Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

tion must steadily go forward, and another twenty years, it may be, are before us for zealous effort and unwavering determination. For the past we should be grateful, for the future soberly confident. But flinching or flagging or tiring must find no place in our midst.

It remains to add what the writer would rather another added—this, that probably no public movement has been so loyally and zealously served by those concerned in it as the Church Defence movement has been. To its service many have brought talent and skill and learning, zeal, energy, and enthusiasm. No names need be named here; but many who read these lines will suggest names for themselves—some, of those who have passed away; and some, of those who still engage themselves in what they one and all hold to be the most sacred and best of causes.

H. Byron Reed.

Art. VII.—PAUPERISM.

PUBLIC attention has of late been repeatedly directed to the subject of the relief of the distressed as one of pressing interest and real importance.

We seem at last to be really waking up to the fact that we have in our midst a vast population who live more or less upon their neighbours. Our wealth, our nominal wealth as a nation, increases; but the increase of wealth seems to multiply those who are a useless burden upon it, those who cannot or will not work, those whose wages are insufficient, those whose employment is precarious, all of whom become more or less at one portion or other of their lives a burden upon the rates—that is, the forced contributions of their neighbours.

The problem that engages the attention of the social reformer, of the political economist, of the philanthropist, is how we are to deal with this very serious evil, how far it may be remedied, how far palliated, how far it must be accepted as a necessary evil and provided for accordingly. The same answer will probably not be given, as we regard the problem from differents point of view. The hard logic of the social reformer, which may be concisely expressed in the homely proverb, "Let every tub stand on its own bottom," and give no man a legal right to live at another man's cost, seems pitiless and unreasonable to those who are aware of another law of "bearing burdens," as not only kind, but wise. But, on the other hand, the easy benevolence of so-called philanthropy wasting its substance on unworthy objects, and for one case of real distress

which it effectively relieves doing harm to nine who are encouraged in idleness or mendicancy, meets with no quarter from the man who does not mind his neighbour spending his money foolishly, but winces under the increased rates, which, as he thinks, are the result of fostering and encouraging the pauper class.

At the present time we are somewhat in danger of being overdone with purely theoretical remedies for a very practical evil. It is peculiarly difficult to take a calm, a kind, and yet a wise view of the subject of pauperism, and yet it is a subject which, to take the lowest ground, we cannot afford to neglect. Pauperism is already a severe tax on our resources, and may in time eat into the very heart of our prosperity. Discontent, moreover, is, it is to be feared, on the increase, and may become dangerous. Those who already live partly on their neighbours are beginning to think of a further division of property, which will, as they suppose, give them a larger share. Those, too, who have sunk into a state of great hardship from causes over which they have no control, such as foreign wars, fluctuations in the money market, changes of fashion, or strikes of workmen in other trades affecting a kindred industry, are apt to be clamorous and may become dangerous.

It is often said that pauperism must be referred entirely to the operation of the Poor Laws, especially the system of out-door relief. There can be no doubt, that there have been grave errors in the administration of the Poor Law, which, instead of educating our population to be self-dependent, has to some extent perpetuated and intensified the old evils. Yet, even here, there are, as usual, two sides to the question. On the one hand, it is obvious that the Poor Law system does in itself tend to lower the wage rate. Take the case of a country parish of agricultural labourers who work for a few farmers. If the latter are compelled by law to provide for the former when they are sick or old, destitute, or out of work, it is plain that they will keep the wages as low as they can. The law of supply and demand works inexorably. They cannot afford to pay high wages and also bear all the risks of the labourer's life. Granted that low wages and a workhouse at last is a sad prospect for a man entering on life, but it is a question, not easily answered, whether the abolition of the workhouse, and a corresponding small rise in wages, would materially improve the labourer's state and prospects, so long as he is in his present condition, unable to command higher wages in the labour market and ignorant of the benefits of prudence and economy. But here there is every prospect of gradual, nay, rapid improvement. Farmers are learning to employ fewer men at higher wages, and to see that they are worth their money. But the workhouse

