

shall be amended, but whether the power of removal in case of destitution should be altogether done away with. This question has been already practically decided in the affirmative. In 1865, when irremovability was allowed to be acquired by a single year's residence, the right of removal was only maintained on the ground that it would be a useful check on vagrancy. An opinion to this effect was expressed by the committee of 1879, upon the laws of settlement and removal. The committee recommended the retention of removal only in the case of persons landing at seaports, in consequence of the unfair burden which its abolition would impose on such districts. *The entire abolition of removal, and the consequent devolution of relief on the place of residence, irrespectively of settlement, is regarded as only a question of time.*"

In several of the older States of America the law recognises a class of paupers known as State paupers, and these—for instance, in Massachusetts—are defined as those poor persons who have no legal settlement in any town or county. The law of settlement therefore becomes the pivot of the system. Prior to 1865 no material change had been made in the settlement-laws since the Act of 1794, which is the foundation of all existing settlements. This was a statute, to use its own words, "enacting and ascertaining what shall constitute a legal settlement of any person in any town or district within this Commonwealth, so as to subject and oblige such town or district to support such person in case of his becoming poor and standing in need of relief," and this was done in one of the following ways:—

1. A married woman was to follow and have the settlement of her husband.
2. Legitimate children to follow and have the settlement of their father.
3. Illegitimate children to follow and have the settlement of their mother at the time of their birth.
4. Settlement to be acquired by citizenship, an adult age, and the possession of an estate of inheritance or freehold of a yearly income of \$10 for three successive years.
5. By citizenship, an adult age, and the possession of an estate of the value of \$200 for five successive years.*
6. By serving one year as town clerk, treasurer, selectman, overseer of the poor, assessor, constable, or collector of taxes.
7. For all settled ordained ministers by such ministerial settlement.
8. By admission as an inhabitant of any town or district by vote.
9. By dwelling in an unincorporated place at the time of its incorporation.
10. The tenth mode, so called, points out what legal settlements may be retained where towns or districts are divided or incorporated.
11. By service as an apprentice for four years, and carrying on business for the five following years.
12. By citizenship, an adult age, a residence of ten years, and the payment of a poll-tax in five of those years.

The existing law is that of 1794, with these exceptions: (1) Naturalisation is no longer required; (2) for men the time of residence is shortened to three years; and (3) settlement is conferred on women for residence only. It is evident, therefore, that the direction of legislation is in America the same as in England, only that in the New England States, especially Massachusetts, they are, if anything, more conservative as regards settlement.

In 1854, after a long and angry controversy on the same or analogous points to those which are now in dispute between Wellington and the surrounding country districts, a new departure was determined on. The country districts had argued that the great mass of cases requiring charity and hospital privileges were confined to the large towns, and especially the seaports. Why, they asked, should we, who have comparatively few, be taxed for the benefit of the towns, who, by their lavish charities, attract all the loafers in the country? Besides, they are rich, and growing richer, by the productive labour of the class whence these paupers come. They have called them in for their own benefit; let them help them if they are needy. Why should we carry their burdens? On the other hand, the large towns replied: We cannot grow rich without benefiting all; we create markets for your produce; we find employment for your children who wish to be mechanics, traders, or professional men. The capital invested within our limits is but partly owned here, yet its presence compels heavy local taxation. In short, it was a modern phase of the quarrel between the belly and the members, and resulted in a compromise—that the towns should support all the *State poor* found within their respective limits: for all that were wholly supported and unable to labour even half a day the towns were to receive from the State treasury 49 cents per week for each adult and 28 cents for each child; for burying the dead, \$5 for an adult and 50 cents for every child under twelve years of age; all other expenses to be borne by the towns, whose bills were to be audited by the Legislative Accounts Committee. This agreement was for a time carried out with tolerable good faith, but with increasing immigration, extending manufactures, and especially increased facilities of travel, difficulties multiplied, and frauds became almost universal. It was found impossible to audit the bills, which soon were many years behindhand. An auditor of accounts was created, and the result of inquiry was overwhelming. Dead paupers were regularly charged for as if living. During scarcity of work whole villages had been enrolled as State paupers. Subscriptions got up for families were made the basis of charging all their members to the State for the entire winter; and so with many other forms of imposition with which we are quite familiar under the existing system in New Zealand.

Three State farms or almshouses were established in 1854, but here the same difficulty recurred. The towns were allowed to send all the State paupers to these institutions whom they could *persuade* Government officers into receiving. Only the sick and aged, whom they could not send, and those whom for local and personal reasons they chose to retain, were maintained at their own cost.

In Connecticut all paupers who have no legal settlement receive support (for six months only at the expense of the State. In Maine the cost of State (unsettled) paupers is repaid by the State.