



HAL
open science

The Emigration debate in the Dublin press of the 1820s

Michelle Mcnamara

► **To cite this version:**

Michelle Mcnamara. The Emigration debate in the Dublin press of the 1820s. Linguistics. Université de Strasbourg, 2020. English. NNT : 2020STRAC016 . tel-03506290

HAL Id: tel-03506290

<https://theses.hal.science/tel-03506290>

Submitted on 2 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG

École Doctorale des Humanités

Savoirs dans l'Espace Anglophone : Représentations, Culture, Histoire – UR 2325 SEARCH

Thèse présentée par :

Michelle MCNAMARA FOURQUET

Soutenue le : 25 septembre 2020

Pour obtenir le grade de : **Docteur de l'université de Strasbourg**

Discipline : Civilisation irlandaise/anglaise

The Emigration Debate in the Dublin Press of the 1820s

THÈSE dirigée par :

Christian AUER

Hélène IBATA

Professeur émérite, Université de Strasbourg

Professeure, Université de Strasbourg

RAPPORTEURS :

Wesley HUTCHINSON

Tri TRAN

Professeur émérite, Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle

Maître de conférences, HDR, Université de Tours

AUTRES MEMBRES DU JURY :

Françoise BAILLET

Pauline COLLOMBIER-LAKEMAN

Professeure, Université de Caen

Maître de conférences, Université de Strasbourg

Acknowledgements

My utmost gratitude must first go to Dr. Christian Auer, who was the first to support me in my research endeavors beginning with my Master Thesis in 2010. Towards the end of this first research project on shipping advertisements in the Irish press in the pre-Famine period, Dr. Auer encouraged me to look deeper to find an aspect that could be developed into a PhD subject proposal. Until his retirement in 2016, Dr. Auer continually supported my research and always encouraged me with kind words and insightful guidance. I can now say to you, Dr. Auer, “I’ve done it, I wrote *more*.”

Secondly, I must thank Dr. Helene Iбата for taking over the direction of this research from Dr. Auer. I greatly appreciate all the efforts over the past two years and the sacrifices (of the summer holiday, no less) made to get this dissertation over the finish line.

My thanks are also due to the *Société des Anglicistes de l’Enseignement Supérieur (SAES)* for a bourse de thèse that was awarded to me for this research project. This funding enabled me to collect the majority of the articles studied in this dissertation at the National Library of Ireland in Dublin in 2015.

For their support and assistance in consulting my newspaper sources, my greatest appreciation goes to the indispensable librarians at the National Library of Ireland and the British Library formerly at Colindale.

To my family, I cherish the love and support of my husband, Damien, our two sons, and all my family in the United States for their unending encouragement. To my mother and father, I love you and thank you for putting me on the path I am on today.

Finally, I want to thank all my friends and colleagues who supported me, especially Dr. Katherine Sowley, who provided invaluable suggestions to improve this work.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
ABBREVIATIONS.....	9
TABLE OF ILLUSTRATIONS	11
INTRODUCTION.....	13
PART ONE: HISTORY OF IRELAND	29
1. Land confiscations to Catholic Emancipation	33
1.1 Land Tenure in Ireland.....	33
1.2 The 1798 Uprising and the Act of Union.....	36
1.3 Penal Laws	39
1.4 Emancipation	40
2. History of the Irish Press	43
2.1 Beginnings of the Irish Press	48
2.2 Government Control of the Press.....	49
2.3 Distribution and Circulation	62
2.4 Sources of Revenue	67
2.5 Political and Religious Divisions of the Press	68
2.6 Selected Newspapers.....	70
3. Emigration from Ireland	77
3.1 History of Emigration.....	77
3.2 Legislation on Emigration	90
3.3 Assisted Emigration Schemes.....	95
3.4 Politics and Emigration	99
3.5 Malthus's <i>An Essay on the Principle of Population</i>	101
4. Conclusion of Part One	106
PART TWO: EMIGRATION COMMITTEES AND REPORTS.....	107
1. The Emigration Committees.....	111
1.1 Wilmot-Horton and the Emigration Committees of 1826 and 1827.....	111
1.2 Creation and Mandate of the Committees.....	115
1.3 Methodology of the Committees.....	117
2. The Emigration Reports	119
2.1 Emigration Report 1 – 1826	119
2.2 Emigration Report 2 – 1827.....	122
2.3 Emigration Report 3 - 1827.....	124
3. Witnesses	140
3.1 Ireland.....	141
3.2 England.....	146
3.3 Scotland.....	150
3.4 Canada and other British Colonies	152
4. Evidence/Testimony	157

4.1	Distress	160
4.2	Emigration plans	220
4.3	Contribution to emigration.....	248
4.4	Vacuum.....	291
5.	Conclusion of Part Two	310
	PART THREE: THE DUBLIN PRESS'S DISCOURSE ON EMIGRATION	313
1.	The Portrayal of the Emigration Committees and Reports.....	317
1.1	First Emigration Committee	317
1.2	Second Emigration Committee.....	322
1.3	Third Emigration Committee	328
2.	Common Discourse on Emigration.....	339
2.1	Encouragement of Emigration	339
2.2	Previous Emigrations	344
2.3	Criticism of Malthus	349
3.	Shift in Discourse over the Decade	353
3.1	Encouragement of Emigration	353
3.2	Distress in Ireland	361
3.3	Alternatives	369
4.	Influence of the Press	377
4.1	Encouragement of Emigration	378
4.2	Passenger Vessels Regulations	382
4.3	State of Ireland	386
5.	Conclusion of Part Three	401
	CONCLUSION.....	405
	APPENDICES	415
	Appendix A – Newspaper Catalogue – articles collected for analysis	416
	Appendix B – Select extracts of articles analyzed	437
1.1	<i>DEM – Dublin Evening Mail</i>	<i>437</i>
1.2	<i>DEP – Dublin Evening Post</i>	<i>448</i>
1.3	<i>DMR – Dublin Morning Register</i>	<i>472</i>
1.4	<i>DWR – Dublin Weekly Register</i>	<i>495</i>
1.5	<i>FJ – Freeman’s Journal</i>	<i>509</i>
1.6	<i>SNL – Saunders’ News-Letter.....</i>	<i>543</i>
	Appendix C – Biographical background on witnesses	557
1.	Emigration Report 1	557
2.	Emigration Report 2.....	561
3.	Emigration Report 3.....	565

