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American history is more than the chronology of elections and wars often covered by textbooks. Although often ignored, our history includes the struggles of many individuals and groups to improve the opportunities of ordinary people and to reduce the role of discrimination and oppression in our society. This book tells this story, the history of American social welfare. It explores the political and economic forces, values and ideas, and social institutions that have influenced the development and reform of social welfare policies and programs over the course of American history.

The goals of social welfare programs derive from the goals of the larger society for itself and from the view that society holds of itself and of its various members. In turn, decisions about who is needy and how they are to be helped bear upon economic development, political organization, social stability, and family integrity. Social welfare programs involve a redistribution of resources from one group to another. Our political culture has often resisted using government to redistribute resources, relying instead on the private economy to carry out this function. Through much of our history, Americans have valued private assets over public goods and individual autonomy over collective choices.

Decisions about who should benefit from public policies often polarize Americans. Priorities for funding programs for older people or children, for example, vie with each other. Americans have disagreed, as well, about whether public aid discourages self-help or voluntary solutions to social problems.

Yet, despite these value conflicts, social realities—economic crises, wars, civil disorder—have led us to embrace many active social policies. This combination of conservative values and progressive action often confuses those who try to make sense of this history.

Deciding to help a particular group is just the beginning. Government then faces many decisions about the actual structure of a program. Should eligibility be defined broadly or narrowly? Should help be offered in cash, goods, or services? Should we require recipients to receive counseling or technical assistance? Is help in one’s own family or community preferable to institutional care? At the same time, decisions about benefit levels and terms of entitlement often communicate whether a program is intended to invite or discourage participation. The extent to which needy individuals are viewed as beneficiaries, recipients, clients, or consumers suggests the intent of the program. Welfare recipients, for example, are subject to behavioral requirement that would be unimaginable for Social Security beneficiaries.

The geographical and demographic scope of the United States—the size and diversity of its population—as well as legal and social traditions related to volunteerism, to separation of church and state, to states’ rights, and to local responsibility—all complicate legislative and administrative decisions in social welfare matters. When programs should be government funded and administered and at which level of government? Which programs should be both funded and administered by voluntary or for-profit organizations? What is the appropriate public/private mix for the delivery of social services? What should be the degree of consumer participation in program design and service delivery? The number and complexity of these decisions result in bills—like the 2010 health care reform law—that are thousands of pages long.

The history of social welfare is also a story of the growing professionalism of those who administer social services—that is, with the history of the social work profession. The early development of the public and voluntary sectors of social welfare was accompanied by the development of purveyors of service seemingly appropriate to the purposes of each: both the overseer of the poor...
and the lady bountiful. Yet, as social welfare programs and services have become more institutionalized, service providers have been required to acquire and demonstrate their skills and capacities. Social workers originally drew their inspiration from the struggle against poverty and want, but as they became more professional, they often sought to define their unique skills as associated with psychology and individual adjustment. The tension between social work as a social change and social work as an individual adjustment profession has gone on for a century and will likely continue in the future. At the end of the day, however, social work practitioners have no choice but to address both social injustice and the immediate needs of their clients. Thus, the philosophical tension between individual and social change surfaces in one's professional practice as one decides how both to address the everyday problems faced by one's clients and to assess one's professional responsibility to pursue social justice in systems that are often oppressive.

This book emphasizes the meaning of social welfare for the family as a unit and for family members as individuals. The assumption is that the family is the basic organizing device of modern society and that all social policy decisions impinge on family well-being. In this sense, then, social policy and family policy are essentially one. The fact that the United States has no governmental family policy, no social policy that overtly supports family life as a goal in itself, highlights the discrepancies and dilemmas that have marked the American approach to social welfare. Society's interest in the family has not resulted in a stated, widely accepted goal for family welfare. Efforts to clarify such a goal through the calling of a White House Conference on Families in the 1970s, for example, were marked by confusion, dissension, and delays. The controversy of gay marriage that arose in 2004 underlined that the very definition of family was being challenged by the decisions of individuals and couples who had previously been less visible.

