

~~than can be expected to result from isolated effort; and such co-operation for the public welfare, whilst relieving the condition of the sick and lengthening the term of life, would also add much to the happiness and wealth of the citizens, and make our great, enlightened, and prosperous City of Belfast the Northern Hygeia, a City of Health on the island of Saints.~~

5.—*The Housing of the People, with special reference to Dublin.*

BY CHARLES DAWSON, ESQ.

[Read Wednesday, 27th March, 1901.]

THERE is no necessity to apologize for introducing this subject to the notice of the Society. It fills the public mind almost beyond any other domestic question. We know, from recent utterances, that it occupies the attention of statesmen, and even the King, who acted on the Royal Commission in 1885, has, since his accession to the throne, more than once introduced the subject into his speeches. It is, therefore, quite clear from this that, notwithstanding what has been done by legislation, by local bodies, by philanthropy and commercial enterprise, the solution of the question of the housing of the people has not, as yet, been arrived at. I do not use the word working classes, I prefer the term used by Sir Sydney Waterlow, "The Weekly Wage Classes." With few exceptions the most of us are workers, but the difficulty of finding suitable house accommodation, though there is sometimes some difficulty, is not so great with us as with those who are at physical work all day, or looking for it, whose pay is weekly, in many cases small and frequently precarious, and who have neither time nor money to fight their own battle. In fact, in this matter they are helpless. The condition of things is very bad in Dublin, as the public press of the day is pointing out in graphic pictures, but there are parallels to be found in most civilized countries. From a report of the medical officer of health of the London County Council of September, 1897, I find the following state of things described in the statement of the Inspector of Camberwell:—

"For instance, a night inspection had been made in the course of last year, which revealed the fact that a ground-floor room, 880 cubic feet in capacity, was occupied by fourteen persons and a baby. Two married couples and the baby occupied the bed, four children were accommodated upon one mattress, five children upon a second one, and a young girl slept in an orange box at the foot of the bed. It may be added that eight cases of small-pox were removed during the

summer of last year from the house in which this overcrowding was found; the members of the family occupying the overcrowded room being those attacked."

M. Louis Bertrand, in his work on the housing of the poor in Belgium, says at p. 79:—

"In a neighbouring parish of the City of Brussels lives a family composed of father, mother, and seven children; the father and mother and two girls aged 12 and 14, work as cotton weavers. Their accommodation consists of one small room in which there were two machines in a small corner only big enough to hold the machine, the whole family lodged at night on a palliase under the machine."

I might show the universality of the evil by contrasting this state of things in Brussels a few years ago by quoting the evidence given by Mr. McBride, representative of the Amalgamated Tailors of Dublin, who gave evidence last year before the Vice-regal Committee. He visited a house in Little Britain Street, conducted by a friend, which he thus describes:—

"He brought me to see a tenement home on the first floor. We found on entering a small apartment with a bed in it, and partitioned off, another apartment, a bed and a machine and two people, a man and a woman, in the room. There was only one window and no fire-place in the other room. The man had a family of six children and his wife. There was scarcely space for the young man and myself when we entered, to stand." (Report p. 223). And so it is from London to Paris and Brussels to Dublin. The other day two fearful tragedies shed a lurid light on the state of things in this city.

This dividing of big rooms into two or more smaller ones reveals the difficulties of adaptation. The second room can have no fire place, and if the big room be at the back of the house, the second room can have no light.

But I find the whole case summed up in an admirable Report of the Commissioner of Labour of the United States on the Housing of the People, published in 1895.

It quotes the following extract from a lecture delivered by Dr. Russell, Medical Officer of Health of Glasgow:—

"Percentages, though accurate, are but a feeble expression for facts regarding men and women like ourselves. I have told you that in Glasgow in 1881, 25 per cent. of the population lived in one room, and 45 per cent. in two-roomed houses. What does that mean? It means that 126,000 persons live in those one-rooms, and 228,000 in those two-roomed houses. But is that all I can say? I might throw down that statement before you and ask you to imagine yourselves with all your appetites and passions, your bodily necessities and functions, your feelings of modesty, your births, your sickness, your deaths, in short your lives in the whole round of their relationships

with the seen and the unseen, suddenly shrivelled and shrunk into such conditions of space. I might ask you, I do ask you, to consider and honestly confess what would be the result to you?"