BIBLIOGRAPHY	571
Primary Sources	571
Cited Newspaper Articles	575
Secondary Sources	577
Emigration.....	577
History.....	580
Politics.....	583
Press.....	584
Theoretical approach.....	586
RESUME EN FRANÇAIS	587
LE DEBAT SUR L'EMIGRATION DANS LA PRESSE DUBLINOISE DES ANNEES 1820.	
.....	587
1. Introduction.....	587
2. History of Ireland.....	600
3. Emigration Committees and Reports	605
4. Dublin Press's discourse on emigration	609
5. Conclusion.....	616
RÉSUMÉ EN ANGLAIS.....	620
RESUME EN FRANÇAIS	620

Abbreviations

BL – British Library

BNA – British Newspaper Archive

NLI – National Library of Ireland

Parl. deb. – Parliamentary Debates

Newspapers

DEM – *Dublin Evening Mail*

DEP – *Dublin Evening Post*

DMR – *Dublin Morning Register*

DWR – *Dublin Weekly Register*

FJ – *Freeman's Journal*

SNL – *Saunders' News-Letter*

Table of Illustrations

Figure 1 – Chart based on data from Kevin Kenny, <i>The American Irish: A History</i> (2014): 45.	17
Figure 2 – <i>DEP</i> – January 16, 1823, 1 (from microfiche at the National Library of Ireland)	22
Figure 3 - <i>DEP</i> – February 20, 1827, 1 (from British Library Archive)	23
Figure 4 – The transfer of land ownership: 1603-1778. <i>Atlas of Irish History</i> (Edwards and Hourican), 164.	34
Figure 5 - Newspaper Circulation 1823-1841, Brian Inglis, <i>The Freedom of the Press in Ireland</i> , 233.	64
Figure 6 - <i>The Mitchell Newspaper Press Directory</i> , 1847	74
Figure 7 - Emigration Report 2, W. H. Hyett, 214.	185
Figure 8 - Prisoner statistics of Brixton Gaol provided by R. J. Chambers, ER1, 84.	187
Figure 9 - Prisoner Statistics of Cold Bath Fields, provided by R. J. Chambers, ER1, 84.	188
Figure 10 - Repeal of the passenger protections 7 & 8 Geo. c. 19.	242

Introduction

In recent decades, the field of migration studies has expanded to become an important meeting ground for historical, economic, political and sociological experts, reflecting the historiographic evolutions of the late twentieth century, the desire of scholars to transcend national histories, and our contemporary awareness of the significance of the movements of populations. Ernst Georg Ravenstein was the first scholar to develop theories about human migration in the late nineteenth century which are still used in modern migration studies. The number of academic journals focusing on this field has increased substantially since the mid-1990s, the first appearing in 1959, and growing from less than twenty in 1994 to forty-five in 2018.¹ The studies in this field of research cover a variety of themes, with earlier studies focusing on the quantitative and statistical aspects of migration related to demography, while later research began to focus on more qualitative approaches, such as geographies of migration, immigrant incorporation, gender and family, governance and politics, diversity, and migration processes. This includes studies on various diasporas, of the Jews in the fifth century BCE, the forced migration of the African slave trade, called the African Diaspora, and the Irish Diaspora, which studies the movement of the Irish outside of Ireland.

At least ten million people have left Ireland since 1800, with significant shifts in the demographics of emigrants over time, which has led to innumerable studies of different time periods and geographical examinations of emigration from Ireland and the experiences of the Irish abroad. During the Great Famine, approximately two million Irish emigrated to the United States alone, leading to the age of mass migration of the late nineteenth century. This field has contributed to discovering the reasons behind migrations and broadened our comprehension of different peoples' movements throughout history. Diverse studies have been undertaken to better understand

¹ Asya Pisarevskaya, Nathan Levy, Peter Scholten, and Joost Jansen, "Mapping Migration Studies: An Empirical Analysis of Coming of Age of a Research Field", *Migration Studies* (Oxford Academic), 3 August 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz031>, 8.

migration in the British Isles with a particular focus on Ireland. Studies, such as *British and Irish Diasporas* (2019), *The Invisible Irish* (2016), and *Migrations: Ireland in a global world* (2013), attest to the increase in importance of this discipline.¹ Studies have been conducted on different characteristics of emigrants of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, who were at first primarily Protestant, and later predominantly Catholic.² Irish female emigration has been studied and results of those examinations show that, unlike other European countries' emigrants who were primarily single men and families, Irish women emigrated on an equal footing with men.³ The movement of the Irish to all corners of the world, not only former British colonies, has continued to produce countless avenues of research in the field of Irish migration and emigration studies.

As some researchers have suggested, the focus on emigration during the mid-nineteenth century, particularly during the famine period, has led to neglect of the study of emigration during other periods in Irish history. Deirdre M. Mageean expressed this point of view in her PhD thesis in 1988, asserting,

Given the sheer scale and drama of the Great Famine it is not surprising that researchers have focused on the demographic haemorrhage of that time. However, this concentration on the immediate Famine period has diverted attention from the study of Irish emigration in other periods.⁴

While emigration during the Great Famine was unusually high (estimates range from one to two million over the entire period), the number of emigrants had been increasing

¹ Donald MacRaild, Tanja Bueltmann, Jonathan Clark, eds. *British and Irish Diasporas: Societies, Cultures and Ideologies*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2019; Mary Gilmartin and Allen White, eds. *Migrations: Ireland in a Global World*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2013.