From the beginning, a separate channeling of family welfare and child welfare, originating with English Poor Laws, and, therefore, at one with the fabric of an English colonial milieu, divided social welfare responses for the worthy poor—the disabled and children—from those for the unworthy—the able-bodied poor. The incorporation of the English Poor Laws into the legislative framework of American colonial governments differentiated those who were unable to work from those who were potentially employable. Poor Law programs were vitally concerned with those who were employed and who might be in danger of “falling into pauperism.” The family was effective to the degree that it maintained the social order and the economic viability of its individual members. To a considerable extent, social welfare programs for poor people in the twentieth century were characterized by this same orientation.

The essential worthiness of children and the importance of nurturing their potential for social and economic contribution led to stated, public concern for their well-being as members of families and eventually to grudging recognition of the needs of families. The twentieth century was proclaimed the Century of the Child, and pressures to make the label stick resulted in the calling of the first White House Conference on Children in 1909 and to a positive statement of public policy in regard to child care. Home and family life were declared to be society’s goal for children, an enunciation of the rights of children. Economic necessity, many felt, should not require that a mother leave her child-care responsibilities for work outside the home. Time and reality have demonstrated more and more ambivalence of policy and practice in child welfare. The twenty-first century began with one-fifth of U.S. children living in poverty.
The expansion of government responsibility for the economic welfare of older Americans represented a break with past approaches to social welfare.

The changing status of women was a pivotal event in social welfare history. Until the middle of the twentieth century, married women rarely worked in the formal economy, yet they provided the vast majority of care, typically to members of their family. By the 1970s, a majority of married women were
working for wages or salaries. Although this helped many family budgets that were strained by inflation and economic stagnation, it created a “caring gap” because women had less time to care for sick or dependent members of society. Today, much of this work is still done by women, but now they are more often poorly paid aides rather than family members.

Government financial capacity often has more influence on social welfare policy than on the needs of clients. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, state and local governments collected few taxes and provided few services, whereas the federal government’s role in social welfare was usually limited to the well-being of veterans. The entry of the federal government into social welfare policy greatly expanded the social welfare budget. However, attacks on “tax-and-spend” policies during the late twentieth century reversed the growth of direct public spending on social welfare. The economic crisis that began in 2008 challenged policymakers, regardless of their political ideology. Should the government increase spending to stimulate the economy and risk a sovereign debt crisis as its budget deficit grew or should the government cut spending to balance government budgets even if it served to prolong and deepen the crisis?

The needs of the aging now receive great attention in the United States. But concern for the welfare of our older citizens was not consistent before the Great Depression. Thus, in the late nineteenth century special attention was paid to the needs of older white men who were veterans, but by the time of the Great Depression the aging were one of the poorest groups in American society. The chapters that follow will trace the evolution of the policy that has given the aging, particularly older white men, some relative advantage within the social welfare system.

The chapters that follow will also give the social welfare needs of two groups, veterans and blacks, special attention to demonstrate two extremes in social policy in the United States. Veterans have usually been given special consideration for social welfare benefits as a result of their unique social and economic contribution through service in the armed forces. They have played an important role in the expansion of public welfare programs because veterans’ programs have often set precedents for benefits later extended to others.

For peoples of color—blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, and Asian Americans, a very different picture emerges. Native Americans were oppressed by white invaders from the very first, and their treatment shames us still. Much of our attention is focused primarily on the largest of these groups, African Americans. This group has suffered the dual difficulties of color and class, of racial discrimination and poverty. Like other peoples of color, they have been assigned a social and economic role that has assured their vulnerability to the risks of industrial society and to extended need. Simultaneously, the assignment of that peculiar economic and social role has been used to rationalize the denial of economic and social justice that might have enabled them to meet their needs. Even when government adopted policies that attempted to address past discrimination, the social and economic inequality of African Americans has proven resistant to change.