The steps taken to relieve this awful state of things have, of late years, been numerous and continuous. Successive Governments in England, and several other countries, have passed innumerable Laws enacting everything that ought to be done. Municipal authorities have tried to put them in force. Philanthropists like Peabody and Sir Sydney Waterlow in England, like Godin in France, and Lord Iveagh in London and Dublin, have done a great deal in the way of erecting new Buildings, as have also the Corporation and Artizan Dwelling Company of Dublin. Miss Octavia Hill has been the pioneer in London in the adapting of one-family houses of former days to the requirements of the numerous families who now occupy them. She has been followed in her good work in Dublin by the Alexandra Guild Co., and the lately established Company for Housing the Very Poor. I am very glad to be able to add the name of another Company who have taken up this work. I refer to the Social Service (Tenements) Co., started by some members of the Dublin University.

Our Lord Chancellor had, I think, a hand in drawing attention to this matter. Lord Ashbourne named the subject of the Housing as the one for his prize essay to the College Historical Society. By the kind permission of the Secretary I had the privilege of reading the prize and other essays, and found in them valuable information and suggestions.

But, notwithstanding all the legislation and all the efforts, the evil is still with us. Nevertheless, these efforts teach some valuable lessons. They prove that the reform is possible—that it has a beneficial effect on the vital statistics, and lastly that it need not necessarily be carried out at a loss, but realise, as in many instances, a profit. As regards the effect of non-overcrowding on the death rate, Dr. Russell of Glasgow says in the lecture from which I have just quoted:—

"It is the small houses which produce the high death rate. There you will find, year after year, a death rate of 38 per 1000, whilst in the districts with large houses it is only 16 or 17."

I find the following Statistical Paper, by Dr. Ed. Bonnacker, on the Housing of the Working Classes:—

Population living more than two in a room.	Death rate from all causes.
Districts with under 15 per cent.	17·51
" " " 15-20	19·51
" " " 20-25	20·27
" " " 25-30	21·76
" " " 30-35	23·96
" " " 35-40	25·17.

In fact it is all a question of pure or bad air. A question of life or death.

To come nearer home. As compared with our heavy city death rate from 1895 to 1899, the Secretary of the Dublin Artizans Dwellings Co., has given me the following figures as to the death rate in their tenements:—

Death rate, 1895	...	13·34
„ „ 1896	...	14·26
„ „ 1897	...	13·75
„ „ 1898	...	10·8
„ „ 1899	...	11·0

As to the financial aspects, in all cases where the purchase money of the site was not exorbitant, the expenses have been met and the interest on principal invested paid. It appears to me, however, that it is not fair to charge the enterprise with repayment of principal. The property created is a fair security. No railway or public company could pay a dividend and return principal.

It is this enormous purchase money and repayment of loan which has made the Dublin Corporate Schemes unprofitable or a loss. Let me give a few examples:—The Plunket Street area of 3 acres and 2 roods cost £32,000, nearly £9,120 per acre. Coombe area cost £26,000 for 4 acres, or £6,500 per acre. In this area one squatter was awarded £600 for a valuation of £5 10s. But the Brides Alley Scheme out-herods all. The clearance cost £35,000, being close on £12,000 per acre. Of all the Corporate Schemes Bow Lane is the only one which goes near paying its way, because the purchase money was comparatively cheap.

Nearly all the London Companies pay 5 per cent. or 4 per cent., carrying over large balances. The Dublin Artizan Company paid last year 5 per cent., and carrying over £7,021 9s. 8d. to the Rest Fund, which now stands at £67,583. I may add, that in addition to its excellent management one factor in its success is that the Corporation leased them a large area at £200 a year, which cost the city £26,000.

Even the small Alexandra Guild effort pays 2½ per cent., and the still more recent Housing of the Very Poor Company declared a dividend of 3 per cent. It is quite clear that if legislation stepped in and prevented the robbery of public bodies by exorbitant awards for valueless property, one obstacle to more extensive operations would be removed.

Before I come to the solution of the general question, it would be well to consider what is required to be done in order to provide healthy and comfortable dwellings. The treatise of M. Louis Bertrand of Brussels, to which I have before referred, contains a preface by Dr. C. De Pape. He deals largely with

the hygiene of habitation, and lays down many important principles. He says:

"In truth, to be well lodged is to be well nourished—it is permissible to say that the first and most necessary of nourishments is oxygen, which percolates in the circulation of the blood through the lungs and skin and also revivifies the blood." He then refers to the importance of the aspect of the habitation, a matter which appears to me not sufficiently regarded by modern architects or planners of streets.

