, that one or other body should deal with the case according as it is suitable to deal with it?—Yes, according as it thought best.

13172. Then the *role* of the perhaps more organised charitable body would be the prevention of pauperism?—Yes.

13173. While the Poor Law authority would deal with or have the treatment of, poverty from the point of view of pauperism?—Yes, it would deal with destitution where proved.

13174. The other would be dealing with the prevention of pauperism altogether?—Yes. I take it the whole aim and desire of those who urge co-operation is that charity in the broadest sense should step in before it is necessary for the Poor Law to do so.

13175. Do you think it would be possible to give some official status to the bodies that deal with the prevention of pauperism?—I have not thought of that, and I do not know quite how that could be done.

13176. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Might I approach it from another point of view? Supposing all the agencies that were engaged in preventive work in a given borough or union were to agree to combine in order to deal with cases, would it be at all possible for the board of guardians, supposing other agencies were represented on such a board, to send representatives to it? At present I believe they send representatives to national conferences; would it be possible for them to send representatives to a body that sat permanently?—Do you mean representatives of charitable agencies?

Co-operation of guardians with charities in various London unions and possibility of extending it.

13177. Yes, to a body formed of all the preventive agencies in the district?—I am not quite sure how that could be carried out to the full extent. To take St. Pancras, for instance; at almost all the relief committee meetings a member of the Charity Organisation Society, who is not a guardian, attends and notes particular cases, and to a certain extent enters into the deliberations with regard to the case, but has no official status.

13178. My question was rather different; it was, supposing you had got a representative body of the charities of a particular union, whether it would be possible for the board of guardians to appoint a representative to it?—They could only do it voluntarily, I suppose.

13179. I am talking of their sending a representative to this board, not of their taking a representative on to their board. It is the business of any member of the community to get on to the board of guardians if he wants to do so, but the difficulty is to get the guardians to recognise the principle of appointing a representative to such a body as I have suggested?—The representative would have to be appointed by the board of guardians, and in order to do that, I take it fresh powers would have to be given to them.

13180. Would they—that is my point?—I think so.

13181. Then although they can appoint a representative to an annual conference, they have not got power to appoint a representative now to a weekly conference or a quarterly conference?—I do not quite understand.

13182. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There is nothing to prevent their appointing anybody, but they could not pay his expenses?—Yes, that is so.

13183. There is nothing to prevent the board of guardians passing a resolution saying that such a member of their body should attend?—I am afraid I did not understand the question, and that I thought it was the other way about—that the representative of the association should have the right, as it were, of being present at the guardians' meetings. I can only say in answer to Mr. Nunn that it would be a very desirable thing.

13184. (*Mr. Bentham.*) What union in London has been most successful in this co-operation?—I suppose one may say St. George's-in-the-East; but there it is quite exceptional.

13185. Have they a representative of the Charity Organisation Society of the district present at each meeting of the relief committee?—As it happens, at St. George's-in-the-East three at least of the guardians are themselves members of the Charity Organisation Society, and so representatives of the society would always be there. I do not think anybody sits at the meetings as directly representing the Charity Organisation Society.

13186. Are all the relief cases dealt with by the general board there?—Yes.

13187. Therefore one or other of these three members is likely to be present each time?—They would almost certainly be there.

13188. (*Mr. Phelps.*) The co-operation you speak of might take more than one form, might it not? Have you any experience in London of a board of guardians consulting with the Charity Organisation Society in inquiry work?—I do not know that they consult with the Charity Organisation Society as a body, but in St. Pancras it is a common practice for the relieving officers to meet periodically the officials of the Charity Organisation Society working in the district and to consult with them about particular cases.

13189. Would the books of the Charity Organisation Society's committee be available for the relieving officer?—Yes; and *vice versa* the books of the relieving officer would be available for the Charity Organisation Society's committee.

13190. Supposing a case comes up before the board of guardians and it is thought that the Charity Organisation Society is the appropriate body to deal with it, what procedure is taken in the case of any boards that you know?—The procedure is almost invariably this.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

14 May 1906.

Some member of the committee or of the board who is there, and who happens to be a member of the Charity Organisation Society, takes down the particulars, and then the applicant is told to attend at the office of the Charity Organisation Society at a certain hour. If a member of the Charity Organisation Society does not happen to be present, then the applicant will be given a note to say that the guardians think it will be better for the Charity Organisation Society in the first instance to deal with the particular case.

13191. But the person has applied to the board of guardians for relief?—Yes.

13192. Do the guardians adjourn the case or refer it to the relieving officer, or do they *totidem verbis* refer it to another source of relief?—The relieving officer continues to be responsible for the case; that is to say, he must see that the case suffers no hardship; but the guardians consider they are justified, where apparently there is no very immediate or urgent condition of necessity, to refer the applicant in the first instance to the Charity Organisation Society, on the understanding, of course, that the relieving officer is not thereby relieved of his responsibility.

13193. In an application and report book have you ever seen the heading "Referred to the C. O. S."?—Yes.

13194. You have seen that in an official volume?—Yes.

13195. I did not know whether it had got so far?—Yes, I have seen it.

Moral effect of charitable relief.

13196. Could you state, without going too much into detail, what you think the advantages which the Charity Organisation Society has over a board of guardians?—For purposes of that sort the principal advantage to the persons relieved is that they are relieved without disfranchisement.

13197. That may be an advantage, or it may not. Do you think that the moral effect of receiving relief from the Charity Organisation Society is different from the moral effect of relieving it from a board, because that is the really important point?—It is a question whether there is much difference.

13198. You do not feel very clear upon that point, at any rate?—No.

13199. Do you think it is much cheaper?—I should say it was, but that I cannot tell you. I do not know what the cost of the inquiry is.

13200. Perhaps you have not knowledge enough of the comparative cost in the two cases?—I am afraid I have not.

13201. Do you think that the charitable people have more opportunity of restoring independence than a board of guardians has?—Yes, I think they have; I think one must accept that.

13202. Do you think that the poor people themselves are conscious of the difference?—I do not know that many of them are. On the other hand, supposing the Charity Organisation Society had taken the case in hand, one would hope that the way in which it would probably be dealt with, would be such as to enable the persons relieved to feel that they were not necessarily losing their self-respect by accepting the assistance. I think the assistance is generally accompanied by conditions.

Co-operati of Poor La and charity

13203. One more question, which perhaps more immediately concerns you: do you, as you go about amongst boards of guardians find that the idea of co-operation is growing?—If anything, I should say yes. I think I may say that, speaking generally, when I have mooted the subject in recent years, I have found less of the direct hostility that one used to meet.

13204. People are inclined to more charitable estimates?—Yes. I think they appreciate it better than they used to. Perhaps I may take some of the credit for that myself, because I have always taken the opportunity when it occurred of pointing out what might be done in that direction.

13205. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is it a common thing for relieving officers to send cases to the Charity Organisation Society on their own responsibility before they go before the Board?—I do not know that it is common, but I have certainly known it done.

13206. In that way the applicants really never come near the guardians at all?—Yes. It is done in St. Pancras I know, and not unfrequently.

13207. It is also a common thing, is it not, for the Charity Organisation Society to send reports of cases to the board of guardians?—Yes.

13208. Which are read at the Board?—Yes. That incidentally shows one great advantage of the case paper system. In the application and report book you never see these communications, but in a case paper every communication and every letter from the Charity Organisation Society is there immediately at hand, and you can turn over the sheets and read them. In those instances in which the case paper system is in vogue, you will hardly take up a file without finding letters or some correspondence with the Charity Organisation Society or other agencies showing what has been done.

13209. The ordinary form of co-operation in London is mutual representation and a member of the board of guardians is on the Charity Organisation Society's Committee, or *vice versa* a member of the Charity Organisation Society's Committee becomes a member of the board of guardians?—Yes, and in some places they do something more. In St. Pancras, and I think in one or two other places, it is recognised that the Local Charity Organisation Society's officials are, not casually but periodically, to compare notes, so to say, with the relieving officer, so that there should be, as it were, cross references between the two.

13210. The relieving officers' lists are shown to the Charity Organisation Society's officers?—Yes.

13211. Do you not think we might put it generally in this way: that the guardians refer cases to the Charity Organisation Society where constructive work is needed?—Yes, I think that would be a very good way of putting it; it is where there is still, so to say, a hope for the case.

13212. When a case may be made independent?—Yes.

13213. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Do I understand that that is a common practice?—I wish it were a common practice.

13214. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) But the cases they do refer are cases of that class?—Yes.

THIRTY-SECOND DAY.

Tuesday, 15th May, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. HENRY LOCKWOOD, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

ffice of chief neral spector.

13215. (*Chairman.*) I should like to ask you whether your position differs at all from that of the other inspectors. There is an inspector-in-chief of the Local Government Board, is there not?—Yes.

13216. He is located in the Local Government Board?—Yes. His title is assistant secretary and chief general inspector.

13217. Is he supposed to give more personal attention to the London district than to other districts?—I think not.

13218. The other inspectors' relations to him are much the same as yours?—Yes, it happens that being on the spot he probably in the course of a given period would give more attention to London subjects, but he is not in a different position with relation to London?

13219. Nor are you in regard to your district in a different position?—No.

-operation tween arities and e guar-ans.

13220. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Would you tell me whether there is any effective co-operation between the boards of guardians and charitable associations in London?—Taking them as a whole, I cannot say that it is effective; in a certain number of them, I do not know that I can name them at once, there is co-operation.

. Olave's bour yard.

13221. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Considering the severity of the winter of 1905, do you consider St. Olaves a typical case whereby to judge stoneyards?—It would be hardly fair to call the St. Olaves example one whereby to judge stoneyards generally, because it was started in a hurry and inefficiently managed.

13222. How would you deal with the different classes noted in Question 4086?—The undesirables should have no relief except in a properly organised workhouse. The others might be tided over exceptional periods of distress by charitable assistance, properly organised after reasonable inquiry.

eed for less athy on rt of tepayers.

13223. Referring to Question 4098, what alternative do you see to returning lax guardians in times of great pressure?—The only alternative I can suggest under the existing system is that those who have to pay the rates should take greater trouble to endeavour to get elected those who would regard their interests equally with those whose distress has to be relieved out of the rates.

asual labour the West nd of ondon.

13224. Referring to Question 4103, is not casual labour greater in the West End, and is this not due to a kind of parasitical labour?—You would know more about this in the parish of Marylebone, for example, than I do; but I should not myself have thought that there was a greater amount of casual labour in the West End than in, say, the neighbourhood of the docks, though, no doubt, there would be more to be picked up by what may be called parasitical labour west of Oxford Circus than in, say, Stepney or West Ham.

Labour colonies for "ins-and-outs."

13225. Ought not the class "gravitating towards ins-and-outs" dealt with in Question 4120 to be dealt with earlier by labour colonies?—I think labour colonies, or branch workhouses, strictly administered, would be useful in this direction.

13226. As regards the 5 per cent. able-bodied referred to in Question 4147, would this not apply now to the class immediately above those in receipt of relief?—I should think that a larger percentage than five of the class immediately above those in receipt of relief would be able-bodied in the usual acceptance of the term.

Casual labour provided by Borough councils.

13227. Referring to Question 4104, is borough council labour casual as a rule?—I am not in the position to say whether or no this is the case as a rule, but when I answered Question 4104 I had in mind such work as relaying streets, street sweeping and cleaning, and so on, and from observation, admittedly superficial, it has generally appeared to me that a proportion, at least, of the men so employed were of the casual sort.

13228. Is not the prevalence of three days a week workers, a danger due to mistaken methods of providing temporary work?—I agree that providing temporary work by three-day shifts is a mistaken method.

Effect of farm colonies upon character.

13229. Will you give your experience as to the effect upon character of the farm colony?—I believe that the discipline, supervision, and the steady work provided in well-managed farm colonies must have a good moral and physical effect.

Methods of dealing with unemployed prior to Mr. Long's scheme and advantages of that scheme.

13230. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) What methods have been adopted to deal with able-bodied unemployed, and what has been the effect on pauperism of Mr. Chamberlain's circular with regard to borough councils and unemployed in 1890, 1895, 1900 and 1905? What has been the extent of co-operation between boards of guardians and borough councils?—In each succeeding winter since 1895, in London, there has been co-operation of a sort between guardians and borough councils, but until the establishment of Mr. Long's scheme there was little or no preliminary investigation of the circumstances of applicants for relief or assistance, and consequently I am inclined to think that there was very much the same mixing up of classes under the three-day shift system as occurs in the case of stoneyard relief. This

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

much can, I think, be at least claimed for Mr. Long's scheme, that there was an endeavour to systematise investigation in lieu of the indiscriminate methods previously adopted.

The records of emigrated paupers.

13231. What steps are taken to obtain reports of the able-bodied paupers emigrated by London boards—say for a year or two after their settlement? Are there any facts or figures relating to this subject now available, especially in regard to Poplar's emigrants of last year? —There are not, so far as I know, any regular steps taken to get reports regarding able-bodied paupers emigrated by London guardians. Of the twenty-five Poplar emigrants of last year, three have, I understand, returned; of these, two have applied for relief, but have been refused it absolutely on any terms whatever.

13232. (*Mrs. Webb.*) It has been suggested that "casual" employment increases the destitution, and thus the pauperism, of certain London unions. Can you supply any evidence for, or against, this hypothesis? —I am not in possession of any direct evidence on this subject, but the special inquiry now proceeding in Poplar may very possibly provide evidence more or less direct on the subject.

Out-relief to wage-earners.

13233. One point to which the attention of this Commission has been directed, is the practice of granting out-relief to persons in employment. Can you give us specific information on the following lines, classifying the relief in aid of wages under the following heads, and stating in which unions within the Metropolis is each one of them most prevalent:—(*a*) To men in employment under some sudden and urgent necessity?—(*b*) To men in employment under the guise of adjuncts to medical relief?—(*c*) To men irregularly employed, in respect of those days in a week, or weeks in a month, in which they have no work? (*d*) To men in employment, in respect of the cost of burial of some dependant?—(*e*) To women in weekly wage-earning employment, at constant work, but earning less than subsistence?—(*f*) To women in weekly wage-earning employment irregularly in respect of the days in a week, or weeks in a month, in which they have no work?—(*g*) To women doing casual "day's work" for different employers, such as "charing"?—(*h*) To women in wage-earning employment under the guise of adjuncts to medical relief?— Relief is not given to men actually in employment except under the guise of adjuncts to medical relief to some member of the family; but relief is frequently given to men irregularly employed during the period that they are out of work, and not unfrequently to men in employment in respect of burial expenses. I am unable to say in which unions each one of these is most prevalent, though it will probably be found to prevail in those unions the guardians of which favoured an out-relief policy. Relief is certainly given in a great many instances to women of the class noted in (*e*), (*f*), (*g*) and (*h*) of your question.

Relief in aid of wages—extent to which illegal.

13234. Are any of the above kinds of relief in aid of wages in your opinion contrary to the regulations of the Local Government Board?—I doubt if they are contrary to the regulations; in fact, the Poor Law Board Instructional Letter accompanying the Out-Relief Regulation Order of 1852 pointed out as follows:—"What it is intended actually to prohibit is the giving relief at the same identical time as that at which the person receiving it is in actual employment and in the receipt of wages (unless he falls within any of the exceptions afterwards set forth), and that relief given in any other case as, for example, in that of a man working for wages on one day and being without work the next, or working half the week and being then in need of relief, is not prohibited by this article." That is Article 5 of the Out-Relief Regulation Order.

13235. Have any cases of such relief in aid of wages been surcharged by the auditor of the Local Government Board?—I am not aware that they have.

Recent London labour yards.

13236. (*Mr. Loch.*) I should like to ask you what unions, including West Ham, have opened labour yards in the last five years, under what regulations, with what number of applicants, and with what results?—Labour yards were opened last year by West Ham, Croydon and Wandsworth this year by Croydon and West Ham only. There was nothing unusual in the result. I am waiting for returns of the numbers and the cost. (Return subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (K)).

Effect of borough council "relief."

13236. (*a.*) Should labour yards be continued? If so, should any conditions, other than those now in force, be required?—My experience of 1895 has unduly, perhaps, prejudiced me against labour yards; the only argument in their favour is that, for the time being, the persons so employed are kept off the labour market.

13236 (*b.*) Is the substitution of borough council employment relief for labour yard relief, satisfactory?—What I have just said in favour of labour yards cannot of course be said of borough council employment, which to that extent may be held to be unsatisfactory, particularly when the relief or the work is given in three days or fortnightly shifts.

13236. (*c.*) What has been the effect of the general adoption of borough council relief on the Poor Law?—The effect of borough council relief in dealing with seasonal or exceptional distress has been that for the time being the guardains have been relieved to that extent of their responsibility for the relief of distress.

Cost of Laindon Farm Colony.

13236. (*d.*) What has been the cost of land per acre; plant; maintenance and terms of maintenance, of the Poplar and other experiments made within the administration of the Poor Law for dealing with the unemployed, the number, conditions and the results?—The only experiment of the nature of a farm colony is that of the Poplar experiment at Laindon. I hope to be able to hand in a return of cost of land, maintenance, etc., to be furnished to me by the clerk. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (L)).

The modified workhouse test order.

13236. (*e.*) What has been the result of the Out-Door Relief Able-bodied Male Persons Order to the several unions to which it has been applied?—The Modified Workhouse Test Order issued to Poplar, Wandsworth, and Kensington, and, I think, Hampstead, has only been put in force in the first-mentioned union, where fifty men were so relieved and sent to Laindon, while their wives and families were supported at home.

13236. (*f.*) So far as the Poor Law is concerned, on what parts of its organisation should reliance be placed for dealing with exceptional distress, if it were to remain the chief agency available for that purpose?—If the Poor Law were to remain the chief agency for relieving exceptional distress, the Modified Workhouse Test Order might probably be very usefully employed; assuming, of course, that suitable accommodation would be available for the men so dealt with.

Joint Committees under Mr. Long's scheme.

13236. (*g.*) Is it desirable that there should be a second relief organisation, such as the Distress Committee, in addition to the Poor Law?—If, some other agency should be brought in, the best as yet suggested, as it seems to me, is an organisation such as the Joint Distress Committee as established under Mr. Long's scheme; the principal value of which is that the essential importance is recognised of careful investigation before relief or assistance is given.

Extent of accommodation in London workhouses.

13237. Is there sufficient accommodation in the workhouses?—Although, as the return handed in shows, there are in the aggregate some 1,500 vacancies in London, the accommodation in the workhouses is not, strictly speaking, sufficient, because the means of proper classification are inadequate, but, as I have previously observed, adequate classification can, in my opinion, only be provided in separate institutions for each class, sick, infirm or aged, and able-bodied—so called.

Effect of farm colony on the colonists.

13237. (*a.*) What is the experience of "farms"—Salvation Army and others?—The restorative effects of Salvation Army treatment on the colonists sent there has not been so considerable as one might be led to suppose.

Position of paupers refusing to work when sent to voluntary institutions by guardians.

13238. Has it not been the practice of some boards of guardians in London to refer lazy, or other able-bodied paupers, disinclined to work, to the Church or Salvation Army labour colonies, and, if they refused work offered them there, to prosecute? Is this system legal? What cases of it have occurred? Can any magistrates' comments or decisions on it, and on the character of the offer made to the applicant by way of work and remuneration, be produced? Cannot the Poor Law deal with cases of unwillingness to work within its own administration without having recourse to voluntary associations in the manner described?—Not a few boards of guardians have referred lazy and other able-bodied paupers to Salvation Army or Church Army colonies and have prosecuted the pauper so dealt with, if he returned to the workhouse. When this practice was first adopted it suited the guar-

diane' purposes so far, that magistrates, as a rule, would deal more severely with the men who had been given opportunities to work in this manner than they would with a man who refused to do his work in an ordinary workhouse, but recently in certain cases magistrates have taken a view hostile to the guardian, and one case—that of Martin of Poplar—was twice referred to the Commissioners of King's Bench, and decisions against the guardians were given on each occasion. The Poor Law should be able to deal with cases of unwillingness to work without having recourse to voluntary associations, but in order to do so, it will be necessary, I think, to provide able-bodied or test branch houses in which employment or work, not necessarily of a severe sort, but continuous, could be systematically provided for every inmate, but disciplinary treatment of the kind I have in mind is, it seems to me, quite impossible in a large mixed workhouse.

Kensington Test Workhouse and cause of its failure.

13239. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you classify the steps taken by London Boards to secure adequate work for able-bodied paupers?—No steps which could be classified have been taken by London Boards to secure adequate work for able-bodied paupers, though I may mention that for some years, the Kensington workhouse at Mary Place was available as a test house, but it failed in its object because stone-breaking was practically the only task, and in a large number of the cases that the guardians wished to send there the medical officer would not certify the men to be physically fit for the task of work imposed.

Effect of out-relief on wages.

13240. Assuming the economic tendency of out-relief to diminish wages amongst certain classes can you indicate any lines upon which, in the metropolitan area any verification in actual facts can be established?—I am unable to indicate any lines upon which complete verification in actual facts can be established of the effect of out-relief on wages, but the exhibits that I have shewn from Bethnal Green and the larger number in the exhibition got up by the "Daily News" may help in that direction.

Unemployed Workmen's Act.

13241. Are you prepared to suggest any useful modification of the Unemployed Workmen's Act, 1905?—Amendment of the Unemployed Workmen's Act is a matter for Parliament and it is beyond my province to volunteer modification, though perhaps I may not improperly express a hope that in any case the record papers will continue to be used.

Effect of Mr. Chamberlain's circular as to providing employment for the unemployed.

13242. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Have you any information as to what has been the result, so far as London is concerned, of the circular on unemployment issued by successive presidents since 1886 recommending local authorities to provide work for the unemployed apart from the Poor Law?—I have only general information as to the effect of these circulars on unemployment, but without doubt, very considerable sums have been spent by borough councils on what were practically relief works during the past twelve years.

13243. In your opinion has the effect of that circular, as far as London is concerned, been to get into people's minds that the State has recognised the principle that it was the business of the community to provide people with work when unable to obtain it through no fault of their own?—It is probable, I think, that the circular has had the effect suggested in the minds of a good many people.

13244. Can you give us the cost of such work put in hand by the old vestries, district boards of works, and borough councils, for the past ten years or for any period which you think would be fair, showing the total amount of money spent each year on special work; the number of men employed, the period for which they were employed (whether continuously or for short periods only), the total net cost of such work, and the estimated cost if done under ordinary conditions and not by unemployed labour?—I have not the material for answering your question, though I presume it could be got from the borough councils themselves.

Men "relieved" by municipal authorities as a factor in pauperism.

13245. Would it be possible for you to put in a return showing the proportion of able-bodied male pauperism chargeable to the Poor Law during the past twenty years in the Metropolis, side by side with the total number of men relieved during the same period by borough councils?—I regret I am equally unable to put in a return showing the proportion of able-bodied males chargeable to the Poor Law together with the total number of men relieved by borough councils.

13246. In your opinion, would it not be fair in estimating the increase or decrease of able-bodied pauperism in the Metropolis, to add these two sets of figures together?—I think that certainly the figures may be regarded, as, to a certain extent, interchangeable.

London boy labour a source of casual labour.

13247. With regard to boy-labour, can you tell us what effect this has on producing the unskilled unemployed labour which borough councils and boards of guardians have had to deal with during the past twenty years?—It is impossible to say precisely what effect this has on the production of unskilled unemployed labour, but there can, I think, be no donbt, that van boys, paper boys, and others who, between the ages of twelve and seventeen or eighteen, pick up a living in the streets, and, perhaps in a lesser degree district messenger boys and telegraph boys must help to swell the ranks of unskilled labour in London.

13248. Would it be possible by any means to get for a given year the ages and the occupations of the men employed by boards of guardians as unemployed?—It might be possible to get this information from the guardians or borough council records, but it would be, I am afraid, a lengthy and difficult business.

Nature of work done at Laindon Farm Colony and its efficacy as a workhouse test.

13249. With regard to the Laindon Colony, you have told us that the Poplar guardians dealt with two separate classes of able-bodied men. In your opinion, during the first six months, when only the ordinary pauper was engaged, was real work done on the estate? That is to say, you saw the estate when it was taken over, and you saw it six months later; in your judgment was the work carried out during the period mentioned work of a character which would test the ability and willingness of the pauper to work, and was not one of the reasons for opening the colony this: that it would prove whether men would work at ordinary labour without being driven to it?—Certainly, real work was done at Laindon during the first six months after it was opened, and was of a character calculated to test the ability and willingness of those employed, and one of the objects for opening the colony was to ascertain whether workhouse inmates could satisfactorily work at ordinary labour.

Physique of bulk of the unemployed.

13250. In your experience would you say that what are called the bulk of able-bodied men are those who, for a variety of reasons, are unable to secure a place in the labour market, and that they are mentally, morally, or physically deficient?—I should say that the majority of those classed able-bodied for Poor Law purposes are in some degree mentally, morally, or physically deficient.

13251. Did you see the 100 men who first went to Laindon; and in your judgment would you consider them all able-bodied in the sense that they were men who could be described as fit for any unskilled employment that was going under commercial conditions?—I think that they could not have been so described when they first went to Laindon.

Generic pauperism.

13252. Have you ever taken sample cases of able-bodied men and women and traced back their history; if so, with what results?—I cannot say I have, except in some instances of school failures, and in the majority of these the failure was the result of some such infirmity as that already referred to. I have, in fact, not known many hereditary paupers, though I did find three generations in one family in the stoneyard at West Ham.

Provision for able-bodied paupers past middle-age.

13253. You have told us that the age when men become too old for ordinary work was growing less. What in your judgment is the best method for dealing with the so-called able-bodied and what are known as the "young 60's?" Would you be in favour of country workhouses where not only agriculture but other industries could be carried on by this class?—The "young 60's" are a very difficult class to deal with, but I should favour branch workhouses with alternative industries and graduated tasks of work, so that all persons could be kept steadily employed according to their capacity.

Need of special test workhouses for able-bodied.

13254. (*Chairman.*) You are not satisfied with the results of the labour yards, I gather; but it is difficult, in your judgment to substitute any other effective system?—I am afraid it is, in the absence of what I live in hope of seeing, namely, a properly equipped separate workhouse

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

specially designed to deal with the class of persons who otherwise might be found in the labour yards.

13255. (*Mr. Booth.*) Do you mean one for all London?—No; I think I should not go so far as that. I question whether you could deal satisfactorily with that class in a very large institution. I may say that my own somewhat vague idea has been that there might be three such institutions as that for groups of guardians who would use each of them according to their needs.

13256. (*Chairman.*) What would be the class for whom this institution would be set apart? Would it be the unemployed who come to the boroughs?—Yes, to a certain extent, but mainly cases which were not considered suitable for assistance by the Distress Committee.

13257. Are you in favour of two authorities dealing with them, or would you wish only one authority?—If you grouped guardians for the purpose, you would have to resort to a similar arrangement to that which obtains in the sick asylum districts. You would require a board of management for the particular institution selected or delegated by the boards of guardians who are to use it, so that you would not have a separate authority, but an authority provided for that particular purpose from representatives of existing authorities.

13258. From your experience, do you think it advisable to bring in the borough councils at all?—The borough councils have hitherto been asked to deal with applicants with a view to their being saved disfranchisement, and being dealt with separately.

13259. Those institutions would be so far part and parcel of the Poor Law as to disfranchise the applicants?—Yes, they would.

Position of paupers refusing to work, when sent to voluntary institutions by guardians.

13260. In answer to one of Mr. Loch's questions you have referred to the case of Martin of Poplar?—May I be allowed to correct that answer? The case did not go to the House of Lords at all. The magistrate, Mr. Cluer, stated a case, which was considered in the Court of King's Bench, and they sent it back to him; he sent it back again to the Court of King's Bench, and ulitmately they upheld his decision.

13261 What was the result of the decision?—Mr. Loch's question was: "Has it not been the practice of some boards of guardians in London to refer lazy or other able-bodied paupers disinclined to work to the Church or Salvation Army labour colonies, and, if they refused work offered them there, to prosecute? Is this system legal?" If that applies to the practice of sending persons there, I have no reason to suppose that it is not legal, but I understand all this was gone into with Mr. Adrian; I have not seen his evidence, but if that was the case, I do not know that I can usefully add anything to what he said. In the Martin case neither the magistrate himself nor the Court, so far as I understand, questioned the legality of the proceedings as between the guardians and the Salvation Army, but what they did question was whether the Salvation Army had a right, as a condition of employing the man, to insist upon his attending a particular form of service, and also advocating teetotal principles.

13262. The statement here is that the board of guardians prosecuted this person for returning to the workhouse from some shelter or Church Army colony?—Yes.

13263. What is meant by prosecuting?—The guardians prosecuted him under an Act which would constitute him, if convicted, a rogue and vagabond; the court held that a man was not in law a rogue and vagabond if he refused to work under the conditions imposed by the Salvation Army.

13264. If the institution had been under the control of the guardians, I assume they would have been able to prosecute?—Yes.

Distinction between work found for unemployed by guardians and by borough councils.

13265. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The distinction between work provided by the borough council and anything done by the guardians is this, is it not, that in the case of the guardians it is relief, and in the case of the borough council it is not?—Certainly.

13266. Therefore it is proper to look upon anything done by the borough council in paying wages as money paid for work done?—That is so.

13267. Whereas the guardians do not pay for the work done?—No, they do not pay for the work done. The man has to work, as it were, as a guarantee of good faith for the relief he receives. He receives not wages, but assistance for himself and family.

13268. The amount given to him, therefore, should not depend on the work done?—It should depend on his actual needs.

13269. It would depend on his family and the circumstances of the case?—Certainly, there is that difference.

Combination of unions to provide a test workhouse for "able-bodied."

13270. Supposing there was some combination of unions for the purpose of providing a test house, I think I gathered from what you said that you rather contemplated that a district should be set up under the Metropolitan Poor Act?—Yes. I do not say that would be the absolutely best way, but it has occurred to me that it might very possibly be a useful way of endeavouring to deal with the class termed "able-bodied." As I have said before, the difficulty with that class is that a large proportion of them are persons whom a medical officer cannot certify as being able-bodied in the ordinary sense of the term. It would be essential it seems to me, that in any institution of this sort you should be able to provide for persons in pretty well any physical condition, this is to say, a man who has a weak heart, or is ruptured, or anything of that sort, who is not fit for very hard work, could be dealt with in some way so that he could be constantly kept employed; his relief in that way would be a test of his worth, physical and otherwise, and an incentive to try and shift for himself.

13271. Outside London there is power for the guardians to combine and have a joint committee, as you know?—That is so.

13272. Section 8 of the Poor Law Act, 1879, does not apply to London. Do you think there would be any advantage in its being made applicable to London, rather than setting up a separate district with a board of managers?—As a matter of fact, a joint board of that sort is composed, is it not, of delegates, not necessarily delegates of the board, but representatives of the board?

13273. The other is a little simpler, you merely get a joint committee of the several bodies?—Certainly the inauguration of it would be simpler than formally constituting a district. I think that would be a simpler way of getting at the authority you want.

Unemployed relieved by boroughs as a factor in London's pauperism.

13274. The point I was mentioning just now about the distinction between persons who got assistance from the borough council and assistance from guardians a little affects the answer you gave that the figures may be regarded as to a certain extent interchangeable. That is not quite so, is it?—Perhaps I ought to have said that it might be possible that persons might ring the changes, a person might be relieved by one authority in one year and by another authority the next. I do not mean to say they would to any considerable extent be transferred from one authority to the other during the same period of distress.

Persons "relieved" by both guardians and borough councils.

13275. Do the borough councils refuse to give assistance to people who have been in receipt of relief during a certain time?—Under the present distress committees they should do so; they have to get special assent, I believe, in case they propose to depart from that rule in any case.

13276. That would be for a temporary period?—Yes.

13277. I do not know whether the question of borough councils acting apart from the Unemployed Workmen Act has come under your notice; but have they, as a fact, laid down rules?—I do not think they have. In cases of that sort it is not improbable that persons who had been relieved by the borough council might be temporarily relieved by the guardians, or *vice versa*.

Remuneration for work at Laindon Colony.

13278. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I think it is the theory that guardian's work is relief work, and not paid by wages?—Is that absolutely the case? How is it at Laindon, for instance, are the men paid a fixed scale?—The only payment at Laindon is the 6d. a week which some well-intentioned benevolent gentleman provided the money for; otherwise the men have their lodging and their rations only, they are not paid wages.

13279. Do they ever try to work by piece-work on Poor Law work; are the men paid according to what they do?—I do not think at the present moment there is any provision for the men being paid by money under any circumstances.

13280. That means, does it not, that you must have very special superintendence to see that they do anything like a day's work?—I suppose you are speaking of the labour yards?

Labour yards a method of relief.

13281. Or any other form of work under the guardians?—Certainly, and that has been one of my objections to labour yards, that it has been almost impossible so to arrange the supervision that you could really make that form of relief at all deterrent to the class of men that you wish to make it deterrent to.

13282. Can you ever get a fair day's work out of them?—I do not know that you ever get that. Of course they are kept employed during the time they are there; it is assumed that each person who goes to a labour yard has a certain task of work, but it is unreasonable with 400 or 500 men in a labour yard to expect that each one of them would be able to break the same amount of stone, you cannot exact a fixed task; all you can do is to keep them employed.

13283. I presume a skilled superintendent could tell sufficiently whether they had done a good day's work?—Yes, he could; but it is difficult to insist upon it.

Application for relief by guardians and borough councils.

13284. It is pretty well known in some of the South London unions that the men have oscillated from week to week between the borough council work and the Poor Law?—I think it is possible. In 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1898 certainly, I think in the South of London in a good many places the men would be alternately relieved by the guardians and employed by the borough council.

13285. I think last winter it was the same?—Probably.

13286. In that case the whole object of the borough council's work as against the Poor Law work is defeated?—I take it that the assumption would be that some of the men employed by the borough council would escape disfranchisement.

13287. But with regard to those who went to the Poor Law in the alternate weeks?—They would not.

13288. There would be no superiority in the work?—They would certainly be disfranchised. The mere fact of being employed by the guardians carries that with it.

Out-relief to women wage-earners.

13289. You have said that it is quite habitual for out-relief to be given to women who are employed?—I am afraid it is.

13290. Do you know whether the guardians have ever had it brought before them, as a question of policy, whether this is a wise thing or not?—I have myself incidentally questioned the wisdom of it, but it is difficult when they have a particular case before them to induce them to take the view that they ought to depart from the practice and refuse relief.

13291. It is impossible on the special case?—Yes; I am speaking of the common case of an old woman who is in receipt of relief, or applies for relief, and she is asked what she does, and she says she is employed cleaning a church, for instance, one day, and somewhere else another day, for which perhaps she gets a shilling and her dinner. It is irregular employment, but still she is employed.

13292. Take another case, when you get a woman working, say, at Pink's factory, the relief might be quite necessary, but would any board of guardians take the line of saying, "If you give up work we will give you adequate relief"?—I do not know that they ever have gone as far as that. That is carrying out the principle, no doubt, to its logical conclusion.

13293. Have any boards got rules on this subject?—No rules to this extent, that no person in receipt of any wage whatever should have relief.

13294. No rules for women earning wages, but with men there are rules in respect of wages?—No, I do not think there are fixed rules.

Application for relief by guardians and boroughs.

13295. (*Chairman.*) Assuming that certain men first get employment from the borough under the joint committee, and then revert to the Poor Law, I assume that the borough committee would not give them employment again if they knew that?—I take it at the present moment there has been substituted for what used to be borough employment work provided by the district distress committees, and I think certainly in that case it is one of the accepted conditions that they should not give employment to men who have been in receipt of relief within a certain period.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

13296. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I believe that in some of the the South London unions though distress committees have been formed, the borough council have continued to give the work quite irrespective of what the distress committees are doing?—That is possible; but my enquiries have not been sufficiently extensive to enable me to corroborate that from facts within my own knowledge.

13297. When that is the case I think the borough council take on the men quite irrespective of whether they had been in receipt of poor relief apart from the Distress Committee?—That is possible.

Co-operation between Distress Committees and guardians.

13298. (*Dr. Downes.*) Do you think that the various agencies of relief, the Poor Law relief and the borough council relief, know sufficiently what each is doing?—I think that the borough relief agency, until the establishment of the distress committees, certainly did not know as much as was desirable, but I should have assumed there is improvement in that respect now; there may be exceptions, as Mrs. Bosanquet has suggested, but as a rule there is an endeavour on the part of the distress committees on the one hand and the guardians on the other to know what has been done by the other body and avoid overlapping.

13299. Are there any definite records available to shew what men receive relief and what amount is expended upon relief from each of those sources?—They are not at hand at present, but each distress committee has, in respect of each person employed, a record sheet which gives full particulars of the person's antecedents and so on. I do not know that they have yet been collected for report purposes by the Cental Committee.

Report as to work under Unemployed Workmen's Act.

13300. Is there any machinery which will collect that information so that the public may have it?—I think so, I think it is certainly intended by the Central Committee ultimately to issue a report on the whole subject.

13301. In such a form that the operation of the two kinds of relief may be clearly set forth?—I cannot tell you, but I suppose it would be in such a form.

13302. Is there any statutory machinery that would produce that result?—I am not quire sure whether the Act provides for all that.

13303. Do you think it desirable that it should be done?—I think so, certainly.

Practice of wives sending money to husbands and receiving relief apart from them under Modified Workhouse Test Order, etc.

13304. With reference to the modified Workhouse Test Order, have you found any difficulty with regard to the wives sending money to the men?—No, but I am sorry to say on the other hand, in the case of men who were relieved at labour colonies under the Guildhall Committee in the year before last and last year, it was not unusual for the men to receive money from their wives in stamps and so on, and Mr. Leonard Cohen and myself, who together supervised the Garden City Colony, discouraged it as much as possible.

13305. Do you know whether anything of the sort happened at Laindon?—No, but I think it is more than likely that it did. It is an extremely difficult thing to prevent; in fact, you can only do so by moral suasion.

13306. Can you tell us under what circumstances the three Poplar emigrants have returned so quickly?—I have not particulars beyond the fact that they have returned.

13307. With regard with the Vagrancy Act, was not some attempt made by the Southwark Union to bring the delirium tremens cases, and that class of case, within the Vagrancy Act?—I am afraid I cannot answer that question positively.

13308. I am under the impression that there was some effort, and it was taken to the Courts?—I will enquire about that, and try to give the answer later. (Mr. Lockwood subsequently replied as follows:—In December, 1899, the attention of the guardians was drawn to the case of a man admitted to Newington Workhouse suffering from delirium tremens, the directions were given for prosecuting this man for neglecting to maintain himself; and with a view to the importance of the matter, the clerk was directed to brief Mr. Corrie Grant (who had settled the information) to argue the

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

point before the magistrate, preparatory to the matter being finally determined by the High Court. The magistrate dismissed the charge, but subsequently stated a case, which was lodged, and on the 31st July, 1900, the Divisional Court, after hearing counsel on behalf of the guardians, held that the respondent could not be convicted under the Act. Mr. Justice Kennedy in giving judgment stated: "In my judgment the magistrate was quite right. The respondent at the time that he was taken to the infirmary was extremely ill and suffering from delirium tremens. He is described in the case as suffering from that disease while at his own residence to such an extent that he was dangerous to himself and to those about him. Now we have to bear these facts in mind, while looking at the section under which the magistrate was asked to convict him. That section provides 'every person being able, wholly or in part, to maintain himself or herself, or his or her family, by work or other means, and wilfully refusing or neglecting to do so, by which refusal or neglect he or she or any of his or her family whom he or she may be bound to legally maintain, shall have become chargeable to any parish, township, or place, shall be deemed to be an idle or disorderly person.' Now the respondent was not merely drunk but had become by his own voluntary act for a time diseased and incapable of maintaining himself. Now I do not think that this Act was intended to punish people who by wilfully bringing on a disease incapacitated themselves from working. The statute is directed against persons who at the time they become chargeable are able to maintain themselves. That is not this case. The magistrate, therefore, would have been quite wrong if he convicted a man under this statute, who was suffering from a disease which prevented him from working, however that disease may have been brought on. Mr. Justice Darling agreed.)"

Workhouse labour tests in London and their respective merits.

13309. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Do you find a great variety of forms of labour test in the workhouses in London?—No. I think you may say there are three: Oakum picking, stone breaking, and, here and there, corn mills.

13310. Do you think that, as a whole, the labour test really serves its purpose as a test of destitution for able-bodied?—I should say to the able-bodied, yes, in the majority of cases.

13311. Could you draw any distinction between the forms of labour in that respect?—Do you mean which is the most efficacious?

13312. Yes?—I am disposed to favour the corn mill myself, because I think it is work that anybody can do, and it has this advantage, I think, that a man in performing his task of work is producing something which will be useful to his fellow creatures in the shape of food later on.

13313. Given that you have a difference in the form that the labour test takes, is the administration of it fairly uniform; is the amount of work required for an able-bodied man in a given time the same?—Fairly so, I think.

Emigration of paupers without labour test.

13314. (*Miss Hill.*) Do you know the particulars of the result of the emigration to Canada of a group of men from the Marylebone workhouse, through the Salvation Army, without any previous test?—Last summer 21 men were sent through the Salvation Army to Canada. Good reports have been received as to several. Others have been sent up country and are rather beyond reach, but up to the present none of the men have returned to Marylebone.

13315. Has any other board of guardians sent men out in that way?—I do not know of any boards of guardians that have sent a group of men straight from the workhouse in that way. Speaking for myself, it has always seemed to me that there should be a greater probability of men succeeding in Canada, if, before going, they had, we will say, six months' training in something like the work they would have to do when they got there, rather than taking them straight away from a workhouse and putting them on board ship.

13316. And you think there should be some inquiry into their condition and characters, too?—Yes, I may say that I happen to know that in Marylebone they have a large number of men at the preset moment with perhaps an unusual proportion of really able-bodied men. There was a considerable discussion as to whether they should not emigrate some—I think it was over forty of them—in a group together; and the decision ultimately come to was that it would be better to postpone the matter in order to see whether they could not give the men some adequate training, before they started, rather than to risk sending them straight from the workhouse with the probability of their coming back again.

13317. (*Professor Smart.*) Are the corn mills you spoke of hand mills?—Yes.

The corn m as a labour test.

13318. The old hand mills of sixty years ago?—I do not know about that, probably the interior machinery has been improved, but a hand mill is always a hand mill, it is a machine with a wheel and handle which must be turned to grind the corn.

13319. You said it was producing something useful to one's fellow men, does not that apply to stone-breaking also?—It does, but you realise the usefulness of the flour more directly than you do that of the stone.

13320. There is no arrangement made for using that flour in the workhouse, is there?—I may tell you that I had a very interesting piece of information quite recently at Lewisham; they have had some trouble with so-called able-bodied men, and when I was there last—about two months ago—they were putting up three hand mills, and I asked whether they would not probably find some difficulty in disposing of the surplus flour they might grind, as I knew in some instances there had been a difficulty, but they told me they had made an arrangement with their flour contractor to take from them all that they could not consume themselves in the workhouse, so they got over the difficulty there.

13321. The cost of the flour produced by that method would be very great?—Yes, it would cost more; however, the contractor was willing to take it off their hands at market price; it was better than their getting nothing at all for it, and not being able to use it themselves.

13322. In approving of the corn mill in preference to the stone yard, are you attaching any weight to the effect on the worker?—No; it is merely this, I am regarding it, so to say, as a test. You may say that any person can turn a handle, and I think it is not necessarily such hard work as stone breaking.

13323. It does not destroy the fingers, of course?—No.

The policy incontinuou work in Labour Yar e.g., the rec mation of Chat Moss.

13324. I should like your opinion on this: Some time between 1834 and 1847 an experiment was made of putting labourers to work in Chat Moss on reclaiming land. Those men, I find, worked on the principle that they got enough days work in the week to earn a subsistence for themselves and their families, but for the remainder of the week they were allowed to take outside work at wages wherever they could get it; is that in violation of modern principles?—I do not think it is in violation of the Out-relief Regulation Order, is it?

13325. But of the practice?—I think that you may take it it is not an uncommon thing at all for a man to be in receipt of relief, we will say, for a certain period, and then go off relief, be employed, and then be relieved again.

13326. In the same week?—Not in the same week, I think. I was thinking of a period of perhaps three or four weeks, then out of work, and then in work again.

13327. Is not that a rate in aid, after all?—I suppose we must say it is.

13328. If a man gets enough for himself and his family by, say, three days' work for the Poor Law authority, and then goes out and offers himself for wages the other three days, he can work for any wages he likes?—The principle on which the Board advocate the use of labour yards is that they shoud be so arranged that the man should be off the labour market, that is, he should be employed there for five days a week.

13329. I wanted to know whether we had got more strict in our views, because I find at that time the Poor Law Commissioners approved of that scheme, or said nothing against it?—As a general rule, where labour yards are in use, the persons there employed would be employed for five days in the week, mainly with the object of preventing their interfering with independent labour.

Olave's bour rd experi- nt l causes of failure.

13330. You say your experience in 1895 has prejudiced you against labour yards. Will you tell us what that experience was?—It is rather a long story, and it is all in my report for 1895–6. It happened that in 1894 the first boards were elected under the New Act, and in Bermondsey they had a considerable influx of new blood on the board, and the view of the new comers was that workhouses were unnecessary, and so on. It also happened that, very shortly after the election, the severest frost for almost a century began, that is to say, on the 7th January. But before the commencement of the frost, which really put an absolute stop to all riverside labour for nearly two months, they had already opened a stone yard, and the consequence was that when the real distress came they had on their hands a certain number of undisciplined men in an overcrowded yard, and then on the top of those, they had those who were driven to relief by the severity of the weather. They got a number of persons whom they practically could not control. There were all sorts of stories of abuse and so on. That was partly due no doubt to the fact that it was opened in a hurry, and was not well managed throughout. People came flocking in from all parts of London. They had two places in which the men were employed, but they would have a certain number of men for half a week and a certain number of men for another half, as I have stated in one of my reports. I do not think that is a fair example of stone yard management.

13331. (*Mr. Loch.*) Was that at Bermondsey?—Yes, St. Olaves. It is now Bermondsey; it was St. Olaves in those days.

13332. In the case of St. Olaves did they put on an additional number of superintendents in that labour yard, proportionate to the number of men that came into the yard?—Yes, they did; they increased the staff at one period.

13333. Did they increase the staff before the climax came, when there was very great difficulty in management at all?—No, they did not.

13334. Did they use the House at all in the case of men who were attending the labour yard?—There again it was not until quite late in the period. As a matter of fact, in those days they had two workhouses only, and they were both already full.

13335. At that time you made I think, on behalf of your board, some kind of investigation of all the circumstances, after the winter was over?—Yes.

13336. Could you tell the Commission what was the nett result of your investigation?—Here is an extract: "In addition to the assistant relieving officers, a large number of other temporary officers were appointed from time to time; the largest number so employed being eighty-five on the 9th March."

13337. As against what number of men?—The greatest number of men in any given week was 3,703.

13338. In the labour yard?—Yes, in the two labour yards. The amount of stone purchased was 4,000 tons; the amount broken was 2,500 tons. "The clerk to the guardians, in his evidence before the Select Committee on Distress, stated that the increase in the cost of salaries might be taken at an average of £100 per week; there can, however, be but little doubt that, notwithstanding the large increase in the staff, the inquiries made by the temporary officers were perfunctory and insufficient, while the supervision in the stone yard was altogether ineffective. The amount of stone purchased was 4,000 tons; the amount broken was 2,500 tons. The amount paid in salaries for stone yard purposes was £1,280, in relief £10,782. It was stated before the Select Committee on Distress that, including supervision, rents, plant and materials, the guardians spent altogether £17,000, bringing the cost of the stone broken to £7 a ton, whereas 5s. or less per ton is the usual cost. It was further stated in evidence before the Committee that the experiment was a great failure, owing, among other things, to the class of men employed; some would have honestly tried to do as much as they could, but were deterred by others.';

13339. One may sum it up in this way, that practically the labour yard was there adopted without any regard to the main conditions under which alone it could have operated satisfactorily?—Yes, it was, as I say, opened in a great hurry, and the great trouble when the frost stopped all riverside and dock work was that they were already handicapped by this large number of persons for whom they had made inadequate provision to begin with.

13340. They did not increase their inquiry staff at the same time?—They increased their staff, but unfortunately they made this mistake, that instead of giving the temporary men the clerical work to do, they started them on the inquiries, so that, as they had not any experience in that sort of work, their inquiries were not as satisfactory as they might have been.

Labour yard experiment at West Ham.

13341. In West Ham, the winter before last, Mr. Rushridge was put in charge of a labour yard; may I ask you in two words whether practically the case was not the same in that instance?—Very much the same.

13342. And the result very much the same?—I am afraid so.

13343. Neither of those can be taken as carefully planned and sufficiently supervised instances of stone yards?—That is true.

Refusal of relief at Poplar to returned emigrants.

13344. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You refer to the returned emigrants of the Poplar Union. What became of the two men who were absolutely refused relief?—That is one of those remarkable things one does not know; they have had no relief there. One can only assume that they are doing something whereby they are earning a subsistence.

13345. Or they have cleared out to some other district?—Very likely, I think.

13346. You have also referred to a special inquiry now proceeding in Poplar. What is the nature of that inquiry?—It is with regard to Poor Law Administration generally.

13347. I thought you were referring there to an inquiry which had special reference to casual employment?—No.

Casual labour and "sudden and urgent necessity" relief at Popar.

13348. A question that was asked you was this. "It has been suggested that 'casual' employment increases destitution, and thus the pauperism of certain London unions. Can you supply any evidence for or against this hypothesis?" I thought the inquiry you were referring to in your answer was on the question of casual labour?—No, the inquiry is general, and I take it that that particular question will be gone into at the inquiry.

13349. May I ask you whether you have any information with regard to the prevalence of casual employment in the Poplar district as compared with other districts in the locality?—It is, of course, common knowledge that there has been a very great deal more of out-relief given under the exceptions in the out-relief regulation Order than there has been in the neighbouring unions.

13350. That does not prove, does it, that there is really more casual labour in the locality?—No, it does not prove there is more casual labour, but it may be assumed in a case of that sort you would have more cases to deal with if you had a larger amount of casual labour than if the locality was one where the labour was continuous and steady.

13351. You think in Poplar there is more casual labour than in the immediate locality?—I believe there is.

The overlapping of Borough Council and Poor Law Relief.

13352. In your answer to a question put by Mr. Lansbury on this subject you say, "I think that certainly the figures may be regarded as, to a certain extent, interchangeable." That is those who were found work by the Borough Councils, and those that were given a labour test by the guardians?—What I rather meant by that answer was this, that one would assume that the employment of persons by boroughs would reduce the number of able-bodied persons the guardians would be asked to deal with.

13353. You do not mean to infer to the same extent to which the borough councils find work for the men, do you?—No.

13354. Do not the borough councils really find work for a good many men who would not be considered by the guardians to be eligible for relief of any kind?—Yes, that was the original idea of having recourse to the borough councils in times of exceptional distress, to save the men from being disfranchised.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

13355. Then they would not really be interchangeable, because the borough council is dealing with a different set of men from those who would ordinarily come under Poor Law relief?—Perhaps I used the word "interchangeable" there wrongly. What I meant was that the numbers might be interchangeable inasmuch as persons who would be relieved by the borough council in a particular winter might possibly, but for the borough council, have been relieved by the guardians.

13356. In taking the measure of the number of persons who are dependents in a given union, you would not say it would be fair to take the whole of those that are found employment by the borough council, and those that are relieved by the guardians and say, "That is the sum total of the pauperism of that district," would you?—No, I do not think you would.

Work provided by Borough Councils apart from the Unemployed Workmen's Act.

13357. Was there any work provided on their old lines by any borough councils last winter, during the time the Distress Committees were in operation?—There were special grants made by the Classification Committee of the Central Committee at the Guildhall to boroughs for work done.

13358. That would be for work done under a Distress Committee?—Yes.

13359. Did borough councils provide any work outside the operation of the Distress Committees?—Yes, they did.

13360. Therefore the Unemployed Workmen Act did not prevent borough councils from carrying out the same class of work they did previously?—It was Mr. Long's scheme, and it has developed now into the Unemployed Workmen Act. The return asked for by Mr. Whitmore, a Member of the House, gave the amount of money expended by borough councils and the number of men employed on that work during the winter of 1904-5.

Relief of persons intermittently employed.

13361. With reference to relieving persons who are intermittently employed do you know if it is the practice to give relief to persons who are employed one day, and out of work the next?—No, I do not think it is, except that it might apply to the persons I was speaking of just now—a woman who did a casual day's work.

13362. I mean apart from women?—I do not think with regard to men it is.

13363. They do not make up a broken week, as it were, by outdoor relief?—I think not a broken week.

Effect of Mr. Chamberlain's Circular.

13364. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to work by borough councils, the Circular issued to district boards, and that kind of body, was first issued in 1886, was it not?—Yes, it was.

13365. Did not that Circular create a new class of people whom society had to deal with, not through the Poor Law, but still out of the public funds?—I do not know whether that was the intention of the Circular.

13366. That Circular called attention to the prevailing distress, did it not?—It did, certainly.

13367. And pointed out that it would be rather bad if a large number of respectable, deserving people were thrown on the guardians?—It did.

13368. Is it not true to say that the effect of that Circular has been to bring about discrimination in dealing with able-bodied men and women in need of help?—It was rather able-bodied men established in a district, not able-bodied men as we speak of them in the Poor Law; it was the class above that.

13369. My whole point is this, that it brought in a new discrimination in dealing with people who needed help from their fellows through the law?—I think you may say that it did do that.

13370. That circular specially mentions spade labour and work that would not injure people's hands, and therefore borough councils, town councils and district boards, who found people that sort of work were really acting on the suggestion of that circular, were they not?—I think they were.

13371. That Circular was issued by the head of the Department?—Yes, it was a Circular issued by the Local Government Board.

13372. That has been re-issued, has it not, on many occasions?—Certainly, on two occasions.

13373. Can you tell me whether it was re-issued in 1904?—I do not think it was. I think, as a matter of fact, in 1904 we had Mr. Long's scheme in its place.

13374. The head of the Department, at any rate, or several heads of the Department, have recognised that there are, or have been, a large number of people whom society ought to provide the means of work for?—Yes, the circular says "What is required in the endeavour to relieve artisans and others who have hitherto avoided Poor Law assistance, and who are temporarily deprived of assistance is," and so on.

13375. That cast on society through the rates, and through the borough councils, the responsibility of providing work for these decent respectable men?—The responsibility of providing work? and it was an endeavour, I think, to so deal with them as to avoid, as it says here, the stigma of pauperism.

13376. The money to do that had to be raised out of the rates?—Certainly it was rate money that was to pay for the work done.

13377. That kind of work is carried on very largely in the Metropolis, is it not?—Yes, for ten years certainly, or more, and many thousands of pounds have been spent on it.

Mr. Whitmore's Return.

13378. In Mr. Whitmore's return* you have figures showing the tremendously increased cost of doing work in that way?—Yes.

Relief by Borough Councils.

13379. Therefore the ratepayers were called upon indirectly to give relief, without the Poor Law coming in at all?—Yes, assistance without the Poor Law—it is relief you may say, I do not know that one need trouble about a phrase.

13380. Some were being paid more than they really earned in the ordinary market value of things?—I do not know that.

13381. The labour cost more than it would have cost if the work had been done under ordinary normal conditions?—That is so, of course.

13382. That is the effect of borough councils attempting to carry out the intention of the circular?—It was really in supplying work in most instances.

13383. And paying men to do it, who were not able to do it?—Who were not skilled in that particular work.

Wood-chopping and question of Workhouse industries competing with outside labour.

13384. Has anything come to your Department with regard to an agitation from the firewood cutters, the people who sell firewood, asking that the Board should prohibit boards of guardians selling firewood?—Yes, and there has been, as you know, a correspondence between the association and many boards of guardians.

13385. Would it not be true to say, supposing any industry were carried on in the workhouses on anything like a big scale, it might have the effect of raising opposition, even from the corn millers?—Yes, that is the difficulty, no doubt, to find a work that is suitable to the aged or infirm class. You do not wish to impose any very disagreeable work upon them, and the difficulty arises of avoiding interference with independent labour.

13386. Is that not one of the reasons why you are suggesting that these men should be taken to farm colonies?—I do not know that it is quite that. I am thinking with regard to employment in the workhouses of the work you would give to a somewhat different class to that which I should propose sending to a farm colony, or a branch workhouse in the country. Taking wood-chopping, for instance, I think as a general rule it is only the older men who are employed in the workhouse on that, but even the work so done is sufficient, according to the association you are speaking of, to interfere with the trade outside.

13387. It interferes with the ordinary labourers?—It does.

Expensiveness of labour yard work

13388. One of the objections to labour yards which you have just mentioned, and, as a matter of fact, to all work provided in that sort of way, is that it makes it more costly. Have you any figures to give us showing what is the cost of corn ground by the inmates of a work-

* H.C. 193—1905.

house and what would be the ordinary cost at a modern flour mill ?—I have not the figures, but you may take it at once that it is very considerably greater; it must be.

13389. So that the figures you just now read out as applicable to Bermondsey apply in a larger or smaller extent to any work that is carried on under the Poor Law ?—Yes, to any artificial work of that sort.

Census of occupations of males at Poplar.

13390. With regard to casual labour, could you put in the census return that was taken at Poplar showing the occupations of the male inhabitants of Poplar ?—You mean probably the census that was taken to supply the materials asked for by a circular from the Board as to the different industries represented in Poor Law relief ?

13391. No, I mean the house-to-house census that was taken in Poplar by the Distress Committee of the district. I was wondering whether your Department had a copy of that ? It was taken during this last winter ?—I have not seen that.

After-careers of emigrants from Poplar.

13392. You cannot tell us what has happened to the remainder of the Poplar emigrants, I suppose ?—No. All I know is what I have heard from the clerk, that letters have been received from four or five of them in which it appeared that they were doing well: but they have no particulars beyond that. They were sent out under the auspices of the Salvation Army, and I suppose the Army Authorities have some arrangements whereby they know something about the men for some time after they arrive there.