America—it is often said—is a nation of immigrants. Yet, American immigration has come in waves. As the number of immigrants has surged during periods of economic prosperity, anti-immigrant sentiment has often led to efforts to restrict their flow, setting off some of the nastiest episodes in the history of American racism. The expansion of the foreign-born population has had a complicated relationship to overall race relations. Within a few decades, America may well become a minority majority nation in which nonwhites...
make up a majority. At the same time, the expansion of immigration sometimes has diverted the nation’s attention from the long-term marginalization of African Americans.

Anti-immigrant attitudes or nativism existed in the United States from the very first days. The treatment of Native Americans is one example. In the Colonial period, Benjamin Franklin had major concerns about the German language and culture spreading in Pennsylvania, and the Federalists worried about the Irish and French. Despite the large immigration of the nineteenth century, the period from the late 1830s to the mid-1850s was markedly anti-Catholic, and anti-Asian sentiment dominated immigration legislation the last quarter of the century. Nativism triumphed in the twentieth century, with legislation against all immigrants in 1924 and anti-Semitism prevailing during the 1930s and 1940s. The entry of millions of new immigrants since the 1970s has again provoked two persistent reactions: a cosmopolitan belief that immigrants enrich American society and a defensive fear that they will steal jobs and dilute the “national character” (itself a product of generations of immigration).

Over the years these principles were implemented in accordance with the country’s economic realities. As the country became richer, social welfare programs usually expanded, regardless of which political party was in power. The disparate treatment of different groups persisted, but policies became more generous for all.

The low level of individual economic output relative to the level of production needed during the Colonial period created little social surplus, which permitted little choice in regard to ability or willingness to work. The well-being, the very existence, of the colonies depended upon the maximum contribution of each of the colonists. Such dependence, supported by a view of human beings as inherently evil and easily seduced into idleness and pauperism, resulted in a policy of coercive alternatives to relief—the workhouse, indenture, apprenticeship, contracting out, and so on.

In contrast, the contemporary economy has an unprecedented capacity to produce consumer goods. Where a majority of Americans needed to work in agriculture to feed the nation, now 3 percent of the labor force can produce enough food to feed all Americans and a large share of the rest of the world. As a result, as a society we have more flexibility in allocating resources for different social groups. The growth of social welfare expenditures in the twentieth century reflects the increased ability of society to meet the social welfare needs created through the industrial process and its impact on family structure. Nevertheless, recurring periods of recession and inflation make it clear that the ability to finance welfare programs is finite and that the economy continues to require an allocation of productive resources among competing uses.

An examination of the history of the American response to dependency gives evidence that morality and ideology follow upon technological and economic reality. The colonial perception of work as moral and idleness as immoral may be challenged, in an affluent society, by a concept of entitlement to protection from society’s hazards and by a view of poverty as immoral. The postindustrial economy offers a new challenge to the linkage of income and benefits to work effort. The current emphasis on the immorality of not working comes at a time of a basic change in the nature of our market economy, as low-paying, unstable service jobs are replacing the more permanent manufacturing employment of a previous era.

Not only are wages in the service sector less adequate to support families, but these jobs offer fewer benefits. These changes would seem to support the
expansion of social welfare programs, but instead we are retreating from our help to the working poor. The resistance to change suggests the strength of the ideological overlay inherited from an earlier economy of severe scarcity we need to resolve value conflicts, if policy and program decisions relevant to today’s various families are to be made.

Even a cursory historical review of social welfare policies and programs demonstrates that political decisions about family welfare have been economically based. Overall, the family has been seen as a unit to be supported, if such support achieves economic independence for its members. When the family seems unlikely to support itself, conventional political wisdom has leaned toward the denial of public support. The hypothesis that family welfare policies and programs are economically based suggests again the numerous questions to be answered before benefits can be determined.