provision will not be made so freely for those whose earnings are sufficient without it. A peasant proprietary is a doubtful benefit to a country, especially when skill and capital are required for the profitable cultivation of the soil; but there is no doubt that things tend to a more independent position for the labourer so soon as he is fit to occupy it. There is a limit, moreover, to the burden which land can bear, and the time is coming when the farmer himself will require relief. The new departure in Local Government which is about to be made under Mr. Ritchie's Act is a wise movement in this direction. Even in towns and centres of industry we can trace the depressing effect of Poor Law provision for the poor. It is true that rates fall not on employers only, but on occupiers, and are very unequal in their incidence. The tradesman pays much more highly in proportion than the man of independent means, as business premises usually command a higher rental relatively than private residences; yet even here, whether for good or evil, the poor rates that we pay must reduce, and that considerably, the earnings of those who have, or who are supposed to have, a provision made for them out of the public purse. The Poor Law provision must tacitly enter into every bargain with a man who has only daily earnings to depend on; and, moreover, those who find the rates a burden have the less to spend in wages, for it must not be forgotten that every penny which goes to a pauper is so much capital that might have employed a labourer. And yet there can be no doubt that if kept within due bounds and intelligently administered, some such system is absolutely necessary for us in England at the present day. For be it remembered that the competition in life is for us necessarily keen.

The good workman will usually command sufficient wages and regular employment; but the weak, whether in health or ability, find it hard to hold up against the competition, and often fall out in the march of life. There is, also, an appreciable disturbance of the labour market caused by the immigration of frugal and industrious foreigners, and still more of those who, for one reason or another, are willing to work for lower wages than Englishmen. Our condition is totally different from that of a new country, where to support life is comparatively easy, and where competition is less keen—where every man thinks that he can do everything, and few things are done really well. The very nature of our position is such as to develop excellence in every walk of life, but in so doing we sacrifice the feeble. We may or we may not regret the necessity, but we must admit the fact; and it would be folly to apply to an old country the rules which suit a young one. Social improvement can never wholly do away with that which is peculiar in our position,

which is the secret of our excellence as well as of much of our misery—I mean the force of competition.

But pauperism among us does not only depend on the competition of trade and industry or the lack of employment. There are idlers in every class of life; there are thousands who prefer the miserable wages of pauperism to the well-earned rewards of honest work. The question, then, before us is this, how to give lame men crutches which will be of little use to sound men; how to apply the spur to the indolent, without pressing unduly the willing horse. We cannot leave the relief of the poor altogether to chance or to capricious or uncertain charity. In what way can we best bring pressure to bear on those who require to be taught self-reliance, and administer needful assistance to those who deserve it?

First, then, outdoor relief must be refused as a matter of *right;* it must be the rare exception, not the rule. I do not say that absolutely no relief whatever should be given from the rates to outdoor paupers, still less that no assistance should under any circumstances be given to those in distress; but I do say that the plan of supplementing earnings by weekly allowances, however alluring it may seem at first sight, is most pernicious in tendency. "Why cannot you foolish guardians see that it is cheaper to give a poor person half-a-crown a week than to take him into the workhouse?" is a favourite argument often employed by district visitors and other kind-hearted people. The answer, "I administer the Poor Law, not charity," may be a sufficient answer in many cases. But in the discharge of their duties as guardians, a certain amount of discretion is allowed; and my experience as a guardian is altogether against being liberal with outdoor relief. Take the case of the labourer in many a country parish. It is with many boards of guardians a standing rule that a man or woman of sixty is to have so much a week. This is thought fair, to treat all alike; and what is the result? Many a hale man is employed as a pauper at lower wages, and other men in the prime of life are either thrown out of work or have to take less than their proper rate. But worse than this, the workhouse provision stops all thought of laying by for old age; for, to receive parish relief, a man must have no resources of his own, and to save a little money means to lose the parish half-crown. I am aware that some boards of guardians differ in their treatment of aged paupers. Some even require a small provision as a condition of outdoor relief. The following instance may be of interest. An aged couple were received into an almshouse, provided by a charitable lady. Her object was to provide an asylum for aged and deserving poor who had some means of subsistence. But the guardians diminished the out-door allowance because there was

no rent to pay. Every rule has an exception, and here I think the action somewhat harsh. When I was in office, we were more considerate; but I am bound to say that cases like this always gave trouble. Again, children are relieved from the charge of their parents in old age by a system of outdoor relief. It is true that if parents become chargeable to the parish, an order can be made for contributions from such of the children as are able to afford them. But brotherly love and filial affection are sorely tried when the guardians' order is in dispute.