13393. We have a return about that, but we rather want to leave them alone. Would it be possible for you to get, and put in, the record papers of those men who were sent, and many other men that were sent from other unions, to show the kind of men that were sent ?—You could probably get those materials from your clerk's office; I am prepared to say this, that I do know as a fact that the 100 men who first went to Laindon, with very few exceptions, were men who were gravitating to the condition of ins-and-outs.

13394. The answer to the question as to money to the wives could only refer, so far as London is concerned, to families dealt with under the modified Workhouse Test Order ?—Yes. I know there were fifty men of that class sent to Laindon under that Order.

Status of unemployed for whom municipalities find work.

13395. Would it be true to say that the people who receive relief through the borough council, or work through the borough council, and receive wages for more work than they are able to perform, are in the ordinary and accepted sense of the word paupers, or dependants upon society in the same way that the pauper is ?—Hardly that, I think, but that adjective of mine "interchangeable" is unfortunate. What I wanted to convey was that they were taken in hand before they reached the condition when Poor Law relief was rendered necessary.

13396. I am on the point of principle as to whether society is to be called on to relieve people before they become destitute; whether that is not what the circular really involves ?—That is, I think, only in times of exceptional distress.

13397. If in times of exceptional distress it means many people, as a matter of fact in principle there is no reason why an individual person should not be so relieved ?—No, that is true.

Need for powers of detention in test workhouses and colonies.

13398. (*Mr. Booth.*) I suppose that any institutions to take the place of the labour yard would either be educational or used as a test with a view to discrimination rather than industrial or productive in their aims ?—Yes, I think you might say that they should be to a certain extent in the nature of a test, and also, so far as possible, reformatory. There comes in the difficulty that unless you get legislation to enable you to deal with the men for a sufficiently long period, it is a question whether the second result would be achieved

13399. In addition to that you would have to follow it up by different treatment and possibly different institutions, according to the results of the discrimination or education ?—That is so.

13400. With regard to the deterrent, I suppose the discrimination would be practically deterrent to those who could but would not work ?—Yes, that is the condition, and I think it is a good thing that it should be so; a man will put up with a good deal before he gives up his liberty. It is a strong incentive to try and work for your own livelihood if you know the alternative is that you will, for the time being at all events, be cut off from the world outside.

13401. The whole system, though elaborate, would have the merit of being deterrent in that sense that those who knew they were to be treated in this way, unless they knew they were likely to be suitable for that treatment, would prefer to stay outside ?—Yes, I think it would. They would try to stay outside.

Relief in cases of sudden and urgent necessity and control over such cases.

13402. (*Mr. Loch.*) No question has been asked you about the sudden and urgent necessity relief which has been given in the past winter. Under what condition was that ?—I understand that the whole of that question was gone into with Mr. Adrian. As a matter of fact, cases of sudden and urgent necessity are not necessarily reported to the Board.

13403. To what extent were those cases passed to the Board during the past winter ?—They are not passed to the Board.

13404. They come to the Board, do they not ?—No, they are dealt with in that way under an exception to the Out-door Relief Regulation Order. The cases which would be reported to the Board are cases under Article 10 of that Order, which is a different one In this case the ordinary urgent cases do not come before the Board necessarily at all.

13405. Are they not reported to the Board ?—No.

13406. Then what control have you over them ?—The only control is this, that it ultimately rests with the auditor to ascertain, as far as he can, whether the cases were such as to justify their being dealt with in that way.

13407. Have you any return as to the extent to which relief was given in that way made to you by the various unions in London ?—No.

13408. Neither this winter nor last ?—No.

13409. Have you noticed at all how far it has affected the figures for the winter ?—In Poplar it has.

13410. Can you say the extent to which it has done so ?—Several thousands.

13411. (*Mr. Lansbury*). That several thousands includes the families ?—Yes, it includes women and children.

13412. There were 500 to 600 actual cases ?—It is between 500 and 700 cases.

13413. (*Mr. Loch.*) In Poplar ?—Yes.

13414. You have no return for St. Pancras, for instance ?—No.

13415. Would it be possible to get that information all round ?—The Commission might get it from the clerks to guardians.

Relief to families of men in Workhouse under modified Workhouse Test Order.

13416. With regard to the Modified Workhouse Test Order, the present application of that Order differs considerably from the application of it in Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East, does it not ?—I do not know that it does. I think there is this difference, that the men are allowed out for a longer period.

13417. I think I am right in saying, am I not, that in Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East no charges were made on the Poor Law with regard to those people who were left outside—the wives and families; they were supported by voluntary contributions ?—In St. George's-in-the-East in a certain number of cases that was so. So I understood Mr. Crowder; that he took them in hand himself.

13418. It was so in Whitechapel ?—I am not able to speak of that.

13419. With regard to fixing the relief which the guardians paid to those families, have you had anything to do with that, as to the amount that should be paid, or anything of that kind ?—No, we have not. That, I think, would necessarily be left to the discretion of the guardians.

13420. Do you know whether any scale has been adopted with regard to it ?—I do not know that it has. At Poplar I thought they had adopted the Mansion House scale,

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

which was 10s. for the wife and 1s. 6d. or 2s. for the first child, and so on downwards. I am informed that was not so, but when attending one of their relief committees I saw two cases which I thought were typical of the others, which led me to assume that they had adopted that scale throughout.

13421. With regard to that scale or a scale approaching it, has there been any consideration by each Committee of the propriety of the amount given to those people who are in the family?—I take it each case is considered as to what is necessary to meet the needs of the family.

13422. The auditor has not drawn attention to it in any case?—No, I do not think so.

13423. It has not been under the consideration of the Local Government Board as a thing rather out of the ordinary course?—It would only come before the Board on the Report of the Auditor. The Auditor must find a case where the relief was excessive, and then it would come under consideration as to whether it should be disallowed or not.

13424. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I thought at Whitechapel they never acted on the Order?—They did not that year.

13425. It was stated to be only temporarily in force?—I was not aware of this, but Mr. Loch is telling us that it has been so.

13426. If so, they have been quite out of order. The Order was only issued for six months or three months—some particular time?—Yes, I believe that is so.

Improved standard of medical relief and its effects.

13427. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) What has been the effect on pauperism of the improved treatment afforded in sick asylums and infirmaries?—The effect has undoubtedly been to increase the number.

13428. (*Mr. Nunn.*) In the face of the increasing standard of comfort and hygiene in regard to infirmary accommodation, can you suggest any lines of action by which boards of guardians, with due regard to humane treatment, may secure ineligibility of conditions in infirmaries?—The improved standard of comfort and treatment generally in infirmaries has been brought about in response to public opinion on the subject, and the improved condition must, it appears to me, be maintained.

13429. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to the sick, do you consider that too much is done for sick persons, and are there any sick asylums or infirmaries in the Metropolis, which, in your judgment, have been built in too extravagant a manner; also is it your opinion that they are administered extravagantly?—Institutions for the sick are necessarily costly, but I should hesitate to say that any of the separate infirmaries have been built in too extravagant a manner, nor should I be disposed to say that they are extravagantly administered. The cost of maintenance may with regard to some items appear higher in one institution than another, but I should be sorry to say that there was any general extravagance in the administration.

Need for London able-bodied Workhouses outside London.

13430. Would you be in favour of removing all institutions of a permanent character outside town areas?—I think any institution for the able-bodied should in future be provided as cheaply as possible beyond the limits of London, but I question if the same could advantageously be done with institutions for the aged, infirm, or the sick.

Old age pensions.

13431. You have told us that considerable numbers will always require institutional treatment. For the remainder of those who could get along outside, are you in favour of their receiving adequate pensions?—I have no objection to adequate pensions, if it could be ensured that they would be legitimately used and in the best interest of those for whom they were provided; assuming also funds for this purpose could be provided without detriment to the self-supporting members of the community.

13432. Can you tell us what the average total cost is for maintaining an aged person in workhouses or infirmaries?—I have been unable to get information which will enable me to answer this question.

Medical relief as a high road to pauperism.

13433. (*Mrs. Webb.*) It has been suggested that medical relief (outdoor) is often the first step to chronic pauperism. Can you direct the Commission to any statistics bearing on this hypothesis?—There are no statistics to which I can direct the Commission, though I can give particulars of some two or three families who have received relief of this sort through three generations. (Paper subsequently handed in. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (M)).

Class of persons receiving out-door medical relief from Poor Law and Voluntary Hospitals.

13434. Are you of opinion that the class of persons applying for out-door medical relief in the Metropolis is any way different, and, if so, in what way, from the main class of (I) workhouse inmates, (II.) out-door paupers?—This depends a good deal upon the view taken by a particular board with regard to medical relief. I know of a case in which, in consequence of the relief committees requiring all medical relief cases to go before the committee the list of persons receiving this form of relief was reduced in the course of eighteen months to some 1,500, which suggests that a class somewhat above that which gravitate to general relief were ready to avail themselves of medical relief if it could be obtained without any great inconvenience.

Result of enquiries by Voluntary Hospitals into income of applicants for medical assistance.

13435. Does this class differ in any way, and, if so, in what way, from the class of out-patients at the voluntarily supported hospitals? Is there any difference, and if so, what, in the kind of illness dealt with respectively by Poor Law out-door medical relief, and by the out-patient departments of the voluntarily supported hospitals?—It is not easy to say in what way this class differs from the class of out-patients at the hospitals; and the inquiries that I have made at St. Thomas', the Middlesex, and the Royal Free hospitals, have not proved very helpful towards arriving at a conclusion. For instance, it was at one time alleged that persons actually in employment had found that they were kept waiting longer as applicants at a hospital than when applying at a dispensary or medical relief office with a relieving officer's order, and there were complaints of this. To meet this difficulty they have, at St. Thomas', appointed two properly qualified men to deal specially with such cases, and so avoid delay. It may probably be said that the class using general hospitals and infirmaries respectively differs to this extent, that the majority of those using the former are of a better class financially than those using the latter, though they are probably in a sense interchangeable; that is to say, the lady almoners who have been appointed at certain hospitals (for example, St. Thomas', the Royal Free, Middlesex, and Westminster) to enquire into the circumstances of applicants, find among them an appreciable number who are referred to the Charity Organisation Society, to the friendly societies, and provident dispensaries. On the other hand, a certain number are referred to the Poor Law authorities, though the number so referred is inconsiderable if the lady almoner's report for Westminster may be taken as a type; because out of a total of 4,000 patients interviewed, forty-seven only were referred to the Poor Law. One of the governors of the Royal Free Hospital wrote me that the object of the hospital in instituting almoner's inquiries, which are paid for partly by the Charity Organisation Society, was, on the one hand, to prevent people able to pay for ordinary medical treatment outside, accepting charity meant only for the poor, and on the other hand, to avoid overlapping the Poor Law. Consequently all cases found to have means were referred after first aid to medical clubs, etc., and all requiring nourishment only, or principally, were, after first aid, referred to the Poor Law. Last year, of 8,000 cases inquired into, 226 were referred to medical clubs, etc., and eighty-four to the Poor Law.

Class of persons resorting to Poor Law Infirmaries.

13436. Are you of opinion that the class of persons entering the workhouse infirmaries in London is, apart from their illness, in any way different and, if so, in what way, from the ordinary (1) workhouse inmates, (2) out-door paupers? Does this class differ in any way, and, if so, in what way, from that of the persons admitted to the voluntarily supported general hospitals?—They differ to this extent, that an appreciable number of them are, under ordinary circumstances, self-supporting and fairly well-to-do; that this is so is suggested, amongst other things, by the large number of persons dying in Poor Law infirmaries who are buried by their friends, and in most infirmaries there are a certain number of paying patients. This class probably differs less from that of persons admitted to hospitals than the outdoor cases previously referred to.

13437. Do you think that there has been of recent years any change, and if so, what change, in the class of persons resorting to the workhouse infirmaries of the London

unions?—The improved conditions of infirmary relief have had the effect of inducing an increased number of persons ordinarily above a status of poverty approaching destitution to make use of them.

The alleged transfer of patients from voluntary to Poor Law Hospitals.

13438. Do you know of any cases, and, if so, in what unions and what kind of cases, in which voluntarily supported hospitals transfer patients, either permanently or during "spring cleaning," or other emergency, to workhouse infirmaries?—As to spring cleaning in the hospitals, the Central Medical Council, composed of representatives of all the London hospitals, or most of them, meet periodically to settle, *inter alia*, how many wards shall be vacated for spring cleaning, and when, and which of a particular group of hospitals shall receive patients so temporarily displaced. There is nothing to show that patients are under these circumstances transferred to Poor Law infirmaries, though I expect that patients in public hospitals are not infrequently, when their case becomes chronic, transferred to Poor Law infirmaries, and it may be taken for granted that where a general hospital is in the neighbourhood of a Poor Law infirmary cases will occasionally arise of transfer or disputed responsibility which cause friction between the authorities.

Decreased deterrency of London Workhouses.

13439. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are workhouses ceasing to be deterrent?—Yes, at least so far as regards the sick and the aged.

13440. What is the evidence on this head, statistical or other?—Guardians, masters of workhouses, and relieving officers all speak to the more or less steady increase in number of applications for indoor relief and in the number of admissions, and the ratio of the increase of pauperism for London for the last ten years has been greater in the case of indoor than of outdoor relief.

13441. What suggestions can be made, if this is in fact the case?—As to suggestions in connection with this, classification in workhouses would at all events ensure that the increased comfort upon which public opinion insists should be confined to the aged, and that the disreputable at least should not enjoy them. More might perhaps be done to keep the aged employed, but this is a very difficult question, inasmuch as no employment of workhouse inmates should to any appreciable extent interfere with industries followed by independent persons outside.

Evidence of change in class of persons resorting to Poor Law Infirmaries.

13442. What evidence is there that in London people of a better class than formerly go into the infirmary?—The evidence that a better class than formerly resort to Poor Law infirmaries is to be found in the appearance of relatives and other visitors to patients; the number of cases where payments are recovered by guardians, and of those where funerals are conducted and paid for by friends or relatives.

Operation of Brabazon scheme in London.

13443. Can you give particulars of the Brabazon Scheme; and the extent to which it is adopted in London?—The Brabazon Scheme is adopted in a good many workhouses in London, and I can give particulars of a few:—Bethnal Green: numbers employed, men, seventeen; women, nine. St. Pancras: men, one; women, thirty. Marylebone: men, eleven; women, sixty-five. Poplar: men, seven; women, thirty-four. St. George's: men, nine; women, thirty-four. Southwark (Newington Workhouse): men, six; women, nine. Hackney: men, three; women, twenty-five. Camberwell (Gordon Road): men, three; women, three. As to those only recently started—Lambeth: men, five; women, twenty-eight. Greenwich: men, eleven; women, twenty. Fulham: men, nil at present; women, twenty-six. Chelsea: old women previously ignorant are taught needlework, and thus become useful in making-up, mending, etc. Much of the work done is of excellent quality, and averages a good price. The workers are recompensed in various ways, entertainments, excursions, and, in the case of Lambeth, twelve of the old people were sent to various convalescent homes and other places for change of air and holiday.

Classification in London Workhouses and Infirmaries.

13444. How far is classification carried out in London in the workhouses and infirmaries, or as between them and the institutions of the asylums board, and joined with a use of private institutions? Could you report on two or three typical unions from this point of view?—Classification in workhouses in London accords with the general consolidated Order, except that in most cases indoor children are in separate establishments. The classes are: (1) Men infirm through age or other cause; (2) able-bodied men and youths above the age of fifteen; (3) boys over seven and under fifteen; (4) women infirm through age or other cause; (5) able-bodied women and girls above fifteen; (6) girls above seven and under fifteen; (7) children under seven. This was the original classification, but as regards children in London, it has been modified to meet the regulations respecting ages of admission to district and separate schools; that is to say, that in the workhouse the classification ages for children are eight to fifteen, three to eight, and under three, children under three not being admissible to the schools. Further classification includes, in workhouses, married couples' quarters, and, in some workhouses, sub-classification in accordance with the Board's circular of 1896 has been provided for. The better class of either sex have to a certain extent separate accommodation, and enjoy special privileges with regard to leave of absence, and so on. In infirmaries, classification necessarily follows to a great extent the nature of the disease, and is, in fact, regulated by the medical superintendent. The sexes are, of course, divided, and in some infirmaries there are separate children's wards. As typical unions or parishes in this connection may be mentioned, St. Pancras—two workhouses, two infirmaries, children's receiving home, separate school, one main workhouse, certified for 1,584. To this all indoor cases are first admitted. The classes retained are infirm men, infirm women, and able-bodied men and women. The sick are not retained in the workhouse, but transferred to the adjoining infirmary in Cook's Terrace or to the infirmary at Highgate. A branch workhouse at Streatham, certified for 454, receives healthy old men and younger men, if crippled or otherwise infirm. All the housework and laundry work is done by the inmates. In case of sickness, unless removal is dangerous, all cases would be transferred to one or other of the infirmaries. The Hackney infirmary has 452 beds, and to this sick cases, including children and phthisical cases, are sent. The cases so dealt with are mainly those resident in the northern part of the parish, while those sent to the Cook's Terrace infirmary are mostly residents in the southern part, excluding children and phthisical cases. The receiving home, about a mile from the workhouse, is certified for sixty. To this all children except the sick, are transferred immediately after their admission to the workhouse receiving ward. They remain in the home for fourteen days, and are then, if under medical certificate, transferred to the schools at Leavesden, unless they are of the class known as "ins-and-outs." The schools at Leavesden are certified for 678 inmates. Islington parish has two workhouses, one infirmary, and a separate school. At St. John's Road there is one workhouse, certified for 1,274, intended for the aged of both sexes and able-bodied women. The Cornwallis Road workhouse is certified for 838, and is intended for healthy old men and women, able-bodied men and children; the latter are kept at this workhouse for a probation period before being sent to the schools. The infirmary on Hackney Hill is certified for 800 beds. The school situated in Hornsey Road is certified for 400. This is the only separate or district school situated within London, and the guardians have not yet been able to see their way to provide a proper receiving home.

13445. What is the accommodation for lunatics in London workhouses?—I have no separate returns of accommodation for lunatics in workhouses.

Effect of Dietary Order in London.

13446. What has been the effect of the Dietary Order in London; has it led to greater variations of dietaries?—I think it has led to greater variation and also to a reduction in the number of complaints to the Board by inmates with regard to the food supplied. Another effect, for which it was, in fact, designed, has been relief at both ends from the tiresome correspondence between the Board and boards of guardians previously necessary in relation to any proposed alteration in the dietary, however insignificant.

Cost of Poor Law buildings in London and checks thereon

13447. (*Chairman.*) The opinion seems to be unanimous that the improved comfort and treatment afforded in the workhouses and infirmaries have naturally tended to increase the number of people entering them. Are you consulted at all in regard to the cost of new buildings that are to be put up?—Yes, very much. We have to consider the plans and the probable cost of new buildings as submitted by the guardians.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

13448. You have no particular scale as regards what the cost per bed should be for workhouses or infirmaries?—No, it is almost impossible to have a scale, so much depends upon local circumstances.

13449. Mr. Davy put in some returns relating to the infirmaries built during the last twenty years, as to the cost per bed, exclusive of site. I will take the London infirmaries. In 1893, Brentford built an infirmary at the cost of £200 a bed; in 1894 West Ham built an infirmary the cost of which was £372 per bed for 672 people; and in 1898 Bethnal Green built an infirmary for almost exactly the same number of people (669), but at a cost of £274 per bed. If you would look at that return (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (3)), you will see that in those two poor districts, both of which had to build infirmaries, there is a difference of £100 per bed, which I calculate means that West Ham paid £65,000 more than Bethnal Green did for the accommodation of the same number of people?—Those, I take it, in neither case include the cost of the site?

13450. No, that is exclusive; that shows a very great discrepancy?—It does. I know that in the case of the West Ham Infirmary the question was mooted originally, I think in 1889; it was not until 1898 I think that the infirmary was built; however that does not matter. The question of the plans was considered over and over again, and so far as I recollect every endeavour was made to keep the cost within due proportions, but ultimately the plans were passed and the cost worked out at the very large figure you have mentioned.

13451. On the face of it it looks as if some explanation was wanted of why two buildings of exactly the same size, for exactly the same class of persons, both put up by poor localities, should so vary in price?—I agree.

13452. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Might I suggest that perhaps the explanation is found in the provision of the laundry, nurses' house and the engineer's and steward's houses. I rather think at Bethnal Green the steward is the master of the workhouse, and perhaps the laundry work is done at the workhouse, which is quite close. After the figures in that return you will see there is a description of the work which was done, and to compare them you want to know what each set of guardians got for the money?—I see that in Bethnal Green the Nurses' Home is not included, and that is always a very considerable item.

13453. (*Chairman.*) Do you think your department have sufficient power over the cost of building?—I do not know how they could have larger power, unless they were to say this: "You want accommodation for this or that number of persons, of this, that, or the other class; you may spend so much money and no more." When you get into the hands of architects and contractors it is very difficult to limit the price.

13454. Mr. Kitchin said that after the plans were sanctioned there were very often alterations, and that structural changes were made which ran up the expenditure. Is that your experience?—I do not think that happens very often. If you once begin to go outside your contract the price goes up enormously, or it is liable to.

13455. Is there any scale at all present to your mind or the minds of those who pass those buildings as to what is a reasonable or unreasonable expenditure per bed?—No. For instance probably anyone would say that the cost of the beds at Hendon, £455, was an unreasonable one. At the same time it had to be passed ultimately.

13456. That is the City of London, is it not?—No, it is the Central London Asylum District. The guardians concerned there are Strand, Westminster, St. Giles, and St. George's, Bloomsbury, three unions in combination. Probably one explanation of the cost there is that the pavilions were two storied instead of three.

13457. (*Mr. Lock.*) Was not that gigantic?—Yes, it is enormous.

13458. Why, therefore, had it to be passed?—I really forget the circumstances now; I know it was passed.

13459. (*Chairman.*) What occurs to one is that if, as is inevitably the case, increased comfort in a building attracts people to it, if the poor localities in London spend these very large sums of money, they are not only taxing themselves for the increased cost of the building, but they are encouraging more and more people in their locality to go into the building?—That is true, unfortunately.

Increased cost of London Workhouses and causes.

13460. There is another return I have here of Mr Davy's. This relates to workhouses. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. V. (2)). If you notice, up to 1898 there were no workhouses which cost more than £154 per bed. Then a number were built in London and they came up to from £269 to £284 per bed. Was there any alteration in the standard of comfort or the accommodation in workhouses in that period, say between 1890 and 1898, which would account for that rise?—It would partly account for it no doubt. In deference, as I have said before, to public opinion, there was a tendency in workhouses, particularly such a workhouse as that in Bermondsey, which is for the aged and infirm, to make such provision, of greater space, subdivision, and so on, as would tend to bring up the cost per bed, and later again, in the case of Hammersmith, it was built with a view to providing for that sub-classification which is thought desirable; and if you attempt to provide for that structurally, you necessarily very considerably increase the cost of the building. Then within the last twelve years the cost of building generally has gone up very considerably. I see that West Ham is put down here as being built in 1894. I do not know quite what that means, but I know that in 1894, when I first came back to London, there was a question of West Ham providing an infirmary, and everything was all settled, and it was then, as the architects call it, cubed at 8d. a foot; by the time they began to build the infirmary five years later the price in the locality had gone up to something like 1s. 1d. per foot. There at once the actual cost of labour, material and so on, is increased by one-third.

The process of passing plans for Workhouse buildings by the Local Government Board.

13461. What is the process through which plans pass. I suppose if it is decided to build an infirmary or a workhouse, you would, from an administration point of view, be consulted?—Yes.

13462. There are certain requirements which you would insist upon?—Yes.

13463. The next process I suppose, if all your wants are complied with, is that it is referred to the architect's department of the Local Government Board?—Yes.

13464. And he makes the best calculation he can, as to whether or not the price is excessive?—He does.

Increased willingness of guardians to incur expenditure on workhouse buildings.

13465. Have you noticed a great change, or has there been any change in the attitude of the guardians towards building these institutions. I suppose in your earlier days as an inspector you had rather to press upon them the necessity of providing certain requirements?—Yes.

Factors in the increase cost of workhouse infirmaries.

13466. Is that still so?—I think with guardians you may find it difficult in starting them, but once you have done that it is very difficult to hold them in hand. With regard to the cost of infirmaries I do not know whether this has been mentioned before (possibly Mr. Kitchin referred to it), the views of experts, and all concerned, with regard to what is a proper proportion of nurses, for instance, in an infirmary, has very materially changed in the last fifteen years; in other words, in every new infirmary now there is considerably more accommodation required for the nursing staff. That is all included in the price per bed. It is only fair to recognise that that is one of the items which must tend to increase the cost.

13467. For instance separate nurse's accommodation requires considerable extra building?—Yes, it is a very considerably item in any new infirmary now.

System of payment of architects a possible factor in increased cost of buildings.

13468. Are you satisfied with the present system. You have had a good deal of experience of it. Can you make any suggestion to bring a little more economy to bear?—It is extremely difficult to say what should be done. If you say that the plans shall not be passed until tenders have been received, it involves a good deal of delay and consequent trouble. I do not see what else can be done. The guardians' architect is told he is to provide for a certain number of people in a certain way. As a general rule there are conferences between him and the architect of the Local Government Board. As a general rule it is found that the board's architect makes suggestions here and there that tend to a reduction in the cost. Then at last the plans are passed as apparently suitable for the purpose required. The guardians' architect in the meantime has estimated the cost to be so

and so, and I may say, probably without exception, when the tenders are received, there is never any tender that is not considerably higher than the architect's estimate. Here comes in a point that is worth considering, but I do not see how it can be altered; the Institute of British Architects requires that every architect shall charge 5 per cent. of the total cost of whatever plans he may prepare, consequently—I do not wish to suggest anything about architects—it is only natural that the architect is not specially anxious that the total sum shall be a small one; and naturally to start with he does not estimate a very high sum, in order to avoid delay in commencing. Then when, as I say, is almost invariably the case, they find it is going to cost a great deal more, it is so much to his advantage. The only suggestion that has ever occurred to me would be this, I do not suppose it is possible, that the architect should be paid his percentage on his original estimate and nothing more. Then, I think, you would probably get estimates a great deal nearer what the buildings actually cost in the long run, and the guardians would be able to determine whether they should go on with the particular scheme as it is presented, or not. As it is they go on more or less blindly, there is a set of plans which are thought suitable for the purpose intended, their architect tells them they are going to cost so and so, but they in most cases cost a good deal more than the estimate.

uardians
w to move
d slow to
p in
atter of
penditure
buildings.

13469. As you say, guardians are difficult to set in motion, but when once set in motion they want to have a building that not only will be up-to-date, but superior to anybody else's?—Yes, not unnaturally, they like a very good thing indeed. I think, speaking for myself and my colleagues, that in considering the plans and so on we endeavour, as far as possible, to see that the plans shall provide what is absolutely necessary, and no more.

ructure of
orkhouses
tisfactory.

13470. As regards the actual construction, there have been no complaints, have there?—I think not.

eaning of
cost per
d."

13471. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to this estimate of cost by the bed, are beds that are referred to in that solely those that are occupied by sick people, or is the bedroom accommodation for other residents covered?—In the cost per bed you take the cost of the whole building and divide it by the number of the patients' beds only.

13472. So that it is not a very good test?—No, it is somewhat misleading. But in an infirmary you must have nurses and medical staff, so it is not, after all, unfair that the cost of the beds should include the cost of the housing of the medical and the nursing staff.

arious
andards for
mparison
cost of
ildings.

13473. That all needs to be borne in mind, and, possibly, does explain the great divergence?—To some extent.

13474. The test you have just mentioned is a sort of builders' test; the 8d. a foot cube, which you say very soon rose to 1s. 1d. a cube foot. That refers to the total size of the building cubed out?—Yes.

13475. Another very common and usual test is that of the square feet of floor surface. Is that ever taken as a test?—I think, as a rule, architects always talk of the cube at so much; it is a simple thing to remember. I know it is the fact that 8d. a cube was what buildings could be provided for in London and the neighbourhood twelve years ago. I do not think now that a building of that class can be provided for less than at least 1s.

13476. That test would be very useful in showing the alteration in actual cost of bricks and mortar, and so on?—I think so.

13477. It might, perhaps, be applied in addition to the test of so much per bed?—It might, certainly. The only further observation I wish to make here is that the Hendon Infirmary is put down as having been built in 1896, two years later than West Ham. As a matter of fact, that date for West Ham is wrong; the infirmary was not completed till 1899 or 1900, I think. The date of 1894 would seem to imply that the infirmary at West Ham ought to have cost less because at that time labour was less costly, but, as a matter of fact, it was built later than the Hendon infirmary was.

ctors in
creased cost
workhouse
ildings.

13478. I think we have had a good deal in evidence that some portion of the extra cost, where they have been very costly, has been due to the adoption of the very latest scientific methods, for instance, with regard to heating and ventilation, and matters of that sort, scientific machinery and other things in the building. Have you recognised that this has been done in a degree that is unnecessary?—I cannot say it has been done to an unnecessary degree. If you have a superintendent of an infirmary, and he is a man whose abilities and usefulness you appreciate, you do not like to say: You shall not have this which you think is essential to good management. I do not think you can very well interfere with him.

13479. Would you say on the whole the high cost is a question of the design, or that it is aggravated by bad management as to the tendering, or in the actual operations?—I do not think there is any bad management. As I say, I think, perhaps, behind it all, this continued excess of actual cost over original estimate lies to a certain extent in that question of the architect's position in the matter.

13480. Do you suppose that the cost is expensive from the point of view of an unnecessary profit to the contractor, or is this additional cost due to an expensive form of design?—I think it is not certainly due to expensive forms of design; there may be here and there something which might have been dispensed with, but I do not think that that operates very considerably. On the other hand, you have a number of firms tendering, and you may assume that the tender which is accepted is one which may be regarded as genuine from a trade point of view. If you have a dozen big firms tendering no doubt their tenders vary considerably, but I think you may assume, if you take the lowest tender, you are probably getting value for your money.

13481. So you blame neither the design nor the operation?—I do not think I can.

Deterrent effect of investigation upon amount of out-medical relief.

13482. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) In answer to a question put by Mrs. Webb, you say you know of a case in which the list of persons receiving outdoor medical relief was reduced in the course of eighteen months to some 1,500. Could you tell us what number it was reduced from, roughly?—I am afraid I cannot; but I think I am right in saying it was reduced to very nearly one half.

Transfer of patients from Hospitals to Poor Law Infirmaries.

13483. (*Mr. Loch.*) There has never been any return shewing the extent to which patients are sent from hospitals to infirmaries or workhouses, has there?—No, never.

13484. You say hospitals receive patients temporarily displaced, and so on; is there any return, or has any investigation been made, with regard to the number of patients that are sent from hospitals to infirmaries?—No, there never has, I think.

13485. It would be a new subject of investigation?—I think it would. I do not wish, as it is a new subject, to dogmatise, but I do not think that they are very considerable now. I have in mind two cases, Middlesex Hospital in Marylebone, and St. Thomas' Hospital in Lambeth, where there was a good deal of trouble at one time, but I think they have come to more or less amicable arrangements now. I do not think it happens very often.

13486. The actual number is not large?—No, I do not think it is.

General indebtedness of the District not considered in dealing with Poor Law Expenditure.

13487. With regard to the questions asked by the Chairman, is any account taken of the indebtedness of a district in relation to the expensive nature of the buildings which they desire to erect?—Before they can get a loan certain forms have to be gone through, and amongst other things they have to send up a form shewing their total indebtedness, giving the date of each loan, how much has been repaid, and so on.

13488. That is the board of guardians alone?—Yes.

13489. No account is taken of the indebtedness of the district as a whole from the point of view of the ratepayer?—The indebtedness of the guardians only is taken into account.

13490. Take the Borough of Stepney. There you have a rateable value of £1,358,000, and the outstanding loans to the credit of the rate are £1,763,000, so that taking the population of the district as a whole, and its liabilities, you find very considerable addition, from that point of view, which the workhouse may effect to the indebtedness of the district?—Quite true, it is certainly a point that, with regard to expenditure by

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

guardians, they are only concerned with their own particular indebtedness; but there is the large item of borough expenditure.

13491. It may aggravate what was already an exceedingly severe pressure?—It might.

Proposed new London Central Board for controlling Poor Law expenditure.

13492. Do you think that economy could be obtained in this way: Supposing there was a Central Board for London, and that central body made a grant towards the expenses of the local board of guardians conditionally upon what they thought the best way of building the kind of institution which they thought desirable, do you think that participation in the cost would lead to economy in the result?—I do not know that I do, offhand. It is dipping into somebody else's pocket, is it not? So far it would be conditional upon the central body being satisfied of the economy of the scheme.

13493. That is what I meant. In the present Metropolitan Common Poor Fund arrangement the local authority builds the institution at its own cost, and then the staff is largely maintained out of the Common Poor Fund. It is a question whether that is an extravagant or an economical method. It may be that it throws upon the locality the expense of an expensive institution which it gaily incurs on the understanding that it will be largely paid for and kept up by the Metropolis at large. So you may find, may you not, on that basis that the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund is acting contrary to good economical results in this matter?—I do not know about that. The fact remains that the object and intention of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was to help to that extent poor unions, and to offer an incentive for providing an efficient staff. I do not know that it makes very much difference.

13494. There is no condition attached to building that there would be on the other plan?—I do not quite see how the other plan would work. There is to be some new authority who is to contribute towards the cost of the building on certain conditions?

13495. There would not be the inducement by this to start a building which would be practically kept up by another fund, by a Metropolitan fund?—The body would continue to be in the form in which it is at present?

13496. I am taking it for granted that the condition would be attached to the other body that they should share the expense, but not pay the whole of the salaries and other items?—That would be a new departure. I think I have said in answer to a previous question that probably the cost of salaries in London in past years would have been less if instead of the whole of the salary, only half had been paid out of the Metropolitan Common Fund Poor, as is the case with sanitary officers.

13497. There might be economy all along the line?—Possibly.

Object of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund in regard to sick-relief and child-relief.

13498. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) In the case of maintenance of inmates would you regard it as fair that the East End of London should have to bear a large proportion of the maintenance of the sick without the assistance of the rest, or only the modified assistance of the rest?—I have said that I take it that the object of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund was to assist the poorer unions, and there again you would have rather a complicated arrangement if the Fund were to pay half the salaries only and the whole of the maintenance. So far it does not pay the whole of the maintenance?

13499. In the case of infirmaries they do?—Yes, in the case of infirmaries.

13500. The intention of the Act was that the charge for the sick poor should be regarded as one in which the whole of London was to assist?—Yes, and to participate.

13501. Therefore it should be charged on the whole area?—As a matter of fact in those days the sick in the workhouses were unsatisfactorily dealt with, and a separate infirmary was one of the objects in view when the Common Fund was established.

13502. One of the great objects of the Act also was, was it not, to induce the Guardians to get the children out?—Yes, to get the children out and to get the sick away.

13503. To build separate infirmaries to get the sick away?—Quite so.

Effect of making cost of Poor Law Buildings only partly a local charge.

13504. Supposing there was a grant with regard to building from the whole Metropolis, which is not the case now, might that not tend to additional expense?—If the cost of the building was to be shared partly by the local authority and partly by the local new authority?

13505. Yes?—I understand Mr. Loch to say that that sharing would be conditional upon the other authority being satisfied; in other words I suppose securing economy in the building.

13506. So far that might have its deterrent effect in the erection of separate infirmaries?—It might.

Formalities of consent of guardians to building of new workhouse.

13507. There is one point with regard to the procedure. Where a new workhouse is intended, or any building involving any considerable expenditure is concerned, it is necessary, I think, under the 'Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act 1882 that the consent of the guardians, at a meeting, held after fourteen days' notice, should be given?—Yes, I did not mention that, but there is also in connection with building expenditure, that provision, so that every guardian knows the precise financial condition of the union.

13508. Does any result happen from that consent being necessary?—I think it has happened that there have been postponements, the guardians have hesitated, but it is very often the case.

13509. Is it practically a useless formula because it comes at the end of the proceedings, after the matter has been throughly known to the guardians, and is thoroughly and carefully threshed out and after the plans have been submitted and approved?—I do not say it is have been submitted and approved?—I do not say it is useless. It sets a seal on what the guardians have all along been perfectly aware of apparently.

Effect of Dietaries Order.

13510. (*Dr. Downes.*) You have said that the effect of the Dietary Order has been to lead to greater variations. Do you mean a more varied diet, or a greater divergence between the different unions?—I mean a more varied diet. I mean that within the four corners of the Order guardians have a larger choice, and the variations have resulted in this way, as you will probably remember complaints used to be very common as regards the dietary previously; they have diminished very much, and we hardly ever get any complaints now.

Decreased sense of parental responsibility

13511. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Referring to Question 4075, has not the sense of responsibility as to children lessened on the part of parents recently? Does not the taking of some of a family give greater encouragement to this want of sense of responsibility?—I fear, in dealing with children, there is a tendency to do that which is calculated to lessen the sense of responsibility on the part of parents, and, as I have said in reply to a previous question, it is better to leave the children with the mother if there is good reason to believe that she will deal with them properly; but unfortunately in a good many cases the form of relief which takes the children from the mother and places them in a school is, in the children's interests, the best way of dealing with them.

Comparative success of various methods of dealing with Poor Law children.

13512. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Can you give any information from records of boards of managers as to the result on after life of children brought up in (1) Barrack Schools, (2) Cottage or Scattered Homes?—I cannot give information from records of boards of managers as to the after life of children brought up in (1) Barrack Schools or (2) Cottage or Scattered Homes, but the Commission can get valuable information as to results of all three classes of schools from the M.A.B.Y.S. and the more recently established associations for befriending boys.

13513. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Will you indicate the lines upon which, in your opinion, the various methods of relieving orphan children may be compared and their respective merits weighed? Do you think there are, as yet, sufficient data for framing a conclusion on the subject?—Material for judging of the respective merits may possibly be found in the records of the two associations I have just mentioned, but I doubt if there are at present sufficient data to determine which is the absolutely best method. For my part, I think they have all their merits, but success depends not so much upon the method as upon the capacity of those who manage it.

Extent and cost of London Receiving Homes for Poor Law Children.

13514. Will you give the number, and give us your estimate of the success and economy of receiving homes for children who would otherwise be admitted to London

workhouses. Receiving homes have been provided by 24 boards of guardians, the total cost being some £200,000. It has necessarily been a costly process, but I think the outlay may be regarded as justifiable, in that it has in a great measure met the demand of public opinion that children, whatever the class to which they may belong, should be provided for elsewhere than in workhouses.

Comparative success of various methods of dealing with Poor Law Children.

13515. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Which system of dealing with children is, in your judgment, the most successful?—As I have already said in effect, it is not so much the question of the system as the men and women who deal with the children under it.

Ophthalmia in Poor Law schools. Dr. Stephenson's Report.

13516. With regard to ophthalmia and ringworm in large school, you will remember that Dr. Stephenson reported on ophthalmia. Can you give us the result of his inquiry, that is, generally speaking, what was the effect of his inquiry, and how did it affect the question as to children taking ringworm and ophthalmia into a school with them?—Dr. Stephenson reported on ophthalmia in the Metropolitan schools in 1897, and the following extracts are worth quoting. In the course of his report, he says, "Were it possible to separate these two classes (children who come for the first time to a parochial school and those who have been there previously) with any approach to trustworthiness, I have little doubt that ophthalmia would be found more frequently among the so-called "ins-and-outs" than among the other children; that the malady, however, is common enough in those who have never set foot in a pauper school is shown by the following return taken from the records of the Central London School at Hanwell by Dr. Littlejohn, the resident medical officer. The figures, it should be explained, cover the period from 1868 to 1888, and their value for the present purpose lies in the fact that children previously in the school have been carefully excluded from the list. During the period referred to in Question 1374, newcomers were found to be affected with ophthalmia, and it is to be particularly noted that this included neither corneal damage nor blepharitis unless attended with thickened and congested conjunctiva. If a large percentage of cases of ophthalmia were actually imported into this school, there is every likelihood that the same sort of thing has gone on elsewhere. Certain other facts tell much the same tale, for example, between 1890 and 1897 St. Saviour's Union sent 1,691 diseased children to the ophthalmic school; of that number 582 came for the first time to a Poor Law ophthalmic school; a fact clearly proved by the record of each individual case. In a word, of the 1,691 admissions, eighty-seven only had been inmates of Poor Law schools before coming under care. To be brief, all the evidence I have been able to collect leads me to conclude that the primary cause of tracoma, as it is met with in the London pauper schools, is to be traced to the admission of affected children. The number of such imported cases will obviously depend upon several factors, such as the poverty or otherwise of the area supplying the school children and the care taken by outside medical officers to detain those suffering from the disease."

Great cost of London Poor Law schools and its justification.

13517. It has been put in evidence that considerable sums of money have been spent on the provision of schools for the children throughout the Metropolis. Do you think that the guardians have wilfully wasted the ratepayers' money in buildings which are too ornamental, and which give the children the wrong kind of impression as to what the life outside, the life they will have to face in the future, really is?—I do not think that guardians have wilfully wasted money on buildings, though there may have been a disposition here and there, in the desire to make the best possible provision, to spend more money than was absolutely necessary.

Excellent results in different Poor Law Schools: Hanwell, Forest Gate, etc.

13518. Can you give us any results which have followed the training of children in barrack schools, cottage homes, and such-like places?—Evidence of all results, as I have already stated, will be found in the records of the two associations for befriending girls and boys; but I would venture to suggest that the Commission should take occasion to see for themselves what sort of stuff is turned out of these schools by visiting some of them, say the Hanwell, Forest Gate, Leavesden, or Annerley Schools, on the annual festival day. There they will see not only the children in the school (the original material) but the finished article, as represented by scores of old boys and old girls, out in the world and independently earning their own living in various walks of life. For myself, I find it difficult to use moderate and decorous language in relation to—I will use a moderate adjective—the inaccurate rubbish that has been reeled out on platforms, in pamphlets, and in the press regarding the alleged deplorable results of the education provided in Poor Law schools. I have no personal feeling in the matter, and I can take no credit to myself for what is being done. I am merely a looker-on, but, knowing the facts, I view with wonder and admiration what has been done, and is being done, by a large number of public-spirited men and women, guardians, managers and officers alike, whose well-directed zeal and devotion, and high sense of duty, render such efficient service to the children of all sorts and conditions who are committed to their charge; and I would like here to refer to some of the reports on these schools which have been made by inspectors of the Board of Education. I select purposely the schools at Ashford, Leavesden, and Annerley, which are all large schools of the much abused barrack type. *Mr. Henry Lockwood.* 15 May 1906.

Ashford. The report on Ashford says:—"Boys:—This in an excellent school, conducted with great vigour and intelligence. The curriculum is comprehensive and up-to-date in every respect, and the results of the teaching are highly creditable to all concerned. The boys are alert and responsible, and the efforts made to interest them in subjects of every-day importance outside the school curriculum are much to be commended. Girls:—The arrival of a new teacher on the day previous to the inspection was unfortunate, but the work seen was in most cases very satisfactory. The writing is uniformly sound, and oral answering is in fair form and generally ready. The work of the fourth standard is exceptionally good all round. Infants:—The infants are doing very fairly well, and the elder children show reasonable proficiency in most subjects, though their knowledge of numbers might be clearer, and the reading is none too fluent."

Leavesden. The report on the Leavesden School is:—"Boys:—The boys' school deserves very high praise for excellent discipline and tone, neat and accurate writing, exercises sound, intelligent and effective instruction, and a high standard of work is maintained throughout the school. Drill and singing are very good, and drawing and geography deserve special commendation. The industrial training of the elder boys and girls appears to be very satisfactory. Girls:—The general efficiency of the girls' school is very praiseworthy. The discipline and tone are excellent, and reading, recitation, singing and sewing are very good. Infants:—The children are very orderly, obedient, and kindly treated, and the school is taught with care and success. The recitation is very good, and enunciation receives very careful attention. The style of writing is too narrow and pointed, and admits of improvement. The babies are delightfully happy and natural, and their power of observation and conversation is quite exceptional in such young children."

Annerley. As to Annerley:—A "barrack school" established in 1849. Extract from Agenda. "The education part of the school curriculum has been transferred from the Local Government Board to the Board of Education. Mr. Henderson, H.M. Inspector, examined the work on November 20th, 21st, and 22nd and has classified the schools:—Boys:—Excellent; Girls:—Excellent; Infants:—Excellent. For the first time diocesan inspectors have examined in religious knowledge. The managers have received the followng reports:—"Boys:—Work of this school is admirable. The instruction is most thorough and the influence exercised upon the children cannot fail to bear fruit. Girls:—I am extremely pleased with the work on the girls' side. It is marked by an intelligence and power of reflection which are very rare in institutions of this nature. The teaching is not only full and accurate, but is brought to bear on the personal needs of the children."

Kensington and Chelsea Cottage Homes Schools. As to the Kensington and Chelsea Schools on the Cottage Home System, established in 1880:—The Report is "Boys:—The boys' school is an exceedingly satisfactory one. There is a good tone and much keen and intelligent interest in the work on the part of both teachers and pupils. Girls:—An exceedingly good school as to tone, discipline, and instruction. All the work is thoroughly good. Infants:—The infant school is conducted on very good lines, is generally satisfactory, and most creditable to the teachers."

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

13519. In your judgment, are the children pampered and made too much of, and, if so, in which schools do you think this has been and is carried on?—I am not prepared to admit that there is any undue pampering in any of the schools.

Question of "pampering" in Poor Law Schools.

Difficulty as to homes for Poor Law children when first apprenticed.

13520. With regard to boys going out to work, is there any difficulty in finding proper homes for them when they are only earning a small wage at the beginning. For instance, a boy is apprenticed outdoor; what means have the guardians for seeing him through his apprenticeship? Would you be in favour of the erection of suitable homes throughout the Metropolis where such boys could be taken in and kept under the control of the guardians until such boys were out of their time or had reached the age of twenty-one?—There is undoubtedly difficulty in dealing with boys on first leaving school in finding proper homes for them, but a satisfactory remedy is not easy to suggest. It would be useful, no doubt, if suitable homes could be provided, but a satisfactory remedy is not easy to suggest. I am doubtful whether homes of the sort suggested in your question should be provided by the guardians.

Number of Poor Law Children returning to the Workhouse as adults.

13521. Can you tell us the percentage of failures amongst children brought up under the Poor Law throughout your district?—I have no returns later than those got out for and after the Departmental Committee's Report in 1896; but I have no reason whatever to suppose that the percentage of failures has since then increased. The return in question shows that of 49,000 adult inmates in workhouses, 336 had been educated in Poor Law schools, of these, all but seventy-two suffered from physical or mental defects for which the school could be in no way responsible.

Inter-Poor Law School Sports.

13522. Are there any school sports between the various Poor Law schools of the Metropolis, and are trophies competed for; if so, with what results?—The results of the inter-school football and cricket, and swimming matches are excellent. On this head I may refer you to my report for 1901, quoting Mr. Bailward.

13523. Do the Poor Law schools enter into competition with outside schools, and with what results?—I think they hold their own.

Numbers of Poor Law children entering the Army.

13524. What is the number of boys who go into Army bands? How many enter the Army, as privates? How many enter the Navy? Can you give us any results?—I cannot give numbers. The great majority of those who join the Army go into the band. Some three years ago I got out a return showing most satisfactory results. There were 1,971 men then serving in various regiments.

13525. Can you give us the total cost for maintenance, exclusive of education, for pauper children inside Poor Law schools, and also for scattered homes, etc.?—I am sorry I have not been able to get these figures out.

Effect of boarding-out in eradicating the pauper taint.

13526. With regard to boarding-out, do you think that boarding-out has succeeded in removing what is known as the "pauper taint," and that the children under that system are absorbed into the ordinary population easier than through a Poor Law school?—With regard to boarded-out children, like any other system it is successful under good management, but I am not at all sure that the majority of the children so dealt with are ultimately absorbed in the rural population amongst whom they are placed in infancy.

Effect of Local Government Board's limitation of number of children to be dealt with on one site.

13527. Your Board has laid it down they only 300 children shall be under one administration; what effect has that had in increasing the cost for providing accommodation for Poor Law children?—The limit of the 300 administration unit in regard to schools must have increased the cost of providing accommodation.

Effect of receiving homes for children in preventing the pauper taint.

13528. With regard to receiving houses in London, these too have been strongly recommended by the Department; can you tell us whether these had good results, the object of course being to prevent the child coming into touch with the workhouse at all. As a matter of fact, do you consider the "pauper taint" cry has any real foundation? Has it had any real foundation during the past twenty years?—The main object of receiving homes was certainly to keep the children out of the workhouse. The "pauper taint" is a familiar platform expression, but certainly a very small percentage of the children brought up in the district and separate schools are affected by it. The odd thing to me is that the people using the term never apply it to those receiving outdoor relief.

Duties of guardians towards children of vicious parents.

13529. (*Mr. Loch.*) In the case of families in which the parent or parents drink, and are what is often called "undeserving," but are unwilling to enter the house if it is offered them (and are unsuitable obviously for outdoor relief), what steps can be taken, or should any steps be taken, to prevent injury to the children, for example, by the prosecution of the parents by guardians for neglect, or in other ways?—I certainly think steps should be taken to protect the children by prosecuting the parents for neglect, but the subject is not a simple one, because hile, on the one hand, one would desire to protect the children, on the other hand, one should avoid relieving the parents of their responsibility.

Operation of Relief to School Children Order in London.

13529 (*a*). As regards the order of the Local Government Board as to the feeding of school children; how far is it adopted in London and with what results?—The order relating to underfed children has not been very generally adopted in London. I may be able to supply particulars of what is being done by one or two boards of guardians.

Results of training of Poor Law children in large schools.

13530. (*Chairman.*) Do you consider the results of the training of children have on the whole been satisfactory?—Exceedingly so.

13531. You like the system of training in large schools in considerable numbers?—Yes, I see no objection to it. I think the results show that it may be very satisfactorily carried out.

13532. Do many of the old boys and girls attend the annual festival days of the large schools?—A great number.

13533. Judging from their condition you would say they were in a satisfactory state?—Entirely. I think of all the pleasant duties I have to perform there is none more delectable than seeing the old boys and girls at a large school on the festival days. You see them there by scores. There can be no sort of question as to what condition they are in.

13534. Do you think the physical training of the children in the larger schools is more satisfactory, and that they develop faster than when they are boarded out?—I think they have certainly greater opportunities.

13535. And greater supervision?—Yes.

Pros and *Cons* of Cottage Homes system.

13536. You do not object to the various other systems?—No, I do not; because I happen to have a particular school well managed, I do not immediately jump to the conclusion that no other school can possibly be well managed on any other system. I think there is good in them all.

13537. But the boarding-out system or the scattered home system requires supervision?—I think so. I do not for a moment wish to say anything unfair about either of those systems, but what has struck me from the first has been that it is a mistake to assume that by the mere fact of placing so many children in a house and calling it a home, and then calling the woman in charge a mother, you start a real home. It is only, in fact, a small institution when all is said and done. When well managed, good results have been achieved. I think if the Commission would see the scattered homes belonging to the Mile End Guardians they would be satisfied that there is a case in which very good work indeed is being done, including good industrial training; the games are well arranged for, in fact everything is well done.

Mile End Cottage Homes.

Number of Poor Law children returning to workhouses as adults.

13538. You have referred to a return which shows that out of 49,000 adult inmates of the workhouses 336 only had been educated in Poor Law schools, and of those all but 72 were suffering from physical or mental defects. Where were those 49,000 adult inmates taken from?—London.

13539. It was a sort of investigation as to the origin of pauperism in the inmates?—What happened was this When the Departmental Committee was sitting, and before it was appointed, a great number of persons had been talking at large on this subject and implying (in fact some of them said so in so many words) that these Metropolitan Poor Law schools were mere manufactories of paupers, that the great majority of those brought up in the schools, spent the greater part of

their lives in the workhouses. I thought there was no ground for saying that, so I asked the masters of the workhouses to give me the number of inmates in their several workhouses on a given day, who had in childhood been in a Poor Law school, with their ages and all particulars, and the reason of their being there, and the return proved my view to be correct. Subsequently a return was asked for in Parliament in which I think the figures worked out very much the same as mine did.

13540. You have been, I think, twelve years an inspector in London ?—Yes.

Increased standard of physique in Poor Law children.

13541. Do you notice any difference in the physique or stamina of the children in the schools now compared with what it was twelve years ago ?—I do not know that there is. I think on the whole, if there is any difference, it is on the right side that the increased interest in athletics, swimming, drill, football, cricket, and so on, has had a good effect on the children.

13542. There has been an improvement in diet as well, I presume ?—Yes, there have been improvements here and there.

13543. You do not see any distinct signs of deterioration physically ?—Not among the children certainly; when they have been a certain time in the schools you generally find them improve.

13544. I would rather take the age at which they went out ?—I should say the improvement continues, and on the average their physical condition is quite satisfactory.

Comparative merits of institutions and boarding-out for Poor Law children.

13545. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I was talking the other day to the inspector in a provincial town about the children there, and she certainly confirmed what has been said so often, that the children coming from the schools, however well managed, are not as bright and not as capable of looking after themselves as children brought up in a normal family ? What is your opinion about that ?—I do not say for a moment that every child turned out either from a cottage home or a barrack school is all perfection, but I have no reason to believe that the large school or the cottage home school necessarily produces a larger number of dull children than any other system does.

13546. Apart from any system, is it possible, do you think, by any kind of institution to get the same kind of initiative in the children as you do in real home life ?—The question is, what is real home life ? I have never seen a real home myself with fifteen children living together under one mother.

13547. I mean the normal family ?—How are you to avoid that ?

13548. I do not suggest that it can be avoided, but I want rather to get at the distinction if it exists ?—A natural home and a natural life must necessarily be preferable to any other. I think when you cannot provide the natural life you provide in a large school as well as you can be expected to provide in any other system. I do not think that a large school is necessarily worse or better than a well managed cottage home school.

13549. I am inclined to agree with that; still, the fact remains, that the children are slightly at a disadvantage to those who come from a family ?—I think one must admit that.

13550. (*Mrs. Webb.*) It rather depends on the family ?—Perhaps it does.

13551. The question is whether the family home of that class is an ideal place. It may be very much below the institution ?—I think that people are apt rather to assume over much the quality of a home because it is a home. There are homes and homes, unfortunately.

13552. There may be a home which is infinitely worse than any institution ?—That is so, I am sorry to say.

13553. (*Mr. Bentham.*) The home you mention of fifteen children is rather large for a scattered home ?—I do not know whether there is any magic in the fifteen, but that was the number recommended as the maximum for a home, ten to fifteen is the usual number.

13554. Is it your opinion that you approximate more nearly to the conditions of life of a real home if you get down to eight children ?—Naturally you do.

13555. You would expect better results ?—I do not know that you need necessarily have better results, but there is this, that the artificial mother ought to be able to give more individual attention to eight children than she would to fifteen.

13556. (*Mrs. Webb.*) In stating a comparison between a home and an institution it is rather usual to assume an ideal home and an ordinary institution ?—That is true, unfortunately.

13557. Therefore if you take the average home of that class, you would not necessarily say that it was usually superior to the institution as provided by the Poor Law ?—I do not think it would be, but I have no desire to disparage homes as such; all I feel is, that everybody assumes that a home must be everything that is right, and there has been a disposition to believe among a large section of the community that a large school must be wrong. All I want is that they should be treated fairly and have a fair chance.

13558. That we should have the facts, and not the theory ?—Yes.

13559. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The home must be an artificial home, because the children have no homes of their own ?—It is an artificial home, consequently it is more or less of an institution.

13560. The real reason for having rather a large number, because fifteen no doubt is a large number in a cottage home, is to avoid all the expense which would result if you had separate homes for a small number ?—It would be that; and then again I think there is this to be considered, there are worthy people who seem to think that all you have to do is to have a house and call it a home, to take the first motherly person you find and say, "You are to be the mother," and all will go well. The more you reduce the unit of your home the greater will be the difficulty of finding a sufficient number of really suitable foster mothers.

Reason for limitation of number of children to be dealt with on one site

13561. The limiting the number of children to 300, where a school is set up has increased the cost a good deal, has it not ?—Yes; it is inevitable that it should.

13562. That has been done in deference to the report of the Poor Law Schools Committee ?—Yes, they asked that 300 should be the maximum administrative unit.

Out-relief as a criterion of administration.

13563. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Do I understand that you consider those unions the best administered where little or no out-relief is given ? The two typical unions for seeing the two policies at work would be Whitechapel and Poplar. At Whitechapel there is no out-relief, but at Poplar outdoor relief is rather freely given ?—I think that low out-relief is, *prima facie*, an indication of careful administration.

Statistics as to alien population; rateable value, etc., in Whitechapel and Poplar.

13564. Can you tell us what the population was in Whitechapel in 1870, and what it was in 1900, showing the proportion of Jews and aliens in 1870 and the proportion of the same nationalities in 1900 ? Can you give us any evidence as to rateable value in the same unions for the above two mentioned periods ? Can you obtain information as to the number of dwellings in these two periods; also railways, warehouses, and factories ? And with regard to Whitechapel (which is in the Stepney Borough Council area), can you give us any return, or have you any facts at all, as to the amount spent by the borough councils on work for the unemployed during periods of depression; can you give us the same information with regard to Poplar as asked for Whitechapel ?—Yes, I can give you the following figures. Whitechapel, 1871—area, 406 acres, houses, 8,772; population, 76,046; rateable value, £314,850; aliens (males, 4,651; females, 3,412); total, 8,063. Whitechapel, 1901—area, 406 acres; houses 6,367; population, 78,768; rateable value, £482,376; aliens, 29,188. Aliens relieved, 1901—medical only, 536; indoor, 185; outdoor, 1; lunatics, 30; a total of 721. Poplar, 1871—area, 2,335 acres; houses, 17,813; population, 116,277; rateable value, £465,655; aliens (males, 864; females, 206). total 1,070. Poplar, 1901—area, 2,328; houses, 11,024; population, 168,822; rateable value, £823,509; aliens (males, 1,535; females, 569), a total of 2,104, which includes Russia and Poland, 277; Germany and Austria, 775. Number of dwellings in Poplar: total tenements 35,787; tenements of less than

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

five rooms, 26,216; of these 3,935 are one-roomed tenements, 6,450 are two-roomed tenements, 8,270 are three-roomed tenements, 7,561 are four-roomed tenements. In the Borough of Stepney: total tenements, 61,113; tenements of less than five rooms, 49,182; of these 13,282 are one-roomed tenements, 15,690 are two-roomed tenements, 11,926 are three-roomed tenements, 8,284 are four-roomed tenements. I have not information as to railways and warehouses.