² Kevin Kenny, *The American Irish: A History*. Harlow: Longman, 2000. Rankin Sherling, *The Invisible Irish: Finding Protestants in the Nineteenth-Century Migrations to America*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's Press, 2015.

³ Pauline Jackson. "Women in 19th Century Irish Emigration." *The International Migration Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1984, pp. 1004–1020. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2546070.

⁴ Deirdre M. Mageean, (1988). *Comparative Study of Pre- and Post-famine Migrants from North-west Ireland to North America*. Ph.D. Thesis. Open University: U.K., 1.

significantly in the years preceding the famine. The following graph demonstrates the steady increase of Irish emigration, with numbers almost doubling every ten years in the two decades that preceded the Famine.




Figure 1 – Chart based on data from Kevin Kenny, *The American Irish: A History* (2014): 45.

This graph shows that the estimated number of emigrants increased from 20,000 a year in 1820 to 90,000 a year in 1842, just three years before the start of the Famine. Surprisingly little research has been done on these decades, which marked the beginning of mass emigration from Ireland. While some works have covered certain aspects of emigration during this period, such as Gerard Moran’s chapter on assisted emigration in *Sending Out Ireland’s Poor* (1985) and H.J.M. Johnston’s work on the government’s position on emigration in *British Emigration Policy 1815-1830* (1972), these studies are incomplete and a more detailed research perspective is needed to get a clearer picture of the relationship between the press and the government on the issue of emigration.

This study will focus on the period of the 1820s, when the British government in London was examining the socio-economic situation in Ireland and attempting to find a remedy to the so-called ‘evil’ that plagued its sister island. Throughout the British Isles,

the social context was tense: the population was increasing rapidly in Ireland, new forms of pauperism were emerging connected with the development of unskilled industrial labor, and the question of poor relief was debated in more pressing terms than previously. However, other solutions were explored for Ireland since Poor Laws did not exist there. Ireland was admittedly in a state of turmoil during this period, though not precisely for the reasons often proffered by politicians and members of Parliament. After the confiscation of Catholic lands was nearly complete by 1778, access to land for poor Irish Catholics was radically different. A small number of primarily Irish and English Protestants owned 95% of the land in Ireland and leased out large parcels to land agents, known as middlemen, who in turn subdivided the lands in order to sublet or rent them out to Irish laborers. Approximately 900,000 families lived on less than two acres of land, paying rent through the exchange of labor or produce instead of cash. These families were dependent on this access to land to cultivate potatoes for their subsistence, which were harvested once a year and had to last until the following harvest season. There was little to no support or assistance for this group, with the exception of occasional private charity, though this did not protect them from being evicted if the high price of rent could not be met under this arrangement. This system of land tenure coupled with a rapidly increasing population nearing its pre-Famine level of eight million, a total lack of governmental assistance for the poor and unemployed, and the dramatic effects of the industrial revolution, all combined to create a laboring class that was in a nearly constant state of 'distress'.

Committees were formed to study this problem: the Select Committee on the Poor Laws (1817), the Select Committee on the State of Disease, and Condition of the Labouring Poor in Ireland (1819), the Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland (1823), the Select Committee on the Survey and Valuation of Ireland (1824), two Select Committees on the State of Ireland (1825), the Select Committee on Emigration (1826 and 1827), the Select Committee on Education in Ireland (1828). The

government appeared determined to understand the conditions in Ireland and wanted to be seen as willing to legislate to alleviate the difficulties, mostly financial, facing the country. While the true motivations for resolving this distress are unknown, the committees appeared most preoccupied with the financial aspects of these issues; the fact that many of them owned land in Ireland could have influenced their motives for addressing this subject. The increase of space in newspapers dedicated to these reports suggests that the public was clearly interested in the subjects being studied by these Committees, or at least that the press felt that the public needed to be informed of the government's proceedings.

This study will focus on the three reports of the Committee on Emigration of 1826 and 1827, which attempted to enumerate the problems afflicting Ireland, while simultaneously proposing an emigration plan to remedy those problems. These reports involve more than a thousand pages of discussions on the state of Irish, Scottish, and English laborers, the existence of a redundant population, particularly in Ireland, the effects of subletting, various aspects of the emigration plans suggested by individuals and proposed by the committees, the financing of said plans, whether the plans would be the most effective remedy, and some alternatives to emigration. The approach to these reports in this study began with researching the members of the committees and the witnesses who testified to the three committees. With this information, a detailed analysis of the evidence given by these witnesses was possible, understanding their background, which, in some cases, explained why they held certain opinions or beliefs. In reading these three Committee Reports, certain themes and preoccupations were discovered among the witnesses and the committee members themselves.

