

It is wholly  
ert,—in fact  
direct cue-  
they find, by  
m neighbor  
undertakes  
expect such  
own town.  
n draw from  
state Govern-  
against undue  
om town to  
its, they may  
n go to mak-

where town  
n the case of  
by ship own-  
of emigrants  
ake the most  
their keeping.  
d, that with-  
they should  
er No. 1, how  
lines.

gerness of the  
"settlement"  
large a class  
one dependent

of its Public  
at stringency

red of the fore-  
en of foreign  
at one in five  
The law re-  
one town of  
ears' taxes.—  
ed this settle-  
in the town,

lass of "State  
hole theory of  
e benefit of a  
meant to as-  
s, perpetually

In the present arrangements of our industry, where frequent removal from one manufacturing town to another is the future, almost necessary, of every enterprising workman, it is indeed a pity that that removal should throw him and his family, in any case of destitution, out of the list of those for whom the town he lives in should provide. A statute intended merely to assume the charge of vagrants, should not so describe them as to include half the working men of the State.

In 1850 I made application to the Overseers of the Poor on behalf of a man who moved into the town in 1832. In 1841 he removed from it for six months. He returned in 1842, and from that time he paid his taxes for eight years. He had been naturalized in the proper form also. Seventeen years of residence had not given him a "settlement," however, because they were not continuous,—nor had tax-paying, nor citizenship. He could not be relieved therefore as a pauper belonging to the town. I may add that the overseers would gladly have relieved him as a State pauper, and wished to do so, but that, from the time of that relief he would have been obliged to have begun a new ten years' probation. The children of this man,—all born in the town, were in like wise a charge to the State Treasury.

It will be observed that this stringent law does not in the least affect the necessity of supporting the persons who have no "settlement." It only creates in every town of the State a class of persons, most of whom have lived there for years probably, from whom every year come those poor persons who are chargeable in part to the State Treasury, in the anomalous and unsystematic way I have described, instead of the town treasury, according to the simple old Saxon arrangement, which we had from the beginning.

No other New England State is nearly so strict. Massachusetts requires ten years' residence.

Maine	"	five	"	"
New Hampshire	"	seven years'	poll tax.	
Vermont	"	four	"	residence.
Connecticut	"	six	"	"

Rhode Island three years' residence to entitle one to support.

To such extent do these States provide more carefully for foreign paupers than does Massachusetts. They give them support, that is, in the town which has been made their home, by a residence of years.

But with us the existence of a class who almost never earn "settlement" is perpetual trouble and cause of useless expense. The temptation is immense to send them to some other town where they have friends, or think a better chance will open to them. Ten thousand dollars a year is a small estimate for