Return as to deaths from starvation (in London).

13565–6. There is a return issued as to deaths from starvation; can you put these in for the period since those returns have been issued?—These returns are not yet to hand, but I hope to put them in. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (N)).

Disuse by Stepney Borough Council of labour-saving appliances.

13567. Is it true that the Stepney Borough Council abolished the horse-broom for the purpose of giving employment to out-of-works?—It is a fact that the horse-broom was abolished as mentioned. I remember this action being criticised last year when reported to the Classification Committee at the Guildhall.

Figures as to increase in paupers in Poplar.

13568. With regard to Poplar, it was stated that there was a great increase of pauperism in that union; can you tell us when the increase in able-bodied pauperism began?—Between 1887 and 1899 the indoor pauperism was about 2,000 and the outdoor between 1,700 and 1,800. In 1889 the indoor was 2,187, and the outdoor 1,790. In 1899 the indoor had risen to 3,076, the outdoor being 1,794. In 1900 the indoor decreased 200 and the outdoor increased 223. In 1901 the indoor decreased 124, the outdoor increased 437. From 1902 there was a steady annual increase in both until in January, 1906, the indoor numbers exceeded those of 1899 by 763 and the outdoor by 4,999; the actual totals being: indoor, 3,836; outdoor, 6,793; total 10,629.

13569. Can you tell us what happened at the borough council with regard to work for the unemployed at the same time?—I believe that for the past five years the borough council have in each winter found special work for the unemployed, but I have no particulars.

Modified Workhouse Test Order, its object, effect and extent to which adopted in London.

13570. With reference to the modified Workhouse Test Order, can you tell me how many unions in London have applied for permission to act under this Order?—The Order has been issued to Islington, Wandsworth, Kensington, Hampstead, Poplar. No cases have been relieved under the order except in Poplar. I am not sure of the number there. About fifty men were sent last year to London.

13571. Would you please describe to the Commission the object your Board had in formulating that Order? that is, was it to enable boards of guardians to discriminate between deserving and undeserving able-bodied applicants for relief?—The suggestion came originally from Whitechapel in November, 1886, and an Order was issued in 1887. It was never put in force. The guardians stated that the object of the Order, was, *inter alia*, that it should not necessarily involve or occasion the breaking up of decent homes. Mr. Crowder, in his evidence before the House of Lords Committee stated, respecting it: "It acts as an efficient test of distress and as a lesson in providence to the man and his neighbour, yet without breaking up the home; that the relief is adequate to the wants of the whole family and not, as in the case of labour yard relief, given into the hands of a man who may or may not share it with his family; also it withdraws from the market superfluous labour which is gradually absorbed again as the demand arises."

13572. What has been the effect of the Order; has it been acted upon anywhere, and with what results?—It has only been acted on in Poplar.

13573–4. With regard to the results, can you put in a return showing how much of the poor rate levied in Poplar and Whitechapel goes distinctly to the poor? What I mean is, how much does it cost in administration to spend one pound in each union, and would it be possible to give us such a return for the whole of the Metropolis, say, for 1905?—I regret I have not been able to get this out.

London Unions with Superintendent Relieving Officers and Cross Visitors.

13575. (*Mr. Loch.*) Generally, will you state whether there are cross visitors or superintendents of relieving officers there (or elsewhere in London)?—Superintendent relieving officers have been appointed at Bermondsey, Bethnal Green, Camberwell, Islington, Kensington, Lambeth, Paddington, St. Pancras, Hackney, Poplar and St George's. Superintendent relieving officers may be said to act as cross visitors. In two instance women have been appointed as visitors, namely, in Camberwell and Southwark. Their visiting is understood to relate chiefly to children and lying-in-cases.

13576. What is the relation of the guardians to the relieving officers?—The relations of guardians to relieving officers are generally satisfactory.

Questions by Guardians to applicants for relief.

13577. How far do the guardians set aside the relieving officers and rely on personal questioning?—I should not say that the guardians set aside the relieving officers, but fresh applications are usually subject to a cross-fire of questioning by invididual guardians.

Use and suitability of Application and Report Book—advantage of case paper system.

13578. How far is the application and decision book filled in; is it suitable in form, does the clerk see that the inquiry is sufficient, and that there is verification, and are there systematic arrangements between the unions for supplementing the local inquiries by investigations outside their unions?—The entries in the application and report book are, speaking generally, properly filled in. In form it is inconvenient in my opinion and less suitable than the method of what is known as "case papers" or "history sheets." In fact, I would go so far as to say that for the application and report book might very well be universally substituted a system of case papers. As to supplementing local inquiries, I think as a general rule one officer is willing to help another when necessary.

London Unions not using Relief Committees.

13579. What unions have relief committees, is there any special organisation of work for the settlement of cases, and what is its success?—The majority of unions work by relief committees. In fact, speaking from memory, the exceptions, I think, are Paddington, Mile End, St. George's-in-the-East, Shoreditch, Hackney and Strand.

Co-operation with Charity Organisation Society in certain London Unions.

13580. Can you describe the system of relief at Whitechapel, St. George's-in-the-East, Paddington, Fulham and Marylebone; the relation of the Jewish population to Poor Law relief in the East of London in the last thirty years; the status, education and ability, salary and appointment of relieving officers?—At Whitechapel, as you are aware, there is a close and systematic co-operation with the Charity Organisation Society, and other local agencies, and the same applies to St. George's in-the-East. In Paddington, Fulham, and Marylebone the association with other agencies, is, perhaps, less close and systematic, but in each case it is a common practice to refer individual cases through one of the guardians present to the Charity Organisation Society. As regards the relation of the Jewish population to Poor Law relief, I have done my best to give information on that head in the table handed in in reply to Mr. Lansbury. (See Question 12685 (*a*). I have already given particulars of the salaries of relieving officers, and my advocacy of higher salaries may be taken to imply that I have a good opinion of the education and ability of the members of that branch of administration in London generally.

Statistics as to industries and pauperism in Southwark, Bermondsey, Kensington, and St. George's, Hanover Square.

13581. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) With a view to understanding the marked difference in rate of pauperism in unions which are *prima facie* of similar character, for example, Southwark and Bermondsey or Kensington and St. Georges, Hanover Square, it is important that information should be available which definitely bears upon the question. For example, can you state (*a*) the nature of occupations in the district? (*b*). How far it is purely industrial or also residential? (*c*.) What is the number of relieving officers in proportion to population; is there a superintendent relieving officer? and (*d*.) What is the average number of paupers to each relieving officer?—I hand in some returns (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII.(O)). These returns must be taken for what they are worth, but they are the best I have been able to provide in an endeavour to answer these questions. The figures in italics give the numbers of persons in certain occupations in the four localities, Southwark, Bermondsey, Kensington and St. George's at fifteen years and upwards. The figures in ordinary type give the number of applicants for relief in the quarter ended Lady Day, 1905, under various headings, indicating the usual occupations of the applicants. It will be seen that in Bermondsey and Southwark, the trade occupations supplying the largest number of applicants are general labourers and building trades. The same applies also to Kensington and St. George's. It is also noticeable that the occupation

furnishing the next largest number of applicants is in each case domestic service. It appears to have been left to the discretion of each clerk or relieving officer to determine what should be included in the column for domestic service. Some, for instance, include charwomen and needle women; others do not, but I think it may be fairly assumed that the bulk of those so returned is made up of those ordinarily included in domestic service, such as cooks, housemaids, general servants, etc., and resident with their employers. I may mention that the clerk to the Kensington guardians attributes the large number of 373 under the heading "Domestic Service" in the Kensington return to the fact that there are a large number of small flats in the parish which lack accommodation for the proper nursing attendance of a domestic falling sick. The figures in black type show the numbers of relieving officers in each of the four unions, and the proportion of population and of outdoor poor to each officer. Columns 2 to 8 of the Return (ordinary type) include all persons and dependents and orphan or deserted children. Columns 9 and 10 give the total adults (men and women) relieved, excluding dependents. Columns 11 to 19 give the ages of men and women relieved in 4 decennial periods. Columns 26 and 27 state the total numbers, including dependents, who received indoor and outdoor relief respectively during the period. The totals of columns 9 and 10 correspond with the totals of column 53. The figures in column 9 (men) are those of columns 2 and 6 added together, and the total of 10 woman) are the totals of 3 and 7 added together.

13582. What is the state of these areas as to sanitation and overcrowding?—As to this, I have not found any special reference to the sanitation and overcrowding in either of these areas in the London County Council's Public Health Report for 1904, though I may menton that the death rate from all causes per 100,000 is stated to be in Southwark 2,008, Bermondsey, 2,007, Kensington, 1,435, and Westminster, including St. George's, 1,344.

13583. What charities are there in the district and what number of lodging houses?—Particulars as to the charities are to be found in the Charity Organisation Society's Annual Digest. In Southwark during 1905, there were admitted from Salvation Army shelters to the workhouse, 256; to the infirmary, fifteen; from common lodging-houses to workhouses, 1,684; infirmary, 474, total 2,429. Of these, 1,169 had less than twelve month's residence. In Bermondsey in 1905, there were admitted to the workhouse from Salvation Army shelters, fourteen; to the infirmary, three; from common lodging houses to the workhouse, 694; to the infirmary, 108. Admissions from this district from lodging houses are said to be diminishing owing to greater vigilance on the part of the outdoor relief staff. In St. George's there are common lodging houses with a total of 1,047 beds, a Salvation Army shelter with 449 beds, and a Church Army shelter with eighty. I have not the figures of admission from these places, but they are said to be very large.

13584. What is the constitution of the board of guardians on the administrative side; does it work by committees?—In each case relief work is done by committees.

13585. Is the inquiry into cases adequate and are case papers used?—The inquiry is, I think, adequate. Case papers are used at Bermondsey and now in Kensington.

13586. What are the regulations as to the leave days in workhouses?—Speaking generally, in these four unions and elsewhere, well-conducted aged and infirm men and women are allowed out on Sunday and on two other days in each month. The number availing themselves of this privilege is in each case considerable.

13587. What is the percentage of aliens to population in the different unions, and what proportion of these receive relief from the Jewish Board of Guardians or similar agencies?—Aliens do not cross the river much. There are a certain number of Jews in the Westminster part of St. George's, but they do not figure much in the relief list.

13588. (*Chairman.*) You think that the case paper system might supersede the application and report book?—I do indeed

13589. If once started, it more or less works in such a way that it saves a great deal of trouble. I suppose there is a good deal of detail work and time required?—Certainly, and it involves very careful indexing and storing of the records and so on. *Mr. Henry Lockwood.* 15 May 1906.

13590. Where it has been started it gives satisfaction to the guardians?—Entirely, I think.

13591. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) They use some supplemental book, do they not?—They do. I should like to mention that it has always appeared to me that where you have the case paper system established and properly managed, you might dispense with the application and report book, and that if you had two relief order books, one that the relieving officer should keep and the other that the clerk should keep, they would suffice for both checking and record. I ought to tell you that Miss James, the guardian for Bethnal Green, who probably knows more about case papers or history sheets than anybody, would prefer a modified application and report book. I thought I would mention that, because I do not wish to pit my opinion against one who has such a very wide and intimate experience of the working of the system. Possibility of abolishing Application and Report Book.

13592. Some book of that kind has this advantage also, has it not, that it contains the record of the actual decision of the guardians?—Precisely.

13593. It is the only legal authority for the relieving officer to give relief?—That is quite true.

13594. It might be said, perhaps, that the relief order book answered that purpose and the relief order book acts as a check on the application and report book under the existing system, which is of value?—Yes, the relief order book is a clerk's book according to the Orders; but I should imagine inasmuch as the relief order book contains the directions of the guardians, which, after all, is the main thing, as to the amount of relief to be paid, that it might be regarded as sufficient authority to the relieving officer.

13595. That book, as you say, is in the custody of the clerk; is it not desirable to have some book which is in the custody of the relieving officer which is his authority for the relief he gives?—I think it would be provided, as I say, by a duplicate Order Book without a large number of columns.

13596. You want a book, whatever it is called?—You must have something. My notion would be to have a book with the least amount of necessary writing in it. Miss James, no doubt for very good reason, would possibly argue that there should be something more than I should suggest in the duplicate Order Book.

13597. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the Whitechapel union, the great change in their administration was in the early seventies, I think?—I think it was.

13598. That would be at a period when the Jewish population was comparatively small?—The Jewish or alien population in 1871, was only 8,000. Jewish population as a factor in Whitechapel relief policy.

13599. So that granted this great incursion of alien population, still the definite characteristic and merit, so to speak, of their method would be taken as indicated by that old state of things, though they still carry them on with a dwindling christian population?—You may say I think, that the reduction in the relief in Whitechapel began when the number of aliens to the population was comparatively unappreciable. It was one-third then of what it is now, 8,000 as against 29,000.

13600. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) You have given us a table comparing St. George's, Hanover Square, and Kensington?—Yes, I hand it in, it is the best I could do.

13601. There is one point I do not understand; there is a very much higher rate of pauperism in St. George's, Hanover Square, than in Kensington?—Yes. Comparison of conditions in Kensington and St. George's, Hanover Square Unions.

13602. How does it happen that taking the quarter there is such a much larger number of applications in Kensington than in St. George's?—The difference is accounted for by the fact that in Kensington a labour yard was opened for three weeks.

13603. About those two districts; comparing them both as to wealth and poverty, and as to industries, they are very much on a level?—Yes, they are.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

15 May 1906.

13604. There is a very large rate of pauperism in St. George's? There is at the present moment. Kensington have started on a new principle recently, and consequently the outdoor numbers have diminished since the election of the last board of guardians in 1904. I think there is the same tendency also with regard to administration in St. George's, but it is true that the percentage does not appear to be accounted for by the circumstances of the two localities, which are very much the same.

13605. So that in that case you would say it amounts to administration?—I think to a great extent it does.

Domestic servants receiving relief.

13606. You point out that a large number of domestic servants come to the Poor Law in those districts?—Yes.

13607. That does not seem at all desirable, does it?—I do not know whether I have mentioned that, but the clerk accounts for the greater number of cases in Kensington by the fact that they have many flats, and they have found it necessary to issue somewhat strict orders with regard to the admission of cases of that sort to the infirmary. They found that cases had been accepted at the infirmary with merely a private practitioner's recommendation, and they have now reminded the superintendent that except in case of sudden and urgent necessity the condition of reception in an infirmary is an order by the relieving officer, and they now insist on a report by one of their own district medical officers.

13608. What happens is that the employer, not wishing the trouble of nursing, sends them there?—It is partly that. There are a large number of flats in Kensington, in which the occupants would have at the most one or two servants; if one of the servants falls ill there is no convenience or means of nursing them properly, and the result is that they have to find some place for them; then so excellent is the treatment and the provision for patients in Poor Law institutions that the family doctor says, "Send them away to the infirmary."

13609. Do the employers ever voluntarily pay?—That is another point they are considering now. In some cases it is impossible to refuse the case. They are trying to make the employers pay, but as a matter of fact I believe in law the employer is not responsible.

Conditions in Bermondsey and Southwark Unions.

13610. You find a very similar divergence between Bermondsey and Southwark, though I believe the industrial conditions are very similar again in those two districts?—They appear to be.

13611. I think Bermondsey is in one respect even better than Southwark, because it has much less density of population?—That is so, I think.

13612. Is that accounted for by any large open space, or any special cause, because it is a very remarkable difference. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Are the Surrey Docks in Bermondsey?—Yes, and there is the Southwark Park, adjoining the infirmary at Bermondsey. The population of Southwark is tending to diminish, I believe.

13613. (*Mr. Bosanquet.*) They get a better result in Southwark with a smaller proportion of relieving officers to the population?—Yes, although at Bermondsey they have a superintendent relieving officer.

13614. That is rather contrary to the general views?—Yes.

Effect of administration on relief.

13615. There again would you attribute it entirely to the difference in administration?—I hardly know how to explain it because the tendency in Bermondsey now is in the direction of more strict and careful administration. The guardians are a good deal more particular and careful than they were four or five years ago.

13616. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Does not it take a certain number of years for that to operate?—Yes, it does; it is better to go slowly in cases of that sort. I have by borrowing from the clerks been able to get similar returns for the whole of London. It is interesting I think to note that, taking the whole of London, as might be expected, the occupation most largely represented in the relief list is general or casual labour, amounting to 12,297. If any one had asked me before I had seen this return, I should have said the next would be building trades probably, but here we have general or casual labourers, 12,297, and the next is domestic service, 5,793; the building trades come next, 3,720.

Previous occupation of London paupers.

Applicants for relief in "domestic service."

13617. (*Chairman.*) Do they include under the head of general or casual labour artisans in the building trade?—It depends to a certain extent on what view the person making up the record takes of what should be included under the building trade. I find from inquiries made that in some cases they have included bricklayers' labourers, as well as carpenters, joiners and so on, and in others they have left them out. Still even so, the remarkable thing is that domestic service comes second with 5,794.

13618. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) I suppose that would include charwomen?—There again some returns include charwomen, and washers and so on, and others do not. I am inclined to think that the majority of those included are persons who are ordinarily resident with their employers. But it is a question which it is not possible to answer without analysing the whole of the figures from which these returns are compiled?

13619. Perhaps we might have that return?—Yes, I think you should have it. It can in fact now be obtained from the Statistical Department of the Board.

13620. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Who has given you the figures for that return?—A Return has been asked for by the Statistical Department of the Local Government Board which is a Return of the number of cases in which relief, exclusive of relief to insane and casual paupers, was applied for and granted during the quarter ended Lady Day, 1905, showing the ages, causes of application for relief and usual occupations of the persons relieved. I found that each clerk had kept a copy, and I got them each to lend me their Return and I copied the figures into this. There again I find that under the head of "other trades" in the case of Bermondsey, they include market porters, hawkers etc., postmen and costermongers. In Southwark under "other trades" they have carmen, ostlers, glass-blowers, harness makers, sweeps, furriers, costers, etc. When you can only partly analyse the figures it is difficult to make much of them.

13621. (*Mr. Booth.*) In addition to that you have the fact that it depends on what the man declared himself?—Yes.

13622. Therefore you start with inaccurate information and tabulate it in various ways?—True. I have at all events made an honest endeavour to supply the information, but I think it necessary to explain that the material is not very reliable.

13623. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Does that Return relate to the whole country or only to London?—Only to London.

M. Henri Monod, called in; and Examined.

M. Henri Monod.

15 May 1906.

13624. (*Chairman.*) I believe you are the late Directeur de l'assistance et l'Hygiène Publiques in France?—Yes.

Historical sketch of Poor Relief in France.

13625. You have very kindly prepared a paper, which you propose to read to the Commission, on the subject of the system of poor relief in France. I am sure I am expressing the unanimous feeling of the Commission when I say that we greatly appreciate the kindness and trouble you have taken in preparing it?—I felt very much flattered when my friend Mr. Loch wrote that the Royal Commission desired to hear my views on the present situation in France of the Poor Laws—of what we call *l'assistance publique*. I am certainly indebted for that honour to the fact that our system of poor relief has undergone considerable changes in the last nineteen years during which I have been at the head of the service. Therefore, you expect me to tell you, I suppose, not so much what French legislation, relative to the relief of the poor, was in former times, but what it is now. However, to place the present state of things before you in its full light, I am obliged to refer to the past; but that may be done briefly. In regard to our present system, I wish to put before the Commission mere facts, legislative or administrative, and to show on what general principles these facts are founded, but not to attempt to justify the principles themselves.

Relief by the Church.

(1.) In old times the care of the poor in France was entirely in the hands of the Catholic Church, and under its control, for it was one of the social obligations of the Church in relation to the State, as well as it was one of the religious obligations of every parishioner in relation to the Church. It has been said that in those times the main pre-occupation of charitable persons was rather to gain Heaven than to raise the poor out of misery. I am no judge of the question, but I must say that until the end of the nineteenth century I do not know of any work in French charitable literature which bears any resemblance to the pamphlet published by your Defoe in 1706 under the title "Giving Alms no charity."

Each parish responsible for its own poor.

(2.) From the beginning the Church established the rule that each parish must support its own poor. We will see further on that this rule is still a fundamental principle of our organisation, only instead of each parish (*chaque paroisse*), we say now each commune (*chaque commune*).

Gifts and bequests for the poor.

(3.) Under the influence of religious feeling, the gifts and bequests for the relief of the poor were numerous and important; and the time came when it was necessary to exercise some supervision in regard to them, so as to ascertain that proper use was made of such large sums of money. By means of religious congregations who were at the head of many of our public charitable services, the Church retained a very prominent part in their administration; but by degrees the control passed into the hands of public bodies, in regard to the establishment of which the Government had something to say.

Respective functions of *Bureaux de Bienfaisance* and public Hospitals.

(4.) The funds available for out-door relief were administered by what was called *les Bureaux de bienfaisance*; those available for in-door relief (not including the able-bodied, who only received out-door relief), were administered by the public hospitals.

(5.) When the funds, having their origin in private means, seemed sufficient to justify the creation of the bureau or the hospital and to ensure its proper working, a separate decree was issued by the Government in each case in order to constitute them public institutions. Each of these institutions was administered by a board of seven persons, the mayor of the commune, two persons appointed by the municipal council, and four members appointed by the prefect of the department.

View of First and Second Republics as to Poor Relief.

(6.) This certainly could not be considered a fulfilment of the duty of relieving the poor; but, in fact, that duty, which was preached as religious and individual, was never regarded as social by either of the two hereditary powers that ruled France, the Monarchy and the Empire. The First Republic, however, stated, with great earnestness, and ability, that principle of social duty. I will say later on why, in my opinion, adopting this principle, it failed to produce any practical results. Besides, obviously time was wanting, as it was wanting for the Second Republic, which in 1848 proclaimed the same principle as the First Republic had done; *Les secours publics sont une dette sacrée.* She soon saw herself and her plans of reform crushed by the Second Empire, just as the First Empire had crushed the First Republic and her reforms. It was the destiny of our Third Republic to realise the old republican programme as far as it could be realised.

(7.) It is easy to understand why the system, or rather absence of system, which I have put before the Commissioners, was quite unable to provide regular relief for any class of the poor.

Finance of the *Bureaux de Bienfaisance* and Hospitals.

(8.) First, the public charitable institutions, the *Bureaux de bienfaisance* and the hospitals, were established as I have said, just at a time when the gifts contributed on their behalf seemed sufficient. But circumstances had changed; or there had been some error in their judgment; and what had seemed sufficient did not prove to be so. That this was sometimes the case is obvious from the fact that public bodies, the Commune, or the Department, or even the State, had to aid the public establishment by way of annual allowances. In 1889 the amount of the expenses of the *Bureaux de bienfaisance* and hospitals in France was about three millions eight hundred thousand pounds sterling (£3,804,000), of which about three millions(£2,912,000), were provided by themselves, and the rest by grants from public funds.

(9.) Secondly, and chiefly, as these institutions had their origin in individual gifts only, nothing could ensure that there would be any proportion between resources and wants. Too much was done at one place, if it happened that at that place there were many wealthy and devout people, anxious to secure, by large gifts to the poor, their place in Paradise. In other places—at a great many places—nothing was done. Again, some kinds of distress made a more sympathetic appeal than did others; those were largely relieved; others, such as sickness or certain infirmities—epilepsy, for instance—were very seldom properly provided for, and many who suffered from them remained without help. Thus our French system as a whole was founded on personal charity, and shared alike its qualities and its defects; for charity is spontaneous, generous, courageous, often smiling, sometimes charming; but it is also capricious, often changing, and sometimes blind; and, worst of all, it is often altogether wanting.

Early French system of relief founded on charity aided in certain circumstances by taxation.

10. Where it had been wanting, where no public charitable institution had been created by private gifts, the local bodies had no power. They were allowed to help, with public money, institutions, the establishment of which was a proof of their usefulness; but they were not allowed themselves to create such institutions. The latter, the prohibition, seems more logical than the former—the permission; for public money, levied by compulsory taxation, ought only to be used for public services, and as long as the relief of the poor was considered the business only of private liberality, private means alone should be required to provide the relief.

Re-organisation of French poor system.

(11.) Very many of our political men, especially those who belonged to what is called with us *le parti avancé*, were anxious to bring some order into this unorganised and unsatisfactory state of things, to resume, in the matter of relief, the formula of the Revolution, and, this time, to enforce it.

Institution of the *Direction de l'assistance Publique*, 1887.

(12.) The first step was taken by the Government about twenty years ago. In November, 1886, the administrative functions of the central authority connected with the relief of the poor were centralised in one department at the Ministry of the Interior, the *Direction de l'assistance publique.* These administrative functions were few and limited; but the new department—and it was then explained that such was its chief aim—had to consider the whole question, and to study the means of carrying out a general and methodical reform.

Establishment and constitution of the *Conseil supérieur de l'assistance Publique*, 1888.

(13.) That was very heavy, very difficult, and attractive task was put on my shoulders in Feburary, 1887.

What was to be done? And how was it to be done?

(14.) In such a work it would have been a great mistake for an administrator to be too confident of his own knowledge and ideas. In 1888 a decree was issued by which the Government establised the *Conseil superieur de l'assistance publique*, the co-operation of which was of the utmost service to me. It was at first composed of sixty-seven members, of whom thirteen were officials, members *ex officio*, while others were members of the Senate, of the Chamber of Deputies, of the *Conseil d'État*, of the *Conseil Municipal de Paris*; and others again, thirteen in number, belonged to the provinces, for in an assembly which had to deal with national questions it was of great service to have their advice. Besides these there were fourteen members representing every kind of political and religious opinion, who had long taken part in public or private charitable work, and by their special knowledge seemed to be well qualified for membership of the council. The *Conseil supérieur* sat for the first time in June, 1888, and since then they have been intimately associated with me in the preparation of the successive laws and regulations which have been made for the relief of the poor. They began by discussing and then formulating a few general principles—the fundamental principles of the work that they had to accomplish. A statement of these principles from which they have never deviated is still printed at the back of their publications. These publications are uniform, and now number no less than a hundred, and they form a most valuable library of the history and practice of public poor relief in France.

Congrès international de l'assistance publique 1889.

(15.) But French advice was not enough. Before our line of action was settled, questions of essential importance were brought before an international gathering, before the first *Congrès international d' assistance publique*, which met in Paris in 1889, during the International Exhibition, and in the proceedings of which my friend, Mr. Loch, a member of the Commission before which I have the honour to appear, took an important part.

Mr. Henri Monod.

15 May 1906.

(16) Now, again, what was to be done?—It was useless to proclaim once more that it was the duty of the community to relieve the poor if we were not prepared to give an answer to practical questions such as these:—

Is it a social duty to relieve *all* classes of the poor?

Classes entitled to relief in France.

If not, what are the categories of the poor that have a moral right to be helped at the public cost?

A close study of what had been planned, and planned in vain, in 1791 brought to light the chief causes of failure.

(17) Our first revolutionary government attempted to organise public help for every form of human misery, whether the distress was due to personal faults or not; whether or not the distress was kept alive by such faults; whether or not the help was claimed by able-bodied persons. I firmly believe that if we had proceeded on such an unlimited plan, the Bills which we submitted to Parliament would not have been adopted. And this is the main difference between the English and the French system. In the French system—unlike the English system—the able-bodied, though not excluded from public relief, are excluded altogether from obligatory relief. And this is the force of the definition which I suggested in 1889, and which was approved by the International Congress—which the *Conseil supérieur* adopted as their own, and which has since governed the terms of all the laws and regulations on public assistance in France. The words of this definition I must state here in French:—"*L'assistance publique est due, à défaut d'autre assistance, à ceux qui sont, temporairement ou définitivement, dans l'impossibilité physique de pourvoir aux nécessités de la vie*," which means that the public assistance is due in the absence of all other help to those who for a time or definitively find it physically impossible to provide for themselves the necessaries of life. Note the principal words—*l'impossibilité physique*. Those words include within the province of obligatory relief children, and the sick, and the aged, but they exclude from that province all adult able-bodied persons.

Relief not a right to able-bodied adults in France.

Obligatory relief to children, sick, aged and infirm.

(18) There may be with you, as there are with us, eager minds never satisfied with limited results, and inclined to look with scorn on such reforms as these. To their criticism I have no answer, except that the reforms seem important enough to those who are concerned in their adoption, most unfortunate beings who used often to be left without any help whatever, and who now are sure to receive help. And I repeat that if we had endeavoured to obtain more, we should probably have obtained nothing.

So we went to work on this limited programme—the children, the sick, the aged and infirm.

Laws as to relief of children.

(19) On behalf of the children two laws were passed, which bear the following dates, July 24, 1889; June 27 and 28, 1904. These laws deal with children who have no parents, or who have parents so bad that they have to be deprived of their paternal authority.

(20) Do not think that before these laws were passed nothing was done for abandoned children. Much had been done for a long time by our *Service des Enfants Assistés*, of which, if time permitted, I should be glad to tell you more; two volumes, which I present to the Commission, contain the results of an inquiry which I made in regard to that service. But in the laws which I have mentioned there were new points. They made it possible to deprive of their parental rights parents who ill-treated, or corrupted, or exploited their children. And next, they included within the scope of the *Service des Enfants Assistés* certain classes of children, and they made it obligatory to provide the expenses of their education, which before it had been left to the discretion of local bodies to provide.

Numbers of children receiving relief.

(21) The number of children registered in connection with our public service was on January 1st, 1905, 212,378, of whom 66,058 were infants assisted at home, and 146,320 were to remain until they came of age under the supervision of the service, and maintained at its expense.

(22) For the complete fulfilment of the general programme adopted in 1889 something, and something important, remains to be done, that is a Bill for securing sufficient relief to the children of good parents who are too poor to support them.

Law as to relief of sick persons.

(23) The second class of persons who in accordance with our definition have a right to public relief are the sick—I mean those who when they are sick cannot face and fight their sickness with their own resources. This question has been settled by the law of the 15th July, 1893, which rendered the assistance of such sick persons obligatory. Such aid includes the attendance of a doctor and the provision of the necessary medicine.

(24) It took some months to bring this law into operation but it has now been in operation since 1895; and I present to the Commission four Reports in regard to its execution in the years 1895 to 1902. From these Reports it appears that in every one of these eight years hundreds of thousands of persons, sick and poor, who without this law would have had no relief, either from private or from public sources, have been the object of proper medical care. The total number of the sick who were assisted in 1902 was 582,264, and of these 28,042 were admitted to hospitals. The average cost of each sickness in that year was 14s. 6d. divided as follows between in-door and out-door relief: £3 10s. 10d. the average cost in the hospital; and 10s. 3d. the average cost at the home of the patient. One of the sections of the law of 1893 specifies that, whenever it is possible, the patient must be attended at home, which is altogether more moral, and, as you may see, much more economical. But if it is ascertained by the certificate of the doctor that the patient cannot be properly attended to at home, he must be admitted to a hospital. You see, it is just the reverse of what is done here for the relief of the able-bodied—and so must it be. In their case in-door relief is the rule, out-door relief, relief at the home, the exception.

Numbers of sick persons relieved.

(25) One of the consequences of the law of 1893—and in regard to this we shall have only to walk in your footsteps—is that we must establish a system of well-trained nurses, for the obligation to do a thing implies the obligation to do it well. But in this matter serious difficulties of more than one kind arise from the fact that the great majority of our public hospitals are at present managed by Catholic sisters.

(26) I have little to say of the third class of our clients the aged (more than seventy years of age) the infirm, and the incurable. The law that concerns them is dated July 14, 1905, and comes into operation only on January 1st, 1907. The principal objection raised against it, an objection that for years checked the progress of the Bill, was this: "You know how prevalent among our people is the spirit of thrift. Would not that spirit be discouraged, or at least would it not lose its effective force, if the people knew that the law would never allow them to be completely destitute in their old age?" We had to deal with this objection, and we did not present the Bill till we had found a system by which the situation of those who provided for themselves—however small that provision might be—would be better than the situation of those who had nothing to live upon except the relief they received from public money.

Law as to the relief of the aged.

(27) You may now see as at a glance what has been done these last seventeen years in France for those that are within the limits of the definition of 1889—those that are in physical impossibility of providing for themselves. I shall now put before the Commission in a few words three rules that apply to all these laws for the relief of the poor.

Rules as to relief.

(28) *The First Rule.*—We have stuck to the old principle the parish must support its own poor. The first revolution had abandoned it. That it did so was the second of its blunders. In 1791 they thought that it should be possible to centralise in the hands of the Government all the resources of poor relief, which would be poured out from the centre to meet local wants. I say this was a grave mistake, and we have proceeded on just the reverse method. We believe in individual effort first—in family aid next, thirdly, in private help, and if none of these is sufficient, then in the help of the smallest "collectivity," the commune, which is as a greater family, and which alone has the means of knowing the people who apply for help. This is one of the rules that is printed at the back of the publications of the *Conseil Supérieur*.

The relief of the poor primarily a local charge.

The words are as follows:—

"*L'assistance publique est d'essence communale. C'est par la commune que doivent être désignés les bénéficiaires de l'assistance parceque seule elle est en situation de les connaître.*"

List of persons eligible for poor relief drawn up by the commune.

Under this rule the municipal council draws up the lists of the inhabitants of the commune who become eligible for assistance under the Poor Laws.

M. Henri Monod.

15 May 1906.

(29.) *The Second Rule.*—The commune, whose business it is, as has just been said, to make the lists of those who have a right to receive public help, must be financially interested in limiting their number. Otherwise, especially in a country of universal suffrage, the danger of waste would be great. Public funds must be protected against the temptation to put on the lists persons who could do without public help. But there arises another danger—that of not putting on the lists the names of all those who cannot do without the public help; and here it is the poor who have to be protected against a spirit of exaggerated parsimony. For the settlement of these cases a special tribunal has been established. The general rule is as follows:—

"*L'organisation de l'assistance doit toujours être telle que la commune soit financièrement intéressée à la limitation du nombre de ses indigents. Des recours doivent pouvoir être exercés contre sa décision si cette limitation est excessive.*"

(30.) *The Third Rule.*—France is divided into departments, and the departments into communes—the State, each department and each commune having a separate budget. Now our poor laws represent a system of joint responsibility, for the whole of the country, and every part of it is interested in their successful working. From this we infer that each of the three national constituent bodies—the commune, the department, and the State—must co-operate in meeting the expenses incurred under these laws.

(31.) But in what proportion are these expenses to be divided between the three constituent bodies? The general plan is not only one of joint responsibility; it is also one of relief, and if the relief passes from the community to the individual, why should it not pass also from community to community? In a department there are richer and poorer communes. Therefore, the share of the department in the expenditure will be divided between the communes according to their degree of wealth or of poverty. There are also richer or poorer departments. Therefore the share of the State in the expenditure will be divided between the departments, according to their degree of wealth or poverty.

(32.) We have an administrative method of specifying these degrees of poverty or wealth. Following the laws of 1893 (sick) and 1905 (aged) are tables which form a part of these laws, which group the communes and the departments in a certain number of classes and fix for each of these classes the proportions of the contribution, on the one hand of the department in the expenses of each commune, on the other of the State in the expenses of each department. For instance, the class of the poorest communes will have to pay only 20 per cent. of the expenditure on their sick, and 10 per cent of the expenditure on their aged, whilst the class of the richest communes will have to pay 90 per cent for their sick, and 70 per cent. for their aged, the rest constituting the nominal contribution of the department. I say the nominal contribution, for of this contribution the class of the poorest departments will have to pay no more than 30 per cent. for both the sick and the aged, whilst the class of the richest departments will pay 90 per cent. for the sick and 50 per cent. for the aged; the rest (70 per cent. of the departmental contribution on the one hand, 10 and 50 per cent. on the other) being the obligatory contribution of the State. You see that by means of the departmental contribution the rich communes aid the poorer; and by means of the State contribution the richer departments aid the poorer. This rule is formulated in the French text as follows:—

L'assistance publique est une œuvre de solidarité nationale. Elle doit s'exercer, non seulement de la société à l'individu, mais de groupe à groupe, les communes riches venant au secours des communes pauvres, les départements riches venant au secours des départements pauvres. La proportionnalité, et non la fixité, doit en conséquence être la regle des subventions, soit des départements, soit de l'Etat.

(33.) So much for the present about public relief. About private charity I have only to say that in France it has at all times enjoyed much independence, especially since our law of 1901 on the liberty of association was passed; that over charitable societies (*œuvres de charité*), or those that take the name of charity, the central authority has no control whatever; that my experience, as director of the public service, convinces me that this absence of control is very objectionable; and that the efforts made by well-intentioned persons to bring the public service and the private societies together, so that they may join in a common undertaking, especially for the exchange of information, has hitherto obtained very little success.

(34.) I hope that the systematic scheme of public poor relief which has been adopted by our Government and Parliament, and which I have put before this Commission, will lead charitable persons to devote more and more of their charity to those who are not the objects of obligatory help—namely, able-bodied paupers, and to study more and more the means, not only of relieving them casually, but of raising them up, of restoring to them the fulness of their moral health, and replacing them under normal conditions of life. On all these points I venture to say that they have a good deal to learn from the experiences of the Charity Organisation Society of London.

13626. I am sure I may express what is the unanimous opinion of the Commission that that is a most excellent and valuable paper. But clear as it is, perhaps you will allow me to put one or two questions to you upon it. Speaking of the law of 15th July, 1905, you stated that you did not present the Bill till you had found a "system by which the situation of those who provided for themselves—however small that provision might be—would be better than the situation of those who had nothing to live upon except the relief they received from public money." I assume that a description of the principles and of the situation will be found in those books which you are kindly going to leave with us?—It will be found in the text of the 20th Article of the law. According to the law, which, as I have already explained, does not come into operation until 1st January, 1907, each commune fixes, without regard to the circumstances of any particular individual, the minimum cost of living within the commune. For instance, it may be that one cannot live within a particular commune if one has an income of less than 10 francs (8s.) per month; then that sum of 8s. per month will be accepted by the Council of the Department and by the State as the standard. Therefore, if anyone living in that commune has no income at all, he must receive the 8s. per month. But if a person has private means, there is of course no reason why all the collectivity should give more than is necessary, and, therefore, his private means will be deducted; for instance, if he has 3s. or 4s. per month of his own, then they would only give him 5s. or 4s. per month. But if those private means had been acquired by personal foresight or thrift, then only half the amount would be deducted, in arriving at the sum which is to be paid to him. Therefore, necessarily, the situation of those who have done something to provide for themselves is better than the situation of those who have done nothing at all.

Minimum scale of relief based on minimum cost of living fixed by each commune subject to confirmation by the department and by the State.

Discrimination between thrifty and thriftless applicants.

13627. Is the amount or the standard fixed by the commune?—It is fixed by the commune with the approbation of the *Conseil general du Department* and of the State.

13628. I presume that they can vary the scale?—Yes, and it does vary very much. A provision has been put into the law that they must not give less than five francs per month; but I do not suppose that even in France there is any place where a man who has nothing at all can live on five francs per month.

Absolute minimum scale of relief fixed by Statute.

13629. According to the second rule, the commune has the right of limiting the number of those who may receive this assistance; is there also a limit to the amount of money which can be given?—No. As the principle is the obligatory relief of all those who need it, you cannot put a limit to the amount of money given; obviously that would be contradictory.

13630. If a commune has a great demand for help from the poor, I gather that it would obtain resources, first, from charitable institutions and, next, from the department, would it be?—Yes.

Source of Poor Law revenue of the commune.

13631. And then, thirdly, from the State?—No. The help of the State goes to the department and not to the communes directly. However, there is now a proposition for a certain amendment being made in the *barèmes*, so that if the number of paupers in the commune is too great, there may be supplementary help from the State directly to the commune; but that would be quite an exceptional thing.

Special grants by State to exceptionally pauperised districts.

M. Henri Monod.

15 May 1906.

13632. That is a proposal, not that it should come through the Department, but that it should come straight from the State ?—That last proposition is that it should go straight to the commune.

13633. If a commune has a special demand upon it, has the department the power of giving extra aid ?—No. The department must give the proportion which is directed by the law according to the class in which the commune is situated.

13634. Then if an exceptional case occurs, the State has to come in and deal with it ?—Yes. But that is quite a new thing, and it is not yet in operation. It has been found that there are certain communes with a great working class population, which, according to our method of stating the wealth or the poverty of the commune in *centimes*, do not occupy their fair position on the table, and in those cases it is proposed that the State should give direct help to the commune.

Percentage of population eligible for sick relief.

13635. With your great experience, have you ever made a calculation of the proportion or percentage of people in the community who are unable to help themselves ?—It is very difficult to answer that in a general way; but we have reports each year giving the proportion of those who are on the lists to be helped in case of sickness. That figure is about 16 per cent. of the population.

13636. As much as that ?—Yes. That is not the percentage of the sick, but the percentage of those who are on the list to be helped when sick. If they are sick in the course of the year, they will be helped for nothing. I cannot say what is the proportion of the aged, because that has not been ascertained yet. We were asked by our Parliament to give the percentage of the aged poor, and we were obliged to give them some calculations, but I remain in doubt as to the value of these calculations.

13637. You want experience there, of course ?—Yes, we want experience.

Proportion of number of children relieved to number born in France.

13638. As regards the children, you tell us that there are 212,378 registered in connection with your public service; what proportion would that bear to the total number of children in France ?—The number of births in France is 900,000 a year, or thereabouts.

Definition of "Child" in France.

13639. What do you call a child in France ? under what age, that is ?—In this number of 212,378 are included those who are assisted at home, and they must be under two or three years old. The others we have under our charge until they are twenty-one. When they are thirteen, we put them out to work, and they earn their own living more or less, but we have full responsibility for them until they are of age.

13640. You are their parents, so to speak, until they are twenty-one ?—Yes. Those services are departmental and are done by the department.

French Relief principally out-relief.

13641. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to the sick, I see your law emphasises their being relieved at home ?—Yes.

13642. The whole experience of the English Poor Law has been a steady inclination to take the sick into institutions; but you do not agree with that ?—No, not at all.

Comparison of cost of medical relief in institutions and at paupers' home.

13643. Why do you say that relieving them in their homes is better ?—The difference in the cost is enormous. The average cost in the hospital has been more than £3 and it has only been 10s. at home.

13644. We have found, as a matter of fact, that the cost at home comes to be more, in consequence of what we call malingering; we have found that you cannot prevent a person at home from shamming illness and from continuing to declare himself ill longer than is necessary ?—Until now, we have not had that difficulty to contend with. The family ties in France, are, as you know, very strong, and they would not like to have their sick going to the hospital if they could help it.

Reluctance of Frenchmen for institutional medical relief.

13645. We have found the people do not like it, but we have also found that it is better that they should go ?—But why should it be so ? Every time the public doctor thinks it is necessary they can go to the hospital; he gives a certificate, and the hospital will not be repaid the cost of the patient if they cannot produce the doctor's certificate.

13646. But you steadily discourage institutional treatment of the sick ?—Yes, because we think it is much better, wherever possible, to help them in their own families.

13647. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Can you tell us what proportion of the total cost is subscribed voluntarily—you have given us the figures for the hospitals ?—I have given you figures showing what was the case before our laws of obligatory relief were passed.

Effect of State-aid on charitable contributions.

13648. Has the effect been that the charitable donations have declined, as State help has increased ?—Not yet, but it will be so. It has been so in regard to the assistance given to the children. More than 100 years ago, the children were only assisted by voluntary help; then the *Service des Enfants assistés* was created, and now there are very few voluntary donations or bequests for that *Service*, which is in fact done on entirely public money. Probably it will be the same in the case of the sick.

Administration of Public Hospitals.

13649. Is the management of the hospital entirely in the hands of a voluntary committee ?—If a hospital has been made a public institution, then it is under the administration of that board of seven persons of which I have spoken; but there may be free hospitals, and they would have nothing at all to do with the State.

13650. What provision is there for a change in the constitution of the board; do its members remain members of the board for life ?—They do not remain members for life. As I have said, four members are named by the Prefect, and every year the powers of one of these four persons come to an end. But he can be appointed anew for four years. Then the municipal council is changed by election, and the two members who are appointed by the municipal council are changed also.

Constitution of Court for revision of Relief Lists.

13651. You have told us, speaking of the second rule, that for the settlement of case of a special kind, a special tribunal has been established; would you describe the constitution of the tribunal ?—Yes, I can do so from the documents I have here. The tribunal is fixed by Article 17, and it has the power of striking names off the list or of putting names on the list. It is a Cantonal Commission composed of the *Sous-préfet* of the *Arrondissement* as representing the State, of a member of the *Conseil Général*, of a member of the *Conseil de l'Arrondissement*, and of the *Juge de paix* of the *Canton*—four persons, of whom two belong to elected bodies.

Rules as to administration of relief in France.

13652. (*Professor Smart.*) You have spoken of a statement of the principles which is printed on the back of your papers; do I understand that there are more than the three rules you have quoted ?—In my paper I have given you the three great rules.

13653. Do you not think it might be good for us to have the whole of them ?—Yes, I will leave these documents with you, and you will find them on the back of every one.

13654. Do I understand that these are the principles on which the Poor Laws were administered before you came into office ?—No. They were not formulated before 1889.

13655. They do form the principles of the present Poor Laws ?—Yes.

13656. Then I think we might have these printed, if you do not mind ?—Certainly. (For translation *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXV.)

Effect of State-aid upon charitable contributions.

13657. Do you anticipate a very great diminution in voluntary charity in consequence of these laws ?—I do not anticipate a diminution in the voluntary charities as a whole, but I suppose they will go in the future to the able-bodied. There will certainly not be a diminution, but I do not think these voluntary charities will come now to those who are the objects of obligatory public relief.

13658. Then there will be voluntary charity neither for the sick, nor for the aged, nor for the young ?—For the young there will always be a lot of charitable works, and very good ones. I think there will be a diminution on behalf of those classes, but not a diminution in the total voluntary contributions. I think the charitable public will always do a great deal in France.

Expediency of relief of able-bodied being left to voluntary effort.

13659. One would hope so, certainly; but it seems to me that the able-bodied will not appeal to the people nearly so much, nor will people see very easily the way to help them; they are a much more difficult class, are they not?—Much more difficult. It is only private persons who can properly do that work, I think.

Lady inspectors in Poor Law work.

13660. Do you associate any women with you in this work?—Yes, we have four *Inspectrices générales des servier de l'enfance.*

13661. But they are not among the governing body—not among the committee who decide these things?—No, they are not yet. It was my intention—and I hope they will carry it out now that I am no longer in office—to have these four inspectresses on our *Conseil superieur de l'assistance publique.* I think they must get on that council, but they have not yet done so. And I had to contend with people who try to put them out of office altogether.

Method of drawing up Lists of persons eligible for medical relief.

13662. (*Mr. Phelps.*) If a man comes and asks for medical assistance, who decides whether he is poor enough to receive obligatory relief?—The list is made up every year. I cannot go into all the details, but in each commune there is a Board of Assistance, and that Board of Assistance prepares a list, not of those who are paupers, but of those who would become paupers in case of sickness. They make out that list, and that list is then agreed to by the municipal council. Now there may be cases where a person who is not on the list must be helped, and then the *Maire* by a special article of the law decides that help shall be given to him. As a rule, a person to be helped must be on that list which has been prepared by the Board of Assistance and decided on by the municipal council.

Relief in emergency to persons not on list.

13663. In an average town what kind of income would a man have who would be put on that list?—He would have about nothing if he was sick.

13664. Would you put on that list a man who had 8 francs a month of his own?—That is a thing to be decided by the municipal council. If he has got 8 francs a month, and he is living in a city like Paris, of course he could not keep himself on that, so that he would be entitled to be put on the list; but if he is living in a little place in the country, 8 francs a month would be quite enough.

13665. It would vary very much, then, according to the place in which he lived?—Yes. In each place it is decided by the municipal council. We have a large number of communes in France—more than 36,000; many of them very little communes—where all the inhabitants know each other.

No stigma attached to medical relief.

13666. (*Chairman.*) Is it considered to be a disgrace to be on the list?—No.

The finance of poor relief.

13667. (*Mr. Phelps.*) What taxes go to the *Assistance Publique*?—The general resources of the commune.

13668. Is there a tax on theatre tickets?—Yes.

13669. Are there any other taxes of that sort?—Yes; but that is special, and that does not come to very much.

13670. Would the council see at the end of the year what their expenditure was likely to be?—Yes.

13671. They would make an estimate, would they, of what they thought the charge would be for the next year, and they would tax the people to that extent?—The expenses are centralised at the department. The department pays the expenses of in-door relief as well as of out-door relief. It ascertains the total expenditure, and then it says to one commune, "You must pay 50 per cent.," and to another, "You must pay so much;" and then it goes to the State and says, "We have to receive from you 35 per cent.," or 40 per cent., or whatever it is, and they get that amount from the State.

The minimum scale of living.

13672. (*Dr. Downes.*) You have spoken of 8s. per month as a possible minimum subsistence in certain communes; how is that arrived at—would it include rent, clothing and fuel?—It would include everything.

13673. Even food?—Yes. I mentioned that figure of 8s., because for a long time we tried to get the people to give those pensions to the aged who had nothing at all, and where we were successful they did give 10 francs per month.

13674. Has that been found to be sufficient?—Yes. The Senate found it too much, and put the minimum down to 5 francs per month.

Separate lists of *indigents* and of those eligible for medical relief.

13675. With regard to medical relief, what is the position of a man who is not poor enough to be placed on the list to receive the gratuitous medical service, and who is not rich enough to pay out of his own pocket for very much medical assistance?—If it is ascertained that he is unable to pay, he must be put on the list. He has a right to ask the tribunal of which I have spoken to put him on the list. He does not ask to be put on what is called by us the list of the *Bureau de bienfaisance*, which is a list of what is called *indigents*, but he asks to be put on the list under the law of 1893, which is a law for the relief of the sick. The two things are quite different. People who would not be put at all on the list of the *indigents* by the *Bureau de bienfaisance* for out-door relief will allow themselves to be placed on this list in case they are sick. They are people who, when they are in health, earn their living, but who, if they happen to be sick, have no money coming in at all, or very little.

Repayment of cost of sick-relief.

13676. Is there any provision by which a man who can pay a little can go into any institution for the relief of sickness?—There is nothing regular about that. It may happen that he is in a commune where that sort of aid exists, and it may happen that he is not. In Paris there are such institutions, but there are a great number of communes where there is nothing of the kind.

13677. I believe that in Paris you have what we call paying hospitals?—Yes, we have some of those.

13678. How much would a man have to pay in such a hospital, taking a man of the middle class with a small income?—It would differ. Even in our public hospitals we have a certain number of rooms reserved for those who can pay something. Some will pay 5 francs per day, and some will pay 6 francs per day; then they have a separate room.

Number of applications for sick-relief in a year.

13679. With regard to your figures as to the number of sick who were relieved in 1902, you give the total as 582,264; is that the number of different persons or the number of applications?—It is the number of applications.

13680. So that it might include the same persons over again?—Yes, but for a different sickness.

Private hospitals in France.

13681. (*Chairman.*) Have you any hospitals in France which are private hospitals not under government?—Yes; we have not very many, but we have some in the large towns. We have the English hospital in Paris, which is quite private.

13682. Most of the hospitals in France are supported by the public funds, I think?—No, they generally are supported by the private gifts of which I have spoken in my paper.

13683. Are they supported by the funds of the department or of the commune or of the State?—Neither one nor the other. They are public institutions by themselves. But since the law of 1893 they may receive money from the department for the treatment of those sent to the hospital in execution of that law.

Administration of *bureaux de bienfaisance.*

13684. Are the *bureaux de bienfaisance* government departments?—They were instituted with voluntary funds, and then made into public institutions, each of them by a separate Act and a separate decree.

13685. Are they under the control of publicly-appointed officials?—Yes; that board of seven persons of which I have spoken will administer each one of them.

13686. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Is there any system among the working people of mutual assistance during illness, like our friendly societies?—Yes, we have a great number of mutual societies, but they are quite apart from this.

Effect of medical relief on Provident Societies, etc.

13687. I was wondering whether this would affect their numbers at all; does it reduce them?—They were afraid it would, but it has not done so. It was alleged that it would, and these societies were afraid that it would. In a speech that I made in the Senate in connection with the law dealing with the aged people, I dealt with that matter. I said that one of our writers in 1885 stated that the recent law which instituted medical assistance to the sick would destroy the majority of the societies of mutual help, and I answered. Here are now the figures: On December 31st, 1895 (the year of that law) there were 10,588 societies of mutual help with 1,354,439 members; and on December 31st, 1904, when that law had been in operation for nearly nine years, the number of societies had gone up from 10,000 to 17,800, and the number of members from

M. Henri Monod.

15 May 1906.

1,350,000 to 2,950,000. Therefore, you see the operation of the law for relieving the sick has had no influence in reducing the number of societies for mutual help.

Right to relief of those incapacitated by old age.

13688. Did I understand you to say that the law which is to come in force next year for the aged, applies to the infirm and incurable as well?—Yes, when they are so infirm and incurable as to be incapable of earning their livelihood.

13689. At any age in their case?—Yes.

13690. Is there any Employers' Liability Act in France, by which employers are liable for the men who are disabled while employed by them?—Yes. But that is a different law, and has nothing to do with the public assistance. That comes under another ministry altogether—the Ministry of Commerce.

Feeding of school children and the relief of the children of the State.

13691. I think that in France there is a good deal of feeding of school children; is that done under the obligatory law?—No, not at all. That also comes under another ministry—the Ministry of Public Instruction.

13692. That works side by side with your care of the children?—Yes.

13693. Would they be dealing with the same children that you do?—No.

13694. They would be dealing with a different set of children altogether?—Yes. Our children who are what we call *Les Enfants Assistés*, and who belong to the State, are not regarded as paupers at all. We have to provide for them, and we would not ask for any assistance in their feeding; we must do that.

Position and functions of Director of *l'assistance publique* in Paris.

13695. Would they be going to the same schools as the other children?—Yes, certainly; they would go to the public schools.

13696. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to Paris, I think I might ask you a question or two, your answers to which might be of great service to us. You have in Paris at the head of the general administration of Public Assistance, I believe, a director appointed by the Minister of the Interior on the nomination of the Prefect of the Seine?—Yes.

13697. He submits a budget of all the expenses of the city from that point of view, and he also is the legal representative of the hospital establishments and of the *Secours à domicile*?—Yes.

13698. He acts as the guardian of the *enfants assistés*, the *enfants trouvés*, and so on?—Yes.

13699. As representing Paris he also takes part in the *Conseil de Surveillance*?—Yes.

13700. And also in the *Conseil supérieur de l'assistance publique* that you have referred to?—Yes.

13701. So he has a very strong assured position in regard to the whole administration in Paris?—Yes.

13702. And he is in touch with the whole administration in the country at large?—No.

The *Conseil de surveillance* in Paris and its constitution.

13703. Then, besides that, in Paris you have the *Conseil de surveillance*, and I want to ask you if you can tell us how it is formed. As I understand, it is a consultative body that stands beside the director of the relief in Paris as the central body of the town?—Yes. I do not know the number of the members, but I can give that information to you. In one of these books you will find all the particulars about that. I think there are thirty or thirty-five.

13704. I have a rough note here; there are ten representatives of the *Conseil municipal*?—Yes.

13705. Then there are two *maires* or *adjoints*, and also two administrators of the *bureaux de bienfaisance*?—Yes.

13706. It is linked to the central body by having one *Conseiller d'État*, I believe?—Is there a *Conseiller d'État* now? Perhaps there may be, but I have nothing to do with it now.

13707. Then there is a physician, who should be a physician attached to the hospitals?—Yes.

13708. And there is also an accoucheur in practice at the hospitals?—Yes.

13709. So you have in that way a very representative body?—Yes.

13710. It is not really an elected body, but it is an appointed body?—Yes.

Members of the *Bureaux de bienfaisance* partly representative and partly nominated.

13711. It is the same with the *Bureaux de bienfaisance* and the hospital committees; they are appointed bodies and not elected bodies?—Do you mean in Paris only?

13712. I mean generally?—In general for each *bureau de bienfaisance* and each hospital, as I have said, there is a Board of seven persons, consisting of the *maire* of the commune, who is elected, two members appointed by the municipal council, who are elected, and four members named by the prefect.

13713. Who are practically appointed?—Yes.

Constitution of the *Conseil de surveillance* and its operation in Paris.

13714. But this central body in Paris is entirely an appointed body?—Entirely; and it is very much sought for by gentlemen in the town. It is a great honour to be a member of that Council.

13715. Do you think it is a good method of managing the general administration in Paris to have this appointed body at its head; does it answer?—I did not see, whilst I was there, any great inconvenience in it. But the Paris business was very much out of my hands. There is a very great autonomy in our commune at Paris, and it will not easily accept the intervention of the Government, you know.

13716. Granting their desire for autonomy, is the administration, in your opinion, well-conducted from the point of view of the general interests of Paris?—Yes, I think it is very well-conducted from the financial point of view. I think their management expenses are very low, that is, the proportion of the expenses that do not go direct to the poor is very low.

The finance of the *Bureaux d'assistance medicale.*

13717. To take another point, the sources of payment in regard to these *Bureaux d'assistance*—the medical body. You take into account, do you not, all endowments that are available for paying your expenses?—Yes.

13718. The receipts of these *Bureaux d'assistance* take into account three *ressources propres*, namely, *dotations*, *droits des pauvres* and *cimetières*?—That goes to the *Bureau de bienfaisance*, but where there is no *Bureau de bienfaisance*, the *Bureau d'assistance medicale* under the Article of the Law for the Relief of the Sick, has all the powers the *Bureau de bienfaisance* has under our law of 1879.