The three Emigration Reports were last studied in the 1970s, in one notable volume by H.J.M. Johnston and articles by Edward Brynn. Johnston's work, *British Emigration Policy 1815-1830: 'Shoveling out Paupers'*, is based on his thesis at Oxford

University, studying the politics toward emigration during this period. This research focuses on the previous emigration support demonstrated by government representatives in parliamentary committees and the Colonial Office, and by important theorists of the time, for instance, Malthus and Adam Smith. Johnston's work is essential to establish the politics surrounding emigration leading up to and including the 1820s, as support for emigration was an ever-evolving policy. The focus on previous assisted emigration schemes also proved indispensable. Edward Brynn wrote two articles in 1969 and 1972,¹ which focused on the emigration policies of Robert Wilmot-Horton, which he asserts "rekindle[d] interest in the colonies".² Brynn examined many of the personal correspondence of Wilmot-Horton, including with Malthus, which gives interesting insight into the exchanges between the two. One final book that must be mentioned is Gerard Moran's *Sending out Ireland's Poor: Assisted Emigration to North America in the Nineteenth Century*.³ While this is a more recent publication, it recounts much of the assisted emigration schemes explained in H.J.M. Johnston's work.⁴

Selected excerpts of the Emigration Reports and their testimony were reprinted in various Dublin newspapers at the time, some with commentaries or critiques and others simply presenting the information. The Dublin press thus gives us an idea of the variety of responses in Ireland to the work of the Committee, and more generally of the dynamic exchanges and tensions between the perception of Irish social issues among the British political elite on the one hand, and in Ireland on the other hand. The press in Ireland had developed rapidly beginning in the seventeenth century. It was an inherently political undertaking, a point which will be further developed in part one of

¹ Edward Brynn. "The Emigration Theories of Robert Wilmot Horton 1820-1841." *Canadian Journal of History* 4.2 (1969): 45-65. Proquest. Web. 1 April 2015, and "Politics and Economic Theory: Robert Wilmot Horton, 1820-1841." *The Historian* 34.2 (February 1, 1972): 260-277. Proquest. Web. 10 June 2016.

² "The Emigration Theories of Robert Wilmot Horton 1820-1841", 45.

³ Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004.

⁴ In addition, it also misreferences Johnston as "Johnson" and calls Robert Wilmot-Horton "William Wilmot Horton".

this study. Hundreds of newspapers were created and only a small number could claim marginal success. It was an expensive enterprise and intervention from the government could make it difficult to continue running such a business. The government employed several methods to encourage and stifle newspapers' activities, such as sponsorship, prosecution for libel, Stamp Acts, espionage, and even establishing their own publications. Nevertheless, the press played an essential role in communicating political information to the Irish public, in particular by reprinting committee reports, parliamentary debates, and correspondence submitted by government officials. For our present purpose, it even provides vital archival information by providing records of parliamentary debates for a period during which there are gaps in the Hansard archives.

In choosing newspapers for this study, a few criteria were selected to attain a more representative view of the political and religious tendencies of the period. First, a short list of newspapers was developed based on the years of publication, each of which lasted for a minimum of five years during the decade. Second, the political leanings of each publication were researched in the Waterloo Directory and Mitchell's Directory. Finally, the availability of the selected newspapers was determined. Initially, ten newspapers were selected for this study on the basis of their political and/or religious leanings and the number of years published. Due to the unavailability of a few, however, that number was reduced to six.

The newspapers selected for this research are the *Dublin Evening Mail*, the *Dublin Evening Post*, the *Dublin Morning Register*, the *Dublin Weekly Register*, *Freeman's Journal*, and *Saunders's News-Letter*. These publications represent conservative, liberal, and supposedly neutral views. The process of collecting the pertinent newspaper articles was a more arduous undertaking than the selection. After spending a week at the National Library of Ireland in Dublin, an examination of the British Library online archives and the Irish Newspaper Archive, over 500 articles related to emigration, the state of Ireland,

and other aspects related to this dissertation had been collected. The articles assembled at the National Library of Ireland were all contained on microfiche, which required a methodical examination of the images preserved therein. This could be a long process, as the newspapers during this period contained as much text as possible with no images, and the environmental circumstances of the library microfiche room was not especially conducive to alertness. The images below are an example of the format of newspapers during this period.




Figure 2 – DEP – January 16, 1823, 1 (from microfiche at the National Library of Ireland)

Figure 3 - *DEP* – February 20, 1827, 1 (from British Library Archive)

Once collected, the articles were transcribed and catalogued, depending on their content, relevance, and type. These documents contained a variety of subjects, reflecting the issues discussed by the Emigration Committee Reports, concerning the encouragement of emigration, passenger vessels regulations, the state of Ireland, the reclamation of bogs and other alternatives, and emigration generally. A full record of the articles collected can be found in Appendix A (page 414).

The aim of this dissertation is to make the connection between these Emigration Reports and the press, making this research unique in its approach to the subject of emigration. In analyzing these sources, we will demonstrate how the press portrayed the debate on emigration, including the Emigration Committees and parliamentary debates, and how opinions on the topic shifted over the decade, both on the part of government and the newspapers themselves. We will also elucidate whether the Dublin press had any influence on the debates taking place in Parliament, or vice versa, which requires further study of the newspapers articles that printed the parliamentary debates. The primary hypothesis of this research is that the press's portrayal of the emigration debate and the Emigration Committees influenced how the debate progressed in the Parliament, whether intentionally or not. These committees, as well as the advocates for emigration, were subject to high levels of criticism in the press for their proposals. This criticism, coupled with the arguments for alternatives to emigration, ultimately led to no action being taken to establish a state-aided emigration plan. The question we will attempt to answer in this study is to what extent this failure to act for a remedy to the distress of Ireland was due to this public debate in the press.

In the first part of this study, we will examine the relevant history of Ireland, beginning with the period from the land confiscations and ending with Catholic Emancipation, including the Penal Laws, the 1798 Uprising, and the Act of Union. This information will give the proper historical context to understand the situation of the

poorest members of Irish society and how they lived during this period. This will be followed by an examination of the history of the Irish press, including its origins, government control, distribution and circulation, its sources of revenue, the political and religious divisions of the press, and the background of the newspapers selected for this research. The presentation of the historical context will finish with a survey of the history of emigration from Ireland, encompassing the development of the emigrant trade, emigration patterns and demographics, prepaid passage and remittances, and motives for emigration. This analysis will continue with legislation on emigration, assisted emigration schemes and experiments, the politics of emigration, and the influence of Malthus's theories on population on the emigration debate.