Another case, of frequent occurrence. This is a standing rule with many guardians, to allow a widow so much a week for her children; thus, it is argued, she is encouraged to do her best and keep respectable, and her home is not broken up. Now, consider what this amounts to. It is equivalent to what in another condition of life, would be called a marriage-settlement, at the public expense. The labouring man usually gains his best wages when he is young. In the middle classes few men early obtain a competence; but as a rule, in one way or another, a man who meets with ordinary success in life improves his position as time goes on. This at least is his aim, his ambition; but the labouring man is no sooner grown up than he earns his best wages. He marries very young, and he neither saves for a rainy day nor for the event of his own death; and this is very much because a provision is to be looked for, for his children, from the rates in the event of his death. I am no disciple of Malthus; and if a man can marry young with prudence, so much the better, in my opinion. But when a man marries, he must remember that, in all probability, not only a wife but children will look to him for support. And he ought to make a reasonable provision for the future. The labourer, as a rule, hopes that if he leaves a widow, the parish will keep her. And this provision she would surely lose, if he did his duty, and saved money by life assurance or provident club. Why, then save? Again, the cases are numberless in which the children have no benefit from the guardians' allowance, which goes straightway to the nearest public-house. Few can doubt that money *given* is much more likely to be spent in this way even than money earned. If, then, it be desirable or necessary, in a special case, to provide for children, we ought to be sure that the children have the benefit. It may seem more costly to board and educate a child, either in an industrial school or by boarding it out in a family, a mode of providing for children which is said to have the happiest results;[1] and it may seem somewhat hard to assume the parent's duty and take the child

[1] This opinion does not seem to be in accord with the report of the committee of the House of Lords, who find the district schools inefficient.

from its home. But the money spent ensures the child the food and education which the parent is unable to provide, and is, in fact, charitable as well as economical in the widest sense.

Other cases of distress there are for which it is difficult to suggest an adequate remedy or a course of conduct wholly consistent; such, for instance, as the prolonged sickness of the breadwinner of the family, or of his wife, or both, ending perhaps in permanent inability to compete with others of greater physical power. Here, perhaps, we may find an exception to the hard rule of no outdoor relief. But the kindly discretion of intelligent guardians will find some better way of ministering to the weak than the unsatisfactory, though obvious, expedient of a weekly dole. There is the case of the needlewoman, of inferior ability, whose work is not worth her keep. In this case assisted emigration may provide at least a partial remedy, or private charity may step in. There is the case of those who have been heavily visited by society for some fault, who are thrown off by their own friends, and have lost their position in life, and, like the unjust steward, cannot dig, though, unlike him, perhaps, they are not ashamed to beg, or are driven to do so. In investigation of such cases, charity organization societies may do good service. But the inexorable dictionary, with its record of the past and with its column marked *undeserving*, does not do much to encourage the latter class to amend, while there are cases in which the minute inquiries which are made would tell heavily against a man's prospects with his employers, when, as an independent man, he seeks for work. I have had some experience of the working of such societies. Too much must not be expected of them. They will do much to abolish mere mendicancy, and this will be an immense gain. They are often instrumental in keeping those who are in want from becoming recruits of the pauper army. But, except under the pressure of abject want, few persons who have any self-respect will submit to the searching investigation which involves revealing their distressed condition to those from whom they would wish to hide it; consequently, of those who apply, the majority are either Poor Law cases or undeserving, and multitudes who really require and deserve assistance, decline to seek it.

The subject of medical relief is one to engage special attention. There can be no doubt that public charities have been much abused. Society does not exist for the benefit of medical men; but it cannot be right for a number equal to one quarter of the population in the Metropolis to receive free medical advice during a year. Personally, I doubt the success of what are called "Provident Dispensaries," to which the healthy will not, the unhealthy cannot, contribute. Nor is

cheap doctoring to be advocated, which means inferior medical skill or inferior physic. There are those who would not relax the hard rule of no outdoor relief, even in the case of sickness; and undoubtedly some limit must be placed upon the too common notion that medicine and medical advice, including nourishment, are to be provided at the expense of the community—either the charitable few or the rate-paying many. Doctors are, on the whole, the most charitable of men, and the most self-denying, and they are too often imposed upon; but a popular dispensary doctor will seriously diminish the receipts of many of his neighbours. If people must pay, they usually contrive to do so; but it is human nature to take for nothing all that one can get. I fail to see the reason why one class in society should be provided free of cost with even the necessaries of life. Provision should be made for the relief of idiots, lunatics, and cripples, who can never take their part in life, and this surely at the cost of imperial rather than local taxation.