13719. That is to say, you fall back upon the endowments which are held in the interests of the public good as far as they will go?—Yes; but when there is a *Bureau de bienfaisance*, that *Bureau de bienfaisance* takes them, under the law. You have some *dotations* for the sick and all those go to the new Board of Assistance. As the *Bureau de bienfaisance* has the entire charge of the relief of the poor, some of its funds must go to the sick, even without a special *dotation*, and so the prefect tells the *Bureau de bienfaisance*: You must take, say, a fifth of your revenue and give it to the new Board of Assistance.

13720. Then also you may obtain reimbursement, may you not, from all persons, societies and corporations who exist for the purpose of assisting sickness?—If they have a special obligation in respect of the sick person.

13721. That is to say, a friendly society, for instance—a *Société de secours mutuels*—might pay towards the cost of the medical relief?—Yes; they would pay what they are obliged to pay, according to the rules, but not more.

13722. Then with regard to the *Enfants assistés*, do you not find that their numbers are increasing very rapidly?—Yes.

13723. Does that at all frighten you?—Not at all.

Increase in numbers of children relieved.

13724. I notice the figures for Paris are very high now compared with what they were in 1891. The figures seem to have risen from 20,616 to 31,308?—I know it. But I do not think it is any advantage for a child to be kept by force with parents who will not keep him. I think it is much better for the child to come to us.

Increase in numbers dealt with by *bureaux de bienfaisance.*

13725. Then with regard to the *indigents*, there again I notice a considerable increase, namely, from 47,000 in 1892 to 53,000 in 1902 in Paris?—That does not all come within the limits of our obligatory laws.

13726. That is what I wanted to find out?—That is the business of the *Bureaux de bienfaisance* of Paris.

13727. Does it strike you that there is an increase in pauperism generally in Paris under the system on which they are now operating?—No, it does not strike me so at all.

13728. I notice that what they call the *Titulaires de secours représentatif d'admission à l'hopital* show a very large increase too ?—Yes.

13729. So that the *indigents* in these various departments are much on the increase ?—Yes; but before that help to the aged was obligatory, there were a great many who had need of help and did not get it, but now they must get it.

13730. You would, therefore, make an allowance for a considerable margin of persons who ought to be relieved, and who hitherto have not been relieved ?—Certainly. I have seen that all round me very often.

Barèmes the location of cost of lief between h and poor stricts.

13731. In reference to the *Barèmes*, the tables which are made of the value of the centime in the various districts, that is made by a Government department from year to year, I think ?—No, not at all; it is a part of the law.

13732. Is it actually incorporated in the law ?—Yes.

13733. So that you have in this way a sort of self-acting system for the assistance of the Department and of the State in the case of each commune ?—Yes. It works quite mechanically and mathematically; there is no opportunity at all for arbitrary appreciation there.

alue of urt for vision of lief lists.

13734. Is it the general feeling in France that this distribution is fairly done ?—Yes, I think it is the general feeling, but I think it would be very desirable that our little tribunal, of which I spoke, the county tribunals, should do more than they have done. We have had instances of a commune where every member of the municipal council and the *maire* himself put themselves on the list. In another, on the intervention of the Prefect, that tribunal struck off eighty out of a hundred.

13735. There is a control really acting on behalf of the Government right through the system, in the form of the Prefect ?—Yes; and not only the Prefect, but every inhabitant of the commune can go to the tribunal and say, "That man ought not to be on the list," or "That man ought to be on the list."

13736. And ultimately the Prefect intervenes ?—Not ultimately. The tribunal decides.

13737. But sooner or later, if he thinks the thing is wrong, he can intervene ?—He can, but he is not compelled to intervene.

oor Law rganisation f Paris.

13738. (*Chairman.*) Is Paris treated as one commune ?—Yes, but it is divided into twenty *arrondissements*, and each *arrondissement* has a *bureau de bienfaisance*.

13739. The *arrondissement* is not the commune, but it takes its place ?—Yes. There are twenty *arrondissements*, and each of those *arrondissements* has a *maire*.

13740. Is the system under the control of the Prefect or of a special officer ?—It is under the control of the Prefect, or rather of the director of whom Mr. Loch was speaking just now, and over the director there is the Prefect.

13741. Has that resulted in pressure being brought on the Government in the Chamber of Deputies to relax the rules and give more assistance in times of distress ?—Not very much, because Paris always has done a great deal more than any other town or commune in France.

13742. Then that has not been a danger under the system ?—No, it has not up to now.

ontribution f Paris unicipality owards cost f poor relief.

13743. (*Mr. Loch.*) But there is a temptation, is there not, for the municipality to intervene and to make grants for relief for different purposes in Paris ?—Yes, because they have to give a great deal towards it. The Public Assistance has to spend about 50,000,000 francs a year, and as it only has 20,000,000 francs of its own the other 30,000,000 francs must be provided by the municipal council. As they give so much money they think they should have something to say as to the way that money is spent.

Minimum scale of living.

13744. (*Professor Smart.*) Would the 10 francs per month you have mentioned be per head ?—Yes.

13745. That is for aged persons alone ?—Yes.

13746. Do you seriously say that a French peasant of any age can live on 10 francs a month ?—In some parts of France, certainly. I objected very much in the Senate to the 5 francs a month, but I must say that I think it is possible in certain parts of the country to live on 10 francs a month.

13747. Do you not mean that a relative would be glad to take them as boarders for 10 francs ?—Yes, a relative would take them.

13748. But they would not make anything out of it ?—I hope not. This is a very difficult question.

13749. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You do not mean that a man or a woman might have a separate house and live alone on that amount, do you ?—Yes.

13750. And it would be sufficient ?—Yes, it would.

13751. Would they have any land attached to the house, and be able to grow stuff ?—There would be a little bit of land and a very little house, but they might live on it.

French Poor Law literature.

13752. Could you tell us what rent they would pay per month for that house ?—Perhaps 10 or 15 francs a year.

With a view of helping any one who would like to go deeper into this matter, I present the Commission with a certain number of documents: 1st, the inquiry of which I have spoken about the children—*Les Enfants Assistés*, two volumes; 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th, four reports about the Application of the Law of 1893 (Relief to the Sick); 6th and 7th, two books about the public money spent for the relief of the poor, first in 1885, and second in 1896—one can see there that it was beginning to increase and since then it has increased a great deal more; a third volume ought to be published. Then, 8th, the Law of July 24th, 1889, dealing with the Relief of Ill-treated Children and the Regulations in regard to it; then, 9th, the Law of July 15th, 1893, dealing with Relief of the Sick and the egulations in regard to it; 10th, the Law of February 4th, 1901, dealing with Gifts and Bequests under Public Control and the Regu ations in regard to it; 11th and 12th, the Laws of June 27th and 28th, 1904, dealing with Children Registered in the Public Services and the Regulations in regard to them; 13th, the Law of July 14th, 1905, dealing with Relief to the Aged and Invalid, and the Regulations in regard to it; 14th and 15th, two speeches I delivered to the Senate concerning one, the Law of 1893 for the Relief of the Sick, and the other, the Law of 1905 for Relief of the Aged—in which speeches are developed the principles I have just put before the Commission; and 16th and 17th, two speeches I delivered at the opening of the International Congresses of 1899 and 1900, in each of which the state of things according to the Relief of the Poor is put down as it was at that time; and then, 18th, 19th, and 20th, three papers containing the decrees relative to the Institution of the Direction of the *Conseil Supérieur de l'assistance publique*, and the proceedings of the first sitting of that Council.

13753 (*Chairman.*) We are very much obliged to you; you have given us the greatest assistance ?—I am very glad to have been able to be of help to the Commission.

THIRTY-THIRD DAY.

Monday, 21st May, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Mr. HENRY LOCKWOOD, recalled; and further Examined.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.
21 May 1906.

13754. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) With regard to certain localities being indulgent, and others strict (not necessarily east and west), has the pressure not been on the whole greatest where now (and possibly consequently) indulgence is greatest?—I think pressure is apt to follow indulgent administration.

Effect of administration on pauperism.

13755. Is laxity the cause or effect of the present state of things, or is it due to want of work, poor physique and such matters?—It is not easy to differentiate on this point.

Variation in attractiveness of workhouses.

13756. Which is the most luxurious—a workhouse or an infirmary in London?—I do not know that there is much to choose between them.

13757. Are there not in some workhouses special features rendering them specially attractive?—In some, the entertainments, small luxuries and so on are perhaps overdone, and, as I have said in previous reports, the leakage unavoidable in a crowded workhouse has special attractions for the class known as loafers.

Effect of Local Government Act, 1894.

13758. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You have had experience of administration before 1894 and since; in your judgment is the Poor Law administered to-day as well as it was before 1894, that is to say, are the guardians as public-spirited nowadays as they were before 1894?—The condition of the poor both in workhouses and in infirmaries is certainly more eligible now than it was prior to 1894.

Army pensioner paupers.

13759. Can you tell us the proportion of old soldiers who become chargeable, the age at which they become chargeable, how many received pensions, and the highest and lowest amount paid?—I hand in a summary of lists of pensioners (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (P.)) in the several workhouses in London. The total is 226. The original lists are available if desired, but they are voluminous and of various sorts and sizes. The pensions vary considerably from 6d. to 2s. 6d. per day.

Proposal to introduce Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order.

13760. (*Mr. Loch.*) Why should not the Prohibitory Order be brought into force in London instead of the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order? As to the applications at times of pressure from want of work, and inclement winters, do not borough councils or "Distress Committees" make provision so that the Prohibitory Order might, so far as the "Unemployed" are concerned, be applied to London?—This might be worth considering, but it would be well probably to have first full reports of the working of the distress committees appointed under the Act of last year.

The practice of giving continuous relief in "sudden and urgent necessity" and checks thereon.

13761. As to "continuous, sudden, and urgent necessity relief." In what unions in London has this prevailed year by year since 1894?—In Camberwell, Bermondsey, and Poplar, but I have no accurate figures as to this.

13762. What orders or instructions, if any, have been given by the Local Government Board?—No special instructions have been given.

13763. What numbers of cases have been passed in this way by the Local Government Board, and in what unions, since 1894?—I have not been able to get figures as to this. (*See* answer to later question, 13842.)

13764. What is the procedure for sending up cases and getting approval? Have the auditors raised questions as to the legality of such relief, and, if so, what replies have been given to the auditors?—The only instance of action by an auditor that I know of is a recent one in Poplar, where a relieving officer has been surcharged in respect of a particular case, but I am not sure that a decision has yet been arrived at.

13765. Has the inspector approved of the system, and, if so, under what conditions?—Regarded, as a temporary expedient, it is preferable to the stoneyard, but of course there should be careful inquiry in each case which should be reported regularly to the guardians or relief committee, who should have the cases before them regularly, and the circumstances reported on carefully, at short intervals. Relieving officers should not be given general instructions to relieve able-bodied persons continuously under the exception in the Order.

13766. If the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order does not forbid continuous, sudden, and urgent necessity relief, should it not do so?—Something might be done in this direction, but it would not be easy to define precisely what was to be understood to be continuous.

The tendency to indulgent administration of Poor Law and its causes.

13767. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you trace to any particular year, or to any movement occurring during any special period, the decline from strict administration, that followed the period immediately following 1869–70?—I cannot speak for the period immediately following 1869 and 1870, but the reduction in outdoor relief began in Whitechapel and in St. George's-in-the-East about 1872, and it was brought about, I think, by the ill results following upon money sent to and indiscriminately distributed in the East End during a period of distress. Within my own experience the tendency to more indulgent administration began, I should say, in 1886 or thereabouts, which was the date, I think, when the agricultural labourer was enfranchised and the inhabitant occupier came on the scene as a voter. Since then public opinion more or less continuously seems to have been in favour of what on political platforms was called "humanising the Poor Law," and it happened that the weather of the first three months of 1895 immediately following the first election of guardians under the Act of 1894 resulted in an excess of unemployment, particularly amongst those engaged in dock and river-side occupations. The Orders and Circulars issued by the Board from time to time during the past twelve

Evils of Charity funds for the relief of distress.

years, all tending to ameliorate the conditions of workhouse life, were issued, I take it, in compliance with public opinion as reflected in Parliament; and though there may be at present a tendency to reaction in respect of certain instances in which indulgent administration has been thought excessive, public opinion continues, I think, to desire that all reasonable comfort, and perhaps something more than what may be considered reasonable by some, should continue to be provided for the aged and the sick.

13768. Can you suggest any better means than those at present obtained, for the enforcement by boards of guardians of their decisions in regard to the recovery of maintenance, loans, etc. ?—Unfortunately, the enforcement by Boards of Guardians of their decisions depends a good deal upon the caprice of individual magistrates.

13769. Assuming the difficulty that has been experienced by the Local Government Board in securing the adoption of their views by Boards of Guardians in the administration of the Poor Law, have you any suggestions to make for consolidating what may be described as the propagandist and educative influence of the central authority ?—There would be advantage, I think, in the issue by the Board of a carefully prepared Circular on the lines of Mr. Goschen's of 1869 calling attention to the importance of care and discrimination in administering out-relief, and the usefulness of co-operation with voluntary agencies. As a detail the Circular might very well call attention to the Annual Digest issued by the Charity Organisation Society, but if the Circular is to be effective it would be necessary, I think, to invite the observations of the guardians to whom it was sent after a stated interval. A close and systematic co-operation with agencies of the kind referred to is, I think, an essential, in a strict out-relief administration, and this view is expressed by the House of Lords Committee in their Report of 1888.

13770. (*Mr. Booth.*) When the word "lax" is used with regard to administration is it understood to mean simply that they do not adopt a certain policy of administration, or that whatever policy of administration they do adopt they are indifferent in carrying out the policy on which it is based ?—I think laxity is not to be taken necessarily to mean careless administration, I should apply it rather to those cases where relief was, perhaps, too readily given.

13771. Too readily as being against certain principles ?—Yes.

13772. Not that they may not be conscientiously carrying out the principle which they themselves think right ?—It is not infrequently the case that where a good deal of out-door relief is given it is given not in ignorance but with full knowledge of the circumstances; but there are boards of guardians who regard the condition justifying relief to be somewhat different to that regarded by others.

13773. "Whatever is best administered is best" is sometimes quoted, would you agree with that motto ?—I think I have given my view that as regards out-door relief it should be kept within reasonable limits. As far as I understand there are three schools of thought with regard to out-relief: there are those who think it should be the principal method of relief, there are those who think there should be no out-relief at all, and there is the intermediate class, like myself, who think it ought to be kept within reasonable bounds if possible; what those reasonable bounds are it is rather difficult to define, I admit.

13774. "Lax Administration" is a very common phrase, and I want to get it more particularly defined, because I do not think it is desirable to indirectly attack any particular system by using that kind of phrase. If I had to substitute a word, I should prefer to use "injudicious" instead of "lax." Would you agree that that is a word which might be used ?—If I were to select my own word, I think I should say, perhaps, that "indulgent" is better than either.

13775. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In answer to my first question on this point, you said you think pressure is apt to follow indulgent administration. What I was trying to state in that question was rather this. Sometimes when pressure was very great, through special poverty or anything of that kind, the tendency was to make men say, "principle must go to the wall altogether for the time being" ?—I did not quite understand that, You mean to say there may be a time when it is felt that the circumstances are such that you cannot apply any strict rules to them.

13776. Exactly, and the tendency, after that, would go to the rather over-indulgent policy ?—Yes, I think that is rather likely to be found in most places.

13777. In another question I asked whether there are not, in some workhouses, special features rendering them specially attractive. You have charge of Richmond, have you not ?—Yes. Feather-beds at Richmond workhouse.

13778. Do you know one specially attractive thing that used to be there in the shape of feather beds ? Near Derby day we always had a very great number in the workhouse because of the old feather beds, which had been given, first of all, by a Queen, and have been continued ?—I suppose I ought to know of the feather beds, but that is the first I have heard of them.

13779. I asked a guardian the other day about it, and he said they still had some; but they did not make the Richmond workhouse, in those days, very attractive?—That is possibly so.

13780. (*Mr. Nunn.*) As an officer of the Local Government Board, are you satisfied with the machinery that lies to your hand for converting opinions that you may have formed, as you get more and more experience of boards of guardians and their actions, into recommendations for actual practice amongst boards of guardians. Supposing you came across some special abuse in connection with the work of any board of guardians, or in connection with a group of boards of guardians, have you any other resource than to mention it in your annual report ?—You have to apply your powers of persuasion as best you can. Methods of exercising the influence of Inspectors and Local Government Board on Guardians.

13781. You have no means of bringing the powers of the Local Government Board to bear directly ?—No. You mean in matters of general administration ?

13782. There is no system of recommendations from you to the Local Government Board that might be converted into circulars or orders ?—No, I do not know that there is. As I say, one has to take each case as it comes before one and deal with it as best one can.

13783. As to the whole question of indulgent administration of outdoor relief, which combines within it the question of giving to a large number of applicants, and giving to them inadequately—which are two recognised evils—is there any systematised method which you have for getting the power of the recognised policy of the Local Government Board brought to bear upon boards of guardians generally ?—I do not know that there is anything to bring it to bear on boards of guardians generally. One has, as I say, to do the best one can to persuade guardians to adopt what is recognised as a good policy, as occasion offers.

13784. Might I go a little further and ask, as a matter of opinion, whether you think that some more direct means might exist for converting the experience of the inspectors into actual propaganda by the Local Government Board ?—Yes, as I rather suggested in my original answer, I think that a circular setting out the Board's view as to what should be done would be advantageous, provided, of course, you were sure, as I suggest, that it is not laid on the table and perhaps forgotten.

13785. Would a recommendation to the Local Government Board by one inspector that the time was ripe for such a circular be out of place ?—No, I think not.

13786. A consensus of the inspectors' opinion on the subject—— ?—Would, I should think, have the effect probably of the issue of a circular.

13787. But there is no regular machinery for sending up such recommendations ?—I do not know that there is any such recognised machinery.

13788. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) There is nothing to prevent an inspector making a recommendation of that kind ?—No, either individually or collectively. Meetings of General Inspectors.

13789. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Do the inspectors ever meet together ?—Not very often.

13790. Certainly not periodically ?—No.

13791. Do you think that would be a good plan ?—It has often been thought so, but somehow all efforts to bring about a periodical meeting have failed—why, exactly, I do not know.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

21 May 1906.

13792. Are inspectors generally of opinion that meetings would be useful?—I really cannot tell you; I believe there are differences of opinion.

13793. It is your opinion that they would be useful?—I think so.

13794. (*Chairman.*) Have they ever met?—They have on one or two occasions; and, speaking for myself, on those one or two occasions, I have derived benefit from hearing what my colleagues thought on various subjects; whether they learned anything from me, I do not know.

13795. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Who would be the convener of such a meeting?—I think any one of the inspectors could do it.

13796. I suppose the chief inspector would be?—As far as that goes, it might come from anybody. The difficulty is so to arrange their duties as to enable them all to meet together on a particular day.

13797. To an outsider it seems that the enormous experience accumulated by the Local Government Board, and the very great power it wields, ought to be combined with some little more systematic machinery for giving vent to its opinion?—Yes, of course, as you are aware, every year there are in the Blue-books reports by each inspector. I have not myself met with many people who appear to have read them, but I daresay those who have read them would find in them useful information.

13798. They are in the nature of pious opinions, are they not?—My particular reports appear twice a year in *The Times*, but unfortunately they appear a very long time after the period to which they particularly apply, and, consequently, I have occasionally to answer inconvenient questions as to what I meant by this, that, and the other, which relate really to matters which occurred perhaps eight or nine months previously.

13799. What I meant was, they do not come as practical proposals of administrative bodies?—No, I cannot say that they do.

Proposed special magistrate for dealing with Poor Law Cases.

13800. With reference to a previous question of mine taking for granted that we have the very greatest difficulty owing to the caprice of individual magistrates, has it ever occurred to you that we might have a magistrate specially appointed for dealing with cases arising out of the poor law?—I do not know whether those cases would be sufficiently numerous. You mean the appointment of a man specially for that purpose?

13801. Yes; one who should have a background of poor law principle, and who was acquainted specially with the poor law?—Of course, that would depend on what view the Home Office might take of it. I fancy very strong representations would have to be made before they would be willing to appoint a person for that particular purpose.

Attitude of magistrates as to enforcing Guardians' decisions.

13802. You are aware that the way in which their cases are refused by stipendiaries does break up principle on boards of guardians to a very large extent?—Yes, I am bound to say I have had not infrequent complaints of the way in which cases have been dealt with.

13803. It breaks up a great deal of excellent resolution on their part?—No doubt, and it is very hard indeed on a board of guardians who have been strictly following up what they are legally entitled to do in cases of that sort, to find it all upset by, I will not say the caprice, but the opinion of the particular magistrate.

Return of deaths from starvation in London.

13804. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) You have given me a return of the number of deaths from starvation in London. The total is 625, of which eighty-eight are Whitechapel Union cases, and eighteen are Poplar cases?—Yes.

13805. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) For what period was this?—From 1891 to 1904.

Reason of large number of deaths in Whitechapel as compared with Poplar.

13806. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) There were eighty-eight deaths in the Whitechapel Union, as against eighteen deaths in the Poplar Union. Would that be anything to do with judicious administration in either place?—I do not think so necessarily. I do not know whether it is in the summary, but in the original reports from which that summary was taken there is a column which sets out what is known of the cases by the Poor Law authorities. I think you will find that in very few there was any cognisance of the case by either the relieving officer or others.

13807. Might not that be because people simply would not go to the Poor Law; they had such a terror (the old terror) of going to the Poor Law?—I should not like to say that. I do not know that there is any evidence to point to that, really. It is only fair, with regard to Whitechapel, in this particular instance, to say that I fancy that Whitechapel has a considerably larger number of common lodging houses and shelters, and so on, than Poplar has, and those cases would very possibly come from them to some extent.

13808. On the other hand, it has a great number of philanthropic homes, where people would be taken in without any question of how they came to be in a destitute condition, and that sort of thing?—I do not know whether that would counter-balance the shelters.

13809. I only want to put the other side: whether it is not possible to make your Poor Law so rigid and so strict and your administration so strict that people would prefer to die rather than go to it?—I fancy that sort of thing must occur very seldom. I should be sorry that it should at all be understood that I have any belief that the larger number of starvation cases in Whitechapel was even indirectly the result of their administration.

13810. Still, eighty-eight as against eighteen is a big percentage, considering that the population of Whitechapel is less than half that of Poplar?—That is perfectly true, but, at the same time, I do not think I have committed myself to saying that the Whitechapel administration is responsible for it.

Attractiveness of London Workhouses.

13811. With regard to workhouses having specially attractive features, there is no workhouse, I suppose, in London where anyone would voluntarily end their days?—Voluntarily—no, perhaps not.

13812. You speak of the orders and circulars issued by the Board. I take it that is the Local Government Board?—Yes.

The causes of indulgent administration of the Poor Law.

13813. You say they all tend to ameliorate the conditions of workhouse life, and were issued, as you take it, in compliance with public opinion as reflected in Parliament?—I think so.

13814. Is it not possible that all the rest of the things that have been done by Poor Law Guardians in London, which have been contrary to what are known as the old Poor Law principles, have only reflected public opinion, as also reflected by elections to Boards of Guardians of people to carry out a certain policy?—I think that is so. I think there can be no question that public opinion as to what is due to persons in the workhouse, certainly in the infirmaries, has materially changed of late years.

13815. Has it not also changed so far as the Metropolis is concerned with regard to old people not being sent to the workhouse?—I do not know that you could really gather that from the returns of relief. If that view had been accepted and effect given to it by increased out-relief to old people, you would find a general increase in out-relief throughout the Metropolis, I think.

13816. In particular unions is it not within your knowledge that that has been done?—Yes. You may say that in the unions in which there is more out-relief given than in others, in most instances it is mainly given to old people.

Excessive out-relief at Camberwell.

13817. Take Camberwell, which is, I suppose, the most avowedly out-relief Board in the Metropolis; that is their policy. Do you consider that union properly administered?—I think they might, without any considerable harm, give less out-relief.

13818. Apart from that, taking it that that is their policy, that they go there definitely to give out-relief because they think people should not be taken to the workhouse, do you consider that those men are capable of administering things?—They are capable of administering, certainly, and it appears to me that Guardians under the Relief Regulation Order have a very wide discretion as to how they shall administer relief.

Effect of strict administration in Whitechapel.

13819. If you look at the top of this table of Mr. Booth's, Whitechapel is another Union which, since 1870, as I understand it, has adopted a strict indoor relief policy. According to that table they started in 1875 with a pauperism of 2·6, and they finished in 1905, thirty years afterwards, with 2·3. If you look at that in the light

Proportion of paupers to Gentile population.

of the figures which we got out the other day, namely, that the alien population of Whitechapel would bring their Gentile population down to just under 50,000, you will see at once that their pauperism has increased, that is, in relation to Gentiles pure and simple?—You mean if you leave out the Jewish population, that the percentage of pauperism would be considerably higher than it appears there—that is true.

13820. It would be 3¾?—I have not worked it out.

13821. The actual population of Whitechapel, apart from the Jews, at this time would approximately be 49,580; with their pauperism that would give you 3¾ per cent. My point is that there you have a Union which has rigidly adhered to the in-door relief and the judicious policy, and yet, with that, their pauperism actually increases?—If you take only the Gentile population, yes.

Medical relief to Jews in Whitechapel.

13822. I suggest to you you must do that, because the Jews go to their own Jewish Board of Guardians. What is the number of Medical Orders for the Jews which you have from the Whitechapel Board?—It is over 500, I think.

Gentile population of Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East.

13823. I am perfectly willing that the actual figures shall be put in. If you say you will put them in, I will not pursue it now?—I will, I understood you wanted figures for Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East in which the Jewish population had been eliminated, or at any rate showing more distinctly what proportion of the pauperism is Gentile and what Jew. I have not been able to get those, but I may tell you I have given all the necessary particulars to the Clerks of the Guardians, and they have promised to let me have them as soon as they can. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (G)).

Effect of numbers of aged on numbers of paupers.

13824. At any rate, there is not much difference. They start in 1875 with 2·6, and they finish in 1905 with 2·3. I want you to look into the next column, and you will see that the persons over sixty in Whitechapel number 46 per thousand of the population?—That is so.

13825. In Camberwell it is 68 per 1000?—Yes, that is remarkable.

13826. I want to ask you whether your experience is that where there are a number of old people resident you get more people on the Poor Rate?—You probably would, but I am afraid I have not a sufficient knowledge of the census returns in detail of the various Unions, and I have not examined this table very minutely hitherto, but when you have a large percentage of old people you would reasonably expect that, I think.

Conditions in Stepney Union.

13827. I call your attention to St. George's-in-the-East also. There you have only forty-eight, and in Stepney, which is another classical union, you have fifty-four. At Stepney I want to call your attention to the fact that that also is another of the group of unions in the East End, and they have positively increased their pauperism?—So I see.

13828. And their population is practically stationary?—And up to date, with not a very large percentage of Jews I think.

13829. Not very large, but they have some. Would you trace that to laxity or injudicious administration at Stepney?—No, I think the policy has somewhat changed in Stepney within the last few years. I think you will find there is a good deal more out-relief given now than there was, say, five years ago.

Conditions in Bermondsey Union.

13830. With regard to Bermondsey, is the administration there judicious or injudicious?—I think it is fairly judicious.

13831. I would like to call your attention to Bermondsey. There, with a falling population, they have increased their pauperism?—So I see.

13832. They have very nearly reached Poplar, but not quite. You have a population that is dwindling, and yet pauperism has increased?—I think the increase is not likely to continue now.

13833. Are we to take it that the 1905 figures here are the normal condition at Poplar?—Apparently not.

13834. Would it not be fair, in this comparison, not to lay too much stress on 1905 and 1906, which are two bad winters, but rather to take from 1875 to 1903, instead of 1905 and 1906, and make comparisons from those. I point out to you that in nearly all cases it would be against the Unions?—You mean taking that long period?

13835. Yes?—In my answer to one of your questions, I have shown that the large increase of pauperism in Poplar began some three years ago.

Attitude of magistrates as to enforcing Guardians' decisions.

13836. I was not going into Poplar particularly, but, as you have made a reservation in the case of Bermondsey, I wanted to get you to make one with regard to Poplar. With regard to the magistrates and obtaining decisions in reference to loans, relatives, and that sort of thing, have you heard of very much difficulty?—One hears of it from time to time. I think if you were to circularise the clerks in London you would find that in the aggregate there were a good many cases.

Charity in poorer districts of London.

13837. Your answer to Mr. Nunn's question with regard to co-operation with voluntary agencies, of course, depends upon whether the voluntary agencies are there?—Yes.

13838. And whether the charities are there?—Yes.

13839. And I suppose it is a well known fact, is it not that people who subscribe to charities do not, as a rule, live in places like Bermondsey, Poplar, and that kind of district?—That is so.

The practice of giving continuous relief in cases of "sudden and urgent necessity" and checks thereon.

13840. (*Mr. Bentham.*) You were asked by Mr. Loch "what number of cases are being passed in this way by the Local Government Board, and in what unions, since 1894." That is as to the number of persons who are relieved under the sudden and urgent necessity plea?—I replied to that that they were not reported.

13841–?. Your answer was, I think: "I have not been able to get figures as to this"?—Yes. I confess in that answer I had got confused between the two things. The cases of sudden and urgent necessity are relieved by the relieving officer on his own responsibility, and they are not reported to the Board, but, under another article of the Order, where the guardians for any reason propose to depart or have departed from the regulations, they then report to the Local Government Board, and the cases are considered by the Board, whether they should be sanctioned or not; but sudden and urgent cases are not reported.

13843. Have you any figures as to the number that have been reported to the Local Government Board?—No. The only instance in which, to my recollection, there was any report of that sort was from Bermondsey, last winter, in which they wrote saying that they proposed to deal with certain cases, not under the exceptions set out in the Order, but under Article 10 of the Order, and the reply was that they had apparently misunderstood that Article, and that, after having relieved persons in the manner provided for in Article 10 of the Order, they must report them to the Board; but, as a matter of fact, no such report was made.

13844. It would be an easy matter to get a record of the number that have been reported to the Local Government Board, in those unions mentioned, would it not?—Yes, I think it could be got if it is thought desirable.

13845. You do not approve of relieving able-bodied persons outside of the workhouse continuously under the sudden and urgent necessity plea, do you?—No. I have no desire or intention at all of shirking my full personal share of responsibility in this stone-yard and out-relief business. What I told the clerk to the Bermondsey Board and others in the winter of 1904 was that they should avoid, as far as possible, except at the very last moment, at all events, opening a stone-yard, and it would be better, rather than do that, that they should so deal with their workhouses that they could take into the workhouses any single men; and persons who had an established residence in the union should be dealt with, not under this sudden and urgent exception, but under Article 10. As it turned out, I do not know that they relieved very many in that way. They did not in fact adopt my suggestion, and the relieving officers did relieve a number of men under the exception to the Order.

13846. As a temporary expedient, I think you prefer that to the stone-yard?—Yes, as a temporary expedient.

13847. In one of your answers you say: "Something might be done in this direction"—that is, forbidding continuous, sudden, and urgent necessity relief—"but it would not be easy to define precisely what was to be understood

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

21 May 1906.

to be continuous." Could it be said that a case was relieved as being suddenly and urgently in need if it was continued week by week?—Probably it could not. On the other hand, I take it it would be difficult to say that a case which was relieved, we will say, this week under certain conditions, when the period of relief had expired, might not become again sudden and urgent.

13848. It is continuous, is it not?—It is hardly continuous. There might be a break. The person who relieves under that exception is the relieving officer, and you have got to show that the conditions were not such, when he gave the relief, as to entitle him to do it.

13849. But it cannot be sudden and urgent week by week, can it?—No.

13850. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is not it "sudden or urgent"?—It is "sudden and urgent" in the Relief Regulation Order.

13851. Is there not another one: "sudden or urgent"?—In the case of overseers it is "or," I think.

13852. Is there not an Order with regard to "sudden or urgent necessity"?—It is "sudden and urgent" in the Prohibitory Order. I am not quite sure, but I am inclined to think that where it is a case of what an overseer is to do, it is "sudden or urgent," but I am not quite sure about that. In the Regulation Order it is "sudden and"; you want the two conditions.

13853. (*Mr. Bentham.*) It is "sudden and" in the Prohibitory Order. I have them both here?—Then that is so.

The 1834 principles of Poor Law administration.

13854. (*Professor Smart.*) I am afraid I must return to a theoretical question. You speak now and then of principles, and you have been discussing principles to-day already. Now, are there principles in Poor Law administration? You cannot have an administration of a law according to a principle unless you know what the principle is?—No.

13855. Is the principle understood, or is it laid down?—I do not know that it is laid down in so many words.

13856. Is it not the principle of 1834?—Yes, it should be.

13857. Is it clearly understood that that should be so?—That destitution should be the condition of relief?

13858. No, that is not the particular point, it is the eligibility; that the condition of the pauper should be less eligible?—Yes.

13859. That is the single principle laid down by the Commission of 1834?—True.

The ineligibility of Poor Law relief.

13860. And it was carried out by the Commissioners. The workhouse test is only a carrying out of that single principle, and the original Commissioners were appointed simply to carry out the original principle through the workhouse test. If you refer to principles, is it not the case that the only authoritative guide you can get is that earliest principle, namely, that the object of the Poor Law is to make the condition of the pauper less eligible than that of the independent labourer outside?—Yes.

13861. So that everything must be judged by that alone, if you are going to refer to principle at all?—I think I have said before that you cannot say that the condition of the aged person in a workhouse now is less eligible than that of a good many people who have to contribute to his support, except for the condition of confinement.

13862. And the deterrent in that case would be this, would it not, that it was clearly laid down in the original legislative documents that it might be possible to fulfil this principle without a workhouse at all. It might be, but it was extremely difficult, but whenever any question came up of how outdoor relief was to be administered, the sole reference was to this one principle, so as to make the condition of the pauper less eligible than the outside labourer?—Yes.

13863. So that there may be a very wide interpretation indeed of the administration of the Poor Law, and yet you cannot call any administration lax or strict except by reference to this standard. Is that not what one would call the philosophical case?—I think it is, but to apply it in practice is not an easy thing to do, unfortunately.

13864. I want you to explain another statement, which seems to be a statement of principle based on that, namely, that the object of the Poor Law is the discouragement of pauperism and the restoration of independence?—Yes.

13865. That was never explicitly laid down, but the words occur continually?—I think in the old Poor Law, the guardians, having relieved the destitution, were considered to have done all that was necessary.

13866. Is it quite fair even to speak of strict or lax administration with regard to any particular union?—I do not know whether it is fair. One has to do it.

Overlapping of charity and the Poor Law.

13867. You may give a dog a bad name and then hang him, of course. There is another point I would like to put to you. It is Mr. Lansbury's point, but I should like to get your opinion of it in this way: a good deal of assistance to poor people is given generally, by way of charities, and by private individuals, generally injudiciously given, or very often injudiciously given, which might be given and ought to be given by Poor Law authorities; that is to say, in a good many cases private charity takes the place of the Poor Law authority, when it would be better for every one that the Poor Law authority should do it?—I do not know that that happens very often. I am thinking where the Poor Law should come in.

13868. I am only on the point that charities and the Poor Law administration very often cross each other and do each other's work?—Possibly, yes.

Effect on pauperism of absence of charities.

13869. So that in a district where there are no charities and no residential benevolent rich individuals, much heavier work is thrown on the Poor Law and the Poor Law funds than in the districts where there are charities and rich private individuals?—Yes.

13870. So that, in such a district, the rate of pauperism might rise enormously above the rate of another district without any reflection at all on the administration?—Certainly. I think you must take into consideration the circumstances of every district in respect of the pauperism of it, though you do find pauperism increasing in districts where one would suppose a reasonable cause was not existent; it does not follow that you have a low pauperism in a district where there are a good many well-to-do people and a good many charities.

Charities in East End.

13871. (*Mr. Phelps.*) In regard to what has been asked you about charities in a district, is it the case in London that the charities at all correspond with the number of well-to-do people?—I do not know that I can answer that question.

13872. Is it not a matter of common knowledge that an immense deal of charity goes from the West End of London to the East End?—I believe that is so.

13873. And the amount of charity distributed in the East End does not in the least depend on the well-to-doness of the inhabitants?—I would say it does not depend on it altogether.

Difficulty of enforcing proper classification and treatment of able-bodied within a Workhouse.

13874. (*Mr. Chandler.*) In your answer to Mr. Russell Wakefield's question as to special features in some workhouses making them specially attractive (which he has this morning amplified by referring to the feather beds at Richmond), you state that in some workhouses the leakage which is unavoidable has special attractions for the class known as loafers. Will you explain that?—By leakage I mean this, particularly if it is an overcrowded workhouse, it is impossible to prevent the able-bodied class sharing in the comfort, and I may say the luxuries, of the older ones. The Dietary Order provides the old people with a better class of diet, and so on, and the able-bodied should be on a restricted diet; there should be nothing attractive about it, and the conditions of the life in the workhouse should be distinct for them and such as to provide an incentive to them to earn their living outside. I say you cannot prevent that class finding the condition of life in a mixed workhouse such as, as a matter of fact, they are not entitled to, and which they ought not to share in.

Need for separate institutions for able-bodied paupers.

13875. Are there any institutions in your district for the separate treatment of the young and able-bodied as distinct from the aged?—No, I am sorry to say there are not. That is a thing I have been urging the desirability of for some time.

13876. Do you think if some arrangement were made of the kind it would stop this feature you refer to as "the attraction to loafers"?—I am quite certain that it would, only, as I have said before, you must have a workhouse so arranged that you can deal with other than actual able-bodied. Amongst the persons who are classed as able-bodied, the percentage of those who could go out

Paucity of genuinely able-bodied.

and do a day's work is very small indeed. As every workhouse master and every guardian knows, it is by no means the actual able-bodied man who is most troublesome, it is the man who has just enough amiss with him to prevent the doctor certifying that he is able to do hard work, so you must have a workhouse in which you can have graduated tasks for each sort of man. It is not so much the severity of the task, what you have to do with the class of man in question is to keep him at something all the time.

13877. Separate treatment in a separate institution you think would meet that ?—I think so, to a great extent.

umbers of ses in ndon of ief in udden and gent cessity."

13878. (*Mr. Loch.*) I think you promised a return of the extent to which continuous sudden and urgent necessity relief was provided during the last winter ?—I am afraid I must have misunderstood your request. I understood your question to refer to the sudden and urgent cases. Sudden and urgent cases are not reported to the Board.

13879. I understood they were not reported to the Board, but I understood you would try to obtain a return of the extent to which the system had worked these last two winters ?—I am sorry I misunderstood you; you shall have that. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (Q)).

13880. With regard to testing the position of the unions, do you think it is a fair test in comparing the past and the present of the unions, to compare union with union ?—Naturally the circumstances at any time are presumably the same in each union.

13881. That is, a comparison between past and present is fair unless there is a strong reason to the contrary ?—I think so.

atistics of pulation d uperism in mberwell.

13882. Taking the Camberwell Union, and comparing its past and present as set down here, the population has gone up from 206,093 to 270,718, and the pauperism has gone up from 3,246 to 8,484, in the period mentioned, from 1885 to 1905 ?—That is so.

13883. The rise is also marked in the earlier years, before any question of distress arose of the larger type of the last few years. It was 3,246 in 1885, and it had doubled by 1895, when it was 6,423 ?—Yes.

13884. Taking that as a record of administration, would you say it is satisfactory ?—I cannot say it is; but as Mr. Lansbury has suggested, it is a policy; it represents the policy of the Board.

13885. Do you think as a policy it has had satisfactory results ?—I cannot say that it has.

atistics of pulation d pauper- n in White- apel and pney.

13886. Taking another problem which refers very much to Whitechapel, the foreign element of the population has largely increased in Whitechapel since 1885, has it not ?—Very much.

13887. The actual Christian population that would take advantage of the poor relief is relatively smaller ?—Yes, probably; I think it would be.

13888. The population has increased only from 72,602 in 1885, to 80,497 in 1905; therefore the chances are that the Christian element is very much less ?—Yes, no doubt. I should think the greater part of that increase is amongst aliens.

13889. A percentage on a decreasing population will show up the numbers, as it were, as against population ?—Yes.

13890. If that is so, then the return of pauperism in Whitechapel must be considered not only in regard to their actual position, but with regard to the past, and how far the population decreasing has itself led to the higher increase in the percentage of pauperism ?—The decrease of Gentile population, do you mean ?

13891. Yes, available for poor relief ?—That is so.

13892. Taking past and present again, in Stepney, there has been an actual decrease of population between 1885 and 1895 ?—Yes.

13893. At the same time there has been, I think you would say, a considerable increase in the Jewish or alien element in this last decade or so ?—I think so.

13894. The pauperism between 1885 and 1895 increased about 17 per cent. ?—Yes.

13895. There again you see the population has been going down ?—It has gone up slightly again since.

13896. I see it has. If you take the last decade for the population, 1905, as put down here, you will see that the pauperism has increased greatly ?—Yes.

13897. 1,267 in 1885; 1,489 in 1895, and 2,197 in 1905 ?—Yes.

13898. Do you think that that indicates a change of policy, as between 1885 and 1905 ?—I think that, certainly within the last five years, there has been a section of the Board who have been disposed to more out-relief than previously was the case.

13899. Therefore this increase, which amounts perhaps to as much as 70 per cent. between 1885 and 1905, is really an increase, marked by a change of policy ?—To a great extent, certainly.

Statistics of population and pauperism in Poplar.

13900. Comparing past and present if we take Poplar, as put down here, between 1885 and 1895, in the first period you have 160,606 as your population, and in the second 167,604, only a small increase of population, say about 4 per cent.; but if you take their pauperism between those years you have 5,008 in 1895 against 3,233 in 1885; therefore comparing Poplar with Poplar you have something like an increase of 54 per cent. in pauperism, with only an increase of about 4 per cent. in population ?—That is so.

13901. If you take the subsequent years 1895 to 1905 of Poplar, which has been in the nature of a district specially under difficulties, in 1905 you have 11,683 as your pauperism against 5,008 in the previous decade, and your population has gone up only a little ?—2,000 only.

13902. Therefore that pauperism has risen, whatever the circumstances may be, about 260 per cent ?—Of course it has enormously risen these last few years.

13903. I want to clinch that by asking this: In view of these figures, do you think it at all advisable as showing the conditions of administration in different parts of London, to compare union with union; is it not better to compare the past and present of the same union ?—You get facts there certainly, which there can be no question about at all.

Deaths from starvation in London in relation to the strictness of administration in certain unions.

13904. I want to ask you a question about the starvation returns. I have here the last starvation return, which was for 1904. I will take the first case that comes. I take it simply as it appears. In the second column you have the address, and then the age, 33, and the date of the inquest: Then, whether admission to the workhouse was offered and refused: No. Then the next column is: "Whether any, and if so what officer of the union or parish was examined at the inquest": "Dr. Lardner, Medical Officer and Elizabeth Dendney (Sister) Whitechapel Infirmary." Verdict. "Acute bronchitis and oedema of the lungs, accelerated by want of medical attention." Then come the observations of the board of guardians: "This man applied to the relieving officer on the 7th January, 1904"—the inquest was on the 8th January—"for admission to the infirmary. He was at once admitted at 11.10 a.m., and died at 3.30 p.m. the same day. The guardians consider that the deceased should have made application for admission earlier. Their officers had no previous knowledge of the case." In that case do you think that the responsibility attaches to the board ?—No, I have already said I do not think you can say that.

Application a necessary condition of relief.

13905. Granted that responsibility does not attach to the board in that case, do you think there ought to be any arrangement by which the Poor Law relief should not depend on application ?—I think you must leave it to the person needing relief to make his own application.

13906. Therefore the system indicated by this return and justified so far as the guardians are concerned, is a just one in your opinion?—I think it is really; the cases are all very carefully gone into. I think it is quite the exception, amongst the large number of returns, to find anything suggesting a reflection on the guardians or their officers. There have been one or two cases, where it has been thought the case might have been dealt with differently perhaps.

13907. Your answer therefore would apply equally to districts such as Whitechapel and districts such as Poplar or any other district ?—Yes, a person may die of starvation anywhere of course.

Mr. Henry Lockwood. 21 May 1906.

13908. Therefore the in-relief method, or the non-indulgent method, or the non-lax method, whatever it may be called, does not make for starvation?—I think we have no evidence that it does.

13909. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is there any indication in that case, that the man had any scruples in applying to the Poor Law?—I do not know anything about the case, except what is stated here.

13910. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) If you take particular unions to judge of their pauperism, you must take the condition prevailing past and present?—Yes, you must take all the circumstances into consideration in getting at the meaning of the figures.

Discretion of Relieving Officer as to refusing application for relief.

13911. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) I suppose there is very great responsibility on the relieving officer when he refuses an application for relief under those circumstances?—Certainly.

13912. In your experience have you ever heard of a case of prosecution following where relief has been refused by a relieving officer under those circumstances?—Not within my own knowledge; but I happen to have here a copy of a foot-note to one of the articles in Glen in which it says: "A relieving officer has no absolute discretion in deciding what is urgent necessity. A relieving officer having been convicted of refusing relief under Section 98 of 4 and 5 William IV, the Court upheld the conviction." That is to say, that in his discretion he refused relief and the person died, and he was tried for manslaughter.

13913. That is the only case you know of?—Yes.

13914. Accordingly there is a very serious responsibility on the relieving officer, and always must be?—Undoubtedly.

13915. (*Mr. Nunn.*) May I ask, was that man convicted of manslaughter?—The note gives a reference to the case, it is *Clark* v. *Joslin*, in a certain number of the "Law Times."

13916. All you meant was that the relieving officer having to exercise his discretion, he was tried on the question of fact whether his discretion was justified or not?—Yes. When it says, "No absolute discretion;" it means, as a matter of fact, he cannot say: "I was right"; he is judged by results.

13917. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Whether he was justified in the action he took?—Yes.

13918. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would he be allowed to refer to one of the overseers, so as to protect himself by his opinion?—I do not think so. The section referred to there is rather curious. Apparently he was tried for disobeying an order framed by the Poor Law board under Section 98, which seems to imply that he was to relieve a case where apparently necessity or destitution actually existed. He took on himself to say, "this is not a condition of things which needs relief." He is to be judged by results and not by whether he sufficiently considered the circumstances of the case as they appeared to him.

13919. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Who took up the case?—It is an old case; I cannot give you the actual particulars.

Relief in kind in Poplar and West Ham.

13920. On the return which you have handed in (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (C)) there is a point I should like to ask you about. The outdoor relief given in kind I see amounts in Poplar to £9,386, and in West Ham to £17,000. What does "in kind" represent there generally?—Which year are you taking?

13921. I am taking the last column; it is £9,386 in the case of Poplar and £17,507 in the case of West Ham?—That no doubt relates to the number of so-called sudden and urgent cases, and, in the case of West Ham, stoneyard cases, which were relieved only in kind, or half in kind.

13922. It really has relation practically to stoneyard relief?—Yes, where stoneyard relief, or relief to able-bodied is given, half of the relief at least must be given in kind. In ordinary relief it is in the discretion of the guardians whether they will give in kind or money, partly or wholly.

Duties and practice of Relieving Officer in case of "sudden and urgent necessity."

13923. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) With regard to the question which was raised just now as to whether it was the duty of a relieving officer to give relief in a case of sudden and urgent necessity, or whether it was to give relief in sudden or urgent necessity, may I call attention to the actual words of the Articles of the Order. In the first place the General Consolidated Order lays down, does it not, the duties of the relieving officer?—Yes.

13924. If you look at Article 215, No. 6, it would be the duty of the relieving officer, would it not, in every case of sudden or urgent necessity, to afford such relief to the adult person as may be requisite?—Yes.

13925. If you turn to the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order, which is the order in force in London, and look at Article 7, there you have the exceptions to Articles 5 and 6 of the Order. Articles 5 and 6 of the Order prohibit the giving of relief to an able-bodied person while he is employed for wages, and require that he should be set to work by the guardians while he is relieved out of the workhouse?—Yes.

13926. Then the exceptions say, those articles are not to be imperative in the case of a person receiving relief on account of sudden and urgent necessity?—Yes.

13927. Consequently the provisions of the two Orders are not identical?—They are not in terms.

13928. Again if you look in the Regulation Order, Article 3 prohibits the guardians or their officers from establishing an applicant for relief in a trade or business and various other things. Then there is a provision at the end of it to this effect: "Provided always that nothing in this article contained shall apply to any shelter or temporary lodging procured for a poor person in any case of sudden or urgent necessity?"—Yes.

13929. There again the language of the Order is not the same as it is in Article 7?—Yes.

13930. Going one step further with the case of overseers, the statute lays down what is their duty and the words of the Statute 4 and 5 William IV., Chapter 76, Section 54, are that an overseer shall not give relief except in case of sudden and urgent necessity?—You require the two conditions apparently.

13931. Does not that rather lead to the inference that no very great distinction is intended to be drawn between cases of sudden and cases of urgent necessity?—I certainly think that it is generally understood.

13932. That when a case is really urgent the question of the suddenness is not very much taken into account?—I take it if a relieving officer were to wait and consider the question of suddenness he might very often find himself in an awkward position.

13933. It is the duty of the relieving officer to relieve when the case becomes urgent, whether the necessity has been sudden or gradual?—Yes, the urgency is what he has to take note of and act on.

13934. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Is the word "or" sometimes used as an explicative and sometimes as an alternative?—Yes.

13935. It is quite possible that "or" may be used in either of those circumstances?—True.

13936. (*Mr. Loch.*) In these cases, the urgency we are referring to would be continuous urgency and so continuous relief?—It amounts to that.

13937. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Not when seven days elapse?—I said it would be very difficult to establish as against the relieving officer that the case was not urgent, when he relieved it the second time.

13938. Within a week?—Whenever it happened.

13939. (*Mr. Bentham.*) People get hungry every day, and may require some help; if they have not anything to eat, the relieving officer may grant relief day by day, week by week, and year by year; and it would be urgent every time he gives it, and it would come within the four corners of the Order?—I think it would, but I take it no relieving officer would in practice do that.

13940. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Is it not also the fact that the relieving officer would have to report the case to his committee or board, and that then it would come under review?—In every case of the kind the relieving officer has to relieve, but he has a further duty, that is, to report the circumstances to the guardians or the relief committee at the next meeting.

13941. (*Mr. Bentham.*) And the guardians sanction that usually, they think it may be an end of the case, and the following week the relieving officer has the case up again for sanction?—Yes.

13942. That might continue week by week?—It might.

13943. And it might be within the knowledge of the guardians also that this will continue week by week and be urgent week by week?—It would be within the knowledge of the guardians, not necessarily that it was urgent, but that it was being treated as an urgent case.

uties of elieving ficer where pplicant uses indoor lief.

13944. (*Mr. Booth.*) Would the case be complicated if an order for the infirmary or the workhouse had been made, if the patient absolutely refused to take the relief in that form, and then continued to be in a state which needed relief to prevent death? Would that force the hands of the relieving officer, and of the board too, to maintain him outside?—I think in a case of that sort the relieving officer's responsibility still continues, and what he is always told is, he must watch the case to see that no serious harm results, and it does happen sometimes that you have very great difficulty of that sort, where a person ought to be in an infirmary and under treatment, but will not go in, and the relieving officer still has to see that no untoward results, or the least possible harm ensues to the person who obstinately refuses the relief which is best for him.

13945. Although they may prefer to die outside?—Yes.

roposed ower to mpulsorily move rtain cases work- ouse.

13946. (*Mr. Loch.*) Would you be in favour of a compulsory power to remove in cases which are unsuitable for out-relief?—If I can speak as an individual, I should say, yes.

13947. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is not a case of sudden and urgent necessity under these circumstances reported to the medical officer, and does not his report come in with reference to whether relief is to be continued or not?—Only in cases of sickness; the doctor does not come in where a man asks for food.

13948. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It is the duty of the relieving officer to report the case at the next meeting of the guardians?—Yes.

Sudden and gent cessity," lief does ot require uardians' nction.

13949. Guardians are sometimes under the impression that their sanction is necessary to the relief so given, are they not?—Yes, they have been.

13950. But that is not so, in fact?—As a matter of fact, although the chairman would initial the column headed "approved," the mere initialling of that does not transfer the responsibility in any way from the relieving officer. The thing has been done before it came before the board, and the personal responsibility continues to be with the relieving officer.

ledical xamination f applicants r indoor lief in cotland.

13951. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) In Scotland in every case of indoor relief there is a medical examination and report almost at once, or as soon as it can be got. Is that not the case in England?—In indoor relief it is.

13952. In outdoor relief, is that not so?—No, unless the object of seeking the relief is the sickness of the man or some member of his family, or the need of medicine. In indoor relief the regular course is gone through. The inmate has to be seen and reported on by the medical officer within twenty-four hours of admission, or earlier if necessary, in every case.

Power of Guardians o give regular out-relief to he able- odied in xceptional ases, with anction f Local Government Board.

13953. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In the absence of an outdoor labour test for the able-bodied, this is the only means of relieving the able-bodied, outside the workhouse, is it not?—It really is. There is a better way under Article 10; there the cases are more likely to come under review, and the Board would have opportunities, if they thought fit, of criticising.

13954. (*Mr. Loch.*) Which would Article 10 be?—Article 10 of the Regulation Order.

13955. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) That is, reporting the case to the Local Government Board as a special case?—"If the guardians shall, on consideration of the special circumstances"—it then requires them to report within twenty-one days under the Regulation Order.

13956. (*Mr. Loch.*) Did any of the London unions report under that Article?—The only one was Bermondsey as to which I had taken the responsibility (and I am quite prepared to support it) of suggesting that they should act under this Article. Instead of doing so, they wrote up and said they proposed to do so and so.

13957. Why should not the guardians have acted on that Article generally?—It would have been better, I think, if they had.

13958. By not acting on the Article they were really acting without supervision in that matter?—What I object to is that there was an unfair, as I think, responsibility thrown upon the relieving officers.

Desirability of Medical report on all applicants for relief.

13959. With regard to the point raised by Mr. Patten-MacDougall just now: In Scotland, as I understand it, there is not, technically at least, any able-bodied relief, but there are many men in the workhouse not unlike those that we should classify as able-bodied. Do you think that in those cases it would be desirable to have a medical report about able-bodied people who applied for relief, whether they applied for out-door relief or indoor relief?—Yes, I do not see why it should not. I fancy the guardians could have that now if they liked.

13960. You think it would be useful from the point of view of ascertaining really what the class of man is?—I think so.

13961. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Have you not made a mistake about London unions?—Is it not true that Poplar at the very commencement of their giving sudden and urgent relief sent up a list of cases to the Local Government Board and got a reply that it was a matter for the auditor?—I am not sure. Possibly they did.

Power of Local Government Board to sanction irregular out-relief to the able-bodied under Art. 10 of Outdoor Relief Regulation Order.

13962. I know we did, as a matter of fact?—Very possibly you did. I have forgotten that. In that case you would have been reporting under Article 10, I think.

13963. I am under the impression that that was so?—I am only speaking from memory. I thought it was the other way, that they were reported as having been relieved by the relieving officer; and that consequently the reply was that it was a matter between the relieving officer and the auditor.

13964. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is that the technical answer that is given to a board of guardians when they report under Article 10, to throw the responsibility back on the auditor?—No, not so, if they report under Article 10; it says: "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 that 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."

13965. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is not Article 10 practically the same position as in the Prohibitory Order?—I think it is except that in the Prohibitory Order they must report within fifteen days, instead of twenty-one.

13966. In effect it is the same?—It is.

13967. (*Mr. Loch.*) Are there not three ways in which boards of guardians can give sudden or urgent necessity relief, that is to say, without asking for permission at all and give it; asking, as Poplar did apparently, by sending up a list and being referred to the auditor; and thirdly, Article 10?—Yes.

13968. Under Article 10, is there any control directly?—Except by the auditor, there is not.

13969. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) When they sent up the list, did not they say that they had themselves given the relief, and they were referred to the auditor?—I almost think that is so.

13970. They were referred to the auditor; the relieving officer was giving the relief in case of sudden and urgent necessity, and the point was whether he could do it continuously?—The letter was sent to the Audit Department; I only saw it incidentally.

Responsibility of and checks on Relieving Officer in respect of relief given in "sudden and urgent necessity."

13971. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Do not the guardians have to approve what the relieving officers have done?—They do approve, but yet by approving they take no responsibility to themselves for what he has done.

13972. (*Mr. Loch.*) And the relieving officer may be surcharged?—Yes.

13973. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Is not that the result of the fact that the relieving officer practically steps into the shoes of the old overseer?—He does really.

13974. Who was the person responsible in law?—Yes.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

21 May 1906.

13975. That is the historical origin of the position?—Yes, the relieving officer is now in the position of the old overseer.

13976. That was not swept away in 1834?—He incurred the responsibility.

13977. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Let us take the duty of the relieving officer? It would be this, would it not, that in cases of sudden or urgent necessity he gives relief on his own responsibility?—Yes.

13978. That relief would be reported to the guardians in the Application and Report Book?—It would.

13979. The guardians might approve of it or disapprove of it as they thought fit?—Yes.

13980. But that would not in any way effect the legality of the action of the relieving officer?—No; he acts entirely on his own responsibility.

13981. He would be the person responsible and, supposing the relief to be unnecessary, he would be the person to be surcharged by the auditor?—Yes, he and not the guardians.

13982. He can only give relief, can he not, until the next meeting of the board of guardians?—That is so.

13983. If, therefore, he went on doing it, it might be a question whether that was within his power or not?—Yes, the guardians might question the propriety of his proceeding.

13984. And the propriety of his proceeding, if it is to be legally tested, must be tested before the auditor?—Yes.

13985. The guardians themselves not being responsible in the matter?—They are not responsible.

Surcharge on Relieving Officer in respect of sudden and urgent relief continuously given.