"It is necessary that man's home should be set towards the east, towards the sun, and exposed to the south-east and west. This aspect entails light, almost as essential to health as air. The insufficiency of light engenders Rickets and Scrofula."

Another French authority, Bandelogue, in his treatise on health, says:

"However insufficient and ill-chosen may be the nourishment, what ever may be the nature of the clothing, what ever may be the climate in which one lives, if the house which one inhabits, is placed so that the fresh air and the sun's rays have free access, and that the house itself is in proportion to the number of inhabitants, scrofulous diseases never appear." So much for air and light, but heat is also required and protection against stress of weather. Within the house periodical whitewashing and painting are essential. At the Vice-regal Committee last year the following recommendations were made.—

"That in tenement houses water should be laid on each floor, and separate sanitary accommodation be provided for at least every two families." It was also suggested, and a most important suggestion it was, that there should be a caretaker to see that all arrangements are kept in order in Dublin. Our people have been allowed to drift into such untidy and uncleanly habits that supervision is, at least for a time, absolutely necessary. Cleanliness is a gospel not yet sufficiently preached. No one has a keener knowledge of the difficulties in the way of the people than I, yet I must confess they could help much more than they do the efforts made for their own health and comfort. These efforts, however, are not sufficient, and until they are I for one cannot arraign the people. The laying of water on each floor is a costly work. The Public Health Committee confess in their report on the Committee's recommendations, that "it would occasion a very large expense on the part of the owner of the poorer class of tenement houses if they were required to provide a water closet for every two families. At the lowest estimate to carry out the recommendation, 7,000 additional water closets would have to be constructed." But the cost does not end at constructing water closets; a permanent expense is necessary to keep them in order and in connexion with the main sewer. If that connexion is not complete and continuous

what is the use of our main drainage at a cost of £300,000? Does not every one of us know that in large households, especially in times of frost, it is impossible, without much care and expenditure, to keep closets in order. Then who is to pay the caretaker? Let me take a typical case of a tenement house, say with eight rooms let at an average per week at 3s. This produces, if always let, 24s. per week, or £62 8s. a year. What are the outgoings? There is ground rent, £10; Taxes on a Valuation of £15, £7 10s.; ordinary repairs, £5; loss by vacancies, £5; dilapidation, £10; and we have £24 18s. for a margin—not 10s. a week for the person living, perhaps, on this resource. It is positively cruel to abandon thousands of people to the chance of having all their requirements supplied out of such a scant margin, or where there is a margin to the hard-heartedness of owners. The process seems to me as cruel as the experiment of gradually producing the death of a small animal in an exhausted receiver in order to teach a student the indispensability of oxygen to animal life. The great bard has said: "You take my life, when you do take the means by which I live." Our civilization is responsible for taking away these lives. Verily, there is a Town Question as well as a Land one.

For the solution of the Land question, compulsory land purchase is advocated. I should propose that the housing of the weekly wage class should be taken in hands by the State or the Municipality aided by the credit and funds of the State. The lives of the toilers should no longer be left to haphazard. Millions are found in the twinkling of an eye for other purposes, and they should be found for this. There are many sources. In the Report of the Royal Commission in London in 1885, on which I said his present Majesty sat, I find that:

"A definite suggestion has been made that the Treasury might lend the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank for the purpose of erecting labourers dwellings at a rate of interest little above what is paid on the deposits."

At page 58 the Commission reports that Mr. Torrens proposed that one half of the annual balances derived from the Post Office Savings Bank may in future be advanced, with the sanction and control of the Treasury by the Public Works Commissioners, to Local Authority on the mortgage of freehold sites purchased for workmen's houses and the dwellings erected thereon, together with the security of the rates of the borough. the principal of the loan, together with the interest, to be repaid by easy instalments."

At the time of the sitting of the Commission the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank amounted, for the United Kingdom, to £80,597,641. They amounted, by the Treasury return on the 31st Dec., 1900, to £130,118,604. Out of this last sum the deposits from Ireland amounted to £7,791,000. Such application of analogous savings are not unknown in some

European Countries. In Belgium, by Article 5 of the Law of August 9th, 1889, the General Savings Bank is authorised to apply a part of its funds to loans to aid in the construction of workmen's dwellings.