No exact formula is available for achieving an integrated response to the questions. Nevertheless, this volume argues that decisions leading to the formulation of social policies and programs for families result from the interaction of four factors:

- Economic productivity
- Perceptions of social institution’s effectiveness
- Views of human nature
- Past decisions about social welfare

The level of productivity, of output, of a particular society lends obvious constraints to choices about the uses of that output. These constraints are quite real. High levels of output and affluence increase the possibilities for choice; and the degree of equality in a society can, and indeed often does, increase as national income rises. At the same time that wealth makes some redistribution possible, it also makes redistribution psychologically necessary; our concept of what might be a tolerable level of poverty varies with gross national product. Still, the United States has not been a generous or equalitarian nation.

Perceptions of social institution’s effectiveness strongly influence the initiation and development of social welfare programs. If society believes itself to be operating effectively, and if most people feel they do well within the system, then those who find it hard to survive can be looked upon as individual failures. In such circumstances, the approach to the poor and to poverty issues is by way of remedial, residual programs aimed at uplifting the failures, at changing them to look like the rest of us. On the other hand, if society is seen as ineffective—for example, during periods of economic or social crisis—social welfare policy is more likely to promote institutional—rather than individual—change. The response to the severe, localized unrest of the 1960s was the War on Poverty, which consisted of educational, employment, legal, and social services aimed at helping individuals to become more effective participants in the labor market. In contrast, government responded to the widespread unemployment crisis of the Great Depression with the permanent social insurance programs of the Social Security Act, which altered the income distribution system and helped it become more effective in meeting the needs of individuals and families.

Views of human nature unquestionably influence the response to human need. A belief in the superiority of any group in the population—indeed, any racial, ethnic, religious, or sexual hierarchical ordering—becomes a basis for discrimination and exploitation. Certainly, the history of social welfare in the United States reflects this in its insistence on blaming the victims. In the nineteenth century, American elites used Social Darwinism to rationalize greed.

Perceptions of social institution’s effectiveness strongly influence the initiation and development of social welfare programs.
If people are seen as basically lazy, as shiftless, even as sinful, then social welfare programs are devised to deter. A nineteenth-century listing of the causes of dependency highlighted individual character flaws and argued that the help given to the poor by organized charity aggravated the problem. The dominant nineteenth-century response to dependency was the organization of friendly services aimed at pushing the poor individual, and by extension the family, above the need for relief. Alternatively, if people are considered essentially good (that is, ambitious), the response to need is more likely to be guided by the offer of incentives and the development of programs that provide opportunity for self-advancement.

Throughout American history, the poor have been considered both blessed and condemned by God, both virtuous and sinful, both lazy and ambitious. And these contrasting views have often been held simultaneously. In connection with the family, for example, the prevailing nineteenth-century view of Charity Organization Society leaders that family members had to be deterred from a base, inherited instinct for pauperism was countered by Settlement House movement leaders' conviction about the constructive force of human aspiration. To the former, pauperism—its effects upon the individual, the family, and society—was a disease worse than death, and hunger and starvation were to be endured for its exorcism. To the latter, poverty resulted from the denial of opportunity, and pressure was exerted for legislative reform designed to affirm and expand an inherent core of human dignity.

The need for resolution of value conflicts seems especially clear in the restructuring of public welfare after the War on Poverty. The federalization of adult categories of public assistance—Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Needy Blind, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled—in 1974 and the rejection by Congress of proposals by Presidents Nixon and Carter to replace Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) demonstrate enduring, contradictory views of human nature and the force of history on the shape of social welfare.

The rejection of Nixon's Family Assistance Plan and Carter's Better Jobs and Income Proposal was especially significant considering their foundation in the inherent virtue of work. Although the proposals were steeped in adherence to the work ethic, this did not dispel opponents' fears that adding the working poor to the welfare rolls would lead to widespread moral decline and increased costs. The link between work and the receipt of income security benefits was not strong enough to dispel the threat to our economic system that Congress saw in a guaranteed annual income—no matter how low that income was. The success of conservative welfare reform during the 1980s and 1990s ended efforts to balance support for the work ethic and a decent standard of living to even our poorest citizens. Rather, by 1996, government used punitive regulations to prevent millions of eligible families from even applying for aid.