To men who can work, and are out of work, I need hardly say that no relief whatever should be given out of the rates in cash. Once admit it, and we should shortly be eaten up by those who would clamour to be fed. But the labour test is still unsatisfactory. The work at present usually provided in breaking stones or oakum-picking is not remunerative, and is unsuited for the hands of the artisan, such as the shoemaker, tailor, or other craftsman whose work requires delicacy of touch. And if a man is breaking stones for bread how is he to seek employment? Yet it is difficult to suggest a remedy. There is an objection to Government or parish workshops, which, it is asserted, would undersell the regular tradesman, and often make matters worse by overloading a market already overstocked. A similar objection applies to all prison and convict labour, while yet it appears but reasonable that all who eat at the public expense should, if possible, earn that which they consume. Relief works, moreover, directly discourage thrift and frugality, while it is found that of those who clamour for employment a very small percentage really desire it. The real difficulty, after all, is with the man who will not work, and the real remedy is one which in the present day it is not hopeless to supply. A man out of work is simply a man where he is not wanted. There is work for him somewhere. Why, for instance, should the neighbourhood of London, where prices range high, and the conditions of life are hard, be chosen for, or, rather, continue to be, the home of an industry which could be carried on elsewhere much more cheaply and with greater advantage both to capitalists and workmen. Yet this is the history of the collapse of the Thames shipbuilding trade, with its consequent miseries. Capital is, perhaps, easier to move than labour, but in the pre-

sent day the labourer must learn to find out where work is to be found. This knowledge will be promoted by such agencies as the Charity Organization Committees and labour agencies, where the workman may find trustworthy intelligence, and know that he will not be deceived. As time goes on, workmen will learn to take care of themselves; but for the present they may require assistance from those who are independent of trade combinations, either of masters or workmen. Arrangements could be made by an independent agency by which masters who require workmen might advance expenses either in whole or in part, to be stopped out of wages by reasonable instalments. But this could hardly be done by Poor Law officers, nor can workmen be allowed to dip into the ratepayers' pockets whenever it becomes necessary or desirable for them to change their quarters. We cannot hope to escape altogether temporary inconveniences from changes and fluctuations in the labour market; but although the wages of idleness be miserable enough, it is astonishing how many soon become reconciled to them, or even prefer them to the wages of industry.

I am not one of those who sympathize with the notion that emigration will be a sovereign cure for pauperism. I do not see that we have any right to assume that population is superabundant here, nor can the fact be concealed that those who succeed in a colony are those whom we can ill afford to lose. It is of no use to send incapables to a colony, and, further, unless capital go with them, it is cruelty to send labourers at all. True, that capital will go further in a colony than it does here; true, that prospects of a certain kind are open to a man in a colony which are closed to him here. For the most part land is to be acquired cheaply and easily, and may become of value in a short time. The absolute necessaries of life are cheap, and labour commands a good price. The man who would have been at home a struggling labourer all his days may rise to be a farmer. The small capitalist may, by lucky chances or natural business talents, amass a fortune, but this is not the rule. The natural growth of a new country may be rapid, very rapid indeed; but those who reckon on this are often doomed to disappointment. To send emigrants faster than they are wanted is to do mischief. In this, as in everything else, demand should regulate supply.

I have said little about public charities, so called — the subject is too large even to touch; and nothing about Church alms, nor yet about the private charities of kind people, who, wisely or unwisely, exercise their benevolence upon objects more or less worthy. However undesirable it be for every reason to waste that which might be better spent, I do

not sympathize with those who consider that private charity, being, as it is, uncertain in its operations, is pauperising in its tendency; and, indeed, though it is much talked of, I believe that the total amount thus given is grossly exaggerated. When in charge of a large London parish, I found it hard work to obtain from a mixed congregation so much as £100 a year, or, say, £2 a week, that the sick and old might have a little help. And if we consider the hundreds of families among whom such a sum is to be distributed, it will appear that the average outlay per head is almost inappreciable, and cannot enter into the calculation of the chances of a livelihood. In a few favoured places, where the poor are few and charity money abounds, there is a compensation, often overlooked, withal higher rents are to be paid.