The late Mr. Edmund Dwyer Gray, in a separate report, said:—

“A Local Authority should, by an extension of Cross' Acts, not only acquire an ‘area,’ but the fee-simple of its entire district. The community represented by the Local Authority would then have the benefit of such future increase in the value of the land of the town as was due to increased prosperity. Such a change, while inflicting no injustice upon any individual, provided a fair purchase price was paid, would, in consequence of the future enhanced value of the land eventually, not only do away with the necessity of local taxation in towns, but yield a constant increasing surplus applicable to the benefit of the entire community. In order to enable the scheme to take effect in the life time of the present generation, the Local Authority should be enabled to purchase, in addition to fee-simple, such leasehold interests as might be necessary. Under such an arrangement the land would fall into the hands of the Authority as quickly as they would be able to deal with it.”

The present Marquis of Salisbury also wrote a separate report, in which he pointed out other sources of funds for the purpose. He says.—“There are many grave objections to the provision of cottages at the cost of public taxation. But, even if those objections could be overcome, the taxes from which the outlay is drawn should be of a kind which all sorts of property should join in paying. There is no ground for charging such an expenditure on the occupiers of land and houses. Incomes of all kinds, whether they come from Consols or foreign stocks, from debentures, ground rents or mortgages, ought equally to share such a burden.” I suggest, that in addition, there should be a municipal income tax, which could be levied on the holders of over £750,000,000 of Consols, and applied to local expenditure. The struggling shop-keeper in a by-street pays more for our public health department, baths and wash-houses, our libraries and open spaces, our technical and industrial schools, than the opulent stock holder in the squares. Then ground rents, which are bound to increase with the increased prosperity of the land, should contribute to the improvements which enhance the value of the property. Were these additional resources at the command of the local authority there would be no difficulty in raising the necessary sum no matter how big it would be. Treasury Bonds or Municipal Stock could be issued and yield a fair interest to investors. From my recommendation regarding the general question of housing I come to the case of our own city, and shall close with a proposal. Now, as to

DUBLIN,

its condition, in this connexion, is very peculiar, and deserves a separate examination. To those who have not made that examination it must appear strange that if in other places, such as London and other English towns, there are plague spots and over-crowding, how does it arise that Dublin's death rate should stand out in so marked and so melancholy an excess. The reason is at hand for those who look into facts and figures. In the Registrar-General of London's Report for the week ending 2nd February, 1901, I find that, though the rate of all London was only 16·9, that of Borough Road District was 42·0; of Mile End, 40·0; and E. Greenwich, 39·0. But those districts, and the classes who contribute the heavy death rate are in the minority, and in the millions of those well housed and fed, these high figures are averaged down to the low general rate. The converse is the case in Dublin—In his weekly return, the Registrar-General of Dublin gives the professional and independent and middle class a total of 97,048. He gives the artizan, general service class, and Workhouse inmates as 252,546. The greater part of this latter number is badly housed, and, consequently the comparatively low rates of the few well housed is raised to the high figure by the preponderance of the ill-housed and I may add, the ill-fed. To illustrate how Dublin is a poor city for the working classes, I have taken steps to compare it with Bradford, a manufacturing town in the north of England, of about the same population as Dublin. In Dublin the most numerous trades and sources of employment are precarious. According to the Census Return of 1891, the Building and Cognate trades numbered 6,606; much of their work depending on the weather and other circumstances. The Dock labourers, also a large class, have an employment which cannot be called otherwise than precarious, as it too depends on fluctuating circumstances. Of those employed in constant trade, such as tailors, I find from the Registrar-Generals Return the number fell from 2,269 in 1871 to 1,443 in 1891, and I fear the next Census will show a greater falling off, owing to the increased importation of ready-made clothing. The boot and shoe makers have fallen from 6,442 in 1871 to 2,480 in 1891. The tanners have disappeared and the shipwrights have fallen to 89. Bakers and Printers appear to be the only trades keeping up numbers because as yet bread cannot be imported and we must have our daily news sheet. Now, let me turn to the Census of Bradford for 1891. In addition to the ordinary trades I have mentioned for Dublin, I find in the textile trades, cotton, worsted, weaving, carpets alone 51,805 persons employed in work that may be considered constant. The outcome of this is, that in the workhouse at Bradford on the 1st of January, 1901, there were 942 inmates. In the workhouse of Dublin there is a standing population, according to the

Registrar-General, of 5,119. But some persons to whom I mentioned this said that there was more out-door relief in Bradford. I have the official figures from the Clerks of the Unions. On the week ending the 1st January, 1901, the number of persons getting out-door relief in Bradford was 1,329—the same week the number getting out-door relief in the Dublin Union was 4,303.