The impact of cultural bias is clear throughout our history. The Poor Laws, as they developed in England during the longtime move away from agriculture to factory production, were an effort to deal with disjuncture and the conflict in that society between feudal lords and an emerging industrialism. The adoption of the Poor Laws for use by the American colonies represented the imposition of laws that were culturally appealing but in some aspects inappropriate to the American territorial and agricultural scene. The renewed vigor with which the Poor Laws were administered during the post–Civil War period demonstrates again the significance of historical heritage. The reliance upon family responsibility and local settlement as requirements for financial relief
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was detrimental not only to industrial expansion but also to family welfare. The importance of mobility and of the nuclear family to successful urbanization and industrialization went unheeded, and the country was bemused by welfare measures that eased but did not eliminate the hazards of the new society. The racially discriminatory application of the Poor Law principles to the freed slaves was touted as a base for helping blacks achieve the independent status of fellow American citizens.

Previous policy decisions cast a long shadow on contemporary social welfare policy debates. The creation of the Social Security system during the 1930s influenced almost all decisions about policy for the aged that followed. By the same token, the failure to include health care in the original Social Security system allowed the health care field to be dominated by private, often for-profit hospitals, insurance companies, and providers. By the time Congress passed comprehensive health care legislation in 2010, past decisions assured that public policy would have to accommodate these private interests. A public option became the flashpoint for debate and was ultimately abandoned in favor of subsidies for private insurance.

In summary, the congruence of technology and the level of output, the view of society, the view of human nature, and the historical heritage will determine the kinds of social policy decisions reached. This does not mean that these four factors contribute equally at any given moment. The very fact that the family, from the point of view of public policy, has been considered primarily an economic unit suggests that the degree to which each factor will exert influence on policy will depend upon existing economic conditions. The response to human need during the 1930s was remarkably different from that during the high-employment era of the 1960s. And yet both were periods during which need per se was widely recognized and civil disorder was threatened.

This volume is organized around historical eras and gives a description of the economic, political, and cultural context for each. The book examines social welfare programs and institutions through the use of legislative documents, judicial decisions, administrative rulings, and statements of public and voluntary social welfare leaders. Reference is made to these documents in the text; documents that represent historical turning points are given in original form.
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Succeed with mysocialworklab

Log onto www.mysocialworklab.com and answer the following questions. (If you did not receive an access code to MySocialWorkLab with this text and wish to purchase access online, please visit www.mysocialworklab.com.)

1. Watch the Core Competency video “Social and Economic Justice: Understanding Forms of Oppression and Discrimination.” Discuss how shaming has been used in America’s response to the poor.

2. Read the MySocialWorkLibrary case study “Community Practice: Mothers vs. The Board of Education.” How do the struggles of these women reflect struggles of women over history?

PRACTICE TEST The following questions will test your knowledge of the content found within this chapter. For additional assessment, including licensing-exam-type questions on applying chapter content to practice, visit MySocialWorkLab.

1. The major aspect of the Elizabethan Poor Laws that has influenced U.S. social welfare is
   a. its emphasis on society’s responsibility to children.
   b. the importance of work and workforce participation.
   c. society’s need to tax individuals to pay for services.
   d. the local government’s responsibilities to the poor.

2. In the Elizabethan Poor Laws, children were apprenticed until when?
   a. males until age twenty-four and females until twenty-one
   b. males until age eighteen and females until they were married
   c. both males and females until they were twenty-one
   d. both males and females until they were married

3. Veterans have historically been given special consideration for social welfare benefits because
   a. of the important status society has consistently placed on males.
   b. they serve a very crucial role in the balance of power.

4. Political decisions about family welfare have historically been made on the basis of
   a. moral values.
   b. gender roles.
   c. economics.
   d. race/ethnicity.