Part Two of this research will contain a full analysis of the three Emigration Committees and their respective reports, which will begin with the establishment of the first committee and its primary advocate, Robert Wilmot-Horton, and continue with a review of the evidence given by the witnesses to the committees. In the analysis of this testimony, four categories were determined to be the most common type of evidence: general distress in Ireland, Scotland, and England; emigration plans; contribution to emigration; and the effects of establishing an emigration system, particularly in Ireland. These four themes encompass multiple subjects discussed in the Committees:

1. Distress covers the subjects of the living conditions of the poor in Ireland, Scotland, and England; redundant population; and subletting.
2. Emigration plans includes seasonal migration, voluntary emigration, the government plan, previous settlers in Canada, the desire to emigrate, and alternatives to emigration.
3. Contribution to emigration discusses the willingness to contribute financially, previous contributions, the financial benefits, and the methods of contributing to emigration.

4. The vacuum essentially involves the testimony of those witnesses who discussed a vacuum occurring after a large number of emigrants leave a community and the testimony of Malthus, which held a particularly important place in the debate on this topic.

These subjects recurred with different levels of importance throughout the three Emigration Committees. For example, subletting was discussed almost exclusively by Irish witnesses, while the issue of previous settlers in Canada was focused on primarily by Canadian witnesses. The aim of this part is to examine the political motivations of the committees, to assess the sociological and historical value of the testimonies, and to establish the first links to the press's reaction to these reports.

The final part of this dissertation is dedicated to the analysis of the newspaper articles collected for this study. We will begin with an examination of the newspapers' positions on emigration in the early years of the 1820s before the debate on emigration gained attention with the Emigration Committees. This will show that the newspapers generally held a clear position on the subject, often criticizing the government's changing policy on supporting, encouraging, and assisting emigration. The conservative and liberal newspapers selected for this study mostly agreed on this point, expressing a common discourse on emigration as a remedy, though there was a notable lack of articles discussing emigration from Ireland, despite having differing opinions on most other subjects, such as Catholic Emancipation, Poor Laws, and Irish affairs generally. There was also a marked criticism of Malthus and his theories as they applied to the distressed situation of the Irish poor from one publication in particular. This shift in tone towards Malthus was novel, in that most Irish newspapers and politicians revered him without questioning the foundation of his theories, according to *Freeman's* articles.

As the debate in the press continued on various aspects of Irish affairs, a notable shift in discourse occurred, with a particular emphasis on the continued distress in

Ireland, and, therefore, the urgency for a remedy. Encouragement of emigration was supported by the publications, as well as alternatives to emigration, for instance, different forms of employment and the introduction of Poor Laws. These aspects were reflected in the Emigration Committees and Reports that followed, and, as previously mentioned, these were topics discussed by the witnesses who testified to the committees. The portrayal of the Emigration Committees' Reports began somewhat tepidly, with little commentary provided by the newspapers on the content therein. This changed dramatically with the publication of the third Emigration Report in 1827, when every newspaper made some expression of their agreement or disagreement with the content of the witness testimony or the Report of the Committee.

The fervor around the Emigration Committees died down rapidly after it was made clear that Parliament would most likely not adopt any of their suggestions, with the exception of the repeal of the Passenger Vessels Act, which was perhaps a way of encouraging emigration by reducing the cost of passage. The press began asserting its influence as strongly as it could with direct criticism of individual members of Parliament for their speech on the subjects of encouragement of emigration, passenger vessels regulations, and the state of Ireland. Because the debate in Parliament had shifted away from emigration as a remedy towards Catholic Emancipation, the press expressed dismay whenever the issue of emigration was brought up, mainly by Robert Wilmot-Horton, amongst the loudest voices for and against Catholic Emancipation. Wilmot-Horton continued making new proposals in Parliament, introducing new petitions for assistance to emigrate, though making no headway in his argument. Despite the appearance of rejecting emigration as a solution for Ireland, the press made use of its pages to advocate for stronger passenger vessels regulations when that debate was taking place in Parliament in 1828, noting a lack of medical officers provisioned for transatlantic journeys.

Finally, the state of Ireland was again front of mind for many members of Parliament after the comprehensive study done by the Emigration Committees was freshly printed. Members of both Houses of Parliament were lambasted in the press for petitioning for appointments for new committees to study the situation in Ireland, though several committees had examined in detail many aspects regarding Ireland, from the Bog Commissions in 1809-1814, to the Employment of the Poor in Ireland in 1823, and the two Committees, one from the Commons and one from the Lords, on the state of Ireland in 1825, in addition to the Emigration Committees, which investigated many of these aspects in their own survey. The Poor Laws and Catholic Emancipation became the final battleground of this decade, with the press participating alongside the Parliament in this debate, reprinting and commenting on every session of the Lords or the Commons that touched upon these issues. These two subjects, ultimately, turned both the press and the Parliament away from emigration as a solution to the distress in Ireland, and Robert Wilmot-Horton's vision of a state-aided emigration system never came to fruition. While it may not be discernable if the press had influence over the debates in Parliament, it certainly was a force in communicating to the public the discussions taking place there and in criticizing members for their positions and lack of knowledge on certain subjects they were debating. The problems afflicting Ireland were complex and the press asserted that the members debating these problems had little understanding of Ireland or the Irish poor and, therefore, could not make sound policy regarding that country's future. This most certainly had influence over the public's view of parliamentary action regarding Ireland and, perhaps, that Ireland should have been making those decisions for herself. This may have been the first stirrings of expressions of nationalist sentiment in the Irish press, or at least an awareness of the ability of the Irish to understand and better manage their affairs than their British rulers.