No doubt there are other causes of disease and death, but want of constant employment and consequent poverty is in my mind the greatest. And for that reason it becomes more and more the duty of the responsible Government, under whose sway this disastrous state of things has arisen, to help the victims in their efforts, with their restricted means to procure at reasonable rents healthful dwellings. No doubt excesses in many cases, and uncleanly habits, aggravate the effects of the poverty I have described, but I look on those excesses and uncleanness in many cases, rather as effects than causes. Now, my proposition for Dublin is based upon figures given by the Registrar-General at the Vice-regal Inquiry last year. In his evidence Mr. Matheson divides the population of Dublin as follows:—

Families having	First Class accommodation	4,694
	Second Class	13,279
	Third Class	14,536
	Fourth Class	19,342

Now I should like to provide for the third as well as for the fourth class. For, although the artizan may be able to pay and does pay 4s. 6d. to 5s. a week rent in Dublin, he cannot get the same self-contained comfortable cottage accommodation that is being provided for his class in London, Glasgow, and which I believe should be provided for the artizan in Dublin.

But to my mind the most pressing case for public and immediate action is the fourth class mentioned by the Registrar-General. The word family does not convey in his return necessarily more than one or two people. Where there are not more than one or two in family we would allow one tenement, where more, at least two. Then we would have, say one tenement and a half per family, or 30,000 tenements. I have it from an architect of the highest eminence and one intimately acquainted with the subject, that plain, but healthy tenements, provided with adequate sanitary accommodation, could be supplied at £68 per tenement. This calculation is based upon a cost of 6d. per cube. I may mention here that for some reason I cannot explain, tenements of the same character can be produced in Glasgow at 4¼d. per cube, or 41·8 less than in Dublin. I learn this from the manager's report of the City Improvement Department, Glasgow, dated 14th Nov., 1900, p. 5. Why this is so is a question which one not acquainted with details cannot enter into;

but in a city of high rents, especially for the poor and weekly wage class, the cost of building is a question of deep interest. But take it that for the building of 30,000 tenements at £68 each £2,040,000 should be raised, and as I understand 100 acres would be at least necessary for the purpose and that land could be got for £400 per acre, the total sum required would be £2,080,000. When the London County Council announced in their last report that they have purchased near London land for a New Scheme at £400 per acre, it ought not to be difficult to procure sites in the old or extended city for a similar sum. Now this sum, which would be considered light for other purposes and voted in a night, is not so formidable. For let me examine it. Of the 30,000 tenements one-third would consist of one or two adults, single men or women, or man and wife without family, or widow with very young children. If the capital were advanced from the Post Office Savings Banks, deposits at an interest say of $3\frac{1}{2}$ on the security of the fee-simple, the buildings, plus the security of the rates supplemented by the other sources pointed out by Lord Salisbury, such as ground rents, stocks, the figures would work out thus:—

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON 30,000 TENEMENTS AT £68 PER TENEMENT,
AND 100 ACRES LAND AT £400 PER ACRE = £2,080,000.

<i>Dr.</i>	<i>Cr.</i>
To Yearly Rental of 30,000 Tenements at 2/- per week each	£ 156,000
<u>£156,000</u>	By Interest on Capital at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum 67,600
	„ Sinking Fund, at 1 per cent. per annum 20,800
	„ Average Rates, less Sec. 75, on a Valuation of £90,000 36,375
	„ Cost of Rent Collection, say 2,000
	„ Cost of Repairs, etc. 7,500
	Wages and Supervision 5,000
	Insurance 2,000
	Surplus 14,725
	<u>£156,000</u>

Domestic scavenging, water, and lighting, etc., is included in the rates, paid the same as in any other property, and come back to the Corporation funds. No sum could, at the rents charged, be set aside for renewals, but as the capital expenditure would be repaid in fifty-six years the premises ought to be in fair condition and the fee-simple property of the Corporation.