13986. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Is not the auditor thereby made a Court of Appeal against the action of the relieving officer, the auditor not seeing either the applicant or knowing the circumstances under which relief is given?—That has always occurred to me to be the difficulty. The probability is that if the auditor did surcharge a relieving officer he would be dealing with something which happened probably at least six months before, and, consequently, supposing he was not satisfied that the relieving officer was justified in doing what he did, it would be very difficult for him to prove the absence of sudden or urgent necessity.

13987. Have there been cases of surcharge of relieving officers under these conditions?—Yes, there has been one in Poplar; it is not settled yet.

13988. (*Chairman.*) Is that an individual case?—Yes, the auditor has disallowed the payment by one relieving officer of a small sum to what he regarded as a continuing case of sudden and urgent necessity. I do not know what precisely the position of the case is now, but it has not been settled, I think.

13989. (*Mr. Loch.*) Does it not follow, as a conclusion from this, that in connection with boards of guardians there are two jurisdictions, the jurisdiction of the relieving officer direct, and tempered as it were by the jurisdiction of the board of guardians itself?—Yes, it is to a great extent.

Position of Relieving Officer when instructed by Guardians to watch a case.

13990. (*Mr. Phelps.*) Is the position of the relieving officer different if he is instructed by the guardians to watch a case?—I think nothing, as far as I understand it, can relieve the relieving officer of responsibility for a particular case. He is responsible that the case comes to no harm, and nothing that the guardians can tell him to do affects it. The guardians may say: We offer the infirmary to this particular person, but that particular person may say: No, I will not go into the infirmary; and that particular person may be in a condition of either disease or dirt, serious or objectionable, but the relieving officer has still to see that no harm comes to that case, but he has no power to carry him off to the infirmary.

13991. My point of distinction is this: if he is told to watch the case it is his duty to visit the person, whereas if he is not, he may wait until he is applied to?—The question of watching the case, I take it, comes only after the guardians have dealt with it. He is required to watch a case where he is aware of the existence of want or need of assistance which has been refused in the particular form in which it was offered.

13992. Then it is his duty not to wait until he is applied to by the case?—Not, I think, a second time. If he has knowledge of a case of destitution or need, it is his business to see that no harm comes to that case as long as it remains chargeable. You cannot relieve him of that personal responsibility as far as I can see.

Qualifications of auditor for deciding legality of relief given.

13993. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) The auditor is an accountant in most cases and is not versed in Poor Law administration. Do you approve of the reference to an auditor of a case which really is one of the proper exercise of discretion in the giving of relief?—Whether one approves of it or no, he is there.

13994. I ask whether you do not think an appeal to, say, the Local Government Board would be more appropriate?—The auditor has to determine the propriety of the payment.

13995. The legality of the payment?—Yes.

13996. But this is a matter of discretion and propriety, not legality so much?—Yes, but having got the facts of the case, he has to deal with it, and he ought to be able to judge whether the case was one of legal relief or not; he would have to determine as to the suddenness or urgency of it.

13997. Is not that more a matter of propriety than of actual legality?—Perhaps it is.

13998. Therefore that is not a matter for an accountant so much as for an administrative body?—On the other hand, it always has been so.

13999. (*Mr. Loch.*) Is it possible for the auditor to go through all these cases case by case and come to a *quasi* judicial decision on them?—He might try to; whether it is possible, I cannot say.

14000. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) He would take a test case?—Yes.

14001. (*Sir Henry Robinson.*) Are not a good many auditors barristers or solicitors?—A good many are, but I do not think it is a condition of their appointment.

14002. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The auditor would not go into a question of discretion; he would go into a question of law, whether the payment was legal or not. In a matter of discretion he would consider whether he could go behind the action of the individual officer?—That is so.

The relation of the inspectors with the Local Government Board.

14003. Now, coming to a different matter, with regard to inspectors, it is competent to an inspector, is it not, if he thinks it desirable, to suggest to the Board some particular action which he thinks it should take?—Certainly.

14004. Either in a particular case or generally?—Yes.

14005. It is also the practice, is it not, before any general action is taken in a matter, to consult the inspectors?—Yes.

14006. With regard to their general line of action, they make an annual report to the Board, do they not?—They do.

14007. Those reports are published in the annual report of the Board?—They are.

14008. So that each inspector sees what his brother inspectors are doing?—Yes, he can.

14009. And he knows what is going on in their districts?—Yes.

14010. Occasionally the inspectors have been summoned up to be consulted by the Board, have they not, upon matters which are of general interest?—Yes, they have.

14011. So that there is no sort of difficulty or hesitation as to full communication between the inspectors and the Board on any general matter affecting Poor Law administration?—None at all. I was only speaking of the meeting of the inspectors. I thought it would be a pleasant thing for them to do, and they might certainly obtain useful information from one another.

Proportion of electorate voting at local elections.

14012. (*Mr. Loch.*) Can a statement be submitted showing how far the local electorate actually vote at elections of guardians?—I hand in a summary of election returns relating to Greenwich, Hackney, Kensington, Marylebone, Poplar and Shoreditch. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (R)).

14013. How far are those in receipt of borough employment relief on the register for the Parliamentary franchise?—The larger proportion, I should think, are on the register.

isfranchise-
ent by
lief.

14014. How far do paupers actually lose the franchise, having been on the register before receiving relief?—I have no precise information as to this.

14015. Should the present condition that the Parliamentary franchise is lost if medical relief with maintenance is received be adhered to, even if the law is now construed so as to exclude the factor of "maintenance" and to have on the register all who receive medical relief whether with or without maintenance?—I think it should be adhered to.

14016. Should all other paupers (except those specially exempted by statute) lose the franchise on receipt of relief?—I think they do lose the franchise.

umbers of
gitimate
d illegiti-
ate births
certain
ondon
orkhouses.

14017. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) With regard to women, can you tell us what is the total of legitimate births in Metropolitan workhouses during the past year, and what was the total for a similar period ten years ago? And with regard to Poplar, can you specifically give the number of births for that union?—I am unable to answer your question in full, but I have the following figures:—Marylebone, births in workhouse for six months, legitimate, 15; illegitimate, 52; total 67. Poplar, legitimate, 16, illegitimate, 21; total 37. Hackney, legitimate, 23; illegitimate, 37; total 60. In this case the proportions were reversed in the previous six months, Michaelmas, 1905, namely, legitimate, 35; illegitimate, 24; total, 59. Bethnal Green, legitimate, 17; illegitimate, 10; total, 27. Holborn, legitimate, 27; illegitimate, 22, total 49. St. Pancras, legitimate, 21, illegitimate, 47; total, 68. Whitechapel, legitimate, 26; illegitimate, 56; total 82.

14018. Can you tell us the number of single women with illegitimate children chargeable throughout the Metropolis on any given days ten years ago, and the same on any given day last year? Would you also give us the same kind of figures with regard to Poplar?—I am afraid I have not material for replying to your question.

ffect
large
milies on
uperism.

14019. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In your Report for 1900–1 you speak of immoderate families being responsible for pauperism fully as much as immoderate drinking. Is it not rather unhealthy families?—I should be inclined to say that in a large number of instances they become unhealthy because there are too many of them, and more than the parents can afford to feed, house, and generally maintain properly.

14020. Would you not think many persons over sixty suitable for pensions?—Some, perhaps, I will hardly say many.

uestion of
terioration
physique.

14021. Has not physique gone down? Would this account for the theory "too old at fifty"?—I should have thought that physique must have degenerated under present conditions of keeping everything alive that is born, and allowing it to reproduce itself, but this view is, I understand, not borne out by the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the subject.

roportion of
ed work-
use
mates able
look after
emselves.

14022. In your 1894 Report you say the aged must be relieved in the workhouse, the reason being that they are not able to look after themselves and that medical care is required; but is not 2 per cent. as the proportion of those able to be relieved outside a very low estimate?—2 per cent., perhaps, is somewhat low, but I am inclined to question whether it would exceed 3 per cent.

ifficulty of
assification
work-
use.

14023. With regard to old people in the workhouses generally, do you believe in classification; is it possible in one building?—I do not think it possible to satisfactorily classify the different classes in one building.

ffect of
shelters"
certain
ondon
nions.

14024–26. Do not shelters help to manufacture paupers by attracting to London and accustoming to a casual sort of life? (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Can you state the effect of "shelters" on Poor Law relief in particular unions?—No doubt shelters attract weaklings of sorts to London. As to particulars of shelters; in six months the following number of applications were received from shelters in Marylebone:—Shaftesbury, 6; Church Army, 25; Salvation Army, 400; common lodging-houses, 71. In Greenwich the following number of persons were admitted from Carrington House to the workhouse, 231; to the infirmary, 74; of these 29 were reported removable. In the Strand Union the number of persons admitted to Bareyard workhouse in six months ending 31st January, 1906, from the Salvation Army, 272; and the Labour Tent, Church Army, 17; of these 26 were removed under justices' orders, and in 19 cases there was no evidence of any settlement.

14027. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) When you attend Boards of guardians or relief committees, do you find that the guardians in poorer unions regard the Poor Law as the means of relieving destitution, or of rendering charitable assistance to the distressed? Do you find that the guardians as a rule have any real knowledge of their work, the principles of the Poor Law, etc.?—The views of guardians with regard to the Poor Law vary, of course. Some say it is their duty to think first of the poor, others think it is their duty to think first of the ratepayer. I think guardians as a rule have knowledge of their work. Divergent views of Guardians as to their duties.

14028. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you trace the results of the case paper system in any better administration of the Poor Law unions where it is in use?—Paddington has nearly always been exemplary in relief matters. The case paper system was invented here. Its adoption at both Bethnal Green and Bermondsey was followed by a reduction in pauperism, and the same is expected to take place in Kensington where it has quite recently been adopted. Effect of the case-paper system on pauperism.

14029. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) In reference to question 4078, do you regard the present increase of pauperism in London as temporary?—I think we may look for a decrease in out-relief, but I question whether there is any likelihood of an appreciable diminution of the numbers in the infirmary or workhouse. Improbability of decrease in London's indoor pauperism.

14030. Can you give the percentage of deaths in Poor Law institutions in London as compared to the total number of deaths?—I will try and get this from the London County Council. (Subsequently sent. *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (8)). Percentage of deaths in Poor Law Institutions.

14031. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Have you anything to do with the Metropolitan Asylums Board? Do you consider the affairs of that body wisely and economically managed?—On the whole I should say yes. Proposal to transfer duties of Metropolitan Asylums Board to County Council.

14032. Would you be in favour of the abolition of that board and the handing over to the County Council of all its duties?—I would not abolish it, though, as I have said elsewhere; I think its duties in relation to imbeciles and infectious diseases might be taken over by the County Council.

14033. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Have you any further suggestions as to a new terminology or classifications or definitions for descriptive purposes under a reformed "Poor" Law for example, able-bodied, "Poor" Law, "Poor" rate, "Relieving" officer, "adequate" relief, "destitution"?—I do not know that I have, though I think for the institutions occupied by the aged and infirm the "Poor's House" would be more appropriate than the workhouse." Suggested new Poor Law terminology for aged.

14034. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) How far have the dock strike, the Employers' Liability Act, etc., and the slackened rate of increase in building (due, perhaps, to increased cost of labour and materials) affected the number of applications for relief in the judgment of certain selected relieving officers? (*Mr. Lansbury.*) Can you give us any evidence as to the conditions of employment at the docks and wharves since the dock strike, that is, as to the number and kind of men engaged as regular hands; also the number engaged in casual occupations?—Mr. Craig, superintendent relieving officer, St. Pancras, can give valuable information about this, and probably others also.

14035. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Can you give any evidence to show the result of the introduction of machinery? Has the extension of the employment of boys and girls diminished the demand for adult labour, and, if so, with what effect on the percentage of pauperism?—I can give no evidence as regards machinery. Boys and girls, no doubt, oust to some extent their elders, but I cannot say the precise effect of this on pauperism.

14036. (*Mr. Loch.*) Can you say whether the 4s. grant for lunatics acts well, or whether some other system for subvention, if subvention is necessary, should be devised?—I doubt if the 4s. grant has the effect in London, as assumed in the country, of inducing guardians to shift senile dements to asylums. The whole question of subventions and common fund charges is dealt with in the report by the Local Government and Museums Committee dated 16th and 30th March, *See* London County Council agenda for 10th April, 1905, page 4, paragraph 3 and *passim*.

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

21 May 1906.

Number of pauper lunatics in London.

14036 (*a*). Can you give the statistics of lunacy in the county of London and West Ham; their number, cost of maintenance, cost of buildings, etc., and the number of pauper lunatics?—I would refer you to the report of the Local Government and Museums Committee; statistical abstract, London County Council, 1905, Vol. VIII., return 24 and 26 pages, 34 and 35, which gives the total number of lunatics in workhouses 1904–5 as 6,539, in asylums, 17,238. I cannot give figures as to cost of buildings, etc., or maintenance.

Effect of compounding for rates.

14037. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) Is not compounding a great reason in West End of London for indifference to the whole citizen life of the Metropolis?—I think there is no doubt of that. There are tens of thousands of people living in flats who pay their rates in the rent and consequently seem to imagine that the rates are of no importance to them.

Relation between rates and rent.

14038. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) I understand you are not in favour of compounding for rates. Is it a fact that the rents are sometimes higher in a low-rated district than in a district with high rates? For instance, can you put in a return showing the average rate per room for any given street in Whitechapel and Poplar respectively?—I am sorry I cannot give a return of room rating, but rents are certainly sometimes higher in low-rated districts than in high-rated districts. Mr. Craig told me that when he went from Poplar to St. Pancras, the higher rents in the latter about balanced the difference in the rates.

14039. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) What has been the effect of the out-relief policy on friendly societies in London?—I have not been able to get any precise information as to this.

14039 (A). (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you indicate any special lines of inquiry for tracing a casual connection between the friendly societies' movement and pauperism in London?—I fear, I cannot help much in suggesting any special lines of inquiry.

Question of making the Metropolitan Asylums Board the authority for phthisis.

14040. (*Mr. Nunn.*) Can you describe any methods of co-operation between the Poor Law and the municipal authorities, and charitable agencies, for the treatment of poor persons suffering from phthisis, and the prevention of the spread of the disease. Would you regard the intervention of the Metropolitan Asylums Board as desirable?—I have no intimate knowledge of any instance of co-operation of this kind. The Metropolitan Asylums Board have, I think, already as much to do as they can be expected to do well. The authority which should deal with phthisis should be, I think, municipal rather than Poor Law.

Proportion of electorate voting at Guardians' elections.

14041. (*Chairman.*) You have handed in a return of persons who vote at Poor Law elections in London?—Yes, a return of the elections of guardians for 1904 in Greenwich Hackney, Kensington, Poplar, Shoreditch and Marylebone.

14042. Have you the percentages worked out?—Yes.

14043. Perhaps you will state them each in turn?—In Greenwich, in the Marsh Ward, the number of electors was 2,362, and the number of votes recorded was 576: percentage of voters to electorate, 24·4. Perhaps it will be enough if I give the percentages. In the South Ward, the percentage of voters to the electorate was 39·8. In St. Paul's, Deptford, in the North Ward, the percentage was 49·2, and in the South Ward 32·4. At a bye-election in the South Ward of Greenwich the percentage of voters to electorate was 49·2. In the union of Hackney, in the Hackney parish, the percentage of voters to electorate was 24; in Homerton, 17·5; in the Kingsland Ward, 20·6; and there were twelve other wards uncontested. In Kensington, in the St. Charles Ward, the percentage of voters to electorate was 16; in the Golborne Ward, 13·3, and in the Earl's Court Ward 26·3. In Poplar, the North West Ward, no contest; in the West Ward the percentage was 45·8; in the East Ward 35·1; and in the remaining wards there was no contest. In Bromley, in the North West Ward it was 35 per cent.; and in the South West Ward there was no contest. The North East Ward, 46 per cent.; Central, 46·2 per cent., and South East, 47 per cent. In Bow the percentages were: North West, no contest; West, no contest; Central, 34·3, and South, 36·2. Then when we come to Shoreditch we find some very different figures: Moorfields, no poll taken; in the Church Ward the percentage of voters was 96·5; Hoxton, 80·2; Wenlock, 67·1; Whitemoor, 49·7; Kingsland, 63·2; Haggerston, 64·3, and Acton, 58·4. In Marylebone: the Church Ward was 73·5 per cent.; the Langham Ward, 49·5 per cent.; and the Cavendish Ward 57 per cent. Those are all I have collected.

Proposed power of detention of unmarried mothers.

14044. As regards illegitimacy, it has been represented to us by previous witnesses that there is a certain class of girls not exactly feeble-minded, but very near it, who are constantly returning to the maternity wards. It has been suggested that after one or two births there should be some control exercised over these girls. Do you agree?—I do. There is no doubt there is a deplorable number of cases of that sort; poor creatures who are really not *compos mentis*, who are victims of others.

14045. Assuming it was thought desirable to exercise some power of detention over them, would you go further as regards unmarried women, who are in possession of their wits, but who constantly resort to these maternity wards for the birth of their children?—I rather hesitate to give an opinion upon that. I think it is a very difficult subject.

Effect of "shelters" and distress funds in London.

14046. You are clearly of opinion that the erection of a certain class of shelters attracts weaklings to London?—Yes, I think there is no question of that.

14047. These weaklings come, and I assume that a certain proportion of them stay?—Yes.

14048. You are clear on that point; they do not come and go; a certain proportion remain?—Such are the attractions of this great Metropolis that I am afraid a person of that class who once finds himself in London is never going to leave it permanently. He may go out of London for hop-picking or fruit-picking, or to the seaside for the season, but he finds his way back to London for the winter.

14049. From time to time funds have been raised to meet distress in London; in your opinion, have they had the same effect as shelters; have they attracted weaklings?—I am afraid so.

14050. And, so far as you know, a certain proportion of those remain?—I am afraid so.

14051. In the case of any fund that is raised, in your judgment very great care is required in its administration?—Certainly. You may remember that in distributing the money raised for Mr. Long's scheme, to begin with, a condition was that, where possible, six months' or a year's residence in the locality should be clearly established, to prevent, as far as possible, the incursion of newcomers of that sort.

14052. Was that fairly successful?—I think it was. Of course, a good deal depends upon the vigilance of the distress committees; but I think in most instances they have been very particular.

Residence qualification under Unemployed Workmen Act.

14053. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Under the Unemployed Workmen Act there must be a residence, must there not, in London, for 12 months?—Yes.

Suggested new Poor Law terminology.

14054. You have been asked a question about the names of workhouses: have there been suggestions in your district that the name should be changed, so as not to use the word "workhouse"?—Yes, there have. There have been suggestions that they should be called Homes of Rest, Homes for the Aged, and so on.

14055. They have not actually been adopted, have they?—No.

Compounding for rates: evils thereof, difficulties of abolishing, and report of Local Taxation Commission.

14056. With regard to compounding, you are probably aware that there is a good deal of difficulty in collecting the rates where there is no compounding?—Yes.

14057. That matter was gone into by the Local Taxation Commission, who recommended that the system of compounding should be continued?—Did they? I suppose they realised the extreme difficulty of direct collection.

14058. They recognise the extreme difficulty of collecting the rates, and give instances showing the difficulty there would be supposing there was no compounding; but it has been suggested that the difficulty of collecting the rates, where there are shifting tenancies, might be got over if the rates were collected more frequently, say fortnightly or weekly, like the rents are. Have you ever considered that point at all, or has it ever come before you in any way?—I have considered it in this way. I

have made inquiries of the collector in my own parish and he says it would not be impossible, but it would require obviously an increase in the collecting staff, and in any case you would have to allow for a certain amount of leakage. I may say at once that in 1894, I think it was, the Deptford Borough issued a circular—I do not know whether it was to all of the boroughs, but they communicated with Paddington—and the gist of their circular was that they had been in the habit of allowing a 25 per cent. rebate, under the Act of 1869, and they thinking it was too much, proposed in future to allow not more than 10 per cent. to any compounder under the Act. The Paddington Borough Council gave notice to various owners or representatives of property who had hitherto been receiving, I think, 20 per cent., saying that in future they would receive only 10 per cent; and the reply was: "Very well, you may collect for yourself." Briefly stated, I think they have come to the conclusion now that 10 per cent. is the outside it would be worth their while to allow to any owner compounding under that Act. One could understand that it would depend a good deal on the number of industrial dwellings there were in the district, and on the number of weekly lodgers; but I think it must be recognised that, if you do undertake to collect yourself, you must make a proportionate increase in the staff. On the other hand, it always seems to me there ought to be no particular difficulty in bringing home, even to weekly tenants, what the rates are doing. I do not know whether legislation would be necessary, but, supposing it is, I think it would be useful legislation, to the effect that in what corresponds to the rent book, every person paying his rent ought to be entitled to see, on the front page of it, what the rates were at that time, and what they were at the last assessment; and it is I think generally agreed to be desirable that everybody should, if possible, know something about the way the rates are going: they are generally going up.

14059. A very frequent collection of rates would involve a considerable increase in the staff?—Yes.

14060. Have you at all considered whether the saving in not allowing a composition would be sufficient to pay the increased staff?—Yes, I should say that you would probably find that experienced persons in that department in a borough would tell you that the cost of increasing their staff for direct collection would not be equal to 25 per cent. of the rate. Now they can allow up to 30 per cent., but in a good number of cases until quite recently 25 per cent. was the abatement. I think you will find that any experienced collector will tell you that the cost of the increase of the staff will be less than that percentage of the total amount collected.

14061. They would not save all that, because the larger allowance is only made where the rates are paid whether the houses are occupied or not?—Yes.

14062. Supposing there was no compounding, they would only get in the rates when the tenements were occupied?—True.

14063. You must make an allowance for that?—Certainly, that is a very important point.

14064. You think the saving on the compounding would be sufficient probably?—I am inclined to think it would. I was not aware that the Commission had reported so directly against it. They must have more evidence and knowledge than I can pretend to. I am only speaking of what I have heard from conversations with men who have had practical experience.

14065. I will read the passage: "But, however desirable in principle it might be to abolish compounding, it is generally agreed that the practical difficulties of collecting and enforcing payment from the large numbers of the poorer classes in the large towns who are weekly tenants and frequently moving from one tenement to another are insuperable. This view has been endorsed by officials of local authorities in large boroughs, and some of them have suggested that the limit of rateable value below which compounding is allowed should be slightly raised. Witnesses of this character have also expressed the opinion that the same system of compounding should apply to all rates subject to composition, though the adoption of the system should remain optional with the local authorities." ?—They were talking apparently there rather of the cost than the moral effect of direct collection.

14066. They realise that also I think, because they begin by saying: "The system of compounding has been frequently condemned on the ground that those who have the right to vote for the election, or become members, of local authorities entrusted with the raising and expenditure of money derived from rates, should pay rates directly themselves, and we entirely concur with this view"?—Yes. I think I have said before, and I should like to emphasise the fact that, apart altogether from this question of compounding, it is very much to be regretted that many well-to-do people, who are living in flats and paying their rates in their rents, seem really to be under the impression that they do not pay any rates at all; they never see a demand note and know nothing of local administration and its cost.

14067. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) In the case of an application for relief on the ground that the applicant is suffering from tuberculosis or phthisis, or that any of his family is suffering from it, and he desires relief for them, is the relief given to them now Poor Law relief?—Yes, I think so. In one or two infirmaries they have made special provision for open-air treatment of those cases.

Proposal to make treatment of phthisis a "public health" matter.

14068. In no case is phthisis or tuberculosis, as far as you are aware, treated as a public health question and handed over to the public health authority?—Not at present in London.

14069. No step has been taken towards that?—No, it has been talked about a good deal, but nothing has been done yet, I think.

14070. How does it strike you, do you think that would be a proper step and that workhouses and the Poor Law authorities should be relieved entirely of the care of the cases of tuberculosis?—I think it might be so. I think I have already suggested it. I have always understood that it is generally admitted by the advocates of the open-air treatment of phthisis, that the possibility of success depends very largely upon the early stage of the disease in which a person comes under that treatment, and so far as my experience is concerned, those cases that are treated in Poor Law infirmaries are very seldom, so to say, caught soon enough, and therefore if special hospitals are to be established for phthisis, they ought to be established rather by the municipal authorities, with the arrangement that the guardians could, if necessary send patients there.

14071. Phthisis now being recognised as an infectious or an understanding disease?—Yes.—I think that if any special provision is to be made it should be made rather by municipal than Poor Law authorities.

14072. And the Poor Law authority should be relieved of all cases of that kind?—Yes, they should be able, where necessary or desirable, to send their cases to this special hospital.

Return as to London "ins and outs."

14073. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the ins and outs, have you been able to get any return on the subject?—Yes, I have a return of the ins and outs. As a matter of fact I have very voluminous lists, but I can give a summary of the total number. I have regarded as ins and outs for the purpose of this return the inmates who have to give 168 hours notice of discharge. They are in varying numbers, but the total of all classes in London at the date of this return was 908, and they are of all ages, that is the remarkable thing, some are quite old people of seventy or eighty, and there are a good many over sixty.

14074. Who have been in and out in this way?—Yes, I assume they are confirmed ins and outs, because the guardians have thought it desirable to give them the maximum detention.

14075. Might we have that return put in in some detail?—I shall hand in the summary and shall be pleased to furnish you with further particulars from the lists if desired. (For Summary, *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. VII. (T)).

Proposed increased detention of "ins and outs" and its difficulties.

14076. That raises the further question, do you think that the evil will be remedied by a yet longer detention?—I think powers of detention should be extended.

14077. Could it be dealt with under the Vagrancy Act, or some statute as a better method, that is to say to be dealt with as a kind of offence?—Yes, but the difficulty of course is, as I say, that amongst those on the list there are so many quite old people. It is difficult to know

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

21 May 1906.

what to do with an old person of over seventy, who insists on going out.

14078. You say they are of all sorts?—Yes.

14079. Supposing we take the other sorts, could not they be dealt with?—Yes, the younger ones.

14080. If there were an exception made on the basis of age, we should meet the difficulty?—Yes.

14081. Do you think the kind of treatment that is laid down in the Vagrancy Act is really applicable to this?—No, I should say that I had in mind that those of the younger age would be, if not adequately, more satisfactorily dealt with in some sort of separate institution, as I have suggested, where the conditions should be continuous, though not necessarily very severe work, a very moderate diet, and strict discipline if the legislature will confer it, with an increased power of detention. I am assuming that some of those I have in mind are capable of reform and improvement and setting-up again.

14082. Would you be in favour of a power of detention adjustable to the reform or apparent reform of the person?—Yes, I think that would be a very good way of arranging it.

14083. You would rather not adopt the power of the Vagrancy Act, but something better and new?—In all these cases, I think, you must have public opinion behind you more or less. I think you would be more likely to have their support if it was known that there was an endeavour to re-establish where possible.

Proposed detention of unmarried mothers.

14084. Now, with regard to the case of unfortunate women who come in and give birth to children in the workhouse, would you be in favour of a medical examination of the persons to show whether they were feeble minded or not, and then, as soon as possible, the removal of the case to another place altogether, or, to put the alternative, would you prefer that such cases should come into a different door or a different department to a normal workhouse, received into a separate institution, and so dealt with?—I think the latter would be the better alternative. They would be under restraint. I take it the conditions of their relief would be different to those of ordinary able-bodied persons, and so on, they would be treated with consideration.

14085. I am speaking purely of the defective. Would you send them to an institution outside, other than the workhouse, when they were better and could more or less look after their own children?—I suppose it would be desirable that you should have grades or conditions; if you found individual cases improving and likely to be able to take care of themselves, you would deal with them accordingly.

14086. What would the Board of guardians be able to pay for such cases?—I suppose they might pay for cases of that sort, they might be regarded as coming under that section of the Act of 1876 which enables the guardians to contribute to institutions which are rendering useful aid in the relief of the poor.

14087. What would be the weekly sum paid, 10s. or 12s.?—I could not say that.

14088. One of the great difficulties has been to get the guardians to send the cases, because of the payment and, even though the payment may be comparatively small, if it is rather higher than the normal, as it must be in these cases, because the child and the mother have to be cared for, a difficulty is put in the way?—I quite see that, but it appears to me that some special treatment of that kind is very desirable, that means ought to be taken whereby guardians practically would have no choice; they would have to pay what was really a reasonable sum for the special care and treatment.

14089. What the result is of treating these women on the lines I have suggested has never come before the board?—I think not. I think we have no experience of that at present.

Main country routes of London vagrants.

14090. To take another question with regard to vagrants, have you ever made an investigation in the winter part of the year of the number of vagrants in the vagrant wards in the neighbourhood of London and on the main roads to London?—No, I have not made any special investigation recently, but I think it may be said to be common knowledge, or it is at any rate within the knowledge of the visiting officers appointed by the Board, that there are certain periods of migration in the early autumn and the late autumn, in which the vagrant wards in the direction of Kent, for instance, and in fact many directions, are temporarily occupied by the migratory casual leaving London for a period, and later on, we will say in October and November, you will find them coming back again along the same route.

14091. There has not been published by any Committee or the Board any document showing what those are?—No.

14092. Would it be possible to make an inquiry on that point by going through the books of the casual ward?—I suppose you could get the numbers returned in any or every casual ward in the country on a given night or for a series of nights.

14093. But the examination of the books in the neighbourhood at particular times of the year would follow it up, would it not?—Yes; it would be very interesting, I think. You would not get much more than the numbers. Of course, in statements by vagrants you have to take a good deal on trust.

14094. Of course, all you could say is that the vagrant said that he was on the way to London?—To be sure, and you have to accept what he said as to where he slept the night before and all the rest of it.

Effect of lunatic gr

14095. With regard to the 4s. grant for lunatics, are you in favour of the continuance of that method? Do you think it is desirable, so far as London is concerned?—As I think I have said in my evidence before, it seems to me that the grant is hardly sufficient in London to be a temptation to send the cases away.

14096. You mean it would be in a case where living was cheaper, but not here?—No, I think in the country it has frequently been alleged that the 4s. grant has been an inducement to guardians to get rid of troublesome cases, senile dements, and that class of case who help to fill up the beds in a lunatic asylum, which might very much better have been occupied by really cureable cases. If that was what you had in your mind in asking the question, with regard to London, I do not think it operates in London; to begin with, there is the Asylums Board's institutions, to which they send senile dements.

14097. Are there not a very large number of senile dements sent by the Poor Law authorities to the country?—From London?

14098. Yes?—I do not know that there are. I know there are a great number of cases.

14099. Do we have the return?—No, we do not get returns. In the Statistical Abstract for London, 1905, you will find a return of the number of lunatics in workhouses on a given day, I think, and the number in asylums. There are a very large number in workhouses—some thousands—but I do not know that amongst these there would be a large number of short-period lunatics. I do not think they transfer a large number.

14100. You have no return?—No, I have no evidence; it is only a surmise.

14101. There are no returns saying how many are sent by the Poor Law authorities?—No, I think in that book there are particulars relating to pauper lunatics, and in the Appendix they give you lunatics in workhouses, and pauper lunatics in asylums. You will see that the pauper lunatics in asylums considerably exceed those in the workhouses.

14102. That is a sign that the Act is being used in such a way as to throw a large number of paupers, who are lunatics, into these institutions, and it is suggested that that is because of the 4s. grant?—I can quite understand its operating in the country, but I should not have thought it would have operated very considerably in London.

14103. The London figures, I fancy—we may take it that these come under the head of pauper lunatics chargeable to London unions—shows a continuous increase in the items "in asylums and licensed houses," and also there are a large number of imbeciles; the total number of lunatics and imbeciles go from 18,000 of 1895, to 19,000 in 1896, and nearly 20,000 in 1897, and there are 24,000 in 1905?—Yes.

14104. Showing a very large increase?—Yes.

14105. Is not it likely that that is due partly to this system?—It may be.

Proposed new authority for dealing with defective class.

14106. Do you think it would be well to have all the defective classes dealt with by a single department, including possibly the lunatics, that is to say, the idiots, imbeciles for whom there is very little provision, and those who come under the general term feeble-minded ?—I do not see why they should not all be dealt with by one authority.

Possibility of abolishing compounding.

14107. You disapprove of compounding, at any rate among what may be called the upper classes ?—I think it is regrettable.

14108. With regard to the Report of the Local Taxation Commission on the subject, you have not, I suppose, been through the evidence ?—No, I confess I have not.

14109. So that since that Report was issued you would not know whether there have been other experiments made with a view of ensuring, as you suggest, that the tenant might know the rate, and pay it in some form, knowing how much he paid ?—I have heard of experiments of that sort, but I have no personal knowledge of them.

14110. If those experiments were proved practically to be advisable, then your wish would be fulfilled, would it not ?—I think you cannot very well go further than that. The point is that every individual, rich or poor, should have—they will not take the trouble to look for themselves—automatically brought under their notice what is happening with regard to the rates.

14111. From the point of view of the officials who have to collect the rates, a simplification by which they can deal with one man instead of twenty or fifty is a great advantage ?—Of course it is.

14112. Therefore the test of the matter would not be a simplification of his own methods to the maximum, but rather what was good for the people at large ?—Quite so, I agree.

Deterrency of relief to women.

14113. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) You say you think all paupers lose the franchise on receiving relief; that of course does not apply to women, does it ?—No.

14114. Therefore, there are no deterrent conditions on out-relief to women ?—Not in respect of the franchise.

14115. There is no substitute for that, is there ?—That is so.

14116. Would this position, do you think, depend on the assumption that women form a class which is naturally dependent ?—I might assume that they were so naturally, but I do not know whether they are in fact in these days. They are very well able to take care of themselves for the most part, I think.

14117. I quite agree with you; but if that were generally recognised, the economic position of women would be greatly improved, would it not ?—Probably, yes.

14118. You cannot really make outdoor relief deterrent to women by any means, can you ?—You cannot give less relief ?—No, you cannot.

14119. I do not know whether that is the motive of the guardians in giving inadequate relief, but it is obviously a wrong way to do it ?—I agree.

14120. So that, as a matter of fact, you cannot apply the law now to women in the same way that you can to men in respect to out-door relief ?—No.

14121. Do you think this would be an argument for extending the franchise to women ?—It might be used as such.

Number of aged persons suitable for out-relief or pensions.

14122. (*Miss Hill.*) Mr. Russell Wakefield asked you whether you would not think that many persons over sixty were suitable for pensions; how did you understand that question ? Is not a pension simply the same thing as outdoor relief, or how would you distinguish a pension from outdoor relief ? When you answered that question, did you mean to say how many people would be able to live out of the house without the care of a nurse and so on ?—That is what I rather thought of.

14123. Then might not the words "outdoor relief" be substituted for "pensions" ?—You see I must not interfere with the question.

14124. I only wanted to know how you understood it; I was not proposing to alter it. Very often I do not see the distinction between pensions and outdoor relief ?—Possibly some of the old people who are receiving out-relief might be suitable persons for pensions, if there was an existing fund from which the money could be provided.

14125. A pension to a person is outdoor relief, is it not ?—Hardly.

14126. I do not mean a pension for services rendered, or anything of that kind ?—At present, as far as I am aware, you may say that outdoor relief amounts in effect to a pension; but assuming that pensions generally were provided for, a condition would be that disfranchisement would not follow.

Possibility of abolishing compounding.

14127. Then with regard to the question of compounding; the percentage allowed by law is 15 per cent., and, therefore, if any borough offers less than that, the acceptance of it is dependent on the owner's agreement to it; that is so; is it not ?—I think it is not quite that. I think that under the Act relating to compounding, when the owner agrees to be responsible for the rate whether the tenement is occupied or not, the rating authority can allow as much as 30 per cent.

14128. Leaving out of question the allowance for let or unlet, which is quite a different point, if they make compounding compulsory in any parish, they are obliged by the Act to give 15 per cent. are they not ?—Yes, I think so.

14129. All landlords can get their rents collected for 5 per cent.—that is the common price, is it not ?—Not being a landlord myself, I cannot speak from experience, but I believe that is so.

14130. Supposing that any local authority wished to promote the intelligent education of the voter, they might conceivably collect weekly or fortnightly, and still have a good deal to go upon for either losses or profits to the rate, for they need not pay more than 5 per cent. ?—The extra cost of the weekly collection would be more than covered by the percentage now given.

14131. It would be covered three times over, would it not ?—Very possibly that may be so.

14132. Therefore, I am unable to see on what ground the Royal Commission on Local Taxation decided that it would be impossible, although it may be difficult; and I think it very important that the facts should be well before the people. Then the compounding allowance above the 15 per cent. is either for let or unlet, which of course must vary very much in the district ?—Yes, undoubtedly it would.

14133. Or else it is a matter of favour; they need not give, if they like, more than the 15 per cent., but the 15 per cent. they are bound to give ?—Yes. Anything above 15 per cent. is voluntary on the part of the rating authority.

14134. And anything below 15 per cent. is a matter of agreement on the part of the owner ?—Yes.

14135. Has there been any plan suggested that you are aware of, with regard to the richer people who do not pay rates direct ?—No.

14136. I have never heard of any suggestion as to how it could be brought to bear upon them ?—In my humble opinion, it is quite as important that those well-to-do people should, whether they wish it or not, know how things are going with regard to the rates.

14137. It has never been proposed that votes should be dependent on the production of receipts for rates I am afraid, but I should like to see that very much ?—It would be a very good way of meeting the point.

Number of persons relieved by boroughs on the Parliamentary register.

14138. In answering a question put to you by Mr. Loch, "How far are those in receipt of borough employment relief, on the register for the Parliamentary franchise," you said you thought the larger proportion are on the register; that means that there are more on the register than are off it, does it not ?—Yes, I should think that would be the case in the matter of borough employment.

14139. Have you made any tests at all of that ?—No, I have not.

14140. You have not inquired into any number of cases in order to ascertain what proportion would be on the register, and what proportion not ?—No, I have not.

14141. This is merely a conjecture on your part then ?—Yes.

Classification by workhouses.

14142. With regard to Mr. Russell Wakefield's question about classification, if I understand your answer, you think

Mr. Henry Lockwood

21 May 1906.

it is not possible to classify satisfactorily the different classes in one building at the present time. Are we to understand from that answer that you are in favour of classification by separate institutions, or classification in the same buildings if it be possible?—I can imagine instances where classification as between the aged and the able-bodied might be possible, but certainly in any large workhouse I do not think it can be satisfactorily provided for. It is that belief which has induced me to desire to see a separate establishment or separate establishments in which the able-bodied class should be provided for distinctly and separately from the aged and infirm.

14143. Do you mean that if they had room, it is not desirable to classify them separately on the same side?—I do not think you can satisfactorily deal with the able-bodied class unless you have them entirely by themselves. That is my feeling.

14144. (*Mrs. Webb.*) With regard to old age, do you think it better to have a separate institution, as they have at Woolwich, for old people of good character?—I do. I know that there are differences of opinion on that subject. You have instanced Woolwich, and I am quite prepared to say that I am responsible for the existence of that institution—it is called Firs Lodge—and the fact that a certain number of old women are provided for there. When there was a question of the acquisition of this particular property, the workhouse generally was crowded more or less continually, and there was the consequent difficulty of which I have spoken in other cases, of dealing satisfactorily with all classes. I advocated the acquisition by the guardians of this particular place, with a view to providing for classification in a separate institution such as was provided, rather than endeavouring ineffectually to carry it out in the existing workhouse.

14145. It enables you to give the old people far more liberty?—Yes, if it is desirable.

14146. If you had them in the same institution, it would be rather difficult to make great distinctions between one person and another with regard to going out in the week, would it not?—That is one of the great difficulties. I cannot conceive myself one institution, in which you could possibly provide for the classification which in my mind would be ideal, that is to say, where not only should the work be different, and the hours different, but the food should be different and everything else should be entirely different as between the several classes. You cannot do that in one institution where you have several classes grouped together, each one seeing what the other is doing and receiving.

Difference between out-relief and old age pensions.

14147. With regard to Miss Hill's questions about pensions, would you not say that the characteristic of a pension as compared with out-door relief is that it cannot be withdrawn, and that in all the pension schemes in the colonies it is given once for all to an old person, and is never withdrawn?—I do not know how that would be in practice, but certainly there is this difference between a pension and relief. It is true that a person has a right to relief, but he or she has no right to say what particular form the relief shall take, whereas in the case of a pensioner the pension has been acquired by service of some kind, and it is inalienable, I take it.

14148. The theory of pensions in the colonies is that the person has paid in rates and taxes an insurance against old age, and receives in return a pension exactly as he would if he put it into an insurance company?—I do not know what the system in the colonies is, but I can understand that that would be the theory and the principle of pensions as distinguished from relief.

14149. It is the consciousness of the persons' feeling that they have paid for the pension that makes the difference?—No doubt that would be so.

Improbability of decrease in London indoor pauperism.

14150. In reply to Mr. Russell Wakefield's question about the present increase of pauperism in London, you say you do not think "there is any likelihood of an appreciable diminution of the numbers in the infirmary or workhouse"; do you differentiate between the infirmary and the workhouse, and is it in the infirmary that you expect the increase?—I am afraid that there is not likely to be a diminution in either. Probably the numbers in the infirmaries will be more likely to keep high than the numbers in the workhouse. I have spoken of the specially improved conditions of relief of recent years, and I think that those improved conditions are more noticeable in the infirmary perhaps than in the workhouse.

Decreased deterrency of Medical Relief.

14151. Do you anticipate that presently the Poor Law infirmary will be completely relieved from any stigma of pauperism, and that therefore we shall all go into one when we require medical attendance and nursing?—I do not know how far the question of stigma may affect the question, but I suppose it has something to do with it. People do not realise that going into a Poor Law infirmary is really accepting Poor Law relief, and that consequently disfranchisement follows. As I have said before, the conditions of relief in a Poor Law infirmary are so excellent in every way nowadays, that a good many people who possibly in ordinary circumstances would make shift to provide for themselves, have little or no hesitation in availing themselves of that sort of relief.

Question of treatment of all infectious disease by non-Poor Law Authority.

14152. Do you think, for instance, with regard to phthisis as well as the ordinary infectious complaints, it is desirable that there should not be any stigma upon going into such an institution?—I do not know that had that in my mind when I was answering Mr. Nunn's question about phthisis. I was thinking only of what was probably the best way of dealing with phthisis under the open-air treatment. I take it that in order that the open-air treatment should have satisfactory results, it is very important that the case should be so dealt with in the earlier stages of the disease.

14153. That is to say, you would put phthisis on exactly the same basis as scarlet fever?—I do not see why you should not. All cases of scarlet fever at the present moment, I take it, are dealt with by the Asylums Board.

14154. And there is no stigma there; on the contrary there is compulsion to accept it?—True.

14155. And you would rather extend that to phthisis?—I see no objection to its extension to phthisis.

14156. Supposing it were discovered that other diseases were directly or indirectly infectious, would you suggest that we should extend that principle?—It appears to me that if you once establish that a disease is infectious, and that it is desirable in the interests of the community that it should be isolated and dealt with separately as soon as possible, then I think you might say that the question of infectiousness would become one in respect to which you will have to consider whether it should be dealt with by the Poor Law authorities or by some independent authority.

14157. Would you extend that principle to what you may call infectious mental states? I mean to say, you might get a person who infects a whole street, or at any rate, a whole household, with very disagreeable characteristics; would you put him into an institution, but relieve him from the stigma of pauperism?—I have never got so far as to consider mental infection.

14158. We have got lunacy and imbecility dealt with in that way on the one hand, and we have got infectious diseases and presently phthisis dealt with in that way on the other hand; and there would be a great many diseases which require as much isolation as lunacy or scarlet fever in a sense. Do you look forward to the extension of that principle—speaking practically and without laughing—to all such people who are injurious to the rest of the community?—I think if you could get public opinion to realise the advantage of some such process as that, it might be done; but I doubt whether you will ever be able to do it. I think in itself it might be advantageous.

14159. We are rather creeping towards it—lunacy on the one side, and infectious diseases on the other?—Yes—and we are including phthisis now.

The incidence of rates as between landlord and tenant.

14160. Then with regard to compounding; is it proved from an economic point of view that if you lower rates of you lower rent? Is not rent determined by the number of people who are applying for housing accommodation on a given site?—Yes.

14161. Therefore, if you lowered the rates, the landlord would get that amount in additional rent, because rates and rent are taken together?—One feels that he does do that, and what one wishes is that the tenant might know really how much of that is going into the landlord's pocket.

14162. How does it affect me as a tenant if my rates are lowered and my landlord by so much raises my rent? I

do not care as a tenant, but I would rather pay it to the municipality ?—Still, you know where it is going, so to say.

14163. No, I do not really; although in the one case it goes into the landlord's pocket, and in the other case it goes to the municipality who gives me something for it ?—If you are paying the whole amount direct to the landlord, you really do not know what proportion goes to the one and what proportion to the other.

14164. All I want to suggest is that it makes no difference to me if my rates are lowered and my rent goes up by so much. The alternative to me is that either I pay so much to the landlord, or I pay the same amount, half to the landlord and half, say, to the County Council, who give me something for it ?—That may be so.

14165. Therefore I have no interest as an occupier whether the money goes altogether to the landlord, or partly to the landlord and partly to the rate-levying authority ?—I do not quite see that. You have to pay the same amount in either case, of course.

14166. I have to pay a certain amount to live on a certain site, and if the rates are lowered, I have to pay that much more to my landlord. That is the economic theory of it, is it not ?—Yes.

14167. Therefore, as an occupier it suits me better to pay it as rates for which I get services, than to pay it in rent for which I get nothing ?—Yes, except that the rate being included in the rent paid, is paid more or less under the system of compounding, and so far as the rent-payer is concerned, it is paid blindly; I mean to say, he does not necessarily know where it is going. But if an arrangement is made by which he knows that so much goes in this direction, and so much in that—even though he may say in the end "I do not care; I pay no more or no less than I did before"—still there is an advantage, I think, in knowing how much is so paid that you get something back again.

14168. Quite so; and that would make me as an occupier, if I had that clearly in my mind, vote for a representative who would do his best to raise the rates ?—That might be the result.

14169. So if you were properly economically instructed, and if you had to pay rates, you would wish to pay as much rates as possible ?—You would have to be very well instructed to wish that.

14170. That is the argument—that we should all desire to pay as much rates as possible in order to take it away from, say, the Duke of Bedford ?—I am not an expert in these things.

Proposed penalties on fathers of illegitimate children born in Workhouses.

14171. (*Mr. Lansbury.*) In reference to some of these single women, in answer to Mr. Loch I understood you to say that you are in favour of detaining them for a certain period. Would you be in favour of strengthening the law with regard to the men through whom these women come into the workhouse to be confined ?—Yes, very much, if one could.

14172. We could do it, if the Legislature would do it, could we not ?—Yes.

14173. Why should it not be made a positive crime ?—I know no reason why it should not.

14174. Are we not in danger of punishing, very often the least guilty party in these things ?—I am afraid that is so.

14175. By visiting not only all the affliction that comes from this sort of thing on the girl, but by letting the man 999 times out of 1,000 go scot free ?—Yes.

14176. In any legislation for giving effect to your wish, would you be in favour of embodying some legislation to deal with the man ?—Certainly. I think that probably in most cases the man is the more to blame of the two.

14177. And therefore should be punished ?—Yes.

The justification for generous out-relief.

14178. Then with regard to pensions, the people in the colonies have paid rates and taxes, and they take their pension as a matter of right; is that not also what some of the poor people here think, who have paid rates and taxes as we are told through their rents for a number of years, and therefore are only getting what they are entitled to in their old age ?—Yes, one frequently hears that.

The relation between rates and rents.

14179. Then about this question of compounding; is it not true that rents are considerably higher in all the low-rated districts of London than they are in the heavily-rated districts such as Bermondsey and Poplar ?—I do not know what it is in all of them, but I have given a particular case in which an acquaintance of mine found that when he removed from Poplar to St. Pancras the rents in the latter parish were considerably higher than in the place he had left.

14180. So that if you abolished compounding, the landlord would get his pound of flesh just the same ?—I do not know. Do you mean that he would raise his rent in order to compensate himself and to meet the rate ?

14181. No; I suggest to you that the rent is not fixed by anything which concerns the rates at all, but by the number that there are going after one house or one room ?—That may be so, but then on the other hand, what I contend is that it is desirable that every occupier, rich or poor, should have some ready means of ascertaining, not necessarily how his rent is affected thereby, but how the rates are going to be used, one way or the other.

14182. Why should he be interested in the amount of the rates unless it does affect his rent ?—I think it would in some degree affect his rent.

14183. How is it that in Whitechapel rents are higher than they are in Poplar ?—I cannot tell you that; indeed I did not know that they were.

14184. It is due to the greater density of population, surely ?—To a great extent it may be so.

14185. Assuming people want to live on a given area, and therefore the rates do not enter into the question, then the landlord simply puts the rent up as much as ever he can ?—That is a question of supply and demand, really. He will ask as much rent as he can get, in point of fact. There is very good reason why every person voting or living in a district should have a better knowledge than he has at present of how the rates are being spent.

14186. That is all right from the point of view of economy, but the point I want to make is that it does not, as a matter of fact, affect the rent. Did you ever know a district where the rates went down considerably, and the landlord lowered the rents forthwith ?—No, I never did; I admit that.

14187. On the other hand, have you ever known landlords put up the rents when the rates went up ?—Yes, I think that is a common practice.

14188. Might that not stop some little service being carried through, because of the rapacity of certain landlords ?—Yes, but I cannot be regarded as an expert on the subject.

The justification for generous out-relief.

14189. (*Mr. Nunn.*) If a man went to the War Office and said that he had paid taxes all his life and he now thought he had a right to a rifle, would you think that a sound argument ?—I do not know what the War Office might think of it; probably they would not.

14190. I suppose the answer would be that the rifles were at the service of every citizen of the community under the conditions prescribed by the Government ?—Possibly yes.

14191. And therefore when a man said that he had paid rates all his life and he now wanted 5s. a week, the answer would be that he had a right to subsistence as a ratepayer according as the guardians should prescribe ?—Yes, that is reasonable.

Suggested new Poor Law terminology.

14192. With regard to the new terminology in a reformed Poor Law, on which I asked you a question, I think our discussion this morning rather indicates that it is very necessary, for instance, with regard to the question of "sudden and urgent necessity" ?—Yes.

14193. You suggest an addition to the terms suggested by me, namely, "poor's house," for the aged poor ?—Yes. That was the term that was originally used.

14194. Would that be likely to suggest to applicants that poverty and not destitution was to be the test of a man's right to relief ?—I hardly think it would do that. Recollect, that I want to see my able-bodied institution, which would be really the workhouse as distinguished from the poor's house.

14195. It is called the infirmary, I believe now by the old people who are not on the sick list ?—As a matter of fact, "workhouse" is the official term which is recognised. There is the infirmary, which is for the sick as distinguished from those who do not require medical treatment and

Mr. Henry Lockwood.

21 May 1906.

nursing, and there is the workhouse, which I confess with the great majority of inmates is a misnomer, inasmuch as they are not put there to work; the older people are put there to be taken care of, you may say.

Difficulty of making relief to the aged deterrent.

14196. But in the case of Woolwich, I suppose you would really consider that that house is for poor old people as apart from destitute old people?—It is for both, I think. They are there because they are destitute in the sense that they have no means of keeping themselves.

14197. Does that not mean that you have abandoned ineligibility as a guiding principle of the Poor Law?—Yes, there is no question that it does mean that, to a great extent so far as the old are concerned.

14198. What principle would you substitute in the place of ineligibility?—I can only say that, though one can take a sheet of paper and write out a series of rules which should guide you in dealing with this that or the other, when you come to deal with the old people in the concrete, it is very difficult to say how you are to arrange that the indoor relief you give them shall be of an ineligible character, because you must treat them with reasonable consideration.

14199. Would not a very large number of persons probably apply if they found they were simply going into a house with no restriction on their freedom?—But there is a certain amount of restriction, even in this place. They have to conform to certain rules. I mean, they have to rise at a certain time, they have to take their meals at a certain time, and they are allowed leave out only under restrictions.

Need for co-operation of various authorities for dealing with phthisis.

14200. With regard to phthisis, under the present circumstances there is a very considerable difference in the actual cases that one has to deal with, ranging from a case of merely threatened phthisis in a home where one feels pretty sure that the people are sufficiently well educated and careful to prevent the communication of the disease, down to the case of a hopeless person in destitute circumstances whose relatives have no intention at all of carrying out any preventive measures?—Yes, that is so.

14201. All such very different cases call for different kinds of treatment, and you could not decide that they should all be sent off to the field hospital or the like, because it would be rather a blundering way, would it not, to deal with the problem like that?—Yes. I committed myself to that opinion just now, but of course it is perfectly true that there would be cases in which it would be quite a question whether you should send them away.

14202. At present one has various agencies in every union or borough which practically take up different departments of the work; the borough council, for instance, accepts notifications of the disease and provides for disinfection, and the Poor Law provides open-air treatment for the hopeless cases, and charitable institutions take up the hopeful cases and cure them?—They take them up, but I do not know to what extent they cure them. Certainly they are more likely to cure them under the circumstances in which they receive them than the Poor Law authorities are, because as I have said, the Poor Law authorities get the cases far too late.

14203. Does that not suggest that as circumstances are at present, in the various boroughs at any rate in London, it is absolutely necessary to have some method of co-operation between the various agencies like the borough council and the board of guardians?—As things are at present, yes. As you have been kind enough to remind me—it is the only instance that I am aware of—there is some organised co-operation of that sort existing in Hampstead.

14204. It is almost impossible to deal with phthisis cases scientifically under present circumstances without that co-operation, is it not?—I think so certainly, only I still hold this, that when you have devised your scheme for dealing with phthisis scientifically or thoroughly, the Poor Law authority should not be the one that should undertake the duty.

14205. But should only take up the hopeless residuum which cannot be dealt with otherwise?—Yes.

14206. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) I want to get a little more clearly your view on the matter of the pension as against outdoor relief. In my previous question I did not suggest that everybody over sixty should be suitable for pensions, but I suggested that many would, and indeed I would hardly say many?—Are you speaking of all the population over sixty, or of those assisted by the guardians?

Differences between old age pension and out-relief.

14207. Of those who come under the operation of the Poor Law. There is a very clear definition morally between the idea of outdoor relief and the idea of a pension, is there not?—In the case of outdoor relief the only thing considered is the poverty, the destitution, of the person, is it not?—Yes; strictly speaking, the guardians are not concerned with the case until it has arrived at a condition of destitution.

14208. There is no question as to the character of that person so long as he is destitute?—No; the person is entitled to relief certainly by the fact that he or she is destitute—and that is irrespective of character, but of course character does come in to some extent.

14209. And the usefulness of the past life is not considered, either?—Not very much.

14210. Of course in regard to pensions it would be quite possible to consider those matters, when they would not be considered in regard to out-door relief?—Yes. I take it that in any scheme for pensions the past life would be considered.

14211. And therefore that would be a very easily marked distinction between the granting of a pension and the granting of outdoor relief?—Yes; you might say that there is this distinction between the two, that a person would not get a pension who had not qualified for it by his or her past life.

14212. And one would not consider it anything unreasonable that after a person had led a life of that kind, he should have something which was not withdrawable at pleasure?—I do not think it is unreasonable.

14213. Would you think it is immoral?—No, certainly not. The whole question hinges upon what it will cost and how it can be provided.

14214. If the State chooses to do it, and if it is desirable, there are moral reasons to favour it?—If you can show that it is desirable there is nothing immoral about it.

Effect of "shelters" and parks in Marylebone Union.

14215. With regard to shelters, in answer to Mr. Gardiner you have selected two localities; had you any special reason for taking those two; is it because there are more shelters in those localities than in others?—Those happened to be places that I was specially acquainted with. As regards Marylebone, those printed returns of which we have heard before show the very large number of persons from the shelters in the Marylebone parish, you may almost say week by week, who have to be dealt with by the relieving officer.

14216. Would you associate with the shelters the fact of there being two large parks close by to which these people may resort in the day-time? Would those parks being close by lead people, do you think, to go into a locality where there were shelters? At any rate, they would congregate there, would they not?—I do not know whether the parks have much effect, because as a matter of fact I believe that they have fewer applications from these shelters in the summer than they have in the winter. Therefore if the parks had any effect at all, they would have the effect of reducing the numbers who would come from the shelters.

14217. Do you say there are fewer in the summer?—I did not quite perhaps understand your question. Did you ask me whether there was any sort of relation between the shelters and the persons who came from the shelters for relief to districts in the neighbourhood of the parks?

14218. Yes?—This class of person, whom one sees lying about in the parks occasionally, would be there in the summer and not in the winter.

Return as aged paup in Maryleb Workhouse

14219. I think you wanted to say something with regard to the aged people in a particular workhouse?—Yes, I want to refer to the large number of women and men in the Marylebone workhouse over eighty—some of them over ninety—and there are a great many between sixty-five and seventy-five—whose records show that they have been a considerable number of years in the workhouse. Many of the old ladies who are now between

eighty and ninety apparently came into the workhouse nearly twenty years ago, when they were not many years over sixty, and there they remain, and, I will not say flourish, but it does seem to me that under the conditions in which they live in the Marylebone workhouse they reach so to say, here on earth, the condition of Nirvana, which Bhuddists imagine can only be achieved after æons of well living. It seems to imply that the circumstances of indoor relief for the aged, rightly or wrongly, are such that they tend to prolong life. I have here the return for Marylebone, and this is an epitome of it—over ninety there are seven; over eighty and upwards there are forty-nine who have been in the workhouse from five to twenty-three years; between seventy and eighty there are 101 who have been in the workhouse from five to fifteen years, and then between sixty-five and seventy there are eighty-four who have been in the workhouse from five to ten years. These figures go to show that there is nothing tending to the shortening of human life in the conditions in which they live.

Apathy of tenants of flats as to local affairs.

14220. In regard to the whole matter of compounding, my contention has nothing to do with the finances of it, but what I say is that people take absolutely no interest in what happens in their locality in those cases where they live in flats, especially the well-to-do, because they do not wish to be bothered with the thing at all. What is your view?—That is so, and I still take leave to say that I think it is most deplorable that that should be the case. No matter where the rates or the rents go to, I think that every citizen ought to be induced to take an immediate and active interest in what is being done by the authorities who demand and spend the rates.