Part One: History of Ireland

While the history of Ireland is a vast and fascinating subject, there are a few aspects to expand upon to understand the historical context of the 1820s. The system of land tenure that had developed after the confiscations of Catholic lands was an intricate web that is necessary to explore to comprehend the distress that the Irish poor were living through on a regular, annual, and sustained cycle. This precarious state endured until efforts were made to allow Catholics to again be landowners in their own right. This subject will be elaborated upon further in the first part of this study, which will be dedicated to an analysis of the historical context that led to the socio-economic conditions of the 1820s.

We will first focus on the various historical aspects that led to the conditions in Ireland in the 1820s, notably, confiscations and land tenure, the Penal Laws, the United Irishmen, the Act of Union, Catholic emancipation, and the overall economic state of Ireland. This will provide the context necessary to understand the analysis of the Emigration Committee's reports and witness testimony, and how those sources were further utilized by the press to communicate their opinions on emigration to readers. This historical presentation is deliberately succinct in order to present the elements that are most relevant to the analysis of the primary sources.

Secondly, we will present a detailed timeline of the development of the Irish press and how it may have influenced emigration legislation during the period studied in this research. We will specifically examine the history of the Irish press, distribution and circulation of newspapers, their sources of revenue, as well as the political and religious divisions of the various newspapers selected for this research.

Finally, we will discuss the history of emigration from Ireland and how the demographics of emigration changed over more than a century leading up to the period studied. We will focus on the development of emigration as an industry, legislation passed concerning emigration, the politics of emigration, and assisted emigration schemes.

1. Land confiscations to Catholic Emancipation

1.1 Land Tenure in Ireland

This analysis begins with this subject because, as Christine Kinealy asserts, “[i]n the nineteenth century, the principal basis of power (and conflict) in Ireland continued to be land. The land question, therefore, is central to understanding both economic and political relations in the nineteenth century”.¹ Land confiscations in Ireland began slowly in the sixteenth century and intensified during the seventeenth century under the supervision of James I, followed by Oliver Cromwell, Charles II, and finally, William III. By the end of the seventeenth century, Protestants of English or Scottish origin held seventy-five percent of the land in Ireland; by the end of the eighteenth century, they held ninety-five percent of the land in Ireland.² The population of Ireland in 1804 was estimated at approximately 5.4 million; the number of landed proprietors were between eight and ten thousand (almost exclusively Protestant) and about one-third were absentee landowners, meaning they owned land in Ireland, but did not reside there, preferring to live in England or Scotland.³

The land tenure system in Ireland was unique in the British Isles. England and Scotland had their own traditional methods of tenancy that were different from the Irish system, though the English system was similar in that there were large estates with cash tenancy leading to competitive rents, and that laborers and servants outnumbered farmers. The main difference was who was leasing the lands. In England, the proprietor would let the land directly to the tenant; in Ireland, the proprietor would hire an

¹ Christine Kinealy, “Economy and Society in Ireland”, in *A Companion to Nineteenth Century Britain*, ed. Chris Williams (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 495.

² Ruth Dudley Edwards and Bridget Hourican, *Atlas of Irish History*, 163. See figure below from same source, 164.

³ James S. Donnelly, *Landlord and Tenant in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1973), 5.

intermediate landlord to manage his estate, who would let large parcels to middlemen, or land agents, who would then sublet small parcels of land to tenants. The middleman system was promoted during the first half of the eighteenth century in response to a lack of foreign demand for Irish farm produce and in the hope that these intermediary agents would improve the estates.¹ Since tenants did not have the means of improving upon their small holdings, landowners hoped that the middlemen would build new dwelling houses, farm offices, and draining and irrigation systems.




Figure 4 – The transfer of land ownership: 1603-1778. *Atlas of Irish History* (Edwards and Hourican), 164.

¹ *Idem.*

The growing demand for Irish produce from 1750 to 1815 should have discouraged this system, but middlemen continued seeking new leases and renewing old ones to increase their own profits, while increasing the number of tenants through subdivision and subletting. In addition, this system persisted because it was a way for tenants to gain access to the elective franchise. From 1793, any man holding land valued at forty shillings annually could be eligible to vote. This part of the population was referred to as the forty-shilling freeholders.

This complex system of land tenure continued into the nineteenth century, even as the end of the Napoleonic Wars led to a significant deflation of agricultural prices, though the rents did not follow this drop. In this situation, small tenants were unable to pay their rents to the managing middlemen, especially during recurring potato failures, which led to a failure of the middleman system in itself.

Despite landowners' desire to improve their estates through this system, middlemen did little to effect this change, preferring to keep the profits during the period of inflation of the Napoleonic Wars. Once this period ended, middlemen were no longer receiving rent payments and had little to no recourse to recover these payments from tenants in arrears. The situation of the tenants themselves was precarious at best. The threat of eviction was almost continuous as little protections existed for tenants and, if they were in arrears, eviction was a commonly exercised remedy, in addition to seizure of stock and grain.¹ During this period, most laborers had access to very small plots of land,² placing extreme pressure on their ability to produce the primary subsistence crop, the potato.

¹ James S. Donnelly, *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821-1824* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 222.

² The earliest accurate statistics are from the 1841 Census, showing that the majority of landholdings were five acres or less.