5. How has the changing status of women been reflected in social welfare?

ASSESS YOUR COMPETENCE Use the following scale to rate your current level of achievement on the following concepts or skills associated with each competency presented in the chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can accurately describe the concept or skill</td>
<td>I can consistently identify the concept or skill when observing and analyzing practice activities</td>
<td>I can competently implement the concept or skill in my own practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______ Discuss cultural bias and its effects on social welfare policy.
______ Describe different ways that cultural bias has been used to discriminate against certain groups.
______ Demonstrate cultural sensitivity when working with diverse groups.
______ Understand how oppression has affected all immigrants at one time or another.
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The document that accompanies this introductory chapter is an Act for the Relief of the Poor, better known as the Poor Laws of 1601, passed by the English Parliament during the forty-third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It is the only document in this book not derived from the American experience. Its inclusion is based on the tremendous and lasting influence that the Poor Laws have had upon social welfare policy and programs, first in the American colonies and subsequently in the United States.

Underlying the provisions of the Act for the Relief of the Poor are those features that have been identified as Poor Law principles. The overriding importance of work and workforce participation was primary. In providing support for the needy, individual and family responsibility came first. The act sets forth the qualifications for the selection of overseers of the poor, their duties and accountability. In addition, the act details the provisions to be made for various categories of poor persons and the ways in which benefits are to be funded and administered.

The Poor Laws of England and Western Europe were a reaction against economic dependency and a statement that those who could earn a living were expected to do so. Those who were incapable of working were to be provided for, either by relatives if possible, or by the local community. But those who were able to work, should. A primary concern with the work effort has dominated U.S. social policy throughout the years.

At the end of the twentieth century, the influence of the Poor Laws on the American response to need has become stronger than at any time since the Colonial period. The legislation originally devised to deal with the upheavals of the shift from feudalism to an industrial society is providing a base for social welfare as we move from an industrial to a service economy.

THE
STATUTES AT LARGE,
From The
Thirty-ninth Year of Q. Elizabeth,
TO THE
Twelfth Year of K. Charles II. inclusive.
To which is prefixed,
TABLE containing the TITLES of all the STATUTES during that Period.
VOL. VII.
DANBY PICKERING, of Gray's Inn, Esq;
Reader of the Law Lecture to that Honourable Society.
Edited by Joseph Bentham, CAMBRIDGE, Printer to the University;
Charles Bathurst, at the
Cross-Keys, opposite St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-Street, London 1763.
CUM PRIVILEGIO.

An Act for the Relief of the Poor, 43 Elizabeth, 1601

Be it enacted by the authority of this present parliament, That the church-wardens of every parish, and four, three or two substantial householders there, as shall be thought meet, having respect to the proportion and greatness of the same parish and parishes, to be nominated yearly in Easter Week, or within one month after Easter, under the hand and seal of two or more justices of the peace in the same county, whereof one to be of the quorum, dwelling in or near the same parish or division where the same parish doth lie, shall be called overseers of the poor of the same parish: and they, or the greater part of them, shall take order from time to time, by and with the consent of two or more such justices of peace as is aforesaid, for setting to work the children of all such whose parents shall not by the said church-wardens and overseers, or the greater part of them, be thought able to keep and maintain their children; and also for setting to work all such persons, married or unmarried, having no means to maintain them, and use no ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by: and also to raise weekly or otherwise (by taxation of every inhabitant, parson, vicar and other, and of every occupier of lands, houses, tithes impropriate, propriations of tithes, coal-mines, or saleable underwoods in the said parish, in such competent sum and sums of money as they shall think fit) a convenient stock of flax, hemp, wool, thread, iron and other necessary ware and stuff, to set the poor on work: and also competent sums of money for and towards the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, blind, and such other among them, being poor and not able to work, and also for the putting out of such children to be apprentices. . . .