14221. Those people escape responsibility in every way?—Yes, these flat-livers do.

14222. They treat the parish much as one of them said he wished to treat the clergy once when I went to call on him:—"Don't you know that we live here in order to escape the parson?"—they want to escape everything?—Yes. They pay so much a quarter and there is an end of it, and they have no responsibility or interest in anything that is going on around them.

14223. (*Mr. Booth.*) With regard to the attitude with which ratepayers should contemplate the rates, do you mean that they should consider the amount spent or the manner and method in which it is spent?—I think they should have the means of considering both.

14224. Which in your view is the more important of the two?—I think one is as important as the other. It depends perhaps to some extent upon the advantage that a person thinks he is going to get out of rate-expenditure. Take as an instance the question of the tramways we will say; a person who is not likely to use the tramway would probably consider that that was not a good way of spending the rates and he would prefer the money to be spent in some other way; but, on the other hand, a person to whom the tramway would be an advantage would say possibly in effect, "I do not mind paying so much more rates, because by this I am going to have locomotion facilitated for myself."

14225. Ought he to limit his consideration solely to his own requirements, or ought he not also to consider the public benefit?—I think he ought to do both, but probably he begins by thinking about himself.

Miss Ina Stansfeld, called in; and Examined.

14226. (*Chairman.*) You have given us a very clear and comprehensive statement of your duties, and also of certain recommendations which you would like to see applied to the infirmaries under the Poor Law (*see* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXVI. (A–N)). I understand you were appointed an assistant poor law inspector in the Metropolitan District under the Local Government Board in 1897?—Yes.

14227. And that previously to that you had had a considerable experience in work germane to that which was given to you to perform?—Yes.

Advantages of treating London as one Poor Law area.

14228. You make a number of suggestions, and towards the end of your memorandum you point out that those suggestions cannot be practically carried out unless the administration of London is treated as a single unit?—Yes.

14229. Therefore, one of the advantages of making London a single unit would be that it would facilitate a good many changes in the infirmaries, which you, after considerable experience, think advisable?—I think it would facilitate desirable changes in the infirmaries and workhouses.

Advantages of having maternity wards in Workhouses rather than in Infirmaries.

14230. I will take you shortly through one or two of your suggestions. First, you are of opinion that the maternity wards should be in the workhouse rather than in the infirmary?—I think it is better for the patients. I think there is a greater reluctance to go into the ward as a patient when it is situated in the workhouse.

14231–3. I can understand that; but why is it better for the patients?—I think it is a bad thing, is it not, if they become too much familiarised with the Poor Law?

14234. You would like to subdivide the maternity wards as they are now conducted?—Yes.

Proposed re-organisation of maternity wards.

14235. You would like to have a central institution in London for women with their first child?—I should like to have a central institution in London, with opportunities for their employment in laundry work and needlework and whatever was most suitable, for some months previous to the birth of their child, and also for some months afterwards.

14236. That would be in the case of a girl's first child?—Yes.

14237. Then you would like also to separate the respectable women from those of bad character?—Yes, I should.

14238. Do you think that is very desirable?—I think it would be well.

14239. Are there any complaints that you have ever heard in that respect?—I have never heard of any complaints on that point.

Associations for befriending unmarried mothers.

14240. You give in the Appendix a very interesting account of many associations which in different unions are working with the Poor Law authorities in trying to get girls who have gone wrong restored afterwards to some form of employment; that movement is on the increase, is it not?—It is very much on the increase. I think the amount of voluntary work which is now being done in the maternity wards of the Metropolis is wonderful. I do not think that I remember any one single instance, when asking a girl whether she would receive help on leaving, of her saying no; and I nearly always ask that question.

14241. You have seen a great increase of that kind of help during the nine years that you have been assistant inspector, I take it?—Yes.

14242. I see you give a long account of the Hampstead Union and their scheme, and that you hold that up rather as a model?—Yes, I do; it gives the girl the best chance, and it tends to keep the rates down at the same time.

Large number of feeble-minded unmarried mothers in Workhouses.

14243. Then I think you are of opinion that feeble-minded women, some of whom constantly come to these maternity wards, should be put under some detention?—Yes, I think they should. They are there really in alarming numbers. It is very difficult for me to say the exact percentage. I have sometimes tried to work it out, and I think about 75 per cent. of the women in these wards are not quite up to the mark.

14244. That is 75 per cent. of the mothers of illegitimate children?—Yes.

14245. As much as 75 per cent.?—I should say so. They are feeble-minded, or something between feeble-minded and normal-minded.

14246. Would it be easy for a medical authority to draw a line between these people and the people who are fully in possession of their wits, or would there be a difficulty in most cases?—I think that a medical authority in going round and examining the women one by one would be able without difficulty to divide them into the two classes at a glance.

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

21 May 1906.

14247. One of the advantages, if London was unified and had central infirmaries, is that you would be able to deal much more satisfactorily with the lock cases?—Yes. I have received, during the last two years especially, many complaints about the want of separation-accommodation for the female lock cases in the metropolitan infirmaries.

Need for segregation of lock cases and senile cases.

14248. Do these cases form any considerable percentage?—It is very difficult to determine, in fact almost impossible, as often that condition is secondary to another. The respectable married woman resents very much finding a patient of that kind in the general wards.

14249. Then in paragraph 24 you suggest that the senile and bedridden women should be segregated, and that at present they give a great deal of trouble to the nurses, distributed as they are through the wards, and also some annoyance to the other inmates?—Yes, they are very troublesome.

14250. You suggest that they should be classified, and if possible located in a special institution?—Yes, I do.

14251. Would they be much more easily managed if they were thus segregated?—No, I do not think they would ever be easily managed. Perhaps they might be more difficult to manage, because that condition of mind is very often very infectious.

14252. I suppose you have put these proposals forward from an administrative point of view, and you have not gone into their cost?—From an administrative point of view as an inspector of the nursing arrangements.

14253. You are looking at it simply from the administrative point of view?—Yes. From the point of view of what is best for the infirmaries and workhouses, and what is best for the inmates.

Need for male nurses and discipline for disagreeable infirmary patients.

14254. In paragraph 41, you make the suggestion that there should be male nurses, owing to the fact that there are a certain class of patients who, you state, are at times apt to make themselves disagreeable?—Yes; they exist in all the infirmaries. It is the commonest experience for me to go round an infirmary and to find two or three men isolated in separation-rooms, because their behaviour or their language has been impossible in the general ward. They are obviously men who need to be handled by men.

14255. Under the present system, can you inflict any punishment upon them for that?—No.

14256. Your idea would be to remove them to some wards where the conditions would be less comfortable?—Yes, to a Special Infirmary, where the conditions would be less comfortable and the discipline stricter.

14257. And enforced by male attendants?—Yes; I think they would take less advantage then.

14258. Would your male nurses be pauper nurses?—No.

14259. Would they be trained male nurses?—Yes, and I think they would be of very great use to the nation. I think a service of trained male nurses would be useful in the nursing of mental cases and delirium tremens cases, and that they would easily find employment after training, and be of great value in the Metropolitan infirmaries during their training.

14260. Have you often had complaints from nurses of the misconduct of this sort of men?—I have had a few complaints, but generally I think I may say that I have a statement that they have been troublesome: "Why is this man in this little room all by himself?" I ask. "Because he has been so troublesome that he could not be managed by the nurses in the general ward."

High quality of Metropolitan Poor Law Nurses.

14261. Passing on to the nurses, I gather that you are very well satisfied with the quality and class of nurses that you now get?—I am thoroughly satisfied with Poor Law nursing as it exists in the Metropolis. Every year it is improving.

14262. And you are prepared to submit—which appears to me to be very sensible—to the fact that the hospitals of London will always get rather the pick of the nurses?—Yes. After having written my memorandum, I was afraid that perhaps by having admitted that, I might have injured those institutions; but the hospitals, with their great traditions and their great work, I think have every right to lead the way.

14263. I assume they produce a larger number of interesting cases and a lesser number of chronic cases than the infirmaries do?—They are supposed to do so, but I do not know that they really do. In my memorandum I have quoted an operation which I saw performed by Doctor Parsons, medical superintendent of Fulham Infirmary, not very long ago, in which he carefully explained to the nurses why he was going to do everything and what effect every action during the operation would have. Naturally, I think, the nurses must become more interested in a case which they are taught thoroughly to understand, than they can be in a general hospital where the surgeon's chief business lies with the medical students, and where it is nobody's business, in the theatre itself, to instruct or to explain to the probationers or to the nurses.

Need for lowering qualifying age for pensions for nurses.

14264. You have something to say as regards the pensions of nurses; I believe you think the age is somewhat low?—The age is very much too advanced.

14265. They are entitled to a pension at the Civil Service age, 60 to 65, are they not?—Yes.

14266. What is your experience; does it want a very strong woman, who begins nursing at about 25, to last till 60?—Yes. In the Poor Law infirmaries the life is exceedingly close. There is no variety in it, and it is one of continuous responsibility. There is comparatively little change in the life of a matron of an infirmary, and that does tend very much, I think, to age a woman.

14267. In your experience, have you known any good nurses who have broken down without becoming qualified for a pension?—Yes, I have.

14268. About what sort of age would they begin to break down?—The woman of whom I am thinking was, I believe, about fifty-five. A certain number of years were put on, because it was found that her health was in a very precarious condition, and she was allowed to retire.

14269. With a pension?—Yes.

Need for proposed separate infirmary wards for children.

14270. Then you would like the children to be all removed from the adult wards?—Yes. I do not like children in adult wards. They annoy the elder patients, and I do not think it is good for the children from either the physical or the moral point of view.

14271. The general practice in most infirmaries is to remove them, is it not?—Some infirmaries do and some do not. Structurally, many of the infirmaries are at a disadvantage, and even if they have children's wards for general complaints, they are obliged to scatter cases of measles, whooping-cough, and infectious complaints among the adult wards; and measles and whooping-cough are two very important diseases in the infirmaries.

14272. In the existing infirmaries, it would necessitate some enlargement and extra wards if they were so separated, I assume?—Yes. The mortality among the children in the Camberwell infirmary, before it was recently enlarged, was very high; now, when it has new wards and separation-rooms attached, it is almost nominal.

Inspection of Poor Law Schools.

14273. How do you come officially in contact with the Poor Law schools? Do you inspect them?—Yes.

14274–5. Both sides; boys and girls?—Yes.

Physique and after-careers of Children in Poor Law Schools.

14276. Are you very well satisfied with the results of the Poor Law education on the children?—Yes, I am indeed very well satisfied.

14277. And you do not endorse the strong objections that are entertained in some quarters to the big Poor Law schools?—No. I have never seen the "pauper taint"; I have heard of it, but I have never seen it.

14278. Do you believe that the children in these large schools are better physically trained and looked after?—I am sure they are.

14279. Have you been able to get any records of how the majority of these children, after leaving the schools, have turned out?—I have not attempted to get any written records for this Commission, but I make very continuous inquiries. I have appended in one of my

appendices some records given to me by Mr. Thurnall, the clerk to the Lambeth guardians, and I have examined a considerable number of Case Papers of the Kensington guardians, the Fulham guardians, and the Holborn guardians. I find that practically none returned to the maternity wards; the number is so small that it is hardly worth mentioning.

Good results from "barrack" schools.

14280. This return, Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXVI. (N), is well worth looking at. These figures I understand were furnished you by Mr. Thurnall, the clerk to the Lambeth guardians. The schools they refer to are both of them big schools, are they not?—Yes. The Lambeth schools, West Norwood, are large schools on the block system; they are certified for 664 children.

14281. These figures, if they are correct, are very remarkable, because they show that out of 25,075 inmates of workhouses there were only thirty who had been trained in a Poor Law school, and out of 10,919 inmates of infirmaries, there were only three cases who had been trained in a Poor Law school. That return, remarkable as it is in the results shown, is in conformity with your experience, I understand?—Yes. Poor Law schools have a great advantage in this, that their children are regularly fed—food is such an immense factor in a child's development; they are regularly sent to bed, and they do not run about the streets as the children do who are in London; their sports are wonderfully organised, and they are taught to take such interest in them that their physical education is remarkable.

14282. It is alleged that they have too much done for them in the schools, and that consequently when they go out into practical life they have a difficulty in adapting themselves to circumstances; have you ever heard that complaint?—I have heard that allegation, but I do not attach any importance to it.

14283. You dismiss it?—Yes.

14284. Summarily?—Summarily, because they certainly do not return to the workhouses—and that is the chief point.

14285. As regards cottage homes, you think they want very careful inspection, I understand?—Yes.

Disadvantages of cottage homes.

14286. I suppose you have examined a good many?—Yes, a great many.

14287. Even with strict supervision would you object to them?—I would rather not have them. Of course I would rather have them with strong supervision than not with strong supervision. They are a terrible strain upon the cottage mother. May I give an illustration?

14288. Certainly?—On Saturday I was inspecting a scattered home. I knocked at the door, and after a considerable time an untidy girl came to answer it. I asked for the mother. The house was generally very untidy. The mother was an exceedingly nice person. She had been an ex-pupil teacher under the London School Board. She understood children and she understood how to manage them. She was very fond of all her children, and there was a most excellent tone which one could not help feeling in the house. At the end of my visit, I called her attention to the points which were unsatisfactory—the disorder, the general want of domestic management, and the untidiness of the girls. The poor woman began to cry at once. I said, "Don't cry; I should not be doing my duty if I did not call your attention to these things; I come here to see that a certain standard is kept up." She said "I know that, and I know it too well; I know that all you say is perfectly just, but the strain is something terrible." "I have thirteen children upon my mind from the time I get up in the morning till the time I go to bed at night." A woman with a natural family of nine or ten children knows that when she has brought those children up her family will have grown up and will perhaps help her. But it is not so with the mother of a scattered home, who has thirteen of other people's children to bring up. When the time comes for the first boy or girl to go out into the world, another child is instantly given her, and she has to begin all over again. I do not think that educationally it is good that children should be placed under the care of people who are under strain or who are overtired.

14289. Thirteen is the maximum number, is it not?—No, fifteen is as a rule the maximum, and in some cottage home colonies there are more than that.

14290. Would the mother have to do most of the work?—Yes, she has to do everything.

14291. In the cottage?—Of course the children help, but if a mother in her own home does not feel very well when she wakes in the morning, she has every right to say to her child, "Go down and make me a cup of tea;" but that sort of thing would not be permitted in a scattered home. The mother must do everything, and must be always at work.

14292. Was not the mother you have described to us somewhat exceptional, or do you think she was about the average?—I think that all mothers in such small institutions—for after all they are only small institutions—are more or less tired.

14293. How long has the system been in force?—I suppose about twelve or fifteen years, but I really could not give you an accurate answer.

Difficulty in finding foster mothers for cottage homes.

14294. Have many of the foster-mothers given up work—because that would be a proof, would it not, that they had found it too hard?—I could not answer that question, but I know that it is exceedingly difficult to find foster-mothers. The Kensington and Chelsea guardians advertised not long ago for a cottage mother and very few answered. Hardly anyone was at all suitable, but they finally engaged one, and when the day came she failed to appear. They had then to begin to advertise all over again at an expenditure of from £6 to £8. Women know it is a very hard life, and they do not readily come to it.

14295. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) What does she get for it?—I imagine about £20.

14296. (*Chairman.*) A fixed salary is it?—Yes.

14297. Is everything provided by order for her as regards feeding and so on?—There are different systems.

14298. But she is allowed so much a child?—She does not handle the money; she is as a rule allowed to order from selected tradespeople up to a given sum per child.

Need for raising the minimum age for girls going out to service.

14299. To go to another point, you are rather concerned as to the age at which girls are sent out to service?—Yes, I am very much concerned. I do not think that any girl ought to go out to service before the age I have quoted.

14300. That is fifteen?—Yes.

14301. Of course if these girls were not in a pauper school, but were members of a large family, say, of a labouring man, or a man in receipt of only comparatively small wages, they might go out to work before fifteen?—Yes, that is true, they would. But as a rule a child who comes into a Poor Law school comes in very backward, underfed, having had far too little sleep, and very undeveloped. It takes a year or two to regulate her in that respect. Then there is the education. It is very bad from an educational point of view for children to be over-pressed. There is such a tendency to over-pressure, they must be doing something at every hour, and every hour of the day is fixed and planned beforehand. There is so little of that leisure which brings the child's best development. I think up to the age of fourteen school and play should divide the day, and then there ought to be a year for domestic training before the girls go out to service.

14302. I thought you meant that the pressure upon the children is the pressure due to their going out at an earlier age. If there is undue pressure before fourteen, is that not rather the fault of the curriculum of the school, or do you suggest that it is in order to bring the children up to the level of outside children?—The guardians of a union who send their girls out at fourteen must give them a certain amount of domestic education before they go, and that must affect the procedure in the school. But if it were to be an understood thing that the girls should not go out till fifteen, that would leave a clear year after the girl left school for her to be taught nothing but to do all those things which would make her a servant. I do not like half-timers or half-measures.

14303. Where would these children go? Would you have an intermediate school for them?—Not necessarily. There is plenty of opportunity in the kitchens, laundries, dormitories, needlerooms, the matron's quarters, and in

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

21 May 1906.

other parts of the school, for first-rate domestic education, and I think that a very good domestic education is being given to the girls.

14304. You would simply keep them for a year longer ?—Yes. I had an argument with the Islington guardians not long ago on that subject. I am sorry to say they have arranged for the girls to go out at fourteen.

14305. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Do you not find great difficulty in getting places for the girls at fourteen ?—I think that servants are so difficult to get now that a mistress, especially a London mistress who cannot afford very high wages, will take anything—she will take a dishonest girl.

14306. And then you ruin the girls ?—Of course you do.

14307. So really you have kept your child for ten years in a Poor Law school and you ruin her through not keeping her a year longer ?—Exactly ; you ruin her for lack of that year's training which would qualify her for taking a better situation, and would give her a better chance from the start. It is not economical.

14308. (*Chairman.*) Do you examine the Roman Catholic schools ?—Yes.

Dr. Barnardo's and Waifs and Strays' Homes.

14309. Have you examined any of the Waifs and Strays, and Dr. Barnardo's establishments ?—Yes, all the certified homes in the Metropolitan District.

14310. Have you been satisfied with what you have seen of those homes ?—I think they require a great deal of supervision, but I think they are fairly satisfactory—some are very satisfactory indeed.

14311. They are the schools in which, I assume, Poor Law children have been placed ?—Yes ; they are certified for that purpose.

Inspection of "certified schools."

14312. Do you only examine a school when there are Poor Law children there, or do you examine a school in order to certify ?—I very often go to examine a school to certify ; I think generally I am the inspector who is sent.

14313. In summing up your opinions as regards education I see you state in paragraph 74 some very satisfactory results ; I suppose you want nothing better than that that system should be continued and improved from time to time as the ideas of the day suggest ?—Yes. I am very well satisfied in this direction.

Number of probationer nurses trained at London Hospital.

14314. (*Mr. Booth.*) I have only one question to ask on your most interesting memorandum, and that is to clear up a point which I do not quite understand. In paragraph 32, speaking with regard to the examination for physical fitness in the case of candidates admitted to the London Hospital, you say, "In illustration of this I would state that after medical examination, guaranteeing physical fitness, twenty-eight candidates are admitted every seven weeks by the authorities of the London Hospital to Tredegar House for a month of preliminary training "—that is in effect, four a week on the average ?—Yes.

14315. Then you go on to say, "Such a number of admissions naturally presumes an equal number of discharges." But will not a certain number of admissions for preliminary training imply that they go on to further training ? Why should there be an equal number of discharges out of those who are taken on for the preliminary month, which, I presume, is intended to lead to further training ?—The staff of the London Hospital numbers 603 nurses, and twenty-eight multiplied by seven gives the total of admissions for the year. That would imply that that same number would have to be discharged for private nursing, or to be dealt with as the London hospital deals with them. They do not discharge them, but they keep private nurses on their staff. They would have to dispense with their services in the hospital, or the nurses would have to leave, because their training had come to an end.

After careers of Poor Law Children.

14316. (*Mr. Nunn.*) In Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXVI. (N), you give us the results of education in the Poor Law schools. Although it is your contention that it does not produce application to the Poor Law again, I notice that taking those three years, 1903, 1904, and 1905, the number of such returns steadily goes up ?—That is so.

14317. Do you think that rise is constant, because, if so, it rather tells against the schools ?—I think it is quite accidental. I have carefully noted these cases. They have nearly all been due to some physical defect—either feeble-mindedness, or deafness, or hip disease, or something which has disqualified the child for life.

14318. We have come across this point before in some other departments of our inquiry ; in getting information of this kind, you do not merely take the statement of the persons you find in the workhouse that they were brought up in the Poor Law schools, but I suppose you verify it afterwards ?—How is it possible to verify it ?

14319. By going back to the school ?—I did verify many of the statements in that way. I have had the children looked up in the school books.

14320. So that one can depend upon those figures such as they are ; but they tell a little against your view instead of favouring it, by reason of the increasing number? —Yes.

Disadvantage of Poor Law Children going to Public Elementary Schools.

14321. It is an inquiry in a very small area, and therefore it is hardly worth while dwelling upon it, because it might be refuted by the next set of figures. With regard to the scattered home system, have you found that an objection to it is that the children bring infectious diseases into the home ?—I think wherever the children go out to the neighbouring board schools they bring back a great deal of infection.

14322. That is a matter of observation ?—Yes ; I find that very marked in the intermediate schools where teaching is not done in the establishment.

Type and qualification of foster mother for cottage home.

14323. May I ask how the mothers are selected as a rule, and what is their status in society before they are taken on ?—One of the great weaknesses of the system is that they have had no training. Nearly every woman thinks she can be a cottage mother ; if she can do nothing else, she thinks she can do that.

14324. There is no machinery for training them, is there ?—No. That is where I have tried to show that the Roman Catholic schools are strong. They have their system of training for their sisterhoods, and they do not put women in positions of responsibility until they have been through long and drastic training. I often ask these cottage mothers what their previous experience has been, I remember one cottage mother told me she had lost her mother and then she had lost her aunt, and she did not know what to do, and so she thought she could do this.

Value of State registration for Poor Law nurses.

14325. Turning now to your paragraph on nursing, are you in favour of a system of registration of nurses ?—The question of State registration is such a very serious one and opens so much argument that I would rather not express an opinion upon it otherwise than as I know it would affect the Poor Law nurse.

14326. How would it affect the Poor Law nurse ?—The annual examination by the Central Board previous to State registration would give the nurses from all the hospitals and all the Poor Law infirmaries of the country an equal chance, and it would make it possible for the Gold Medal of the year to be won by a Poor Law nurse. As I know that the training in the Metropolitan Poor Law infirmaries is in many cases equal and in some cases superior to that which is given in the general hospitals, I should naturally welcome State registration as the only way of obtaining for Poor Law nurses the public recognition which I think they deserve, but which they do not get.

Method of selecting Poor Law Nurses.

14327. With regard to the selection of nurses by guardians, I was very pleased to read in paragraph 36 "There is an increasing inclination on the part of boards of guardians to leave the selection of candidates to medical superintendents and matrons." Is it the case with many boards of guardians, do you think, that they leave the selection to the medical officer and matron ?—The greater number are wise enough to do that. Do you not think it wise ?

14328. I think it is excellent, but it is quite new to me ? The medical superintendent is naturally an expert in physique ; and the matron knows well which young woman she can train into a good nurse. There have been many failures, and there are still, with those boards who insist upon retaining that power in their own hands.

14329. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Do the medical superintendent and the matron recommend the name of one person if there is only one vacancy ?—Yes.

14330. And the board appoints that one ?—Yes.

14331. (*Mr. Nunn.*) I think your suggestion about male nurses was rather coupled with the suggestion that there should be separate institutions for cases which could be best dealt with in them ?—Yes. I should like to see that class of men who are so troublesome—it is only a small class—peremptorily placed there, and at the first time they misconduct themselves.

14332. They are not usually suffering from diseases so as to prevent that, are they ?—No.

14333. There is one point with regard to the removal of patients from infirmaries, which in my experience has caused a good deal of trouble. Patients go into one of our Poor Law infirmaries and they are fitted with garments or appliances which the doctor considers necessary for their use, but when they go out again they are suddenly deprived of them ; for instance, a flannel belt or something of that kind, which is really necessary is supplied in the infirmary, and then when the patient is removed it goes back to stock again and the patient goes out, perhaps in mid-winter, without it. Do you know of any method by which a difficulty of that kind might be overcome ?—I think that is a very cruel thing, and I did not know that it was possible.

14334. Do you think that superintendents of infirmaries make paupers presents of such things, or does it come before boards of guardians, who relieve them in that way ?—I have never heard of such an instance.

14335. Do you think that they receive them during their stay in the infirmary, and do you think that having used them they are sent out without them ?—I think that if they are supplied with them, they are sent out with them.

14336. That would be practically giving them extra relief without application to the board ? I am only anxious to know what the system is with boards of guardians ?—I do not quite understand.

14337. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) If it was a medical or surgical appliance, would not the recipient usually be allowed to take it away ?—Such as a splint ? Yes. The patient in many cases would have to take away such an appliance, or would not be able to leave the infirmary.

14338. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) And if it were left behind, the patient would probably come back again to the infirmary ?—It would be against the interest of the medical superintendent, of the matron, of the guardians, and against his own interest ; indeed it would be against everybody's interest for him to leave it behind him.

14339. If it is necessary to his health he must have it ?—Certainly.

14340. (*Mr. Booth.*) While they are in the infirmary they do not wear the clothes in which they came to the infirmary, I suppose ?—No, they do not.

14341. So that apart from anything that can be called a surgical or medical appliance, the clothes supplied there might be much better for their health than those they entered the infirmary in ?—Yes, that is quite true.

14342. And in the clothes in which they entered they have to go away ?—Yes.

14343. (*Mr. Nunn.*) On that second point raised by Mr. Booth, which is perhaps a less aggravated form of the same evil, do you know of any arrangements that are made by nursing committees or boards of guardians to see that patients go out properly clothed ?—No, I do not.

14344. Have you ever had complaints of that kind come before your notice ?—Never.

14345. With regard to some of these committees of women who look after these workhouse girls, I think some are appointed by the guardians and some not ?—They are all permitted by the guardians.

14346. They are added to from the outside, but mainly consist of women guardians, I think ?—Yes.

14347. Have you come across any cases of friction between the women guardians and the women coming in from the outside, or any difficulty with regard to discipline in the workhouse ?—I have never had any complaints of that nature.

14348. Do they work harmoniously on these committees as a rule ?—Yes, I think so.

14349. When these girls leave the workhouse, are they provided permanently with visitors, or do they just go out in the world without the supervision of these befriending societies ? Is it part of the scheme of these societies to aid the workhouse girls ?—The scheme of the Workhouse Girls' Aid Society is really to make good women of them, and I think they do follow them up.

14350. Do they follow them up personally ?—Yes, most of those who help in that way are very devoted women. I think they realise that the after-care is perhaps the most important care of all.

14351. In how many cases—I have not been able to gather it from your memorandum—do the guardians subscribe to the funds, should you say, roughly ?—I could not answer that question.

14352. Some do, do they not ?—Yes, they do.

Observance of Dr. Downes' Memorandum as to Ophthalmia in infants.

14353–4. With regard to the Paper issued by Dr. Downes in reference to ophthalmia, are the regulations pretty generally carried out ?—They are very generally carried out. In some instances the medical superintendent prescribes for each child at birth exactly what is to be done to its eyes, and in some instances the written rules are given to the nurse and she administers whatever is prescribed by them.

Practice of sending some mothers to Workhouses and others to Infirmaries.

14355. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Are we to understand that some unions adopt it as a principle to send lying-in cases into the infirmary and that other unions adopt it as a principle to send them into the workhouse ?—In some cases the maternity ward is the infirmary, and in some cases it is in the workhouse.

14356–7. Do you ever get lying-in cases treated in the workhouse and in the infirmary in the same union ?—Yes ; because sometimes when the maternity ward is in the workhouse and some complication arises after the child's birth, the mother is transferred to the infirmary for further treatment.

14358. I see that in London there were ten of these mothers who died in 1905 ; am I right in supposing that there were only ten of them ?—Yes.

Proposed reorganisation of institutions for dealing with lying in cases.

14359. If you add one to the ten you get a very big rate. I mean to say when you have got such small figures as that to begin with, you may get a tremendous death rate by adding a very few, so that if one or two serious cases are sent into the infirmary it would enormously increase the rate when you are dealing with tiny figures ?—Of course it would.

14360. If some of these cases which are presumed to be going to be serious cases are transferred to the infirmary, then, starting with these very low figures, you would increase your rate in proportion ?—Yes. I can find all that out for you.

14361. We should rather like to have, I think, the unions in which the lying-in cases are treated exclusively in the infirmaries, and those in which they are treated exclusively in the workhouses, and whether as a matter of fact cases are transferred to the infirmaries when they are presumed to be serious ?—I have here a return relating to the maternity wards, which I got out for Dr. Downes a month or so ago, which might answer some of your questions (***handing in same.*** *See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXVI. (O)).

14362–3. I do not quite gather from what you say whether you desire that lying-in cases should be treated in infirmaries or in workhouses ?—I think on the whole I prefer their being placed in workhouses. I think it is better in every way for the woman ; it is considerably more of a disgrace to begin with, and I think that is good.

14364. Do you wish to make it a disgrace ?—I think it ought to be deterrent.

14365–6. On the assumption that it ought to be a disgrace, you wish them to be treated in the workhouses ?—Yes ; I do not think it would do to open the doors too widely.

14367. Do you think that on the whole it is better for the woman—quite apart from the deterrent effect—to go into the workhouse ?—She must go into the workhouse before the birth of her child.

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

21 May 1906.

14368. She does anyhow, does she?—Yes; and it is a great inconvenience sometimes to transfer the mother, especially when the infirmary is at some distance. I think that taking it all round, I do really prefer that the lying-in ward should be in the workhouse.

14369. I see you expressly recommend a lying-in hospital for a certain class of cases?—Yes, I do.

14370. Would the same objection apply to a general lying-in hospital as applies in your mind to a general Poor Law infirmary?—Do you mean its being too easy of access to be deterrent? I only advise that central maternity home for young women applying for maternity relief for the first time. I look upon them as a special class.

14371. Do you think it desirable that those people should not go through the workhouse?—I should not allow them to go through the workhouse or to come under the Poor Law in any way at all. Upon application I should refer them to a ladies' committee, on the lines of the Hampstead ladies' committee, or I should instruct the relieving officer that they were to be sent to a central maternity home under the Poor Law.

14372. That is to say, that all destitute young women lying-in for the first time, you would desire should go to the lying-in hospital?—Yes.

14373. As regards cases which come at frequent intervals, which are the terribly difficult cases to deal with, would you make any distinction between persons who were defective in the sense of being weak-minded, and persons who were perhaps vicious; I mean to say would you segregate weak-minded people more than you would segregate people who were vicious?—Yes, I should, for I think very often the feeble-minded are not at all vicious, but they are exceedingly weak, and they catch up influences and expressions and habits and words to an alarming degree from those who are stronger-minded than themselves.

14374. That would mean, if it was to be any good, that it would be a compulsory detention for life, practically?—Yes, for life.

14375. Does not that same argument hold good with regard to people who are vicious? Why should you let them out on society? Their children may not be unsound in body, but if heredity goes for anything they are unsound in mind?—I could not answer that question.

14376. There does not seem to be any reason why you should not detain these imbecile young women and prevent them having children—which I agree with most heartily; so why should you not detain wilfully vicious women and prevent them having children?—The whole question strikes at the freedom of the subject, does it not?

14377. I quite see that?—I am very clear about the feeble-minded, but I should not like to express an opinion about the others.

14378. It comes to this, that as regards lying-in hospitals those women who come for the first time are to go to special lying-in institutions, and those women who are imbecile and defective and come constantly are to go into separate lying-in institutions?—Yes.

14379. So that there is only left the class of vicious people to go into the workhouses?—And a few respectable married women.

14380. Would you suggest the respectable people should go with the girls who were lying-in with their first child?—I should always give them the chance. I think the number is very small.

14381. Therefore the respectable people would be allocated to this first-time lying-in hospital?—Yes.

14382. So that leaves nothing but the vicious people for the workhouse?—Yes; and for them I should have a very strict rule—no luxuries, no comfort, beyond what was absolutely necessary.

14383. Is it quite fair to the other inhabitants of the workhouse to put those people in? Why should you not segregate them too in another institution?—I am afraid there are a great many of the same kind in the workhouse.

14384. Would you put those people under definite disciplinary regulations?—Yes.

14385. You would not be inclined to compulsorily detain those people?—I would rather not express an opinion upon that point.

Death rate of infants in Poor Law institutions.

14386. With regard to the death rate of infants which you refer to in paragraph 7, does that mean during the first year of life?—During the period spent in the maternity ward.

14387. Have you compared it at all with the normal death rate of the district?—No, I have not.

14388. Then you do not know how it compares?—No.

14389. Could you tell us how many infants there are, because that is important from the point of view of the normal death rate?—I have given it in paragraph 5.

14390. That gives the number of births in the institutions?—Yes, and in paragraph 7 are the corresponding deaths.

Block system of schools.

14391. With regard to the different systems of education, you do not differentiate the block system. The block system seems to be an intermediate between the associated schools and the cottage homes; is that so?—Yes, it is. In one of the appendices I have given the number of children in the blocks of the various schools.

14392. But you do not give us any opinion about the block system?—I do not think it is as dangerous as the cottage homes or the scattered homes, but I do not think it is as good as the associated schools. I think it is very much less dangerous than the smaller systems.

14393. Your conclusion about the associated schools is rather startling?—I know it is a heresy.

Advantage of barrack schools.

14394. I was not saying that it is a heresy, but that it is rather startling. Could you say anything more to explain exactly what you mean by believing this so strongly? Do you think that the whole indictment of barrack schools falls to the ground?—All—absolutely. When I am asked that question, I first of all think what I should wish for my children if I were a working woman and I were dying and leaving them to the public to bring up. I should certainly wish that they should be sent to an associated school. Then I try to think of myself as a child and wonder which I should be the happiest and the best in. I should certainly wish to go to an associated school. It is a happier, brighter, freer, breezier life. It is full of interest. The cottage home, especially the scattered home, is very often exceedingly dull.

Disadvantages of cottage and scattered homes.

14395. But there is a great difference between a cottage home and a scattered home. I noticed that your illustration of the tired-out mother was from a scattered home?—Yes, but that applies to cottage homes as well.

14396. In the case of cottage homes surely they have a system of relief; the mother, for instance, goes out once a week, and there is an odd mother kept?—Yes; there are relief mothers attached to every group of scattered homes. The strain is perhaps less acute upon the mother in the cottage home colony. One can never make up to the children for the great loss of their own home and their own parents, but there are many advantages in the associated school which the children in the cottage homes and the scattered homes can never have; for instance, there is the swimming bath.

14397. The cottage homes have a swimming bath at Chorlton?—Yes, they have, but some cottage colonies and scattered homes have not.

14398. Very much of what you say applies only to the scattered homes, I think?—I think scattered homes are much the less satisfactory, but I think the cottage homes have very many fewer advantages than the associated school.

14399. In the cottage homes they have swimming baths and workshops, indeed they have all sorts of things?—Yes, they have.

The advantage the Poor Law child.

14400. You are of opinion that the Poor Law child on the whole turns out better than the child of the same class which is not a Poor Law child?—Yes, I am; because I think that physical education and physical strength are great factors in a successful adult age, and the children in the Poor Law schools are admirably fed, sent to bed early instead of being up at night, and are well clothed and kept occupied, and they are exceedingly happy.

14401. When you talk of the home being such an advantage, you are talking of the ideal home, and not

of the home of that particular class, because in a home of that particular class you may rightly say that the children stay up till ten or eleven o'clock at night?—Yes.

14402. So that when you are comparing it with the home, it is not with the home of the class to which that child belongs?—It is with the good home of the class to which that child belongs.

14403. But not the average home?—No.

ss of lic Poor schools.

14404. I gather you think that the Catholic schools are particularly successful in their effect on the children?—Yes, I do. I think they are managed by women who have given up the whole of their lives to it, and who have been prepared by drastic training for it. Then there is the fact that the system adopted for the management of the school does not come to an end when a Reverend Mother is withdrawn or dies, but is at once carried on by someone educated on the same principles and perhaps even more adept and clever than she has been.

14405. That is to say, where you get a religious order looking after education, you get continuity of good?—You get continuity of good, which you can get in no other way.

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

21 May 1906.

14406. Do you especially think that is so with respect to the education of girls, in other words, that the Orders are particularly successful with the girls?—I think they are particularly successful with the girls, and I think they are wonderfully successful with the boys. It was a very bold experiment to put into the hands of Sisters of Mercy, St. Mary's, North Hyde, certified for 697 boys, which had been allowed to get into a very unsatisfactory condition by a brotherhood who did not know how to manage the schools. The boys now have carried off the shields for football and for cricket from all the metropolitan schools; the schools have been re-organised, the boys are in good hands, the discipline is excellent, and the schools are thriving.

14407. On the whole, would you say that the Catholic schools are on a very high level?—I think they are on a very high level. I think the Catholics are great eductionists. I am not a Catholic myself.

THIRTY-FOURTH DAY.

Tuesday, 22nd May, 1906.

AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE, DOWNING STREET, S.W.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, G.C.S.I., etc., etc., etc. (*Chairman*).

The Right Hon. Sir HENRY A. ROBINSON, K.C.B.
The Right Hon. CHARLES BOOTH, F.R.S.
Sir SAMUEL B. PROVIS, K.C.B.
Mr. F. H. BENTHAM.
Mr. FRANCIS CHANDLER.
Dr. A. H. DOWNES.
The Rev. T. GAGE GARDINER.
Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY.
Mr. C. S. LOCH.
Mr. J. PATTEN-MACDOUGALL.
Mr. T. HANCOCK NUNN.
The Rev. L. R. PHELPS.
Professor WILLIAM SMART.
The Rev. H. RUSSELL WAKEFIELD.
Mrs. BERNARD BOSANQUET.
Mrs. SIDNEY WEBB.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL.

Mr. R. H. A. G. DUFF (*Secretary*).
Mr. J. JEFFREY (*Assistant Secretary*).

Miss INA STANSFELD, re-called; and further Examined.

t death in Poor institu-

14408. (*Mrs. Webb.*) I want to ask you about the death rate of infants; looking at the total number of deaths of infants and the number born, it is an amazingly low death rate. I make it out to be between 40 and 50 per 1,000. The average death rate is, I think, about 150, and the death rate amongst that class in those districts would be about 250. If this really represents the deaths of infants in the first year it is only about 40 or 50 per 1 000, which is an amazing result?—Do you refer to the death rate of infants contained in my memorandum?

14409. Yes; you have the number of infants dying and the number of infants born, and it works out, if those figures are correct, at something between 40 and 50 per 1,000 for the different years, which is an amazingly low death rate?—It is an amazingly low death rate. I believe those figures are absolutely accurate.

14410. My only doubt is whether you were really calculating the first year; if it was only for the first two months it would be amazing?—It is for the first month.

14411. You said it was for the first year?—I ought not to have said so; it was for the first month.

14412. Even then it is very low. Could you give it us rather more accurately? Could you find out whether it is for the first month or for the period which those infants inhabited the workhouse, which I rather suspect it is?—It is for the period for which those infants were in the maternity wards.

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

22 May 1906.

14413. That might not be the first month, it might be the first three months?—No, it is the first month.

14414. I want to clear that up. It is very likely that it is the number that die in the workhouse before the mother takes her discharge, which she might do in a month or in three months. All I should like brought out is, taking the real death rate apart from the period death rate, taking the real comparison, whether the infants born in workhouses and infirmaries have an enormous advantage from the point of view of survivorship. Would it be possible for us to get those statistics, first, as regards the comparison of the death rate with the ordinary death rate of that class in that district; and also in comparison with the death rate of infants belonging to mothers who are given outdoor relief when they are lying-in. I think those are very important points? I think I could get those statistics. [Miss Stansfeld subsequently replied as follows:—"I have endeavoured to ascertain the ordinary "death rate but am informed by the Registrar General that "he his unable to furnish me with the death rates of infants "under one month of age."]

14415. (*Mr. Booth.*) Are the cases followed up at all? Do you know what happens after the first month? If they leave the workhouse after the first month, do you at all know what happens to the mother and child,

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

22 May 1906.

say, during the next six or eight months?—Many of the ladies on the Girls' Aid Committees help the girls, and they do follow the girls up very closely and see how they are going on.

14416. There is no information you could bring forward about that?—I gave some information on that point in my appendix on that subject. I could also obtain more information quite definitely if you wish for it.

14417. I think it would be rather important if it proves that the death rate is very low while under the charge of the guardians, because therefore, presumably, the child left in a good condition, and it would be very interesting to know whether after that time there is possibly an exceptionally high number for the rest of the year?—I will if possible obtain that information. [Miss Stansfeld subsequently replied as follows:—"I have been unable to "obtain information as to the death rate of infants after "discharge from the maternity wards and after the mothers "have taken their discharge from the workhouse."]

Duties of lady assistant inspector.

14418. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In your memorandum you do not specify very definitely your duties as an assistant inspector?—My duties have never really been very clearly specified. I am the assistant inspector for the Metropolis, and I assist the inspectors in both the districts: the district north of the Thames, and the district south of the Thames. My special duties have, I think I may say, lain in the maternity wards, in the workhouse nurseries, in the inspection of the nursing of the infirmaries, and of the schools; those duties being such as are specially women's work.

14419. And cottage homes?—Yes, they come under the schools.

14420. Do you deal with children boarded-out within the union at all?—No, I have nothing to do with children boarded-out.

Meaning of "infirmary" and "hospital" in different parts of the country.

14421. The word, "infirmary," as you use it, applies absolutely to the workhouse nursing institutions, is that not so?—Entirely.

14422. The word "hospital," when you use it, applies to voluntary institutions?—Yes, St. Bartholomew's, St. Thomas' and the like.

14423. Exactly the opposite is the case in the north, I think?—Yes.

Attractiveness of maternity wards in Poor Law infirmaries.

14424. You seem to point out a danger in having maternity wards connected with the infirmaries because of their attractiveness. It might be an encouragement for people to avail themselves of these wards because they are situated in the infirmaries you say; and you instance a case of a married woman who availed herself of the maternity ward who ought not to have done so; is that not so?—Yes.

14425. You recommend the establishment of a maternity institution which might be, as I understand, a joint institution for all the London boards?—Yes. I recommend that all the young women applying for maternity relief for the first time, should be provided for in a special and central maternity institution. I further recommend that this need having been supplied, the discipline of the workhouse and infirmary maternity wards should be greatly increased—that they should be depleted of all luxuries and conducted on hard and plain lines deterrent to the undesirables and the vicious characters who, at the expense of the ratepayers too often make use of them. If this were done it would surely be necessary to make some special provision, duly safe-guarded for the very small class of respectable married women, *bona fide* deserted wives, or women suffering from extreme poverty. It is well known that the best administered unions are those whose guardians make the most searching investigations into the characters and circumstances of the applicants for relief. The better classification of applicants for maternity relief must depend upon increased individualising efforts, and the institution by each union of a ladies' committee, such as that at Hampstead—so long as London is not unified for the purposes of Poor Law administration, which unification would at once initiate a readjustment of the principles of relief.

Proposed new central institution for maternity cases and its effect.

14426. And the object of that institution is, if I understand you aright, to take in those first cases, and also, you say, so that respectable married women might avail themselves of the institution?—Yes.

14427. Then you are not afraid of an institution of that class, if it were formed, attracting women of a respectable class to it? Would it not rather tend in that direction?—It might possibly tend in that direction to a very small degree; but I think that the feeling is very strong, so far, in the minds of the women of the working class, that it is rather a social disgrace to accept help from the Poor Law under any condition. They would feel it much less than applying to the workhouse, as they feel it very much less applying to the infirmary than applying to the workhouse.

14428. They would feel it much less applying to be admitted to an institution of this kind than they would to an infirmary, would they not?—Yes.

14429. Therefore, it is making it easier?—I have ventured to suggest that I should like to see the methods adopted by the Hampstead guardians adopted all over London. The amount of education ladies on committees of that kind can give to the women is great; showing them how to help themselves and how to prevent themselves coming upon the rates. Such a committee must always be a great protection against the undue use of the Poor Law maternity institutions.

14430. In the case of the person you mention who refused such assistance because of the good treatment she had heard of in the workhouse infirmary?—Yes, it does take a little time, I think, to educate a neighbourhood.

14431. Do you not think there would be less chance of educating people to apply to other institutions if a separate home, such as you suggest, was established under the Poor Law?—I suggested that that institution should be primarily established for young women applying for maternity relief in the first instance, and I should always hope that it would exist mainly for them. The number of cases of *bona fide* respectable married women I do not think would be very great. It is always possible, of course, to institute charges.

Power to recover cost of maternity cases in Poor Law institutions.

14432. Under the Poor Law?—I think in that case the Hampstead Board, finding that the woman had applied after all to be taken to the infirmary, charged her husband 10s., half the doctor's fee, 8s. a week maintenance in the infirmary; 34s. in all; there is a balance due of 10s. for which a county court summons has been taken out. I think I am right in saying the Kensington guardians have made charges.

14433. They cannot institute a charge, can they; they can only enforce repayment; there is a difference, is there not?—I ought to have called it enforcing a repayment.

14434. There is a distinction there which ought to be noted?—Yes.

14435. (*Mrs. Webb.*) Do they take paying patients? Do they willingly accept anyone who is ready to pay the cost, as they do in lunatic asylums?—I am sorry I cannot answer that question.

14436. They do that in pauper lunatic asylums?—Yes.

Difficulties to proposed central institution for maternity cases.

14437. (*Mr. Bentham.*) I want to point out that the danger you wish to avoid by having a lying-in ward in a workhouse in preference to one in an infirmary would probably be enormously enhanced by the provision of a separate establishment which is to be a more desirable establishment even than an infirmary, it being apart altogether from either workhouse or infirmary. There may be a danger, but I think it would be more than counter-balanced by the benefits which would result from saving the younger women from evil influences, and as I have said, it is primarily in their interests that I make the recommendation.

14438. Do you think that could be practically carried out? Boards of guardians, of course, differ in their view as to the kind of case they would probably desire to send there; and it is rather unlikely that you could get a number of boards of guardians to join who would carry out explicitly the view that you have of only selecting that particular kind of case; there would be a danger of their sending all the cases, would there not?—Yes, but some conditions of admission would need to be instituted.

14439. Particularly if they had to pay their share of the cost on any other basis than on the number of persons sent. They would want to avail themselves of the advantages which they were paying for? They would ultimately send all the cases if it paid them to do so. Do you not think it would tend in that direction?

—I think in shaping any new scheme dangers always crop up which one hardly realises beforehand, they have to be met and handled as they arise.

14440. Do you think your recommendation avoids the danger which you point out exists by providing for such cases in an infirmary ?—No.

14441. It is not made with that object ?—No, it is made primarily to provide greater seclusion and more helpful assistance to young women who come for the first time.

orkhouses th lying-in ards.

14442. Are there any lying-in wards in workhouses as apart from the infirmaries, where the infirmary is at a distance from the workhouse ?—Yes.

14443. Where are they ?—St. Pancras and Marylebone.

14444. St. Pancras is quite an infirmary on the workhouse site; there is a matron of the infirmary also, a resident medical officer ?—Yes; perhaps St. Pancras is not a good one to quote, but I was rather thinking of the infirmary at Dartmouth Park Hill and the workhouse near King's Cross. Marylebone, of course, is some distance.

14445. Are there no other kind of sick cases on the workhouse site than lying-in cases ?—Do you mean in the case of the Marylebone infirmary or St. Pancras infirmary ?

14446. In the case of Marylebone ?—Yes, there are sick wards.

14447. Therefore, it is really an infirmary, is it not ?—No, it is a workhouse.

14448. Have they a resident medical officer ?—No.

14449. Have they a matron of the sick ward apart from the workhouse matron ?—They have a superintendent nurse.

14450. Then it is quite an infirmary, is it not ?—No, it is a very large workhouse; it is an unusually large workhouse and there are perhaps an unusual number of infirm in the workhouse sick wards.

14451. I want to get exactly what you meant by a workhouse in that case, whether it is a lying-in ward in a workhouse which is an able-bodied workhouse with no other sick cases there; did you mean that ?—I meant a lying-in ward in a workhouse.

14452. Even though there might be no other sick cases there ?—Whether there are, or whether there are not.

ossibility of tending efulness of oluntary ing-in stitutions.

14453. In your appendix (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXVI. (O), you give a list of the lying-in institutions in London. Do you think those institutions could be made useful to the extent of taking the cases which you would recommend to be sent to a special home that you suggest being formed ?—I think if that method were taken up firmly and with enthusiasm they could be made to meet it, perhaps entirely.

14454. You think with organisation all the cases you have mentioned might be dealt with outside the Poor Law ?—Yes, that would meet all that I wish, because what I want is that the young women should never be allowed to get accustomed to workhouse ways or workhouse society.

ttitude of ntral Midives Board wards Poor aw stitutions training hools.

14455. You mention in your memorandum the Central Midwives Board and the fact that they refused the application of the Whitechapel Guardians to have their infirmary recognised as a training school for midwives; is that not so ?—That is so.

14456. And you refer to some structural defects; were those defects serious enough to warrant the board in refusing ?—In my opinion they were not.

14457. Do you think there is in the minds of the Central Midwives Board a prejudice against workhouse institutions ?—I think there is.

14458. Have you evidence of it in any other London infirmaries ?—I could not answer that question.

14459. Have any of the others been refused sanction ?—Yes.

14460. Could you name them ?—Bethnal Green has applied; it is not yet settled. Camberwell applied and there has been no result, except that a medical man has been to inspect. Chelsea has not applied. Croydon has applied and been accepted. Fulham has applied and been accepted. St. George's, Hanover Square (Wallis Yard), has not applied. St. George's-in-the-East: the medical officer made application to be recognised as a teacher, but he was refused, which naturally he took "as a gratuitous insult, and has therefore lost all interest in the matter." Lewisham: recognition promised, after carrying out the regulations as to the details of the ward work. Greenwich: granted. Hackney: the clerk of the board is in communication at the present time. Hampstead: the medical officer has applied for recognition as a teacher and has received no reply. Holborn: there is not sufficient accommodation. Islington has not applied. Kensington is recognised. Lambeth applied and was refused. Lambeth is one of our best lying-in wards.

14461. And that was refused ?—Yes; City of London (Thavies Inn), was refused. Marylebone Mile End and Bermondsey have not applied. Paddington: application made and refused. St. Pancras, Poplar, Richmond (Surrey) and Southwark (Newington) have not applied. Shoreditch: application has been made and the medical man or representative of the Central Midwives Board has made an exhaustive inspection of the wards. Stepney, Strand, Strand (Bear Yard) and Wandsworth have not applied. West Ham has been sanctioned by the Central Midwives Board. Westminster: no application. Whitchapel: letter received and permission declined owing to structural defects in the ward. Woolwich has not applied; it did not consider the number sufficient. I may say that the midwifery in Whitechapel, ever since I have been in office, has been extremely satisfactory.

Poor Law provision for female lock cases.

14462. You have referred in your memorandum to the lock wards in the London unions; are those usually provided for women separately from the other patients ?—I think that the arrangements for the reception of female lock patients in the metropolitan institutions leave a good deal to be desired. In a good many workhouses there are wards set apart for such patients, combined with those who are suffering from "scabies," which is a skin disease; and in one or two of the infirmaries there are female lock wards.

14463. Do you advocate separate wards ?—That is a very difficult question to answer—there are so many *pros* and *cons*. I do not advocate such patients being scattered about the general wards: I should prefer to see all young girls under twenty withdrawn entirely from the Metropolitan Poor Law institutions and treated in an institution, perhaps just outside London, where prolonged treatment, and what I think is much more important, prolonged influence could be brought to bear.

14464. Do you find that the common ward there has the same dangers that you find with regard to the common ward for maternity cases ?—Very much so indeed.

14465. Do you advocate detention in any of these cases ?—I could not answer that question.

Children suffering from measles and whooping cough in adult wards of Poor Law infirmaries.

14466. You have referred to the children that are in the adult wards of infirmaries. Is it usual to provide separate wards or separate detached buildings for infectious cases, such as measles and whooping cough ?—No, it is not—not separate detached buildings.

14467. The usual method is to scatter those children who are suffering from infection about the adult wards to avoid contact with the other children ?—It is the only method possible under the existing provisions.

Proposed separate institutions for infant [infectious] diseases.

14468. You think that is undesirable ?—I think it is always undesirable to have children among adult patients. I do not think that the presence of the adult sick is ever good for children, and I think as the children regain health their turbulence disturbs the adult sick, and when they are very ill their crying does. I should like to see all children withdrawn from metropolitan infirmaries where there are no children's wards.

14469. How would you have them dealt with ?—I should have four houses taken, north, south, east and west of the Metropolis for the reception of measles. It is not at all good to move a child too far when the measles has already established itself sufficient for diagnosis. I should have whooping cough dealt with in the same way as ringworm and ophthalmia are dealt with by the Metropolitan Asylums Board—I mean to say, in such institutions. Whooping cough lasts a very long time; education during that time is necessary, and if the child does not receive education a great deal of time is wasted.

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

22 May 1906.

Schools on the block system.

14470. You have described the various methods of dealing with healthy children. I do not see the distinction between what you term schools on the block system and cottage home colonies?—There is a great distinction. When an associated school is broken up into blocks the blocks receive a large number of children: quite too many to be compared in any kind of way with the largest cottage; and we have some very large cottages—too large.

14471. In some cases the houses which are provided on what you call the block system will have about forty or fifty children; does not that often obtain in the case of a cottage home colony?—No, not in a cottage home.

14472. Is that the only distinction—that there are a larger number in each cottage?—The blocks are not cottages at all—they are sections of a large building.

14473. It is an old barrack school divided up?—No, it is a school built for that special purpose.

14474. You have an objection, I think, to scattered homes?—Yes, I have.

Disadvantage of cottage homes for children.

14475. One reason you gave yesterday was that the mother who might not feel so well in the morning, when it is time to get up and look after the children, cannot have the comfort of a cup of tea brought to her bedroom, and cannot remain in bed longer than is usual; she must get up and attend to the children, whatever her state of health. Can she have those comforts that you desire her to have under any other system?—No. I think I mentioned that in connection with the mother of the scattered home whom I found one day last week working under great strain, and I was endeavouring to show that the scattered home is not really a home: that the mother of a family of her own could say to one of the older children, "Get up, and go down and make me a cup of tea, I am not very well this morning," but I venture to hope that no mother at the head of a scattered home would ever presume or expect such a thing to be done.

14476. The connection is between the idea in the child's mind as to what is a mother, and the idea in a mother's mind as to the duties of the child; her own child would do it, but she would not ask a child in a cottage home to do it?—Yes.

14477. Is that really so, do not all these little affectionate attentions enter into cottage home life?—They are necessarily limited, and I think that the size of the families in the cottage homes brings about many restrictions along those lines.

Proper number of children for a cottage home.

14478. What are the numbers that you had in mind at the scattered home that you take exception to?—The scattered home which I visited last week was certified for fifteen, I found in it thirteen. Personally I do not think that any cottage home should be certified for more than six children, if one woman alone is expected to take care of them.

14479. You think the nearer it approximates to the size of a real home the more likely it is to be successful?—That is what I mean.

14480. Your objection is principally to the size of the home and the unreal family life?—It could never be real where there are fifteen to twenty children mothered by one woman, and the number always kept up.

Advantages of large Poor Law schools.

14481. Is there not an advantage in this way that these children get in touch with the child life of the neighbourhood, although they have not swimming baths, cricket fields and so on, they still have the same advantage that people have of the same rank by sharing in the public provision of these things?—I do not think they have.

14482. As the training they receive in a large school? No, there is so much *esprit de corps* in a school, and I am glad to say that in our metropolitan schools on the Associated system, sports and games and activity are the order of the day. I cannot conceive any better counteractant of the pauper heredity of idleness.

14483. In dealing with the children in bulk it is not likely that any attendant can get to understand the child, and its little idiosyncrasies, and its temper, having so many children to deal with, as a foster mother can in a cottage home with a few children?—I do not quite agree there. I have known officers in our schools and I know officers in our schools to-day, who do get to know their children. I am quite sure that the mother in a scattered home who has to take care of fifteen to twenty children has not much time to get to know the idiosyncrasies of her children.

14484. You think it is an advantage for child life that it should get up to the ringing of a bell, it should have its breakfast announced by the same process, and dinner and all the rest of the meals of the day?—Yes I do not see any objection to the ringing of a bell.

Advantages of boarding-out for children.

14485. With regard to boarding-out, you have no opinion, have you?—I have indeed. I think that when boarding out is good it is ideal, quite the best system that the State can possibly adopt, but when it is not good it is fatal.

14486. On the ground I suppose that the child gets absorbed into the community more readily by that process, it being done in early life, than by any other method of dealing with children?—I think in an ideal boarded-out home, the child really becomes one of the family. I do think under those conditions that the child is likely to be understood and to develop as a natural and ordinary child would do, but boarding out can never deal with more than a comparative few of the number of children for whom the State has to provide.

Need for high class personnel in institutions for children.

14487. There are drawbacks in the same way to a large school are there not, that we might get an undesirable person as the head of the establishment. Take the Brentwood case for instance. You remember that, do you not?—I have heard of it.

14488. The person there got five years' penal servitude for cruelty?—That case occurred before I was appointed. That leads up to an expression which I should like to give, and that is that I do not mind really so very much which system is adopted if the *personnel* of the administrator is all that can be desired. All the systems depend upon those who administer, more than upon their methods.

14489. There must be a difference in principle in the different methods that are in vogue; with boarding out you admit that the child is more readily absorbed into the community and becomes one of the family and has a home, that is different entirely to any kind of training it can possibly have in a large institution, therefore, it is different in that respect, and, in a lesser degree probably, scattered homes have a tendency to get the children absorbed into ordinary society. You agree to that distinction, do you?—No, I do not think I do agree with that distinction. I think the children in scattered homes are exceedingly marked and set apart. For instance, in the house of a natural mother the front door is generally open; the door of a scattered home is always hermetically closed; the steps are scrupulously clean, and there are a great many institutional distinctions which apply to the children as well.