Almsgiving does not attempt to cure the disease of pauperism; it only applies a plaster to the sore of distress. Experience taught me, as a clergyman, that the hard-hearted guardian was doing his duty as truly as the kind-hearted clergyman. I, for my part, tried to act in both capacities, and found no difficulty in reconciling the two. The knowledge of the poor which I gained as a guardian helped me as a clergyman; the knowledge which I acquired as a clergyman was equally helpful to me as a guardian.

I have tried in this paper to show that the Poor Law should neither crush by severity nor demoralize by unreasonable liberality. I hold that a man should pay his own way, and earn enough to pay it with. I am not one who thinks that, because a man earns daily wages, he ought to have any of his wants supplied at the public expense. I would cultivate an independent spirit. Better let a man earn a shilling and spend it, than give him a shilling's-worth for nothing, be it food, physic, raiment, education, or recreation. But while this is the policy of the hard-hearted guardian, let me not be supposed to undervalue for a moment the ministrations of Christian charity—owe no man anything, but to love one another.

That anyone, cleric or lay, should enter the home of the sick, with the consolations of religion, and speak of a God of love and mercy, and be content to say, "Be ye warmed, be ye fed," when the grate is empty and the cupboard bare; that he should coldly argue that the parish should do the needful, or that the sick person ought to have provided for illness during health, and should deliver a mocking message of good-will which he does not show by his deeds, is too much, I should hope, for even the coldest logician to expect. Evil will the day be, if it ever come, when the Church fails to be associated in the minds of men with deeds of charity and benevolence. The higher law of love should modify the hard

necessity of the struggle for life, or the Good Samaritan would have left the wounded traveller to take his chance upon the highway.

E. K. KENDALL, D.C.L.

Short Notices.

The Names of God in Holy Scripture. A Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. Notes of a course of Lectures. By ANDREW JUKES. Pp. 224. Longmans, Green and Co.

This work, as one would expect, is truly suggestive. It will repay reading, and lead many to profitable study. The subject, it appears, has long occupied the author's mind. He was led to it many years ago by noticing the four differing Names of God in the opening of the ninety-first Psalm :

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the MOST HIGH shall abide under the shadow of the ALMIGHTY. I will say of the LORD (Jehovah), He is my refuge and my fortress ; my GOD (Elohim), in Him will I trust.

The Homiletic Magazine. January to June, 1888. Nisbet and Co.

This volume contains a good deal that is worth reading ; but some of the papers are dry. The sermon sketches are made partly from published sermons : Liddon, Pusey, and Manning have been utilized.

The Discipline of Life. By the Rev. REGINALD G. DUTTON, M.A. Pp. 182. Rivingtons.

A preface to this posthumous work has been contributed by Canon Legge ; and what he tells us about the author adds much to the interest of these "last words of counsel." Reginald Dutton, from the time that he was an undergraduate at Cambridge, and had associated himself there with the Christian efforts which have for many years past drawn together so many young men, threw himself into the evangelistic work of the Church, whether as a layman at Portsea, or as a clergyman in Lambeth, in Lewisham, and in London. He caught a fever in the course of parochial visitation amongst the crowded back-streets of a London parish, and after a few days' illness, calm and firm in the faith, he sank quietly to rest. The book is spiritual and suggestive.

We have pleasure in inviting attention to Part I. of the "Penny Library" series, viz., *Strange Scenes*, by the Rev. James Neil, M.A., well known as the Author of "Palestine Explored," containing 40 original illustrations of Joppa and Jerusalem. The first edition of sixty thousand (Woodford Fawcett, and Co., Dorset Works, Salisbury Square) will prove, it may be hoped, the beginning of a worthily large circulation.

A new and cheaper edition of that admirable book, *Among the Mongols*, is very welcome, and will do a great deal of good (Religious Tract Society). Mr. Gilmour's detailed descriptions have well been compared to Daniel Defoe's. One type of Missionary work—and that a very interesting one—is, so to say, photographed. Mr. Gilmour is now living among his Mongol friends.

The Archbishop of York's Sermon, preached at the close of the Lambeth Conference, has been published, we are glad to see, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge : "The Manifestation of the Sons of God."

*** *Other Notices are unavoidably postponed.*