1.2 The 1798 Uprising and the Act of Union

Prior to the period studied here, there had been a few major uprisings and rebellions in Ireland, none more important to this period than the 1798 United Irishmen uprising. The United Irishmen was an independence movement that began in the north of Ireland. Until 1782, all legislation passed by the Irish Parliament had to be approved by the Parliament in Westminster, effectively giving all control over domestic policy to the English. In the 1780s the Irish Patriot Party sought to reform the Parliament and gain legislative independence, though after the Constitution of 1782 granted Ireland legislative independence and some of the Penal Laws were repealed, the reform movement lost its momentum in the mid-1780s, disappointed by only a partial reform.¹

This parliamentary reform movement was replaced by the United Irishmen in the 1790s, whose founders were inspired by both the American Revolution and the French Revolution.² All of those present at the first meeting were Protestant, though they enjoyed support from Catholic organizations, such as the Catholic Committee and the Defenders. The main objective of the organization was Catholic emancipation through any means necessary. When legislative reforms appeared to have failed, the United Irishmen began making other plans. The movement was officially banned in 1793 after the war with France was declared. The administration feared that the French would send troops to assist the United Irishmen in a violent uprising; they were not wrong in their suspicions, as the French attempted to send aid to the group in 1796, but this failed due to poor weather conditions at sea.³

¹ Thomas Bartlett, "The Brotherhood of Affection': The United Irishmen". In Brennan, Paul. (Ed.), *La sécularisation en Irlande* (Caen, France: Presses universitaires de Caen, 1998). <<https://books.openedition.org/puc/110>>.

² Roy Foster, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972* (London: Penguin, 1989), 270.

³ S. J. Connolly, *Divided Kingdom: Ireland 1630-1800* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008), 471.

Martial law was imposed in 1797 to prevent further activities of the United Irishmen, but this proved insufficient, as the group decided to go ahead with the rebellion it had planned, but without French help. The 1798 Rebellion was poorly organized and only about ten percent of the group's members participated in the uprising. Some French troops attempted to assist the movement, but it was ultimately unsuccessful. Amnesty was offered to any member of the group, except its leaders, and it appears many abandoned the cause of the United Irishmen as religious divisions in Ireland deepened, though its activities continued clandestinely for some time. These events ultimately led to the Act of Union, which further tied Ireland's economic and social fate to the whims of the British Parliament.

The failed uprising of 1798 led to a renewed call for union between Ireland and Great Britain among parliamentarians.¹ The Act of Union had to pass through both the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland, and did so in less than a year. Bribery, promises, and threats were used to convince Irish parliamentarians to vote for the Union. The Irish administration, under the leadership of the Lords Cornwallis and Castlereagh (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Chief Secretary for Ireland, respectively) gained the support of the Catholic hierarchy by promising that Catholic Emancipation would follow the new Union.² The only opposition the administration faced was from Daniel O'Connell and other Catholic barristers.

The Irish Parliament held its debates in January 1800 and in March the terms were agreed upon by both houses. The same bill was put before the British Parliament, which passed both houses in July, and was given royal assent on August 1, 1800. The Union officially began on January 1, 1801. The eight articles of the Act of Union dealt with

¹Thomas Bartlett, "Ireland, Empire, and Union, 1690-1801", in *Ireland and the British Empire*, Kevin Kenny (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), 82. Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, 484.

²Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, 490.

political, church, trade, financial, and judicial matters.¹ The Irish Parliament was dissolved and a small representation for Ireland was added to the British Parliament, including 100 members of the House of Commons and thirty-two members of the House of Lords. The respective Church of Ireland and Church of England were united. Free trade was established between the two countries with duties remaining on certain goods. The two countries' financial systems were to remain separate for the foreseeable future, though Ireland had to contribute two-seventeenths of the budget of the newly-formed United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The judicial systems were to remain as they were before the Union.

Despite the title of this Act, 'Union', no integration took place between the two countries: there was a separate administration of Ireland, under the supervision of the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary of Ireland; the laws were now made exclusively in London instead of Dublin; and the Protestant Ascendancy held its dominance over the central and local government in Ireland.² The promise of Catholic Emancipation, uttered in backroom meetings, was not delivered and ultimately led to a growing movement which rejected the legality of the Union and further demanded emancipation.³

¹ "Union with Ireland Act 1800". No. 39 & 40 Geo. 3 c. 67 of 2 July 1800. *Legislation.gov.uk* <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/apgb/Geo3/39-40/67>.

² Alvin Jackson, *The Two Unions: Ireland, Scotland, and the Survival of the United Kingdom, 1707-2007* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011), 186. Terrence McDonough, *Was Ireland a Colony? Economics, Politics, and Culture in Nineteenth Century Ireland* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2005), 4.

³ *Idem*.

1.3 Penal Laws

The first Penal Laws were enacted to restrict and suppress the Irish Catholics (and other dissenters) who opposed the English crown. From 1607, Catholics were no longer allowed to hold public office or to serve in the Irish army. Further, in 1613, the Irish House of Commons underwent a redistricting to give Protestant settlers a majority in that house. Catholics had to pay a fine for non-attendance of Anglican churches. Catholic church services were effectively banned and were conducted privately and sometimes clandestinely. Following the invasion of Oliver Cromwell and the Act of Settlement of 1652, Catholics were no longer allowed to serve in the Irish Parliament and most landowners saw their lands confiscated under the Adventurers' Act of 1642, whose express aim was "the speedy and effectuall reducing of the Rebels in his Majesties Kingdome of Ireland to their due obedience to his Majesty & the Crowne of England [*sic*"]".¹ These confiscated lands were used to pay Cromwell's army, as he had no other means of compensating them.

The first Test Act was enacted in 1673; its full title, "An act for preventing dangers which may happen from popish recusants",² meant that none but Anglicans taking communion in the established Church of England could be public servants or hold public office. Additional acts were passed over the years, preventing Catholics and other dissenters from attending certain universities, holding certain offices and professions, voting, inheriting land from Protestants, obtaining custody of orphans, being educated abroad, owning a horse worth more than five pounds, marrying a Protestant, and

¹ "Charles I, 1640: An Act for the speedy and effectuall reducing of the Rebels in his Majesties Kingdome of Ireland to their due obedience to his Majesty & the Crowne of England." *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*. Ed. John Raithby. s.l.: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819. 168-172. *British History Online*. Web. 30 July 2019. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp168-172>.