It has been suggested to adapt the present tenement houses in Dublin, as Miss Octavia Hill has done in London. Once I was an advocate of this. But experience has taught me, most of

them, if not all, are not worth restoring. It should have been done over 30 years ago. The walls are almost all that remain. In new buildings the walls represent a third of the entire cost, but here they represent nothing of the kind, and as for their interior reconstruction it would mean demolition from the base to the attic. I fear disease is in every crevice. The plan is, build new houses, and instead of pursuing the policy of buying old houses at fabulous prices, let them be closed by degrees and the areas turned into open spaces. Now Rome was not built in a day—nor could we rebuild Dublin all at once. The work could proceed at five or ten thousand tenements at a time, or even less. And thus by degrees the reform could be effected with great advantage to the people, and, I firmly believe, if well managed, at no loss to the ratepayers.

So much for the tenement houses. But what about that other and worse blot, the Lodging House. Where is the casual lodger, man or woman, with no household goods, or such permanency of employment as to warrant them even in hiring a single tenement to go to. Amongst the lodging houses now provided the worst over-crowding occurs. We may pass bye-laws and have tickets and surprise visits—but where, if you shut up the existing places are the unhoused thousands to get a night's shelter? Are they to be left on the streets? Surely in every well managed city where casual labourers, men and women, come to look for employment, safe and sanitary lodging should be provided by responsible public authority. Here there should be no fear of any financial loss. If the rents I have quoted can pay for a tenement costing £68, why should not 4d. per night, 2s. 4d. per week per bed, pay well. As far as I can see no bye-laws are able to prevent the cases I have quoted of Camberwell in London and the Coombe in Dublin. Day visits are useless. Night visits are a highly objectionable interference with privacy, and when they are not continued the over-crowding commences the next day. Then there is another matter, by the dwellings and lodging-houses I am speaking of being in the hands of public authority, the enormous expense of the Public Health Department would be almost wiped out. How few prosecutions or inspections do the Corporation Buildings require—or the Artizan's Dwellings Co., or the Guinness Trusts. I believe the saving would be several thousands a year, to be carried as another credit for the carrying out of my scheme. But it will be said, what has the State or the Public Authorities to do with providing good lodging than with providing good bread, or meat, or clothes. Well, I answer. There are plenty of people competing to supply bread, and meat, and clothes. There is no such competition in supplying the weekly wage, or the daily wage class, with good and healthful dwellings. Again, it may be urged, you interfere with private enterprise. Do we not interfere with private enterprise when we supply water at a cost of a million—a well invested million—to the people,

and pure air is more essential than water. Many cities supply gas, &c., at a great profit to the rates. The last objection is there may be danger to the rates. I have tried to show there need not be if there is a competent management. But even if there were do we not know that in many cases for railways and other public works the rates are pledged. There is, to my mind, no reason why the State should not itself undertake, or enable the Local authority to make provision for the lives of the toilers in the towns as to carry out the great land reform already passed or proposed to be passed for the toilers in the rural districts.

It is, at any rate, in my opinion, the only way. At present society stands like the rustic described by Horace, on the bank waiting for the stream to flow by. But it will never cease to flow as long as the wells of misery, which feed its awful tide, remain undried.

6.—*The Tourist Movement in Ireland.*

By D. J. WILSON, Esq.

[Read Friday, 19th April, 1901.]

“And sure it is yet a most beautiful and sweete country as any is under heaven, with many goodly rivers, replenished with all sorts of fish, most abundantly sprinkled with many very sweet islands and goodly lakes like little inland seas, that will ever carry shippes upon their waters.”—*Spenser's State of Ireland*, 1596.

WHILE I cannot plead that I am unaccustomed to public speaking, I can claim your indulgence on the ground that this is the first occasion on which I have ever read a paper of this description, and on the further ground that I have not had very long notice in which to prepare a paper to adequately treat what, to my mind, is a most important subject.

My paper should, I am aware, be devoted to a statistical and social review. I have discovered, however, that the subject is eminently one which does not lend itself to statistics, and I propose instead to treat it from a historical and an economic point of view—in the first place, endeavouring to justify the title of paper by showing that there is a Tourist Movement in Ireland, and next (assuming that I have succeeded in establishing this fact), dealing with its economic value to the country. In using the term historical I have no intention of diving into remote antiquity. Ireland has apparently always been a very attractive country, and has had a very varied list of visitors; but while some of them were extremely peripatetic, the “Tourist,” in the modern sense of the word, is the evolution of comparatively recent times. I do not, therefore, propose to deal with the journeyings of Strongbow or the tours of Oliver Cromwell. And may I here