* * *

III. And be it also enacted, That if the said justices of peace do perceive, that the inhabitants of any parish are not able to levy among themselves sufficient sums of money for the purposes aforesaid; That then the said two justices shall and may tax, rate and assess as aforesaid, any other of other parishes, or out of any parish, within the hundred where the said parish is, to pay such sum and sums of money to the church-wardens and overseers of the said poor parish for the said purposes, as the said justices shall think fit, according to the intent of this law: (2) and if the said hundred shall not be thought to the said justices able and fit to relieve the said several parishes not able to provide for themselves as aforesaid; Then the justices of peace at their general quarter-sessions, or the greater number of them, shall rate and assess as aforesaid, any other of other parishes, or out of any parish, within the said county for the purposes aforesaid, as in their discretion shall seem fit.

* * *

IV. And that it shall be lawful, as well for the present as subsequent church-wardens and overseers, or any of them by warrant from any two such justices of peace, as is aforesaid, to levy as well the said sums of money, and
all arrearages, of every one that shall refuse to contribute according as they shall be assessed, by distress and sale of the offender's goods, as the sums of money or stock shall be behind upon any account to be made as aforesaid, rendering to the parties the overplus; (2) and in defect of such distress, it shall be lawful for any such two justices of the peace to commit him or them to the common gaol of the county, there to remain without bail or mainprize until payment of the said sum, arrearages and stock: (3) and the said justices of peace, or any one of them, to send to the house of correction or common gaol, such as shall not employ themselves to work, being appointed thereunto, as aforesaid: (4) and also any such two justices of peace to commit to the said prison every one of the said church-wardens and overseers which shall refuse to account, there to remain without bail or mainprize until he have made a true account, and satisfied and paid so much as upon the said account shall be remaining in his hands.

* * *

V. And be it further enacted, That it shall be lawful for the said church-wardens and overseers, or the greater part of them, by the assent of any two justices of the peace aforesaid, to bind any such children, as aforesaid, to be apprentices, where they shall see convenient, till such man-child shall come to the age of four and twenty years, and such woman-child to the age of one and twenty years, or the time of her marriage; the same to be as effectual to all purposes, as if such child were of full age, and by indenture of convenant bound him or her self. (2) And to the intent that necessary places of habitation may more conveniently be provided for such poor impotent people; (3) be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That it shall and may be lawful for the said church-wardens and overseers, or the greater part of them by the leave of the lord or lords of the manor, whereof any waste or common within their parish is or shall be parcel, and upon agreement before with him or them made in writing, under the hands and seals of the said lord or lords, or otherwise, according to any order to be set down by the justices of peace of the said county at their general quarter-sessions, or the greater part of them, by like leave and agreement of the said lord or lords in writing under his or their hands and seals, to erect, build, and set up in fit and convenient places of habitation in such waste or common, at the general charges of the parish, or otherwise of the hundred or county, as aforesaid, to be taxed, rated and gathered in manner before expressed, convenient houses of dwelling for the said impotent poor; (4) and also to place inmates, or more families than one in one cottage or house; one act made in the one and thirtieth year of her Majesty's reign, intituled, an act against the erecting and maintaining of cottages, or anything therein contained to the contrary notwithstanding: (5) which cottages and places for inmates shall not at any time after be used or employed to or for any other habitation, but only for impotent and poor of the same parish, that shall be there placed from time to time by the church-wardens and overseers of the poor of the same parish, or the most part of them, upon the pains and forfeitures contained in the said former act made in the said one and thirtieth year of her Majesty's reign.

* * *
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VII. And be it further enacted, That the father and grandfather, and the mother and grandmother, and the children of very poor, old, blind, lame and impotent person, or other poor person not 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 of peace of that county where such sufficient persons dwell, or the greater number of them, at their general quarter-sessions shall be assessed; (2) upon pain that every one of them shall forfeit twenty shillings for every month which they shall fail therein.

** * * *

VIII. And be it further enacted, That the mayors, bailiffs, or other head officers of every town and place corporate and city within this realm, being justice or justices of peace, shall have the same authority by virtue of this act, within the limits and precincts of their jurisdictions, as well out of sessions, as at their sessions, if they hold any, as is herein limited, prescribed and appointed to justices to the peace of the county, or any two or more of them, or to the justices of peace in their quarter-sessions, to do and execute for all the uses and purposes in this act prescribed, and no other justices of peace to enter or meddle there: (2) and that every alderman of the city of London within his ward, shall and may do and execute in every respect so much as is appointed and allowed by this act to be done and executed by one or two justices of peace of any county within this realm.