14490. There again it is management, is it not?—You mean it depends on the mother.

14491. Yes.—I suppose it does.

Difficulty in obtaining proper foster-mothers for children.

14492. With regard to the training of foster mothers you said that there ought to be some method of training the foster mothers who will take care of the children in a scattered home. Yes.

14493. That would apply to the block system or to the cottages in a colony, would it not?—It would certainly apply to cottage homes, whether in colony or whether scattered.

14494. Do you find that suitable foster mothers can be so well obtained in the south?—No, I believe there is very universal difficulty in finding the right women. There really is no doubt that that is a very serious difficulty.

14495. Do you find that obtains elsewhere, say in the north of England?—I do not know anything of the working of the system in other parts of England as to cottage homes.

Advantages of large Poor Law schools.

14496. (*Professor Smart.*) With regard to schools, your principle evidently is that the boarding school system which we approve with regard to children of the upper classes should be extended as far as possible to the pauper children?—Yes.

14497. At what age do you send them to the associated homes?—Three years of age.

14498. That is rather earlier than we care to send our own children to boarding schools, is it not ?—Yes.—But in the associated schools there are infants' departments where the little ones are kept entirely apart and are, as a rule, under the care of expert nurses, so that they do not really bear the brunt of mixing with the older boys and girls. They have charming nurseries, very suitable food and a programme of their own, and they mix hardly at all with the older ones. Boarding schools for our own class do not make provision for infants.

14499. Still one could quite well approve of the boarding school system for grown-up children, and strongly disapprove of it for young children, if it could possibly be aranged otherwise. I cannot help thinking that there is rather a contradiction between your statement that the boarding-out system is your ideal, and at the same time your speaking so strongly for the boarding school system with regard to associated schools ?—I think the boarding-out system is excellent where it is good, but I know the boarding-out system can only deal with a nominal number of the children the State has to provide for, therefore some provision must be made for a very large number, and in making that provision I must say that I do prefer an associated school and such treatment for the boys as is given by the training ship "Exmouth," off Grays, on the Thames.

Wisdom of provision for certain maternity cases by voluntary institutions.

14500. You speak of the efforts made by the Church Army, the Salvation Army, Rescue Societies, and so on, rendering assistance to women and making provision for them outside the workhouse. Those, of course, are women who otherwise would have to go to the workhouse ?—Yes, they are women who are in need.

14501. Is it not desirable that maternity cases should, so far as possible, be dealt with by private charity?—Always, I think.

14502. You are very strong on that ?—I feel that very strongly indeed; I also feel that the more Poor Law authorities and boards of guardians will co-operate with the volunatry charities the better will it be for the girls who are treated, and of course the better for the rates.

14503. I rather thought you had strong views on the deterrent influences of the maternity wards, for example, and where you approve of the Church Army, Salvation Army and so on, you consider them from the ground simply of the feelings of the applicants. There is no disgrace attaching to a person who goes to one of the Salvation Homes, for instance ?—No.

14504. Yet I think you were rather strong that there should be some disgrace ?—No, not for young women applying for the first time. I feel very strongly that many of them have been more sinned against than sinning, and they need discreet and wisely administered help.

14505. I am glad to get your opinion, so far, as to the superiority of private charity over the workhouse treatment ?—It is not because I think such girls are not well looked after in workhouse wards, because I think the influence brought to bear by the matrons and nurses working at any rate in the maternity wards of the Metropolis is excellent. It is entirely because of the companionship of *habituées* and women of bad, and not only bad, but dangerous, character, that I think that such young women should be kept out at any cost.

14506. (*Mr. Bentham.*) That can scarcely be avoided in the workhouse ?—You cannot avoid it.

Indoor relief to women with babies and its duration.

14507. (*Professor Smart.*) You speak in your memorandum of the young mother who elects to remain with her child during the first few months of life. Is that possible ?—Yes.

14508. By paying, I suppose ?—There is no payment. She simply remains in the house as an able-bodied woman.

14509. She can remain in the house as long as she likes ?—She can remain in the house till she takes her discharge.

14510. Exactly like an ordinary pauper ?—I have never known the guardians turn anyone out.

14511. (*Mr. Booth.*) Is that without limit of time ? Do you mean they would not turn her out after a year ?—They are never turned out until they take their discharge.

14512. (*Miss Hill.*) Is that so, even if they are strong and able to earn ?—Perhaps a lady may find them a place, but I do not think the guardians turn them out.

14513. (*Mr. Booth.*) If a woman had a baby outside, and after six months she was still able-bodied, would she be allowed to come into the workhouse ? Where does the destitution come in ?—What is destitution ? A woman who is going to work may come to the end of her week's wages and may be destitute. She has got through the last few shillings she earned, she is destitute.

14514. Is every woman who has a child with her to support necessarily destitute ? That gives an entirely new conception of destitution. (*Miss Hill.*) Is it because it is difficult to prove that she can support herself and the child ?—As Mr. Nunn has said to me, the theory of the English Poor Law is that you test the ability or the inability of able-bodied men and women to work by using the workhouse test; that is supposed to be a sufficient deterrent in itself to prevent any able-bodied persons who could maintain themselves out of doors accepting that.

14515. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In that respect they are treated like all other inmates of the house, that is, they remain in, unless there is somebody who takes an interest to get them out, or the guardians ask them to take their discharge ?—Exactly so, and they remain among the able-bodied.

The circumstances of women using the Poor Law maternity wards.

14516. (*Professor Smart.*) In your memorandum you speak about the factory girls of Stepney and so on. I suppose that you would say that, with the current rate of wages which these women earn, it would be quite impossible for them to pay their own maternity expenses ?—I should think absolutely impossible.

14517. Do you mean the married women as well ?—When a married woman works in a factory, one naturally presumes that her husband is also working, and that their wages conjointly ought to be able to produce the payment.

14518. Of those cases you mention, the factory girls for example, and the other class which I see you mention, namely the theatrical and music hall profession, is a large proportion that of single women ?—Yes.

14519. It is rather an unpleasant question, but I think it must be asked. You have made yourself acquainted with the antecedents of these factory girls as far as possible, I suppose ?—I have not time to make myself acquainted with the antecedents of individual women in the ward. Do you mean to say their circumstances ?

14520. Yes. Have you thought anything, for example, of the connection of low wages with immorality ?—No, I have not.

14521. Do you consider, as a class, these girls are the victims of circumstances, of passion, or of necessary conditions attaching to low wages ?—Of defective education and insufficient home protection very often, I think.

14522. Do you not think that these low wages, especially in the case of warehouse girls, are very often supplemented by the wages of immorality ?—I do not think that it is so in quite so low and poor a class as that, but I am afraid in the rather better class of working girls in London that is so.

14523. I have been very much struck by the emphasis you give to the theatrical and music hall profession. Had you any particular reason for mentioning that ?—No, I only mention that in all the maternity wards I find a small proportion, not a very large proportion. They are generally very homeless and look very sad and lonely.

14524. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) They are very badly paid too ?—Yes.

Possibility of making maternity relief deterrent.

14525. (*Professor Smart.*) You speak of the deterrent policy adopted by at least one union. Would you mind telling us what you mean by the deterrent policy ?—Not making the maternity wards too pleasant.

14526. Under a definite policy ?—A definite policy not to make the maternity ward too pleasant, or to give the patients any comforts they could do without.

14527. Have you heard any expression of the principle on which they do that, and why they do it ?—It is, I think, because the board which adopts that policy wishes to do everything possible to discourage the young women from coming in a second time. They feel those little differences

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

22 May 1906.

very much. In one of the maternity wards there is an old nurse who has been there very many years. She is an exceedingly kind woman, and if she thinks a patient is not very well and she is making a cup of tea for herself after lunch, she will say to the patient: "I am going to make a cup of tea for myself, I will make one for you too"; and she makes it and takes it to her. I generally find that ward pretty full. I am quite sure that there is a system of telegraphy among the Metropolitan paupers, and that they readily find out where they receive such little attentions and where they do not.

Metropolitan maternity homes.

14528. You speak of Metropolitan maternity homes; what are these?—By a Metropolitan maternity home, I mean those of which I have given a list in my Appendix III. They represent voluntary charities.

14529. Always?—Yes.

Degree of feeble-mindedness of unmarried mothers in workhouses.

14530. With regard to the 75 per cent. of the feeble-minded that you spoke of, you do not mean simply stupid, feckless, and unintelligent people, but you mean people whom you would definitely say are feeble-minded?—No, I do not mean people whom I should say definitely were feeble-minded. I mean young women who entirely lack the power of self-support in life and who are not mentally up to the average. One meets such people in all classes.

14531. You do not mean people who are what we call in Scotland "wanting"?—Well, not very bright.

14532. Exactly?—There is a great difference between "not very bright" and "wanting," is there not? There is a distinct line, is there not?

The workhouse routine for mothers with babies.

14533. You use the words "feeble-minded class," but the class of stupid women and unintelligent women, I am afraid, is enormously large compared with the feeble-minded. With regard to the workhouse nurseries, how far is it compulsory on the mothers to spend the greater part of the time in those nurseries?—When a mother is discharged from the maternity ward and elects to remain in the workhouse she is at once put to able-bodied work, and as a rule pretty hard work, in the laundry, for instance, and she assists the upkeep of the institution by her laundry work, or she will go and work in the scullery. Then there are only stated times, such times beyond the hours when she has to be at work, that she is allowed to be with the child in the nursery. She sleeps with her child.

14534. And that is all?—Yes.

14535. After work where does the child go, with the mother in the ordinary common sitting-room?—To the nursery.

14536. Always?—Yes.

14537. She can only see the child in the nursery?—Yes.

14538. She cannot take it into the house?—No.

Disadvantages of cottage homes as compared with Poor Law schools.

14539. (*Miss Hill.*) I am extremely interested in your opinion as to the relative merits of the small homes and the schools, because it rather bears out my own impression; not that I am at all an authority upon the matter. May I ask whether your opinion is at all based on the feeling that in the small homes, if any evil does come into them, there is very much less possibility or chance of its becoming known?—Very, very much less, and I think that the dangers involved in those small bedrooms of conversation and undesirable anecdotes or experience related, which the children have witnessed before their admission, are so insurmountable and so great and important that cottage homes should be put out of court altogether on that point alone.

14540. That would have been my impression very much, but, quite independent of the *brio* and stimulus and animation of the school, the greater support to the teachers and officials of meeting one another is also better for the children?—Yes, it reflects very much.

14541. You really would feel there would be a danger in the smaller groups?—An intense danger.

14542. And in the small bedrooms?—Yes.

14543. Because, of course, these children have seen many things which children ought not to be talking about?—Of course they have; they have frequented the common lodging-houses; I know of an instance which occurred where the orphans of a respectable joiner and his wife who, as working people, had given their children every advantage and guarded them carefully and brought them up well; those children were left orphans suddenly, and they were sent to one of our Metropolitan schools on the cottage home colony system. They were two little girls, and they were put to sleep in one bedroom. Classification is very difficult when you have large numbers to deal with, and in a week or so there came along a girl about their age, who had been dragged about common lodging-houses by her parents, and who knew as much evil as most grown-up people know, and in two or three days she had told those children such terrible things that they were talking about it in the home and about the schools, and so it came to the knowledge of the superintendent and matron.

14544. Any danger of anything approaching to cruelty in the same way would not be found out?—Bullying might go on to an alarming degree; it might go on very much in boys' homes, of course.

14545. You have not a real family life, and it is no good calling it a home or calling the people mothers?—No.

14546. It is not like a boarded-out home, where there is the real family life in the cottage?—That is so, and personally I very much object to the use of the word "Mother." I do not think that we have any right to expect children to be brought to a home to meet a stranger whom they have never seen before in their lives, and be told that they are to call her "Mother." As a rule, children in that class do not mind what they call anyone—granny, or auntie, or anything; but every now and then you come across a child who has really loved her mother. In one instance which came to my knowledge the child looked up into the the face of the matron and said, "Must I?"

14547. You think the Metropolitan Poor Law Schools have very greatly improved; there is much more life in them now, more games?—Yes, they correspond with the high schools and the public schools. They are happy, bracing atmospheres, and the officers are as happy amongst themselves as the chi dren are amongst themselves, and one reflects upon the other.

14548. You find the children willing to return to the schools when they grow up, very many of them without any sense of disgrace, and with affection for it, I suppose?—Yes; one only has to go to the prize days and see old boys and girls returning so proud and happy if they are doing well.

Nurses' excessive working hours.

14549. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Are you satisfied with the nurses' hours of work?—Are not the hours of nurses in some cases very long?—I am not at all satisfied with the nurses' hours of work. I think they are too long.

14550. Is there anything further you would wish to say definitely on that point beyond a general statement?—I do not think that that can be helped, unless there were considerably more nurses employed, or three shifts in the twenty-four hours were adopted, which would be at present quite impossible. I think the strain is very much too great upon the young nurses. There have been two cases of suicide in the last six months in London entirely due to the girls having been over-pressed and dreading their examinations.

14551. (*Dr. Downes.*) Were those in Poor Law institutions?—One was in a general hospital and one was in one of the infirmaries.

14552. This over-stress of nurses is not peculiar to Poor Law institutions, I take it?—No, I think it exists everywhere.

14553. (*Mr. Gardiner.*) Would you extend the powers of inspection under the Infant Life Protection Act?—I could not answer that question.

14554. You have not had an opportunity of getting information?—No.

Question of size of assistant inspectors' district.

14555. Are you able to give as much time as you would wish to the very considerable number of institutions under your inspection, that is to say, if there were not so many could not you give more time to the individual institutions, and so improve their level of administration?—I think there is such a thing as over-inspection, and as I cover the districts of two assistant-inspectors, I think that it is quite sufficient.

Difficulty of married couples with children obtaining Poor Law appointments.

14556. Do you wish to amplify what you have said in your memorandum about the Poor Law officers advertisements, because I thoroughly agree with what you have said?—It seems to me so inconsistent. We lay such tremendous stress upon the handling of our children, and

the treatment they are to receive in these cottage homes, where they are to call the matron "Mother," and in some cases the husband "Father," and then you see the same body, representing the State, advertising for a married couple "without encumbrances"; it is altogether inconsistent. Of course, children are rather an inconvenience in an institution, but I think that more consideration towards children of officers might be given.

14557. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) Do you think that perhaps one reason why women would prefer an infirmary even to an hospital would be that there are no medical schools in the infirmaries. I have known women who have a great objection to go into hospitals, because of the students, and the fact that their cases are interesting?—The maternity hospitals have medical schools, have they not, where students attend the women in their own homes. I think that there is a well-rooted objection to the Poor Law altogether, but I think that women are much less afraid of the infirmaries, and the maternity wards which are in the infirmaries.

14558. But, taking infirmaries altogether, do you not think, in all the wards, the women prefer them as having no medical schools attached, where their cases will not be made illustrative to the students?—Do you think they are quite aware of it?

14559. You think not?—I really have not worked sufficiently among the women outside in their own homes to be able to answer that. I do not think I could.

14560. I have met with very great objections?—I have no doubt there are such objections.

14561. You do not think it tells with regard to infirmaries?—I think a very comparatively small number of really respectable women apply for maternity assistance to the Poor Law at all.

14562. You have given us a list of a number of rescue homes and maternity charities. It is possible, I suppose, that these may become almost as demoralising as the maternity wards of a workhouse if they are not under good management?—Every institution depends enormously upon its administration, and I think all voluntary institutions have a tendency to change: either to be on the upward grade or else to be deteriorating.

14563. Can you tell me this, I do not know whether it is in your line: can anyone open a rescue home, or must they be inspected and certified? Is there any supervision at all of such places?—There need not be any supervision at all.

14564. You point out that a very large proportion of domestic servants come into the maternity wards. That indicates, I suppose, a very great carelessness, very often, on the part of their employers?—Very great carelessness on the part of their mistresses, but it also means, I think, that there are a great many country girls who come up to London quite ignorant of London ways and London's temptations; they are unprotected and unguarded, and they are thus led astray.

14565. That goes together with the carelessness of the mistresses who take no pains to provide for their leisure time?—Yes, and the means of recreation in London are surrounded by dangers to young and unsophisticated girls.

14566. Does it occur to you that there is any means of bringing home to employers their responsibility in this connection: that they are responsible for the girls who enter their families?—I suppose it can only be done through the Press, and I think such a society as the M.A.B.Y.S. must have an extraordinary influence along that line, because a number of ladies who visit as representatives of the M.A.B.Y.S., come into contact with the mistresses, and the mistresses have to account to them if a girl goes wrong obviously because she has not been properly looked after.

14567. Turning to the question of feeble-minded girls, I think everybody is agreed that if we could detain them in some way it would be well, but the object of that would be entirely their own protection, would it not—it would not be as a punishment?—First of all, it would be to protect them, and, secondly, surely, it would be a sort of safety for the State, because it is exceedingly hard that the State should have to bring up large numbers of feeble-minded children who cannot possibly be of any use to it. I should advocate permanent detention in institutions with every possible attraction, recreative and otherwise. This would be due to them.

14568. With regard to nurses, is it compulsory that they should wear their uniforms when they are off duty?—Do you mean their outdoor uniform?

Advantages and disadvantages of out-door uniform for nurses.

14569. Yes?—It is not compulsory, but I should like to see outdoor uniforms entirely abolished. Twenty years ago it was a protection to nurses in the streets of London, but now it is by no means a protection, rather the reverse; it is worn by women of all classes, of all grades of character; by women who are trained, by women who are not trained; by little nursemaids who earn about £8 a year, who in extraordinarily loud costumes, dirty cap strings, holey gloves, and untidy boots, take out their mistresses' babies. It is abused. Some years ago I met a society woman who told me she visited a hospital once a week, and she went on to say she always went to them in nurse's dress, because she thought it more sympathetic and suitable. Only last week I heard of a nurse who lent her uniform to a girl friend of hers, to be photographed in.

14570. It is considered to be picturesque?—Yes, I suppose it is, but anyone who lives in the streets of London, as I do, and sees the abuse to which it is put, would wish that all institutions would beg their nurses not to wear it, and that no board of guardians should ever think of providing outdoor uniform?

14571. At present it is provided for them, but they are not compelled to wear it?—In some very few institutions; I do not think that there is any instance of provision of outdoor uniform in Poor Law infirmaries, but I think some of the general hospitals provide it. Nurses wear outdoor uniform if they like, and they do not if they do not like, so it ceases to be a uniform.

14572. (*Mrs. Webb.*) May I suggest the one great advantage of the uniform is the question of expense; that you can look nice on £10 a year in uniform which you cannot look under £40 a year in ordinary dress. It really is a question of expense. You can look a charming person on £10 a year in uniform, but you cannot look at all distinguished and nice under £50 or £60 a year out of uniform?—There is the washing of those white strings.

14573. Even that, I went into very carefully with a nurse and we discovered that you can look very charming on £10 a year. (*Mr. Russell Wakefield.*) But that adds to the possibility of abuse?—It does.

14574. (*Mrs. Webb.*) As a Sumptuary Law, as a mode of getting our living less expensive, it might be advisable. A uniform has a tremendous advantage, and I would like to see it adopted by many women?—I do not think it is at all a good thing that a nurse should leave the ward when she has not very long off duty, put her cloak over her apron, and get into an omnibus, which undoubtedly has an exceedingly septic atmosphere; that dress and that apron come back and bring, you do not know what, to the wards.

14575. (*Mr. Bentham.*) Is outdoor uniform ever provided by the London unions?—I do not think it is—(I think some of the general hospitals do)—but it is permitted. I once saw four or five nurses going out on leave from one of our infirmaries and they each had a costume of different colour, one had dark green, one dark blue, and so on. That is not uniform, there is no sense in it, and I believe it is worn by women of exceedingly doubtful character. I have no evidence to give of that, but I do not think I am wrong in saying so.

The supply of Poor Law nurses.

14576. (*Mr. Chandler.*) Do you think there is any difficulty in obtaining an adequate supply of nurses for Poor Law?—No I do not think the stream of probationers will ever run dry. I think there will be quite sufficient applications. I think as Poor Law nursing becomes more really recognised it will hold an increasingly good position. It is only a question of time, and I think there will be less and less difficulty.

14577. You think more women will take to it as a profession?—Yes, it has to live down great prejudices; it has to live down unkind words, which takes time and which is not easy.

Effect of Poor Law Superannuation Act.

14578. I had in my mind your reference to what you call the inadequacy of the Poor Law Superannuation Act as applied to the matrons and nurses. You do not

Miss Ina Stansfeld.

22 May 1906.

think that has any effect of keeping ladies from adopting nursing as a profession?—I have no doubt if they compare what is given in the general hospitals, and find that much less is given in Poor Law Institutions, it would be a deterrent. The length of period of service to a thoughtful girl who chooses to go into it is very alarming. I do not think a matron or a nurse, especially under the Poor Law, ought to be required to work after she is sixty. I think it ought to be competent for her to resign at fifty-five

Need for lower qualifying age for pensions.

Nurses' pensions at voluntary hospitals.

14579. And yet you admit that at St. Bartholomew's hospital very few people apply for pensions, and few continue in the service for any length of time?—Yes a good many marry, and some go abroad. The training at St. Bartholomew's Hospital is looked upon as a good education and is an asset in the hands of a nurse, and at the end of her period she makes what arrangements she likes, she goes out to the Colonies, and she has a profession in her hands.

14580. A great many of them, of a large percentage, marry, and therefore cease to need it?—Yes, and at the London Hospital, they never have to give many pensions for the same reason.

Disadvantages of cottage homes as compared with large Poor Law schools.

14581. With regard to Poor Law schools, you hold some very pronounced views as to the merits of the different schemes. I notice you favour very strongly the associated school above all other systems in force?—Yes.

14582. You tell us, as a reason for your belief, that the last corresponds with that of the public and high schools with their peculiar advantages, amongst which you mention a band-master, accomplished musicians, drill instruction, and training in all different kinds of trades, etc., that are among the additional advantages of public schools; and the associated schools largely embrace those?—Yes.

14583. If the cottage home system embraces those features, your objection would mainly be removed?—Some of the cottage homes in colonies have all those points.

14584. Your objection is largely removed in a case like that, where the cottage home in colonies embraces all those features?—It is to a certain extent removed, but the cottage home bedroom would always be an insuperable objection to me.

14585. The fact of there being half a dozen children in a bedroom?—Not so many; two or three.

14586. Do you think there is all that absolute freedom from any of those contingencies you have referred to in a large dormitory?—Yes, absolute. The large dormitories are never left unguarded by attendants. After the children are once in bed they cannot talk, or, if they do talk, what they say is overheard. The officers sleep in cubicles in those large wards, and in some of the schools there is a night watchman and a night nurse.

14587. (*Mr. Bentham.*) There are other opportunities for conversation besides in the bedroom?—But not so favourable? The child is generally sent to bed a little earlier than it wants to go.

14588. (*Mr. Chandler.*) I was trying to find out how far your theory of contamination and improper discourse related exclusively to the bedroom. Mr. Bentham was putting the point which I was arriving at. There must be association in large numbers in all schools, whether in Poor Law schools or universities in this case?—There are so many officers about, and with such a large number of boys and girls rising to be monitors, after a good education they have a sense of responsibility, and they also act as witnesses; the children forget they are observed, but they are observed; they are always, I think I may say, under observation.

14589. My point again is this, if I can make it understood, that it does not necessarily follow that, because the children we have in our Poor Law schools come from a very poor class of people, they are more liable to be vicious in their habits than even a few amongst a larger and a better class?—I quite agree with you. I do not think it is a class question at all. I think it is a question for all to consider who have the management and the direction and the education of children, especially the boarding education of children.

14590. (*Mr. Loch.*) With regard to the nurses, at what age do you think they should be entitled to receive a pension?—I think they should be able to apply for a pension at fifty-five.

14591. Not before?—I think most women ought to be able to work till they are fifty-five.

Qualifying age for and amount of pensions for Poor Law nurses.

14592. With regard to hospitals, a great many of the nurses are doing work outside in particular cases, with long holidays in between?—That is so, and that is a great point.

14593. Therefore, is not it rather late to say fifty-five, if they are willing to retire at fifty?—Nobody would be more pleased than I should if it were possible to say fifty. The nurse I have quoted before as being so kind to the patients in the maternity ward of a workhouse is a woman of fifty, but that woman looks like sixty-five, because she has always been shut up.

14594. What pension do you think would be able to attract as good a class as possible to the service, considering the competition of hospitals and so on?—The London Hospital gives a very large pension?

14595. Do you think a pension approaching that is necessary?—No, I think not.

14596. What would you say?—That is a very important point, and it is one I have not considered. I feel its importance so much that I really do not like to answer without time for consideration.

Difficulties as to guardians sending feeble-minded women to voluntary institutions.

14597. I thought it might have occurred to you in the course of your visiting. With regard to these defective women, have you found that the guardians are disinclined, on account of the payment that is made, to provide for these women in an institution outside, when they first come into the maternity wards?—Some guardians might be, I suppose. I think the guardians of the Metropolis are very keen and realise very much the intense importance of segregating them, and that, for that reason, they would be more ready.

14598. Do you not think, that if you are to deal with this class as a whole, it would be necessary to make some quite special provision for them outside the infirmaries in connection with the Board, but requiring a payment for them at some home, and not allowing them to be in the infirmary?—I think that would be most important, and I think to make it at all effective it ought to be done on such a very large scale that it would be impossible to leave it to the discretion of the guardians.

High qualities required of Poor Law nurses.

14599. (*Mr. Paton-MacDougall.*) I think your view is that the position and the status of the Poor Law nurse is not what it really ought to be in the nursing world, or rather that it does not rank as high as nursing in the general hospitals?—I am obliged to admit I do not think it does rank as high. I do not think it would be so if the public understood how excellent the training under the Poor Law is, how Poor Law nursing really requires the best women, how it is infinitely finer work to nurse a poor bedridden woman who continually wants lifting and feeding, or to watch a chronic case, than it is to assist in one of those great accident cases in one of the general hospitals. I do not think it will be long before the public will come to this recognition, and before the public will also recognise that the private nurse, trained in a Poor Law institution, is likely to be an infinitely more effective and satisfactory private nurse than the private nurse trained in the general hospital.

14600. I am glad to hear you say that, because that view is held in many quarters now. I think the view is sometimes taken that, when nurses have to deal in the poorhouses or workhouses with all people of all classes of temper, who are always there, their position and their duty is sometimes rendered very difficult. I think Sir Henry Burdett himself said that, "Whereas in a general hospital any patient who may be guilty of gross breaches of rules, or may otherwise be found objectionable, can be dismissed from the hospital, patients in the Poor Law infirmary must still be retained and dealt with as the circumstances best permit." That is a view with which you agree?—Yes, I think that the nurse in the Poor Law institution is really worthy of a higher status than the nurse in a general hospital.

Suggested register of Poor Law nurses.

14601. Has it ever occurred to you that it might assist the Poor Law nursing if there were a register of nurses of Poor Law institutions who were qualified by examination?—I think State registration alone will entirely establish the Poor Law nurse's position.

14602. Apart from State registration, which would be of all nurses, would you advocate a register for Poor Law nurses only, with a qualifying examination? Do you

think that would be of any benefit?—I think that might be a help, because the medical superintendents and the matrons are so intensely anxious; they are so keen about the results of those examinations. It would help along that line; it would grade the infirmaries at once, and it would be an incentive.

14603. What is your view as to the proportion of nurses which is required for efficient nursing in Poor Law institutions?—It is exceedingly difficult to say any number. I think I have mentioned that eight beds per nurse conveys nothing to me, unless I have found out exactly what the cases are. A nurse might be able to manage eight patients perfectly well, without any undue effort; but, on the other hand, eight patients might mean work far beyond one nurse, and perhaps beyond two. It is extraordinary how there are almost epidemics of heavy cases in some of the infirmaries.

14604. Is there a nurse now for each eight patients, or anything like it?—I could not answer that question.

14605. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) I think in one of your answers you refer to the expediency of making the Metropolis one unit for Poor Law administration. You perhaps were not thinking then of Poor Law administration generally, but rather for the management of the institutions. Is that so?—Yes.

14606. You were not intending to say it should be one unit for outdoor relief?—No, I was not thinking of outdoor relief.

14607. Were you thinking of workhouses generally or only particular institutions?—I was thinking of all the institutions. I think there is a great deal of overlapping, and a great deal might be done under those circumstances which cannot possibly be done now.

14608. Would you think the number of institutions large to be placed under one body? There would be, of course, a very large number, would there not?—No, I do not think so, if under a competent body.

14609. How would they work? Were you thinking of committees?—Yes, I suppose one large central committee with sub-committees.

14610. With a committee to look after each institution?—Yes, a sub-committee. I am quite sure that a great deal might be done in that way, which cannot be done now.

14611. You made a very careful report in 1889 on the industrial training of girls in separate district schools, did you not?—Yes. *Miss Ina Stansfeld.* 22 May 1906. Miss Stansfeld's Report on industrial training of girls in Poor Law schools and its result.

14612. I think in connection with that you got a good deal of information as to how far girls who had been sent out to service had turned out satisfactorily? Could you state at all, generally, what the result of your investigation was on that matter? Was it good or bad?—It was excellent. I was trying to think of the percentage of failures, but I feel a little nervous in saying what I think it was, for fear I should not be correct. I believe the failures were 5 per cent.

14613. That information might be useful to the Commission, and if you would put that report in as a part of your evidence it would be convenient?—I will do so, certainly.*

14614. In the last paragraph of your memorandum you refer to the advertisement by boards of guardians for married couples without encumbrances. Is that usually the case with a master and matron?—No, couples with two or three children are engaged as superintendent and matron. Difficulty of parents with children obtaining Poor Law posts.

14615. What officers had you exactly in your mind?—Gate porters, drill masters, and subordinate officers.

14616. There is a good deal of difficulty, is there not, in providing accommodation for children of that class?—There would have to be a little rearrangement. I think those officers would have to live outside the schools or outside the institution, and provision would have to be made for their children while they were away at work. It disqualifies so many couples who would do excellent work. I think we might venture to expect that men and women who have children of their own are much more likely to understand other people's children than those who have not.

14617. (*Mr. Lock.*) Would the overlapping you refer to be overlapping as between institution and institution of inconnected with the Poor Law?—I think there is a good deal of overlapping in institutions both with the Poor Law and institutions not in connection with the Poor Law. Overlapping of institutions for relief of the poor.

14618. That is based on your finding applicants in one place and then in another?—Yes.

* Report (Cd. 237—1899) not printed in Appendix.

Mr. Edward John Mott, called in; and Examined.

14619. (*Chairman.*) You have been clerk to the guardians for the parish of Fulham for several years, I believe?—Yes. *Mr. Edward John Mott.* 22 May 1906.

14620. When were you appointed?—In 1899.

14621. You have written for us a memorandum stating what you think would be the effect of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, and we will take that memorandum as your evidence-in-chief (*see* Appendix, Vol. I. (A), No. XXVII. (A–B)) but there are one or two questions I should like to ask you upon it. Referring to paragraph 4, does the rule that guardians in all cases must pay 4s. in connection with each lunatic, at all diminish the amount that the guardians would otherwise get?—I have one case here that I will mention to you, which might perhaps show the effect generally. This is an actual case which has recently occurred. The man is in an asylum, and he is entitled to a pension of £19 9s. 8d. per annum. The pension is, I think, from the General Post Office, or, at any rate, from some Government Department. The guardians have agreed that the wife of the lunatic should draw the pension. If they received it themselves, of course, there would not be a charge of 4s. weekly in respect of the lunatic, and the claim upon the Exchequer would not be allowed. They have allowed the wife, as I said, to take the pension, but the Government Department have made it a condition that the grant shall not be allowed, and it is only being paid to the wife upon that condition. The effect of that is merely to throw the burden upon the Common Poor Fund. It makes no difference to Fulham whether they receive the grant or not, because if they receive it it would have to be credited to the Fund; and, therefore, by allowing the wife to take the pension, the financial effect on Fulham is just the same. Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14622. Does the wife bear the whole cost of the maintenance of her husband?—She contributes nothing at all. She draws his pension, and the claim on the Exchequer is not allowed, but the whole cost of the maintenance is a charge upon the Common Poor Fund.

14623. Then your suggestion would be, I suppose, that the payment of 4s. should be made, quite irrespective of contributions from relatives?—It would be better if it were so.

14624. Under the present system there would be a tendency to reduce the contribution from the relatives, so as not to make the cost of maintenance a loss of 4s. to the guardians?—That is possible.

14625. I gather from your fifth paragraph that your experience is, that people of rather a higher social status than before try to avail themselves of the gratuitous maintenance and treatment provided for them when suffering from certain forms of illness?—Yes, that is so. Higher class of person applying for gratuitous treatment of infectious diseases.

14626. Is that tendency increasing, do you think?—The percentage of admissions to notifications in the case of the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board has increased in the case of scarlet fever from 42 per cent. in 1890 to 84 per cent. in 1904, and in the case of diphtheria from 17 per cent. in 1890 to 79 per cent. in 1904; so that the number of admissions has gone up very considerably indeed in consequence of that.

14627. Is that rise simply due to the numbers having gone up, or is it due to a special outbreak; in other words, have there been any exceptional circumstances to disturb that comparison that you make?—None whatever, I think.

14628. It just shows the tendency of which you were speaking?—Yes, quite so.

Mr. Edward John Mott.

22 May 1906.

14629. Are your figures for the Fulham union or for the Metropolis?—They are the figures for London.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14630. From paragraph 9 I gather that you think that the distribution of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund operates rather to the detriment of the salaries of certain Poor Law officials in London?—Yes, I am sure it does.

Detrimental effect of Metropolitan Common Poor Fund on salaries of Poor Law officers.

14631. In consequence of the local authorities having to make special applications in every case to the Local Government Board?—I do not know that it is entirely in consequence of having to make special application to the Local Government Board; I think it is because of the operation of the Common Poor Fund.

14632. That is the say, the guardians do not wish to put any burden upon the local rates in connection with these salaries?—Of course, the guardians are very much averse to that.

14633. Is there not a system of gratuities in force by which in certain cases, with the assent of the Local Government Board, a special grant will be made to an officer out of the local rates?—That is being done to some extent, but, of course, the guardians do not like that sort of thing. It is very objectionable to everyone concerned—both guardians and officers.

14634. It is invidious and personal?—Yes; it is most objectionable.

Imperial contribution to cost of relief in London and the country.

14635. Would you look, please, at paragraph 24: that seems to me a little germane to what you complain of in paragraph 9. You say there, "In London, of the amount expended in connection with the relief of the poor about 5 per cent. is contributed from the Imperial Exchequer, as compared with about 30 per cent. outside the Metropolis." How do you get those two sets of figures? Is there not a contribution from the Imperial Exchequer which goes through the London County Council and is paid under the head of "County rate"?—That is the 5 per cent.

14636. It is not more than 5 per cent., then?—No, it is not more. There is another grant which probably you have in your mind, but that is a charge not on the Exchequer contribution account, but on the county rate.

14637. The Imperial Government contribute to that, do they not?—I think there is some small balance which partly makes it up, but it certainly is not sufficient to pay the whole of the grant by a very long way.

14638. What do boards of guardians outside the Metropolis get, which inside the Metropolis they do not get, from the Imperial Exchequer?—They get a grant based upon the amount paid in respect of the salaries and maintenance of their officers on an average of the five years ended Lady Day, 1888. It is paid under the Local Government Act, 1888.

14639. And is very much in excess of any similar contribution to the London unions?—Very much.

Detrimental effect of Fund on Poor Law salaries.

14640. Under the procedure laid down, application has to be made to the Local Government Board in connection with an increase of salary of certain officials, from which the provincial guardians are exempt, I believe; is that so?—I think that the provincial guardians have to apply to the Local Government Board for sanction in the same way.

14641. How does the administration of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund operate to the detriment of the Poor Law officials in London?—I have one or two cases here, and perhaps the best thing would be to let you have them. The first one I made a note of is that of a sculleryman in the infirmary. The man had been in the service of the guardians for ten years, and it was proposed that his wages should be increased from 20s. to 22s. per week. The Local Government Board at first refused to sanction it. The man was at work from six o'clock in the morning till six o'clock at night, and he only had only alternate Sundays off. The Local Government Board finally wrote as follows: "I am directed to state the Board have again given the matter their consideration, but that they do not feel justified in assenting to any increase in the present charge upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund in respect of this officer's remuneration. They would not object, however, to the amount of the proposed increment being paid to the officer out of the common fund of the parish."

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14642. Is what you mean that, although the assent of the Local Government Board may in certain cases be required as regards an increase in the salary of provincial officers, yet the fact that the Local Government Board are supposed to specially guard the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund makes them more reluctant, as regards London, to give their assent to those increases than they would be in the country; am I right?—I suppose they are anxious to secure that one particular district is not getting more out of the fund than another in the way of salaries.

14643. The idea of the equalisation of salaries, so to say, is present to their mind, and they fear that an increase in one quarter might be followed by demands for an increase in many other quarters which, if a precedent were once set, it would be difficult to refuse?—That, of course, must be the reason.

Proposed "block-grants" from Fund toward general cost of Relief.

14644. I see you are in favour of there being a common fund, but I see from paragraph 16 that you would prefer some other system of distribution, and I think you suggest population as a basis?—Yes, I do.

14645. Your idea would be, would it, simply a grant in aid of local rates, or would you attach any conditions to it?—The grant should, of course, be for the relief of the poor; but it should not be ear-marked to any particular item.

14646. The drawback to that might be that as regards certain special services—the nursing of the sick, and infirmaries—which it was desirable should be kept up in a high state of efficiency, they might—I do not say they would, but they might—be allowed to lapse into a state of inefficiency, the money which was obtained from the common fund going to other services?—That could always be guarded against by making it a condition that the grant would not be allowed in the event of such a state of affairs being brought about.

14647. Then there would have to be some conditions attached?—Yes, possibly.

14648. It would not be simply an unconditional grant in aid of the local rates?—No, perhaps not.

Effect of increased comfort of Poor Law institutions in regard to the workhouse test.

14649. In paragraphs 17, 18, and 19 you put forward a very interesting theory, namely, that the increased cost of the institutions has made them so comfortable that they have ceased to be an effective deterrent against applications, and that, therefore, the number in the workhouses has gone up until they are practically full, and consequently in times of distress they are not able to apply the test of the house, and outdoor relief has gone up to a considerable amount. Am I accurate in so describing your theory?—That certainly seems to have been the position. What I endeavoured to do was to compare the London system with practically what would be a national system.

14650. Do you think that if your method of distributing the fund could be adopted, it would check what you consider has been the tendency just referred to?—I have every hope that it would. The theory is that instead of having an equal rate which all bodies should draw upon according to their expenditure, they should be provided with, as near as it is possible to get it, an equal income.

Anomalies as to charge on Fund of cost of relief to sick children.

14651. I believe there are certain anomalies which have been permitted, by which certain boards of guardians are allowed to get relief for children maintained in sick asylums, which concession has not yet been made to other boards of guardians?—That is so.

14652. Is your board of guardians one of those boards which have had this concession?—No, we have not had it. It is due to the fact that in the Poor Law statutes the word "infirmary" does not appear. An infirmary is a workhouse, and the maintenance of children in a workhouse is not to be made a charge upon the fund. The children whose maintenance is charged on the fund are in asylums. Of course, these asylums really are infirmaries, just the same as the separate infirmaries, and they were established equally with the infirmaries as a consequence of the passing of the Metropolitan Poor Act. This was quite an oversight, I should think.

Effect of Fund on recovery of maintenance from relatives.

14653. In paragraph 23 you point out that in certain cases the recoveries from relatives, which are very difficult to effect, go to the credit of the common poor fund, and not to the credit of the parish?—Yes, that is so.

14654. In your judgment that has an inevitable tendency to check the efforts that would otherwise be made to get these recoveries?—I think it must be so.

tropolitan mmon or Fund.

14655. It is, I assume, an unpopular and a very tiresome work ?—Very, indeed.

14656. Should you think that this operates to any considerable extent in preventing the relatives from otherwise contributing as they ought to ?—The figures are not published, and it is very difficult to say how that operates. I have a list of figures here in respect of the half-year ended Michaelmas, 1903, from which I notice that for Fulham, for instance, where we try to do the work as carefully as possible, £1,107 was credited to the common poor fund within the half-year; while in the adjoining parish of Chelsea, a parish certainly as rich, with more pauperism (in respect of which there should be a larger sum collected), the amount credited is £493.

14657. Are you allowed first to repay yourselves the necessary legal expenses, if there are any ?—The commission of the collector is a charge on the fund. I have two of the claims here; I do not know whether any of the Commissioners would like to examine them; if they are not acquainted with the fund, probably they may like to see them (*handing in same.**)

14658. You contend that as this is necessary, unpleasant, and distasteful work, unless the union has some inducement to undertake it, it naturally becomes rather lax in enforcing what would nevertheless be a legal claim ?—That certainly does appear to be so.

lect of nd in couraging onomy.

14659. In your last paragraph you state the change you would like to see, which would be not the unification of London for Poor Law purposes, but the continued existence of the present areas, and the distribution of the equalised rate on a basis which would not tend to extinguish the local interest; and at the same time the adoption of a system which would not penalise localities which are economically administered. Are there cases now where effective economy is at all punished under the distribution and procedure of the Common Poor Fund ?—I give an instance in paragraph 22 in connection with the emigration of children.

14660. That was a special charge, and I assume the £1,000 did not legally fall within the scope of the charges which can be imposed upon the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—Not at present.

14661. How would the position of Fulham as regards that £1,000 be improved under your scheme ?—The grant that Fulham would receive would be independent of the cost of the maintenance of the children in the schools, therefore the expenditure of the £1,000 would relieve the parish of the burden of the seventy children, and the guardians would suffer no diminished grant.

14662. By removing those seventy children you got rid of certain charges that would have fallen on the local rates, and also certain charges that would have had to be paid out of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—Yes. The principal charges are those which would have been charged upon the Common Poor Fund.

14663. Therefore really your contention is that this £1,000 was an economic expenditure, not only for the local rates, but for the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund in the future ?—Yes.

14664. The fact that the whole £1,000 had to come out of the local rates is deterrent to guardians adopting this or any similar measures, which, although they are a charge for the moment, tend to relieve both the rates and the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund for the future ?—It must have that effect, unless, of course, they all do the same. If every Board spent £,1000, the result, of course, would be different.

14665. I assume your contention is that you have benefited the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund at the expense of the local rates ?—At the expense of Fulham.

14666. I assume that there are other branches or other items of expenditure which might have that effect, and which the Fulham Board of Guardians would not care to incur, because, though the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund would be benefited, the money that came from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund could not be applied to this purpose ?—Yes, that is so. Out-relief would be one of those.

14667. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) Would you mind looking at Paragraph 5 of your memorandum, which refers to the maintenance of persons suffering from fever, small-pox and diphtheria. You point out there, quite correctly, that attention should be drawn "to the fact that the power that exists outside of the Metropolis for recovering the expenses of maintenance of a patient in a hospital for infectious diseases does not now extend to London. Then you add, "Such power was taken away from the Guardians by the Public Health Act, 1891;" was that quite so ?—Yes, that was so. The Act under which they were empowered was 52 and 53 Vic., Cap. 56, Sec. 3. By that Act the guardians were empowered to recover these expenses from any person so treated, or from any person liable by law to maintain him. That Section 3 was repealed by the Public Health Act, 1891, and most of the provisions of the former Act were re-enacted in the later Act, but the provision under which the guardians could recover the expenses of maintenance from the patients, or those liable for them, was not re-enacted, and consequently the guardians are not now empowered to recover any such expenses.

Mr. Edward John Mott.

22 May 1906.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund. Absence of power to recover maintenance of patient in infectious hospital in London.

14668. Then you were not thinking of the power the sanitary authority had, but you were thinking of the power the Guardians had under the 52 and 53 Vic., Cap. 56 ?—Yes. The sanitary authority has no similar power, I believe.

14669. It has outside London, and there was an exception made in the case of infectious diseases with regard to the sanitary authorities by the Public Health (London) Act. In paragraph 12 you suggest that superannuation allowances might properly be charged on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund; in that case, you no doubt would say, too, that the contributions must be credited to the Fund ?—I suppose so.

Conditions of proposed charge of superannuation allowances upon Fund.

14670. Do you not think so ?—Yes, they should.

14671. You have suggested that there might be a contribution to boards of guardians, in lieu of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, based on population. Do you not think that the fact that the charges on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund have been made in respect of particular kinds of expenditure has been beneficial in this way, that it has encouraged that class of expenditure; for instance, it has encouraged getting the children out of the workhouses ?—I think that would have happened the same if the boards of guardians had the funds at their disposal to bring about that change.

Effect of Fund in encouraging certain Poor Law reforms.

14672. Was that not one of the reasons why particular classes of expenditure were selected, namely, to encourage such things as getting the children and the imbeciles out of the workhouses, and so on ?—It was not extended to the remainder of England.

14673. No, and, therefore, they have not got them out ?—If they had the funds at their disposal, I have no doubt they would, whether the funds were specially ear-marked for that purpose or not.

14674. You would not question, would you, that the allocation of a charge for a particular purpose, or, to put it in another way, the benefit of enabling the guardians to charge the Metropolis with a certain class of expenditure, does tend to encourage that expenditure ?—It has done so in London; it certainly has encouraged the expense of in-maintenance.

14675. And you yourself say so, do you not, in your second paragraph—"For the purpose of evenly distributing so large a proportion of the cost of relief of the poor over the whole of London, the fund has been most useful, and especially has it been beneficial in enabling the provision of suitable establishments for the treatment of the sick poor and maintenance and care of children to be made in all parts of the Metropolis." The underlying notion of that is, is it not, that by making those things a Metropolitan charge you encourage them ?—Yes. Of course the actual cost of the provision of the establishment is not a charge on the fund. The cost of maintenance is, and in that way it has, there is no doubt, done as you say. London is now very well supplied with institutions, and the question is whether the time has not now arrived when some change might be made.

14676. Then you have explained with regard to paragraph 21 that the reason for the difference between the unions you have mentioned and the others, is really that the Metropolitan Poor Act does not include a separate infirmary as one of the institutions the cost of maintenance of which is a charge on the fund ?—Yes, that is so.

Cost of separate infirmaries not chargeable to Fund.

* Not printed in Appendix.

Mr. Edward John Mott.

22 May 1906.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14677. That of course, is statutory and therefore cannot be altered without legislation?—That is so. I think most of the boards of guardians appealed to the Local Government Board some four or five years ago to make the cost a charge on the fund, but nothing was done.

14678. I think a good deal is to be said for your view that there is no real difference between the case of a separate infirmary provided for one union, and the case of an infirmary provided for a number of unions combined?—There really is not much difference between the cases.

Imperial contributions to cost of relief in and outside London.

14679. In reference to paragraph 24, have you compared the amount which the unions outside London get from the officers' grant with the amount which unions inside London get from the indoor poor grant?—I made that comparison in 1902.

14680. What was the net result of the comparison?—At that time, after deducting the expenditure of the metropolitan asylums board in respect of infectious diseases, the poor law expenditure in London was £3,093,122 and the grants from the Exchequer Contribution Account amounted to £223,045; whilst outside of London the Poor Law expenditure was £8,348,618, and the grants, including that under the Agricultural Rates Act, amounted to £2,054,000.

14681. Did that take in all the grant?—Yes.

Origin of Officers' Grant in country and In-door Maintenance Grant in London.

14682. There is this difference, is there not, between the metropolis and the rest of the country, that in the metropolis the guardians get a grant in respect of indoor relief and they do not get it outside London?—The London grant is from the local rates of London.

14683. It is a grant to the boards of guardians, so far as they are concerned?—So far as they are concerned, yes.

14684. Outside London there is an officers' grant, and the grant for indoor relief was given in lieu of that officers' grant?—Yes, but it did not come from the same source.

14685. It did come from the same source, surely?—Not from the Imperial taxation.

14686. But the other does not come from Imperial taxation; it is a charge on the county fund?—No.

14687. Both are a charge on the county fund. In London the indoor relief is a charge on the county fund, and outside London the officers grant is a charge on the county fund?—The county council is the channel through which the money passes, but the outside London grant does not come from local rates.

14688. That has nothing to do with it; the amount which goes to the county council is not in any way based on the amount which is paid to the boards of guardians in respect of indoor officers; it is arrived at in an entirely different way?—It comes from the death duties and the beer and spirit taxes.

14689. Certain funds go to the county council in respect of a share in the estate duty and in the licences, but the amount which the county council get from that source in no way depends on what the charges are upon them in respect of officers?—It so happens that outside of London the amount which the county councils receive from this particular source is sufficient to pay the grant, whereas in London it is not. In that way the London grant is a charge on the county rates of London.

14690. That may show that the amount of the allocation to the London County Council as compared with the allocation to other county councils should be greater; but when comparing the amounts which the boards of guardians receive, you ought to compare the amount of the officers' grant outside London with the amount of the indoor grant inside London, ought you not?—If we were dealing with the grants in aid of Poor Law expenditure, of course I should do that.

14691. Perhaps you have not exactly compared them?—I know the amount of the indoor pauper grant in London it is £320,000. I have not included that.

14692. (*Chairman.*) Which is an imperial contribution paid through the county council?—I do not agree that it is an imperial contribution.

14693. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) It comes from the county council?—Yes

14694. (*Chairman.*) Your contention is that though it comes from a central fund and a certain proportion of it does come from what I may call imperial taxation, the remainder comes from local rates; is that so?—Yes, the largest portion comes from the local rates. Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14695. And therefore is not a subvention, but is a —charge common to the whole of London?—Yes, it is.

14696. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) The same would happen outside London, supposing the amount which a particular county council receives is not sufficient, would it not?—That might happen if it were not sufficient. Still that was not contemplated, because the Act provided that in the country the payment to the guardians should be made direct from the Exchequer contribution account. In London it is especially provided that this indoor pauper grant should be paid, not from the Exchequer contribution account, but from the county rate. So that it was never contemplated that the Imperial taxes should provide sufficient for London, whereas it was so contemplated outside of London.

14697. Was that so, having regard to the terms of Section 26 of the Local Government Act, 1888, which is the officers' grant?—Yes.

14698. Look at Section 26: "After the 31st day of March next after the passing of this Act, every county council, other than the London County Council, shall grant to the guardians of every Poor Law union, wholly or partly in their county, an annual sum for the costs of the officers of the union and of district schools to which the union contributes; and, until Parliament otherwise determine, the said annual sum shall be such sum as the Local Government Board certify to have been expended by the guardians of each Poor Law union during the financial year ending the 25th day of March next before the passing of this Act, on the salaries, remuneration, and superannuation allowances of the said officers (other than teachers in Poor Law schools), and on drugs and medical appliances." That would be paid out of the county fund, would it not?—No, it comes out of the Exchequer contribution account. *See* Local Government Act, 1888, Sec. 23 (2) (iii).

Difficulties to establishing one authority for in-door relief in London.

14699. I have only one other point, and that is with regard to paragraph 25. You would not be in favour of making a unification of London for all purposes, but would you think there would be any advantage in any unification for the purposes of the administration of institutions such as workhouses, infirmaries and so forth? I do not think there would be any advantage in unifying London for the purposes of administration. For the purposes of classification it certainly seems that there might be more to be said.

14700. That is to say, you could have different workhouses for different classes of people?—Yes.

14701. Do there seem to you to be objections to that arrangement, looking to the large number of the institutions?—Is the proposal to administer the Poor Law of London from one central authority?

14702. I am only taking the institutions now, and I am leaving aside the question of outdoor relief?—I think it would be an enormous thing. I do not see how you can separate the indoor relief from the outdoor relief.

14703. But you do that in certain cases, do you not; for instance, you place certain classes of the indoor poor now under the Asylums Board?—Yes, but that Board merely provides the establishments. It is the guardians that keep in touch with the inmates, and have all the local work.

14704. Does it seem to you that it would be in any way possible to apply that system to the indoor poor generally?—It would prove to be a most expensive system.

14705. You think the expense would be one objection does any other objection occur to you? For instance, would there be a difficulty in administration, because, owing to the large number, the local authority themselves could not look after them, but must delegate that work to committees?—The difficulty of administering such a system would be immense. The classes that are at present dealt with by other authorities, say by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, are stationary classes. The imbeciles, for instance, are confined in the asylums, the fever cases we will leave out of account, but the

tropolitan mmon or Fund.

estion of arging penditure

tropolitan ylums ard upon ferent ions cording their leable lue.

ntrol of cal vernment ard on pointment officers in ndon.

dvantages proposed block-grant" om Fund d possible sis for such ock-grants.

children of course are also confined. When you come to deal with men and women freely admitting and discharging themselves, I think such a system would break down.

14706. The system at the present time, with regard to the expenditure of the Asylums Board, is this, is it not, that they charge each board of guardians with the cost of the maintenance of the persons sent from the union, and then the guardians recover that sum from the common poor fund ?—That is so.

14707. Consequently, that becomes a charge on the whole metropolis ?—Yes.

14708. Would there be an advantage in the Asylums Boards making one order on each board of guardians for its expenditure based upon rateable value, and not charging them in respect of individual cases ?—No, you would conceal the fact that the cost of maintenance in any particular locality is very great, because you spread it over London.

14709. It would be rather a simplification, would it not ?—It certainly would be simpler.

14710. But you think that that would be balanced, do you, by the fact that it would not be shown what the cost of relief was in any particular union ?—Yes, it is only a matter of account. There is no reason why it should be dealt with other than the way it is.

14711. Do you remember that the Workhouse Accounts Committee made some representations upon that subject ?—The Metropolitan Asylums Board itself did, I think.

14712. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) Am I right in assuming that it is not in regard to the appointment of every officer that you require the sanction of the Local Government Board, but only in regard to the question of the salary being made a charge against the grant ?—The entire question of the appintment of officers is in a most extraordinary position in connection with the Local Government Board and the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund. I have only mentioned one case, but I have another one here in which the Board sanctioned the appointment of an assistant clerk, but made it a condition that no portion of his salary should be a charge on the common poor fund—a most illegal proceeding, I believe.

14713. It is only, then, as regards the question of the salary being a charge upon the fund or the grant that the sanction of the Local Government Board is required ?—No.

14714. Supposing you make an appointment, you do not necessarily go to the Local Government Board for the sanction of that appointment, do you, apart from the question of the salary ?—There is an Order in existence which enables the guardians to appoint what assistant officers they please in connection with the maintenance and care of the indoor poor; but that does not extend to, say, the clerks' office. Notwithstanding that, the Local Government Board have, in their discretion, confirmed the appointment but made the condition; whether they have legal authority for it or not, I do not know, but I very much doubt it.

14715. (*Mr. Loch.*) To go back to this question of the salaries and rations of the officers, I understand that your chief objection is to the interminable labour in correspondence, and your next that it leads to "vexatious differences, and dissatisfaction, boards of guardians being only too frequently, in the interests of good administration, forced to charge upon the local rates sums the Legislature intended should be charged upon the common fund of London." Your last case had reference to that, had it not ?—Both the cases I mentioned had—the scullery man and his 2s. a week, and the salary of the assistant clerk.

14716. Is it within your idea that there might be certain charges for salaries which should not come up for sanction in detail, while others, the more important ones, should come up; is that how you would stop this interminable labour, etc., or what is your cure for it ?—The block grant, or a grant distributed upon some other basis, as I have before suggested.

14717. That is to say, for the moment you would suggest, so to speak, the abolition of detail, and a grant given towards those purposes which, you say, are put down as the present purposes of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund ?—Yes.

14718. Then with one stroke of the pen you would take away the whole question of salaries, or any control over them ?—Such control as is exercised for the purpose of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund. Yes. *Mr. Edward John Mott.* 22 May 1906.

14719. So long as you thought a block grant plus the local rates could meet the charge ?—Yes. Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14720. If you did that, you propose, I understand, a population basis for the distribution of the grant; that is, raised on a rateable value basis, it would go out on a population basis ?—I have not quite fixed upon the population alone. Of course, one can but recognise that poverty is not equally distributed.

14721. That is the point I wanted to work from. Suppose you did not for the moment say that population alone was to be the test, what would your next step be ?—That is rather difficult; that is where the trouble comes in. It is known that the census tables show us the distribution of the different classes of people, and where the workers are to be found; they also show us the places where overcrowding exists, and overcrowding is, of course, a very prolific cause of pauperism. I think on those two, taken together, some basis could be found upon which this fund could be better distributed.

14722. Apart from solving the question in regard to salaries as you have done, would you consider this—whether or not you could find a basis in the number of houses or tenements, say, of a certain rateable value; that is to say, that a district which has a large number of a certain low rateable value—£30, or whatever it might be—should have a grant according to that, there being, by implication, a kind of test of need in the class of house in the district ?—I had not previously thought of that. It would require to be looked into; I could not say off-hand.

14723. I am trying to take some concurrent or other basis for your own proposition ?—It is much on the same lines as the suggestion that the amount of overcrowding should be ascertained.

14724. Only I think that is more difficult to ascertain, and that something on the rate-book as to houses and tenements would form a good line of demarcation ?—The number of rooms which each person occupies is set out in the census tables.

14725. It is, I know. Might we take for the moment some alternative to your general proposal ? Have you the feeling that the rating in one union is, so to speak, based on an idea that you should do what is best for your own union, and that the assessment, therefore, is rather low ?—I have nothing whatever to do with the assessment part of the business, and I am afraid I cannot answer that.

14726. You have not had before you the suggestion, for instance, that the City is rated low ?—I do not know anything whatever about that.

14727. Putting that point aside, do you think that to insure quite similar equality in regard to rating right through London, there might be for that purpose some method of distributing on the basis of London a rate made for London as a whole, so that one authority should make the calculations as to what should be the rateable value for London, and on that basis the rate should be made ?—I should certainly leave the Common Poor Fund rate and its distribution to the Local Government Board.