** * * *

X. And further be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if in any place within this realm there happen to be hereafter no such nomination of overseers yearly, as if before appointed, That then every justice of peace of the county, dwelling within the division where such default of nomination shall happen, and every mayor, alderman and head officer of city, town or place corporate where such default shall happen, shall lose and forfeit for every such default five pounds, to be employed towards the relief of the poor of the said parish or place corporate, and to be levied, as aforesaid, of their goods, by warrant from the general sessions of the peace of the said county, or of the same city, town or place corporate, if they keep sessions.

** * * *

XI. And be it also enacted by the authority aforesaid, That all penalties and forfeitures beforementioned in this act to be forfeited by any person or persons, shall go and be employed to the use of the poor of the same parish, and towards a stock and habitation for them, and other necessary uses and relief, as before in this act are mentioned and expressed; (2) and shall be levied by the said church-wardens and overseers, or one of them, by warrant from any two such justices of peace, or mayor, alderman, or head officer of city, town or place corporate respectively within their several limits, by distress and sale thereof, as aforesaid; (3) or in defect thereof, it shall be lawful for any two such justices of peace, and the said alderman and head officers within their several limits, to commit the offender to the said prison,
there to remain without bail or mainprize till the said forfeitures shall be satisfied and paid.

* * *

XII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That the justices of peace of every county or place corporate, or the more part of them, in their general sessions to be holden next after the feast of Easter next, and so yearly as often as they shall think meet, shall rate every parish to such a weekly sum of money as they shall think convenient; (2) so as no parish be rated above the sum of six-pence, nor under the sum of a halfpenny, weekly to be paid, and so as the total sum of such taxation of the parishes in every county amount not above the rate of two-pence for every parish within the said county; (3) which sums so taxed shall be yearly assessed by the agreement of the parishioners within themselves, or in default thereof, by the church-wardens and petty constables of the same parish, or the more part of them: or in default of their agreement, by the order of such justice or justices of peace as shall dwell in the same parish or (if none be there dwelling) in the parts next adjoining.

* * *

XV. And be it further enacted, That all the surplusage of money which shall be remaining in the said stock of any county, shall by discretion of the more part of the justices of peace in their quarter-sessions, be ordered, distributed and bestowed for the relief of the poor hospitals of that county, and of those that shall sustain losses by fire, water, the sea or other casualties, and to such other charitable purposes, for the relief of the poor, as to the more part of the said justices of peace shall seem convenient.

* * *

XVI. And be it further enacted, That if any treasurer elected shall willfully refuse to take upon him the said office of treasurership, or refuse to distribute and give relief, or to account, according to such form as shall be appointed by the more part of the said justices of peace; That then it shall be lawful for the justices of peace in their quarter-sessions, or in their default, for the justices of assize at their assizes to be holden in the same county, to fine the same treasurer by their discretion; (2) the same fine not to be under three pounds, and to be levied by sale of his goods, and to be prosecuted by any two of the said justices of peace whom they shall authorize. (3) Provided always, That this act shall not take effect until the feast of Easter next.

* * *

XVII. And be it enacted, That the statute made in the nine and thirtieth year of her Majesty’s reign, intituled, An act for the relief of the poor, shall continue and stand in force until the feast of Easter next; (2) and that all taxations heretofore imposed and not paid, nor that shall be paid before the said feast of Easter next, and that all taxes hereafter before the said feast to be taxed by virtue of the said former act, which shall not be paid before the said feast of Easter, shall and may after the said feast of Easter be levied by the overseers and other persons in this act respectively appointed to levy taxations, by distress, and by such warrant in every respect, as if they had been taxed and imposed by virtue of this act, and were not paid.