14728. Or the county council ?—No, I should prefer to see it left with the Local Government Board.

14729. Do you think, taking your block grant suggestion, that in some form you might make a system by which some central authority should, on a rateable value for the whole of London, distribute for particular purposes whatever you might suggest, and the local body, that is the Board, should raise the rate for certain other definite purposes ?—No. My first idea was that it should not be ear-marked for any particular purpose—that that should be the income for the Board, and that the guardians should be expected to do their work within the amount of that income. Necessary conditions to be attached to proposed "block-grants"

14730. True; but, as was said, if you do not have any purposes earmarked will you not require that a certificate of the work being properly done should be submitted to the central authority ?—Yes.

14731. Then does it not come to this, that the grant made to you under those terms would be a grant made on

Mr. Edward John Mott.

22 May 1906.

approbation of the policy of the Board; and that, possibly, not only in regard to the institutions benefiting by the common poor fund, but generally?—Yes, it would certainly be necessary that the central authority should be satisfied with the general policy of the Board.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14732. Then if you take that step, are you not driven to go one step further, and to say that you must have for the Metropolis some kind of board of supervision?—The Local Government Board is that board of supervision.

14733. True; but you are altering the whole basis under which it makes its grants. At present it makes grants in regard to various points in respect to which you have to report minutely; that protection is to be withdrawn, and you fall back really upon general inspection, which must itself be made very much more close if a central board or the Local Government Board is to be satisfied, must it not?—There is no reason why that should not be made more close.

Difficulties as to one Poor Law authority for London.

14734. What is your objection to a central governing body, in a manner, a central board for London?—It is unnecessary. It is simply adding one more to the local authorities of London.

14735. We are already treating London as a separate geographical area, from the point of view of finance, by the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?—That is so.

14736. And you have another central body already in the Metropolitan Asylums Board. If London has interests in common right throughout, then does it not imply that both in regard to outdoor relief, which is a very important item, and in regard to indoor relief, there should be an equality of supervision?—But that central board could only do that which the Local Government Board is at present in a position to do—it could only issue orders to its local committees or local boards.

14737. To take the question of outdoor relief, it practically stands outside, and you yourself see from the statistics, which you know very well, what variations there are on the present system?—Yes; but how are you to avoid those variations with the present unequal distribution of the different classes of people?

14738. If your block grant which you propose is a block grant on a policy through and through in reference to a body that thoroughly understands London, possibly in a very close manner, would you not have a chance of amending those variations?—To some extent, possibly.

Effect of lunatic grant on recovery of cost of maintenance by guardians.

14739. Then to take some other points; in paragraph 3 you refer to the question of the lunatics; are you in favour of the continuance of the 4s. grant?—Certainly; I am in favour of the Imperial Exchequer contributing as much as possible.

14740. I am speaking of it in the form in which it is given; are you in favour of a grant per pauper, as it were? I take it that your criticism has this result, that it puts a hindrance on the guardians raising as much as they could from the relations, because otherwise they may be without the 4s. grant?—Yes. But that is a small point, and I should think it is quite easy of amendment.

14741. What would your amendment be?—I should prefer to see the 4s. given, whether the relatives contribute or not.

14742. Would not the effect of that be that at any rate in some unions where they are careful, they would be induced to care less for the money of the relatives?—Not if the locality benefited entirely by it.

14743. There again, with regard to this 4s. grant does it not tend to clear the workhouse of rather senile people, who are put into lunatic asylums, which are very expensive?—I do not think the 4s. grant ever enters into account there at all.

14744. Not at all?—I am sure it does not. It is quite true that a number of aged persons go from the workhouses to the asylums, but that is not because of the 4s. grant; it is because they are almost intolerable in the workhouse.

Effect of Fund in discouraging economy.

14745. And it is not because you want to clear the institutions to a certain extent, and to have more room?—Not on that account.

14746. On the present basis of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, are you inclined to think that it pays a rich district to be extravagant, as it were? That seems to be a point of your table in the Appendix, and of one of your paragraphs?—Yes.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14747. So that a rich district which actually has largely taxed itself gets an advantage, in your opinion, from its large claims on the fund?—If it does not increase its claim on the fund it must necessarily increase its contribution to the fund.

14748. Therefore the fund is acting rather as an impulse towards extravagance in rich districts?—It certainly has that appearance.

14749. To take this year-by-year expenditure, is it your opinion and your experience that constantly there are larger charges under rations and salaries every year in your own union? Taking the unions as they are put out in the Annual Report of the Local Government Board, and comparing, we will say, a matter of twenty years, it seems almost as if there were a perpetual rise everywhere in everything?—It has been so, but it is, I think, principally due to the Metropolitan Asylums Board that the charges in respect of salaries have increased enormously.

14750. Would you say that that really accounted for it?—Not entirely.

Increase in charges upon the Fund.

14751. That is so say, allowing a considerable margin, there would be, as on those figures, a great increase in the expenditure incurred by boards of guardians and charged upon the fund; for instance, here you have a matter of 60 per cent. as the increase between 1885 and 1905, that is, in 1885, the expenditure charged upon the fund was £1,001,939, as against £1,619,568 in 1905; and that increase seems from the figures to have been pretty well scattered over every item of expenditure?—I do not think you are quoting from my table.

14752. No, I have had these figures handed to me by Sir Hugh Owen. Is it not clear from these figures that the whole system is productive of large extravagance, may we say?—That is what I have attempted to suggest—the system is wrong.

Reason for distinguishing "rations" from salaries.

14753. To take the items of the fund, is it desirable that there should be a separate entry of salaries and a separate entry of rations; what is the necessity of an item like that coming on a central fund for London?—It is part of the remuneration of the officer, and if the salary is to be on, there is no reason why the rations should not be on.

14754. Is it necessary to split the salary into two parts, and to call it salary and rations?—The Local Government Board find it very convenient.

14755. In order to check the expenditure?—No, not always that; but in order to provide some deserving officer with an increase of salary without making it entirely a charge on the fund.

14756. Then it is really at the basis a matter of accounting?—Entirely.

The incidence of registration and vaccination fees.

14757. Then with regard to registration fees; would you be in favour from that point of view of continuing those as a charge in relation to the Poor Law?—There can be no reason why they should not be continued.

14758. And vaccination fees?—Yes; I see no reason why they should not be on.

14759. Then with regard to medical relief, which again is a question of detail; would your block grant be for all these things, or would you say that the medical relief should be a separate block grant?—That would depend upon how it would work out in different localities. I quite see that to alter the basis of the distribution of a grant like this, off-hand, would certainly not suit those places that have flourished, may I say, under the common poor fund system.

Functions of the police in relation to the Poor Law.

14760. If we could adopt certain principles, we might work towards them, and an adjustment might be made and, as I understand it, your object chiefly is to suggest principles. With regard to paragraph 23, why should not the police do a lot of the work of ascertaining the means and assessing the amounts to be contributed, which is so very difficult? The time occupied in doing that and in reconsidering cases, excusing arreas, etc., is, you say, very considerable; and you add that it frequently becomes necessary to take proceedings in the county court. You do employ the police, do you not, in desertion cases and such like cases?—No, not at all. Of course a warrant can only be executed by a police officer; only to that extent are the police used at all.

etropolitan ommon oor Fund.

14761. Have the inquiries to be done by yourselves right through ?—Yes.

14762. How much of an officer's time does it take in Fulham to ascertain means, and to do the whole of the work that is referred to in paragraph 23 ?—That work is distributed amongst several officers, and I could not tell you how much time it takes altogether. One man's time is entirely taken up in collecting money and accounting for it, and in looking after the people after the order is made.

ffect of and in dis- uraging covery of aintenance.

14763. Therefore taking the whole general administration of Fulham, it really depends upon whether the clerk and the guardians are intent upon getting their money back ?—To a very great extent it does. That can make a difference of a penny or a twopenny rate very easily.

14764. Granted that that is good and should be added on, I understand your criticisms to be that you practically get no credit for that on the present system ?—We are simply collecting for the rest of London.

14765. For yourselves, do you collect largely locally in cases that have nothing to do with the metropolitan common poor fund ?—Almost all that we collect is credited to the common poor fund.

14766. Almost all ?—Yes, but not entirely; because in respect of the maintenance in the workhouse, the charge on the fund is only 5d. a day, and the Local Government Board have decided that we need not credit more than 5d.

14767. How comes it that the work is so entirely done, or almost entirely done, by the common poor fund, because you must have many cases that you deal with apart from that fund ?—Nearly all maintenance, whether for lunacy, children, or boarding-out, or what not, is a charge upon the fund.

14768. That is to say, the fund covers such a large range that practically it touches you everywhere ?—Yes. It is only the sums in respect of outdoor relief that are not credited to the fund; and they are few.

14769. So then we may say, in accordance with your paragraphs 17, 18, and 19, that generally you think the system is working in a way which puts a bounty on institutions, and then allows a new difficulty to arise, owing to the institutions not being sufficiently large for the applications ?—Yes.

14770. And then comes the tendency to revert to outdoor relief ?—Yes.

etrimental ffect of und on Poor aw salaries nd *ersonnel.*

14771. (*Mr. Chandler.*) You tell us of instances where the Local Government Board have refused to sanction advances in salary, unless the guardians choose to pay those advances out of the rates; have you ever known any cases where they absolutely refuse to sanction the appointment of necessary officers on that ground ? If, for instance, the guardians recommend, after mature consideration, that a certain officer is necessary—it may be an additional officer—have you in your experience known the Local Government Board refuse to sanction the appointment of that officer on the ground that his salary would become an additional charge on this common poor fund ?—They have not done so lately. They have gone on the lines of allowing the guardians to appoint the officers they need, provided the salary is not a charge on the common poor fund.

14772. That is, they have sanctioned the appointment, but with the distinct understanding that it is not to be an additional charge on the fund ?—That is so.

14773. Have you found that that has resulted in less qualified officers being appointed for the administration of the Poor Law in London ?—I have another case here. The guardians had an electrical installation at the workhouse, and the engineer who had previously been engaged was not competent to act as engineer under the new system, so it became necessary to get a more highly skilled man. The guardians, after taking the best advice, applied to the Local Government Board for permission to engage a man at £200 a year. The Local Government Board sanctioned the appointment, but on the condition that £50 of it was in lieu of lodging, coals, and lighting. That meant that £150 was to be a charge on the fund, but £50 was to be a charge on the local rates. In that case the guardians agreed; they had to get a man, and there is no doubt they were bound to have a qualified man. But in the course of time that man went, and then the guardians said, "We will reduce the wages of the next man down to the amount which the Local Government Board sanctioned upon the fund." They did not understand that the amount which the Local Government Board sanction for the purposes of the fund has no relation to the value of the services. In that way it does tend to depress the salaries, and it may be to get people of lower qualifications.

14774. Do you think it has that effect ?—It is not unreasonable to expect that it would.

14775. In making a change such as you describe, is it not usual to start at a lower rate of salary ?—In this particular instance that I have given you, the two men started one at £200, and the other at £120.

14776. In your judgment the administration of this common poor fund rather tends to keep down the qualifications of the officers, I gather ?—It is not unreasonable to expect that it would.

Basis for distribution of proposed "block-grant."

14777. (*Mrs. Bosanquet.*) By making your distribution of the block grant on any such basis as the poverty or over-crowding of a district, or any particular type of house in the district, would you not put a premium on maintaining those conditions ?—I do not think that the local authority would be able to check it. Certainly the board of guardians would have nothing whatever to do with maintaining those conditions.

14778. Supposing the local authority had it in view to clear an insanitary area, or to pull down a certain type of house where there was over-crowding; as they might to a large extent be the same people as the board of guardians, might they not be influenced by the fact that any such policy might reduce their grant ?—There is that possibility.

Detrimental effect of Fund on Poor Law salaries.

14779. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 9 you give us the impression that salaries generally are lower in London than in the provinces; have any steps been taken by the officers of the London boards of guardians to induce the Local Government Board to raise the maxima of these salaries that are already specified ?—I think that many appeals have been made.

14780. Individual appeals ?—Appeals by different associations of officers.

14781. Has that been done collectively ?—Yes, it has.

14782. Do you think those salaries are much below what are paid in the provinces in unions of a similar size and responsibility to the London ones ?—There are many instances where they are much lower.

14783. In London, the cost of living being higher, the maximum really ought to be higher than in the provinces ?—Then the work itself is much more difficult in London than it is in the provinces, I think.

Proportion of "rations" chargeable to Fund.

14784. With regard to the cost of rations, rations now, I think, are fixed at 8s. 9d. per week, but you give the cost in Fulham as actually being 14s. 9d. for the principal officers and 11s. 10½d. for subordinates. Is that fixed on any scale of diet ?—Yes.

14785. Are the principal officers appointed without any scale, or does the scale apply to all officers ?—In this book you will find two scales, one for the principal officers and the other for the subordinate officers.

14786. Do you think the amount allowed of 8s. 9d. per week will be insufficient to give a proper scale of rations for the officers ?—I do not raise any objection about the 8s. 9d. per week, because the guardians can improve it if they choose without the sanction of the Local Government Board.

14787. There is a difference of 6s. there, you see, between 14s. 9d. and 8s. 9d., and that is rather a serious matter ?—Yes, it is, but that is a matter for the locality. I am not in favour of releasing the locality from all responsibility.

Effect of Imperial grant on administration.

14788. With regard to the grants generally, are you of opinion that grants tend to extravagance in administration ?—Not necessarily. I do not think they are when they are distributed on a proper basis. I have not found guardians to be unduly extravagant.

14789. It is always much easier to spend other people's money than money belonging to the ratepayers of the locality, is it not ?—It is easier, certainly, than to spend your own money.

Mr. Edward John Mott.
22 May 1906.

14790. If the whole expenses of the unions in London were borne by the the national exchequer, do you think that that would tend to economy in London?—It certainly would not.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14791. Then you would say that grants generally do not lead to economy in expenditure particularly if they come from the national exchequer and are locally administered?—A grant such as the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund grant does not.

14792. There has been a proposal to rather alter the basis of that grant and to abolish the county grant altogether, and instead of that to give a grant of 10d. per day for all indoor paupers; would that not simplify matters very considerably?—No. It would be a worse system than the present system. Whatever evils there are in the present system would be increased by that.

14793. Then that would not assist you at all?—No, I think not. I do not think that would be a good thing for London. That is the proposal of the Local Government Committee of the London County Council, and it has been rejected by the council.

Effect of Fund on outdoor relief.

14794. In paragraph 19 you refer to the extension of outdoor relief; do you think that the tendency of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund from the beginning was towards restricting outdoor relief?—Yes, I think that must have been so.

14795. Now, that has been overtaken, and the tendency is in the opposite direction, because of the accommodation being insufficient to deal with the indoor poor—I think you attribute it to that?—That does appear to be so.

14796. Do you not think there is a change in the public sentiment with regard to outdoor relief generally in London, and that it is now in favour of giving outdoor relief instead of indoor relief?—There is a large number of ill-informed persons who are certainly in favour of it.

14797. Do you think that the tendency all over London is in that direction?—I do not think that is so.

14798. Does the opinion in that respect differ in different unions in London?—Yes, certainly it does.

Basis for distribution of proposed "block-grants."

14799. (*Mr. Nunn.*) In seeking a basis for an apportionment of the block grant, I think you said just now, in reply to Mr. Loch, you were rather in favour of some estimate based upon the number of rooms occupied by a tenant?—What I should like to get at would be the prospective needs of the different localities.

14800. Do you think that could be attained by taking the figures of the census of the persons who occupied one, two, three, four, or five rooms?—I mentioned that table as probably containing a possible basis.

14801. Or a partial contribution towards it, perhaps?—Yes.

14802. A considerable number of persons are rather over-crowded in London, because it is absolutely necessary for them to live especially near to the centres; they give up a certain amount of the physical comfort which is derived from living in more spacious apartments in order that they may live more closely to the City, for example. Therefore you cannot judge their wealth or poverty from the fact that they are living in one, two, or three rooms?—If that is so, of course that does detract from the value of that table as a basis. Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14803. I think there is another set of tables in the census from which you might select, for instance, a certain number of trades in each district, and then you could ascertain from the Poor Law Returns of each district the numbers belonging to those trades who had within a certain number of past years applied for Poor Law relief?—Yes, you could do that.

14804. That would give you a figure that would be much closer, I take it, to what you need, would it not?—I think it is possible; at any rate, it is between those two tables, I think, that we must look for any different basis.

14805. You should balance the two?—Yes.

14806. You are in favour of the stricter as opposed to the laxer administration of outdoor relief?—Yes.

Conditions to be attached to block-grants.

14807. Do you think it is possible that by giving up the system started in 1870, and withdrawing outdoor relief from the purely local funds, and substituting a very careful system of inspection which would base grants upon the propriety of the relief given by the guardians, that system of inspection, considering the needs of the district, the amount of indoor relief required, the adequacy of the outdoor relief, and the amount of efficient work done by the boards of guardians—if it were done by a system of that kind, do you think that one might compensate for the purely economical motive the 1870 system inaugurated?—I am afraid I do not quite follow you.

14808. I am afraid I found some difficulty in expressing it myself. I mean to substitute for the purely economical motive of the Act of 1870 a system of inspection, so that the amount that a district earned—to use a phrase adopted in another department of local government—should be dependent upon the efficiency of all its arrangements in administration?—I should certainly make that a condition.

14809. Would it be practicable?—That really comes to distributing the grant on the number of officers engaged, does it not——?

14810. No, I should think not, but on the general propriety of the arrangements that were made, including the officers and the amount of outdoor relief that was given, and the economy with which the establishments were conducted?—Certainly efficiency should enter into it.

14811. And the fall or rise of pauperism in the district, taking several years together?—Yes. Under the present system the fall in pauperism does not help us; under certain circumstances it might act against the district.

14812. Do you think that the stricter administration of outdoor relief might possibly gain and not lose under such a system?—Gain in amount, do you mean?

14813. No, but the administration might gain in strictness, possibly, under such a system, even though the economic motive provided by the regulations under the Act of 1870 were dispensed with?—I should think so, if the central authority acted with fairness and firmness.

14814. A great deal would depend on that?—Entirely so.

Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B., called in; and Examined.

Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B.
22 May 1906.

14815. (*Chairman.*) You were, as we know, for several years Permanent Secretary to the Local Government Board?—Yes.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14816. And you are the Receiver of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, having been appointed to that office on the death of Sir John Lambert?—Yes.

Erection of casual wards a charge upon the Fund.

14817. You have been kind enough to prepare for us a Memorandum on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, which very clearly gives its history and explains the purposes for which it was instituted and its present operation. (*See* Appendix Vol. I. (A), No. XXVIII. (A-E)). There are two separate questions I should like to put to you at once upon this Memorandum, and the first is, Is the erection of the casual wards a charge upon this fund?—Yes; and the cost is very considerable. The payments in respect of principal and interest on account of the loans amount to nearly one-half of the whole charge for houseless poor.

14818. The second question is, Do you find that the power of declaring a union in default is a power which you can put into practical use?—It never has been exercised, but it has been threatened from time to time and the threat has secured the desired result. Metropolitan Common Poor Fund. Exercise by Local Government Board of power to declare a union in default.

14819. The difficulty of putting it into effect would, I assume, be that if you did deprive the union of a grant from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, the very services it was the object of the Act of Parliament to promote might become starved?—I do not think there is any probability of an authority standing out; the loss would be so great.

14820. Therefore in that sense it is an effective weapon?—Yes.

Inadvisability of increasing class of expenditure chargeable to the Fund.

14821. There are various questions that suggest themselves in connection with the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, and you will allow me to put them to you One of

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

the objects of the common poor fund, I understand, was to secure an improved administration; are there any further items of expenditure which in your opinion should be charged on the fund for a like object?—I have in the Memorandum set out somewhat fully the object of the fund, apart from the equalisation; it was to secure improvement in administration, an improvement which was very greatly needed. If you ask me whether at the present time I think that there is any item of expenditure of boards of guardians in respect of which some stimulus to additional expenditure is required, I should say certainly not.

14822. During the last year or two have there not been suggestions made to the Local Government Board by some boards of guardians for an extension of the operation of the common poor fund, with a view to further aid being given to the poorer unions?—Yes. There has been rather a large number of suggestions from different unions, and especially from the unions which are now receiving from the fund. Those who contribute have not generally proposed any extension.

Proposal to throw whole cost of relief on Fund.

14823. What is your opinion about this suggestion, that the whole cost of the net expenditure should be a charge on the common poor fund?—It seems to me to be altogether inconsistent with any separate administration of the several unions. If the whole expenditure of a union were charged on the fund as suggested, there would be no check on extravagant administration by a union, whilst any such extravagance would cause an undue burden to be cast on the other unions.

Proposal to make out-relief a charge upon the Fund and objections thereto.

14824. Has there been any suggestion as to out-relief being charged on the fund?—Yes. The Camberwell, Bermondsey, Mile End Old Town, Stepney, Poplar, and Wandsworth Guardians have proposed this.

14825. What is your opinion of that proposal?—In my memorandum I have shown that 70 per cent. of the total expenditure by boards of guardians is now borne by the grants made out of sums raised by imperial taxation or other receipts in aid, or by rates levied throughout London in the proportion of the rateable value of the unions. That being the case it appears to me to be a grave question whether it would be judicious to further reduce the proportion of the charges which is to be borne exclusively by the unions incurring the expenditure. As regards out-relief, it appears to me that it is especially undesirable that the charge should not be borne by the particular unions by which the relief is granted. There is a marked difference between indoor relief and outdoor relief. With comparatively few exceptions a person will not go into a workhouse unless his destitution is such as to leave him no alternative, and this gives him an incentive to make every possible effort to avoid becoming a pauper inmate. Relatives and others interested will often assist a person to keep out of the workhouse. I admit that these considerations do not apply to anything like the same extent in the case of workhouse infirmaries, as in the minds of the poor the infirmary is regarded as very different from the workhouse. But a person must be suffering from illness to qualify himself for admission to the workhouse infirmary. On the other hand, out-relief may be granted to almost any extent. A person who is most reluctant to go into a workhouse will readily receive out-relief and congratulate himself on obtaining it. The burden of the relief, it is to be remembered, is borne not merely by the well-to-do, but also by the struggling, independent poor, who have to pay their share of the rates either directly or indirectly in their rents. Unwise expenditure in the case of other expenses of the guardians means at the worst a waste of money; but an injudicious administration of out-relief may have much more serious results in its effect in undermining the self-reliance and independence of the poor. From my memorandum it will be seen that there are several unions which would each contribute to an expenditure by them of £500 in out-relief a sum not exceeding £10, the remaining part of the £500 being borne by other unions. The effect of placing the out-relief in the year ended Ladyday, 1904, on the common poor fund would have been to increase the burdens on some of the East End unions.

Discussion of proposal to charge certain classes of out-relief upon Fund.

14826. There have been proposals that out-relief to certain classes of the poor should be made a charge on the fund, I believe? Yes. The Greenwich Guardians proposed that the sums given in out-relief should be a charge on the fund to a strictly limited extent, and in respect of a clearly defined class or classes. The Islington Guardians suggested that out-relief limited to persons of 65 years and upwards might be a charge on the fund, and the Lewisham Guardians suggested the same in the case of widows and children. The observations I have made as to out-relief generally apply to these cases also. With regard to the suggestion of the Lewisham Guardians, I know that it was the practice in some unions, with the view to enabling a respectable widow to maintain herself without outdoor relief, to take some of the children into the separate school of the union, this being an advantage to the children; but I cannot say to what extent at present that practice continues.

Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B.

22 May 1906.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

Proposals for increasing amounts chargeable upon Fund in respect of indoor relief.

14827. Then as regards the indoor poor, have there been any proposals as to increasing the payment out of the common poor fund for that?—The guardians of the Stepney and Poplar unions have suggested that the total cost of the maintenance of all classes of the poor in the workhouses and separate infirmaries should be borne by the fund. The guardians of Lambeth and Hackney desire that there should be an increase of the rate of 5d. per head per day. Camberwell, Lambeth, and Islington suggest that children under the age of sixteen in workhouses and infirmaries should be allowed to be claimed for. The Fulham, Greenwich, Hackney, and St. Pancras Guardians make a similar suggestion as to children under sixteen who are in separate infirmaries. The proposal of Hackney also referred to children in workhouses and separate infirmaries under the age of three years.

14828. What is your opinion of these proposals?—The suggestion that the whole cost of the maintenance of the inmates of workhouses and infirmaries should be borne by the common poor fund, I think, is not one that should be entertained. The adoption of the proposal would remove any safeguard against extravagant expenditure in connection with indoor relief by one union at the expense of the other unions of the Metropolis. As to the proposal that the payment at the rate of 5d. per head per day should be increased, the fact of the payment by the London County Council at the rate of 4d. per head per day on the average number of indoor poor in the five years ended Ladyday, 1888, will be borne in mind. I doubt the expediency of increasing the rate per head per day charged on the fund. Then as to the proposal that the payment of 5d. per head per day should be made in the case of children who are under the age of sixteen in workhouses or workhouse infirmaries, the only children under the age of sixteen years who should be retained in workhouses or infirmaries are the infants under three or those who are suffering from illness. As to the infants, many of whom are nursed by their mothers, the cost would be comparatively small. The number of children who are not removed to separate schools in consequence of illness will now be somewhat reduced by the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District providing for children suffering from ophthalmia or other contagious diseases of the eye and contagious diseases of the skin or scalp. As regards other children who are retained in separate infirmaries in consequence of illness, I should not see any objection to the 5d. per head per day being allowed as a charge on the fund, especially as this is the arrangement in the case of sick children in an asylum of a sick asylum district. At present it is somewhat of an anomaly that 5d. per head per day should be paid in the case of sick children in a sick asylum, whilst no such payment is made in the case of children in a separate infirmary.

Anomalies as to charge upon Fund of cost of relief to sick children.

Salaries chargeable against the Fund and proposal to increase amount thereof.

14829. Then going to another point, have any suggestions been made as regards the remuneration of officers?—The full salaries of all officers whose appointments have been sanctioned by the Local Government Board are now repaid from the fund. This applies to temporary as well as to permanent officers, provided that the sanction of the Board is obtained to the appointments. The guardians of the Poplar union proposed that the salaries to be repaid should be so fixed that they should include any additional emoluments of the officers, so that the full cost of the officers should be borne by the fund, and that the extra fees to medical officers, the cost of uniforms and any gratuities to officers should be repaid. The Stepney Guardians also proposed that the salaries of temporary officers (although the salaries may not have been sanctioned by the Local Government Board) and gratuities to officers should be allowed. As to the first

Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B.

22 May 1906.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

Proposal to repay from the Fund lump sum in respect of certain classes of expenditure.

point, there is nothing at present to preclude guardians, with the consent of the Board, giving inclusive salaries in the exceptional cases where emoluments in addition to salaries are allowed to officers. With respect to the cost of uniforms and gratuities to officers, there is nothing in the character of these charges which appears to require that they should be a charge on the fund.

14830. Have there been any proposals made that, in lieu of the repayment of actual expenditure, the common poor fund should contribute the expenditure based on some scale or some system of averages?—There have been several suggestions of this character. Lambeth suggested that the claim for salaries and rations should be abolished, and that a sum calculated on the certified number of inmates of the several institutions should be borne by the fund. Fulham suggested that an average sum per officer in respect of the majority of indoor officers should be paid, or that a sum to be fixed, instead of the allowance of 5d. per head per day for indoor poor, should include a sum to cover the cost of the salaries of officers. Greenwich suggested that in lieu of the present payment of salaries the daily sum for the maintenance of indoor poor might be increased. Woolwich proposed that a lump sum should be paid in respect of salaries on an average of three or five years; and Islington suggested that on an estimate of the sums properly chargeable in respect of officers in each Poor Law union a fixed sum should be settled, the sum so fixed being subject to revision from time to time.

14831. What do you think of those suggestions?—Some of the proposals are only made with a view of the unions being saved giving details in their claims on the fund. I think that there will be the greatest difficulty in devising any general scale according to averages or otherwise which will be regarded as satisfactory to the unions generally. A receiving union would object to any scale which would give that union less than that which it is now entitled to receive; and a contributing union would object to any scale which would impose on them a larger contribution than that which they can now be required to pay. In the case of both classes of unions it would appear, as a general rule, more equitable that the payment from the fund should be on the actual expenditure authorised to be charged on the fund, rather than on averages or estimates.

14832. Now, you have made use of the words "as a general rule;" will you please explain them?—I was thinking of the washers and scrubbers in the infirmaries. There is a very large number of women employed in the infirmaries in the work of washing and scrubbing; they are paid a daily wage, and there are frequent changes in the persons employed. The reporting to the Local Government Board for sanction of the employment of the individuals, and the setting forth in the claims on the fund the particulars of all the cases, involve a good deal of trouble, and I am sure that it would be appreciated if some arrangement could be adopted by which the Board could sanction a certain sum to be allowed to a union from the fund for the services of those washers and scrubbers without any sanction of the employment of particular persons, subject to such sum being actually paid by the guardians. This cannot, however, be done under the existing law. The same principle might perhaps be applied in the case of some other classes of subordinate officers and servants.

Difficulties as to Local Government Board's power to sanction salaries for purposes of the Fund.

14833. Now there is the question of the salaries which are to be paid to the officers; does that not at times cause friction between the Local Government Board and the guardians of London unions?—It has always been a source of friction. The guardians consider that they are the representatives of the ratepayers and know the value of the services of the particular officer to whom they propose to give an increased remuneration; but they are not always mindful of the fact that the union making the proposal does not pay the increased cost, but that the cost is borne by all the unions in London; and, in fairness to other unions, the increase should not be sanctioned unless the circumstances fully justify it. If one union offers for a particular office a higher salary than that generally paid in London, that union would probably induce an officer of some other union in London to become a candidate for the office and secure his services. The union losing their officer would then not unnaturally desire that the salary assigned to the office in their union should be increased to the amount paid in the other union. The salaries paid in respect of particular offices in different unions are generally known, and the salary paid in one union is continually quoted by other unions in support of proposals for increased salaries, and there is pressure to secure a levelling up. The effect of a sanction of an increase in one union often extends much beyond that particular union. I know that it was the practice of the board to have for their guidance in respect of certain offices, scales of salaries on which they acted when applications for an increase of salary were made, and in other cases each proposal was considered in connection with the salaries for like offices held in other unions, having regard, of course, as far as practicable to the varying circumstances of the unions. This continually involved the preparation of very elaborate comparative statements. This, I believe, is still the practice. The trouble involved is very great, and when the question is as to the salary to be paid to a very subordinate officer, it appears scarcely seemly that the Local Government Board should be in conflict with a board of guardians over a question of a few shillings a week; but, of course, the decision may affect the rate of remuneration of a very large number of persons of the same class, involving in the aggregate a considerable sum. The endeavour to safeguard the common poor fund has, however, the disadvantage that in equalising salaries there is not the scope that is desirable for the recognition of the services of specially zealous and valuable officers. For instance, one union may have a master of the workhouse who may so discharge his duties that he may greatly increase the efficiency of the administration of the workhouse, and possibly with a diminished expenditure; whilst in another union the master may discharge his duties with no special zeal or efficiency. The tendency of the operation of the fund is to give the two officers equal salaries—assuming that the workhouses are of a similar character.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14834. Have you any suggested alternatives that you could make for meeting this difficulty?—I think that it would have been better if a proportion of the salaries sanctioned, rather than the whole, had been made a charge on the fund. It would be difficult now to propose to take away from the poorer unions the benefit to which they have so long been entitled in connection with the salaries of officers, but in the case of the more important offices, I think it might help if the guardians of a union were empowered within certain limits to pay out of the rates of that union in the case of a specially deserving officer a sum in excess of that which for the purposes of the common poor fund may be sanctioned by the Board.

Proposal that guardians should be empowered to pay salary in addition to amount chargeable upon the Fund.

14835. Have you anything to say about the rations of officers?—The Stepney and Poplar Guardians propose that the whole cost of the rations should be charged on the fund. The St. Pancras Guardians desire that the scale which was fixed in 1887 should be revised; and the Greenwich Guardians propose that it should be increased. Mr. Ritchie, in the year referred to, obtained returns of the actual cost of the rations of the officers in the different unions, and settled as high a scale as it was then considered should be adopted. There is, at present, no evidence, so far as I am aware, to show that the scale should be increased.

Proposal to charge whole cost of rations upon the Fund.

14836. There is a question I should like to ask you about loans. I am not quite clear on this point: Are all the loans for building which are charged to the common poor fund raised on the security of the whole of the rates of London?—The only loans which are charged on the fund are those in respect of casual wards, and the amount is comparatively a small sum—it is only about £14,000 or £15,000 a year. These loans are raised on the security of the rates of the union incurring the expenditure, not on that of the whole rates of London. Taking the payments of principal and the payments of interest generally, they exceed £400,000 a year in London.

Loans chargeable to the Fund.

14837. What would those loans be in connection with?—I am referring to loans for all purposes in connection with the erection of buildings. Those are the only purposes practically for which loans can be raised.

14838. Does each union pay the cost of its own workhouses?—Yes. The principal and interest amounting to £400,000, which I referred to, are not a charge on the fund, but are an expenditure of the guardians, which the unions bear.

Incidence of cost of erection of workhouses.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14839. That being the law now, have any suggestions been made with regard to charging on the fund payments in respect of loans?—Yes. Greenwich has suggested that the operation of the fund might be extended to include a sum in respect of the provision of accommodation; and Bermondsey, Stepney and Poplar have proposed that loan repayments should be made a charge on the fund. The repayment of the principal of loans and the payment of the interest on loans constitute one of the heaviest items of expenditure borne exclusively by the unions by which the loans were raised. The amount of these payments in the year ended Lady Day 1904 (excluding the payments in respect of loans for casual wards, which are already a charge on the fund), amounted to £403,167. If these payments in the year referred to had been charged on the fund, the unions, which would have been the gainers, would, with two or three exceptions, have been the poorer unions which are now receiving aid from the fund. Personally, I have great doubt as to the expediency of any additional charge being cast on the fund, except that in the case already referred to of sick children in separate infirmaries. The expenditure of guardians which is now borne by the union incurring the expense, it appears to me, is not greater than is desirable in the interest of economical administration. If, however, the conclusion arrived at is that the operation of the fund should be extended, it may be desirable to consider whether one half of the expenditure on principal and interest in respect of loans might be so charged.

Proposal to make provision of buildings and repayment of loan a charge upon the Fund.

14840. Have any suggestions been made that the cost of the maintenance of the inmates of the asylums provided by the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District should be charged to the several unions, in the same way as the common charges of the district are distributed?—Yes. The Poplar Guardians suggested that all the expenditure of the managers of the Asylum District should be apportioned to the several unions according to rateable value, and excluded from the operation of the Common Poor Fund; and Lambeth made a similar proposal. The cost of the maintenance of inmates of asylums under the Metropolitan Asylums Board would, if they were dealt with in the same way as common charges, be borne by the different unions on practically the same basis as if the payments continued to be made from the Common Poor Fund. The change would not involve the simplification to any extent of the present claims on the fund, but if the alteration suggested is deemed desirable, I am not aware of any reason why it should not be carried out. Of course, if this change were made, it would be necessary that the London County Council should pay to the managers of the Asylum District, instead of to the guardians of the unions as at present, the grants in respect of the expenditure of the managers.

Proposed alteration in method of defraying expense of Metropolitan Asylums Board.

14841. Are there any other suggestions which have been made as to placing charges on the fund?—Stepney proposed that the expenses of certification and removal of patients to and from asylums, and the cost of the conveyance of patients to infirmaries and sick asylums, should be made a charge on the fund. Camberwell, Lewisham, Greenwich, Hackney, Poplar, Stepney, Lambeth and Woolwich, suggested that the cost of the superannuation of officers, less the sums received from the officers, should be so chargeable. In the year ended Lady Day 1904, these superannuation allowances amounted to £30,968, the deductions from salaries towards superannuation being £11,001, leaving on the unions a charge of less than £20,000. There does not appear to be any ground for these proposals other than the desire to obtain larger contributions from the more wealthy unions. Then there are proposals that unions should not be required to give credit in connection with the claims on the fund for the receipts from relatives. This is supported by Lambeth and Camberwell. Such a proposal appears to be unfair to the unions which have to bear the burden of contributing to the charges of other unions.

Proposal to make superannuation allowances and other expenditure charges on the Fund.

14842. There have been some suggestions made, have there not, that the form in which claims on the fund are required to be made might be simplified?—Yes, there have been several representations to that effect. It is the fact that a great mass of detail is required to be given in the forms which have been settled, and the preparation of the claims involves a considerable amount of labour on the clerks to the Guardians. But details are essential if the Receiver of the Fund is to have any means of checking the claims. The fact that these details have to be supplied, and that it is known that they are very carefully examined before any claim is allowed, ensures accuracy to an extent which would not otherwise be obtained. There have been cases where without such an examination the fund would have been improperly charged with sums of considerable amount. It is noteworthy that the complaints as to the detailed character of the claims, with one or two exceptions, come from the receiving unions. This may be regarded as some evidence that the contributing unions, whilst they are subjected to the same trouble in making their claims, generally appreciate the safeguard which the fact that these details have to be supplied affords. The suggestion that I have made in regard to washers and scrubbers would effect a saving in the preparation of the claims without, I think, any disadvantage. There is another class of items which I should see no objection to excluding. All payments made by relatives or others in respect of the maintenance of paupers, with the exception of receipts from other Boards of Guardians in the metropolis, might, it appears to me, be omitted from the claims. The details as regards these payments which are now given are not such as can be utilised by the Receiver in checking the amount which should be deducted from the claim, and their omission (the aggregate amount of such payments only being entered) would effect a material saving of time in the preparation of the claims.

Proposed simplification of form of claim upon the Fund.

14843. If these payments were omitted from the claims, I assume they would go to the credit of the unions who enforced them?—No. I merely suggest that all the details as to the payments which are made by relatives and others should be omitted from the claim, but that the total of those amounts should be deducted. It is only saving certain details being furnished.

14844. The Fund should still get the benefit of it?—Clearly.

14845. But the accounts should be in the aggregate and not in detail?—Yes. That is with the view of simplifying the preparation of the claim.

14846. With the exception which you have very clearly stated, you are, I see, opposed to any further charges being put on the Common Fund?—That is my view. I think that you must have a margin of charge on a union if you are to get something like economical administration.

The basis for raising the Fund.

14847. (*Mr. Bentham.*) In paragraph 39 you refer to the method of assessing the various localities on the rateable value; is any allowance made in the rate for leakage in collection, or is it taken on the net amount of the rateable value?—It is the net amount of the rateable value. In London, as you are aware, there is a special Act, the Valuation of Property (Metropolis) Act, and certain valuation lists become absolutely conclusive as a basis of charge. The rateable value according to those valuation lists is taken as the basis of distribution. No doubt there is a leakage, especially in some of the parishes of London, in consequence of the compounding. There are cases where there is voluntary compounding, the limit being £20 rateable value; and in others the authority may make an order for the actual rating of the owners instead of the occupiers in the case of all properties not exceeding the limit of £20, there being an additional allowance when the owners undertake to pay the rates for the properties whether occupied or not.

14848. In a locality where leakage is rather large, it might take a 7d. rate to raise the 6d. which they have to pay?—The actual rate that it is necessary to levy in order to raise a certain sum must vary in different unions and parishes.

Effect of the Fund in discouraging economy.

14849. Is there anything in the point which was raised just now, by a question that was asked of another witness, with respect to the effect of administration on the contributing unions, namely, whether they are less careful because they contribute a larger amount to the expenses of the administration of the Poor Law generally?—As long as human nature is what it is, I feel sure you can never constitute a common poor fund for defraying expenses, without some of the expenditure not being so carefully considered as would be the case if the whole charge were cast upon the union.

Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B.

22 May 1906.

Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14850. I am afraid I did not make myself understood; I meant to put the question the other way round?—I beg your pardon. I should say, first, that I think the receiving unions sometimes put forward claims which they would be less willing to do if they had to bear the whole expense, and then the contributing unions are sometimes, I think, disposed to say, "Well, there are those unions that we contribute to receiving so much, why should not we benefit a little more from the fund?"

14851. (*Dr. Downes.*) I gather from what you said that you rather think that the stimulus on expenditure which was originally needed when the fund was established, is not so necessary now?—I certainly do not think it is acute.

14852. Is it not the fact that the distribution of the fund essentially rests on expenditure?—Yes, and I think it is extremely difficult to find any other basis.

Possible basis for distribution of the Fund.

14853. I did not know whether you had considered the possibility of any other basis than that of expenditure?—I know population has been suggested, but population is not the basis of expense. You may have a parish with a considerable population of well-to-do people, and obviously the population there is no criterion as to the extent of expenditure in connection with the poor relief that may be required.

14854. Is not what is wanted rather a measure of the true poverty of a district?—When the Local Government Bill of 1888 was passed, the question what should be the basis of a contribution by the London County Council to the unions was very carefully considered? It was considered then, after every proposal that could be suggested had been weighed, that the best basis was the number of indoor poor. That was to a certain extent a test of administration, and it was also a test of the poverty of the district. You cannot make indoor poor unless people are really destitute.

14855. Would you apply that principle to the infirmaries as they are now constituted?—I have made an exception as regards infirmaries. I think in the minds of the poorer classes there is a very marked distinction between the workhouse and the workhouse infirmary. The workhouse infirmary is practically a hospital.

14856. Should I put the problem correctly if I said it was to distribute the fund equitably with a view to equalisation, but in such a way as not to remove any stimulus to local carefulness?—Yes. When the Bill was introduced by Mr. Gathorne-Hardy he said, "I want to select what will not admit of extravagance and jobbery." He said people would not go into fever and small-pox hospitals unless they had fever or small-pox; and he selected lunatics, because you cannot make a person a lunatic in order to get him on the fund. So it was with almost every item. There was intended to be some check and control.

Effect of Fund in encouraging sending of lunatics to asylums.

14857. With regard to the lunatics, I do not know whether you are aware that there is alleged to be an increased tendency to send old people to asylums nowadays, both to the Asylums Board asylums and to the county council asylums?—I cannot speak with any certainty as to what has happened in recent years, but I have known some cases in Provincial unions where it was considered that it was more economical to send the insane inmates of a workhouse to the county asylum, than it would be to erect additional buildings.

14858. Is there an advantage accruing to a union by sending such old people to, we will say, an Asylums Board asylum? If they keep them in their own workhouse they obtain only a certain repayment, do they not, but if they send them to the Asylums Board asylum they get the whole maintenance?—They get the whole maintenance then, and apart from that, if they have a pressure on the workhouse, it is convenient to reduce the number, because if the certified number for the workhouse is exceeded, the guardians get no allowance—no 5d. per day—for the number in excess. So that they may get an advantage both ways. If the old person remains in the workhouse, they receive the 5d. per day, and if he goes to the asylum, the whole cost of the maintenance is borne by the fund. Then there is the further advantage that I have just referred to, that you get spare accommodation in the workhouse, and can fill up that accommodation without diminishing and possibly increasing the claim on the fund.

14859. May not all that offer a temptation to send old people to the asylums?—I think it is quite possible that it may, but still the increase in the numbers sent to the Asylums Board's asylum is not equal to the increase in the numbers sent to county asylums and licensed houses.

The Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

14860. Where no fund exists?—I think so. The charge on the fund for insane poor has increased from £215,973 in 1885 to £378,683 in 1905. That increase is chiefly attributable to the increase in the number of the insane poor. The number of pauper patients in county and borough asylums, registered hospitals, and licensed houses was, in 1885, 8,714, and in 1905, 17,198, an increase of 8,484. The number in the asylums of the Metropolitan Asylums Board was 5,404 in 1885 and 6,642 in 1905, an increase of 1,238, the total increase being 9,722.

Figures as to increase of pauper lunatics in asylums.

14861. I may perhaps remind you that it has been alleged that the accommodation has been insufficient in the case of the Asylums Board?—More might possibly have been sent if there had been more accommodation.

14862. I believe that under the Act of 1867 all medicine and medical surgical appliances supplied to the poor are charged on to the common poor fund, or at any rate what is not charged on to that fund is charged on to the county grant?—The total cost of medicines and medical and surgical appliances is charged on the Common Poor Fund. The county council make a grant out of the moneys they receive from the Imperial taxation, the grant being equal to one-half of the cost of the drugs, and that is deducted.

Effect of Fund in decreasing economy in drugs.

14863. So that practically the guardians are not troubled with any local expense for drugs?—None whatever.

14864. Then what stimulus to economy remains to them?—I cannot say that there is any in the case of this item.

14865. Have you noticed that the claim for drugs is increasing?—Almost every item chargeable on the Fund has increased, but in connection with drugs, I think you must have regard to the epidemics that have existed in London, because that makes a considerable difference. In 1902, the year of the small-pox epidemic, there were over 32,000 admissions to the asylums of the Asylums Board, and of course the whole of the drugs required for those patients had to be paid for.

14866. I was speaking more particularly of special unions. I happen to hold in my hand a contract of one of the unions for drugs, and I will only say of it that it does not strike me as showing any tendency to economy. I rather wanted to ascertain whether there was any incentive to economy on the part of the guardians?—I think that the guardians are advised by other medical officers, and they are very much in the hands if those officers as to the drugs that should be obtained.

14867. Should you consider it desirable that more effective checks should be introduced?—I do not see what check you can have, unless you are going to throw a portion of that expenditure on to the union which incurs the expenditure.

14868. But if the union itself had to bear the larger share do I gather that you think that would be an additional check?—Yes. I feel, however, there is a good deal of difficulty about that item, because the guardians would naturally be guided by the views of their medical officers. They would say: We do not ourselves know what drugs are required for the patients.

14869. But would they not possibly compare themselves with other unions?—I do not think they do, but no doubt there would be an advantage if this were done.

Figures as to cost of drugs.

14870. Or notice whether the expenditure was increasing, that is, whether it is more under one officer than it had been under another?—You might find that with one board of guardians, but perhaps not with another. It is very desirable no doubt that attention should be given to that point. I am under the impression that there has been rather a falling off in the cost of drugs. In 1905 it was £24,600, in the previous year it was £22,354, in the year before that it was £26,437, and in the year before that it was £28,303; so that there has been some diminution of the charge.

14871. But I think as you pointed out those years are rather affected by the operations of the Asylums Board ?—They are considerably, no doubt.

14872. (*Mr. Patten-MacDougall.*) To meet the very obvious objections and disadvantages which pertain to the present conditions of things, under which the whole salaries are charged against the fund, I understand that you suggest that a portion of these at any rate should be paid out of the rates. Would you approve of the system which prevails in Scotland, where there is a fixed sum of £20,000 granted towards medical relief, and that sum is devoted to nursing in the first place and then to all expenditure which falls under the head of medical relief, the balance being paid out of the rates ? The result, I am sorry to say, is that the sum is a diminishing sum, for whereas 10s. per head was payable some twenty years ago, it is now reduced to only 6s. per head, the total grant being a fixed sum ?—We do a great deal more apparently than you do in Scotland, because we pay from the fund the whole salaries of the medical officers and the whole salaries of the nurses, and we pay for all the drugs and medical and surgical appliances. So that we go much beyond you.

14873. We have not got that at all, but I understand that your opinion is that that rather leads to extravagance on the part of the union ?—What I said with regard to the salaries was that according to my view it would have been better if, in the first instance, instead of throwing the whole burden on the fund, you had only charged a proportion, leaving the unions to bear the difference. But after this has been going on for nearly forty years it is extremely difficult to take away from the poorer unions the help that they have hitherto had.

14874. (*Mr. Loch.*) There is no form of re-adjustment that you can suggest otherwise to carry out your principle, is there ?—I am sorry to say that I cannot suggest any. I believe myself that the actual expenditure is the best test.

14875. (*Sir Samuel Provis.*) That charge under the Valuation (Metropolis) Act on the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund has nothing to do really with the fund proper —it is not a poor law expenditure, in any way, is it ?—No. It was considered at the time a convenient way of raising the amount over the whole of London.

14876. Might it not now more properly come off the fund, and be paid by the London County Council ?—The amount is only about £300 or £400 a year. It is hardly sufficient to render it necessary to make a change.

14877. It is not worth while to make a change, you think ?—No. I may say that the Act allows a payment to the clerk to the county council being charged on the fund, but for some years past the county council have made an arrangement with their officer which renders unnecessary any claim on the fund for his services.

14878 It was in fact intended, was it not, by the Act of 1888 that it should be paid as part of the costs of the Quarter Sessions in London ?—Yes. When the Act was passed there was an Assessment Sessions for the three counties. Then, when London became one county, and there was a separate Quarter Sessions, these duties were transferred.

14879. It has been suggested to us by a previous witness that the superannuation allowances might properly be charged to the fund inasmuch as the salaries are ; would you have any view about that ?—When a union wishes to draw more largely from the fund, they are ingenious in finding reasons for it. They say because the salaries are paid, then any fees, any gratuities, any uniforms, any allowances of any kind to officers, and the superannuation allowances, all ought to be brought on the fund. But there is no reason for it as far as I see, beyond the desire to draw more largely from the fund.

14880. Of course, assuming that the superannuation allowances are to be charged on the fund, the Fund ought to be credited with the contributions ?—Yes, and no doubt they would be. The contributions are not at present nearly so large as the superannuation allowances.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE POOR LAWS AND RELIEF OF DISTRESS.

LIST OF APPENDIX VOLUMES TO THE REPORTS OF THE POOR LAW COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND AND WALES, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND.

Appendix Vol. I.—English Official Evidence.
Minutes of Evidence mainly of the Officers of the Local Government Board for England and Wales. 1st to 34th Days: 8th January to 22nd May, 1906: Questions 1 to 14,880.

Appendix Vol. I. A.—English Official Evidence.
Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence included in Vol. I., being mainly the evidence of the Officers of the Local Government Board for England and Wales.

Appendix Vol. I. B.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vols. I. and I. A.

Appendix Vol. II.—London Evidence.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) mainly of London witnesses. 35th to 48th Days: 28th May to 23rd July, 1906: Questions 14,881 to 24,739.

Appendix Vol. II. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. II.

Appendix Vol. III.—Associations and Critics.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) mainly of critics of the Poor Law and of witnesses representing Poor Law and Charitable Associations. 49th to 71st Days: 1st October to 17th December, 1906: Questions 24,740 to 35,450.

Appendix Vol. III. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. III.

Appendix Vol. IV.—Urban Centres.—Liverpool, Manchester, West Yorks, and Midlands.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) containing the oral and written evidence of the British Medical Association and of witnesses from the following provincial urban centres—Liverpool and Manchester districts, West Yorkshire, Midland Towns. 72nd to 89th Days: 14th January to 26th March, 1907: Questions 35,451 to 48,347.

Appendix Vol. IV. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. IV.

Appendix Vol. V.—Urban Centres.—South Wales and North Eastern Counties.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) containing the oral and written evidence of witnesses from urban centres in the following districts:—South Wales and North Eastern Counties, 90th to 94th Days: 15th April to 30th April, 1907: Questions 48,348 to 53,067.

Appendix Vol. V. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol V.

Appendix Vol. VI.—Scotland.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) relating to Scotland. 95th to 110th Days, and 139th and 149th Days: 6th May to 21st June, 1907, and 13th January and 2nd March, 1908: Questions 53,068 to 67,565; 88,667 to 89,046; 94,629 to 95,323.

Appendix Vol. VI. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. VI.

Appendix Vol. VII.—Rural Centres.—Friendly Societies, etc.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) containing the oral and written evidence of witnesses from various rural centres in the South Western, Western, and Eastern Counties, from the Parish of Poplar Borough and from the National Conference of Friendly Societies. 111th to 122nd Days: 9th July to 7th October, 1907: Questions 67,566 to 77,734.

Appendix Vol. VII. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. VII.

Appendix Vol. VIII.—Unemployment.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) containing the oral and written evidence of witnesses relating chiefly to the subject of "Unemployment." 123rd to 138th Days: 14th October to 10th December, 1907: Questions 77,735 to 88,666.

Appendix Vol. VIII. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. VIII.

Appendix Vol. IX.—Unemployment.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) containing the oral and written evidence of further witnesses relating to the subject of Unemployment, etc. 140th to 148th Days: 150th to 156th Days, and 158th Day: 14th January, 1908, to 11th May, 1908. Questions 89,048 to 94,628; 95,324 to 99,350; 100,020 to 100,590.

Appendix Vol. IX. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. IX.

Appendix Vol. X.—Ireland.
Minutes of Evidence (with Appendices) relating to Ireland. 157th and 159th Days: 25th April and 12th May, 1908: Questions 99,351 to 100,019; 100,591 to 100,928.

Appendix Vol. X. A.—Index.
Index to Appendix Vol. X.

Appendix Vol. XI.—Miscellaneous.
Miscellaneous Papers. Communications from Boards of Guardians and Others, etc., etc.

Appendix Vol. XII.—Commissioners' Memoranda.
Reports, Memoranda, and Tables prepared by certain of the Commissioners.

361. 70,500—Wt. 27649. 5/09. Wy. & S. 7865r.

6658

2 WELLCOME LIBRARY

APPENDIX VOL. XIII.—DIOCESAN REPORTS.
Diocesan Reports on the Methods of administering Charitable Assistance and the extent and intensity of Poverty in England and Wales.

APPENDIX VOL. XIV.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—MEDICAL RELIEF.
Report on the Methods and Results of the present system of administering Indoor and Outdoor Poor Law Medical Relief in certain Unions in England and Wales, by Dr. McVail.

APPENDIX VOL. XV.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—CHARITY.
Report on the Administrative Relation of Charity and the Poor Law, and the extent and the actual and potential utility of Endowed and Voluntary Charities in England and Scotland, by Mr. A. C. Kay and Mr. H. V. Toynbee.

APPENDIX VOL. XVI.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—INDUSTRIAL AND SANITARY CONDITIONS.
Reports on the Relation of Industrial and Sanitary Conditions to Pauperism, by Mr. Steel Maitland and Miss R. E. Squire.

APPENDIX VOL. XVII.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—OUT-RELIEF AND WAGES.
Reports on the effect of Outdoor Relief on Wages, and the Conditions of Employment, by Mr. Thomas Jones and Miss Williams.

APPENDIX VOL. XVIII.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—CHILDREN: ENGLAND AND WALES.
Report on the condition of the Children who are in receipt of the various forms of Poor Law Relief in certain Unions in London and in the Provinces, by Dr. Ethel Williams and Miss Longman and Miss Phillips.

APPENDIX VOL. XIX.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—UNEMPLOYMENT: ENGLAND AND WALES.
Report on the Effects of Employment or Assistance given to the Unemployed since 1886 as a means of relieving Distress outside the Poor Law in London, and generally throughout England and Wales, by Mr. Cyril Jackson and the Rev. J. C. Pringle.

APPENDIX VOL. XIX. A.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—UNEMPLOYMENT: SCOTLAND.
Report on the Effects of Employment or Assistance given to the Unemployed since 1886 as a means of relieving Distress outside the Poor Law in Scotland, by the Rev. J. C. Pringle.

APPENDIX VOL. XIX. B.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—UNEMPLOYMENT: IRELAND.
Report on the Effects of Employment or Assistance given to the Unemployed since 1886 as a means of relieving Distress outside the Poor Law in Ireland, by Mr. Cyril Jackson.

APPENDIX VOL. XX.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—BOY LABOUR.
Report on Boy Labour in London and certain other Typical Towns, by Mr. Cyril Jackson, with a Memorandum from the General Post Office on the Conditions of Employment of Telegraph Messengers.

APPENDIX VOL. XXI.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—REFUSAL OF OUT-RELIEF.
Reports on the Effect of the Refusal of Out-relief on the Applicants for such Relief, by Miss G. Harlock.

APPENDIX VOL. XXII.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—OVERLAPPING OF MEDICAL RELIEF IN LONDON.
Report on the Overlapping of the Work of the Voluntary General Hospitals with that of Poor Law Medical Relief in certain districts of London, by Miss N. B. Roberts.

APPENDIX VOL XXIII.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—CHILDREN: SCOTLAND.
Report on the Condition of the Children who are in receipt of the various forms of Poor Law Relief in certain parishes in Scotland, by Dr. C. T. Parsons and Miss Longman and Miss Phillips.

APPENDIX VOL. XXIV.—INVESTIGATORS' REPORTS.—ABLE-BODIED AND "ORDINARY" PAUPERS IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.
Report on a Comparison of the Physical Condition of "Ordinary" Paupers in certain Scottish Poorhouses with that of the Able-bodied Paupers in certain English Workhouses and Labour Yards, by Dr. C. T. Parsons.

APPENDIX VOL. XXV.—STATISTICAL.
Statistical Memoranda and Tables relating to England and Wales, prepared by the Staff of the Commission and by Government Departments, and Others, and Actuarial Reports.

APPENDIX VOL. XXVI.—CHARITIES.
Documents relating more especially to the Administration of Charities.

APPENDIX VOL. XXVII.—REPLIES OF DISTRESS COMMITTEES.
Replies by Distress Committees in England and Wales to Questions circulated on the subject of the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.

APPENDIX VOL. XXVIII.—VISITS.
Reports of Visits to Poor Law and Charitable Institutions and to Meetings of Local Authorities in the United Kingdom.

APPENDIX VOL. XXIX.—REPORT BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.
Report on the Methods of Administering Charitable Assistance and the extent and intensity of Poverty in Scotland, prepared by the Committee on Church Interests appointed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

APPENDIX VOL. XXX.—SCOTLAND.
Documents relating specially to Scotland.

APPENDIX VOL. XXXI.—IRELAND.
Statistical Memoranda and Tables relating to Ireland, etc.

APPENDIX VOL. XXXII.—FOREIGN LABOUR COLONIES COMMITTEE.
Report on Visits paid by the Foreign Labour Colonies Committee of the Commission to certain Institutions in Holland, Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland.

APPENDIX VOL. XXXIII.—FOREIGN POOR RELIEF SYSTEMS.
Foreign and Colonial Systems of Poor Relief, with a Memorandum on the Relief of Famines in India.

APPENDIX VOL. XXXIV.—LIST OF WITNESSES.
Alphabetical Lists of Oral and Non-oral Witnesses.

E. 1.

Poor Law Commission.

Appendix

Vol I.