² "Charles II, 1672: An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants." *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80*. Ed. John Raithby. s.l.: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819. 782-785. *British History Online*. Web. 30 July 2019. <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp782-785>.

numerous other restrictions. These laws were not equally enforced, but in general, largely constricted the majority of Ireland's population in many aspects of everyday life especially regarding political power.

The Penal Laws led to what is referred to as the Protestant Ascendancy, which was the political, social, and economic dominance by a minority of Protestants in every domain of Ireland. As the Penal Laws were repealed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which we will discuss further in this section, this period of Protestant elitism in Ireland gradually came to an end.

1.4 Emancipation

In the late eighteenth century, some of the restrictions on Catholics were lifted. In 1778, Catholics were allowed to own property, inherit land, and join the army. In 1782, Catholic schools were established. Further restrictions were lifted in 1791, allowing access to middle class professions, including lawyers, grand juries, universities, and lower ranks of the army in addition to the forty-shilling freeholders being allowed the elective franchise in 1793. More restrictions were abolished in 1811, which allowed Catholic soldiers to worship openly.

Despite some Penal Laws having been repealed, the fight for Emancipation was far from over. One of the major hurdles to accomplishing Catholic Emancipation was King George III, who was fiercely hostile to Catholic relief, claiming it would be a violation of his coronation oath. Many petitions were submitted and debates took place in the Parliament, with this existential issue being designated 'the Catholic Question' or 'the Irish Question', both in the parliamentary debates and the Irish press. Another hurdle to Emancipation was the Protestant Ascendancy, who held most economic and all political power in Ireland and were opposed to any relief, asserting that it "would

undermine the Protestant interest by weakening the constitutional, economic and religious supports upon which it rested”.¹

Numerous attempts were made to fully emancipate Catholics and other dissenters after the passage of the Act of Union. William Pitt, the Prime Minister during the passage of the Act of Union, believed emancipation was necessary to calm tensions and gain support in Ireland, but, as mentioned above, King George III would not consider it. Pitt was Prime Minister from 1783 to 1801 and (after a short resignation following his inability to pass emancipation) for a second term from 1804 to 1806, during which he received a petition for Catholic Emancipation. This petition, submitted in 1805, began a new debate in the Parliament on the Catholic Question, but the differing parties could not agree and it ultimately failed.

A final attempt for emancipation began in the 1820s under the leadership of Daniel O’Connell, who was educated abroad and returned to Ireland to become a barrister once that profession was open to Catholics. O’Connell founded the Catholic Association in 1823 with the objective of achieving Catholic Emancipation through economic development, increased tenants’ rights, and reforms to the electoral system and the Church of Ireland. The association met with great success after it began a new subscription method, where for one penny a month (the “Catholic Rent”) one could become a member. This raised significant amounts of money for the association’s activities, in addition to growing its official number of members to include even the poorest in Irish society. This movement, considered the first populist movement in Europe, was extremely popular and held regular protests and boycotts as part of its activities. These gatherings were called “monster meetings”, where tens of thousands

¹James Kelly, “Eighteenth-Century Ascendancy: A Commentary.” *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, vol. 5, 1990, pp. 173-187. *JSTOR*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30070893>: 177.

would gather to hear O'Connell give speeches on numerous subjects, primarily Emancipation, and later on, the Repeal movement.

These actions came to a head in 1828, when Daniel O'Connell was a candidate in a by-election for County Clare against incumbent parliamentarian William Vesey-Fitzgerald. Though Catholics were not allowed to sit in Parliament, no law forbid them from being a candidate in an election. Through his organizing, O'Connell was able to mobilize massive support which resulted in a 35-point victory. This result, despite not being able to take his seat in Parliament, was a signal to the government that Catholic Emancipation was imperative, as the political elite feared that denying the extremely popular O'Connell could lead to another Irish uprising.

In its final form, the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 granted Catholics, and therefore O'Connell, the ability to become members of Parliament, while simultaneously changing the requirements to vote and, thus, disenfranchising over 200,000 previously eligible Irish voters. The forty-shilling freeholders could now only vote if their property had an annual value of ten pounds. The issue of Catholic emancipation was of great importance during the second half of the 1820s, dominating the debates of the Parliament as well as many editorials in the Irish press, which will be seen in our analysis of the press during this period. In the next section we will present the history of the Irish press and through an examination of the government control in particular, determine what the state of the press was by the 1820s.

2. History of the Irish Press

Though there are few historians who have written specifically on the Irish press during the period studied, some notable works must be mentioned. The earliest work found during this research on the British press is *The History of British Journalism, from the Foundation of the Newspaper Press in England, to the Repeal of the Stamp Act in 1855*, by Alexander Andrews, published in two volumes, in 1859. The focus of this study, however, is not the Irish press, though there are some aspects of the press in Great Britain that are shared with Ireland. The first volume offers one chapter consisting of five pages dedicated to the beginnings of the press in Ireland through the end of the eighteenth century. The second volume has no chapter specifically dedicated to the press in Ireland, but combines details of the Irish press with its counterparts in Scotland and England.

Compared to similar works on the history of the press during this period, these two volumes give very little information or detail on the beginnings or the evolution of the press in Ireland. In a study which focuses more specifically on the history of the Irish press (published in 1867), Richard Robert Madden strikes a harsh tone in his criticism of Andrews' book, citing significant errors in data and a general lack of knowledge, or simply stereotype accepted as fact in the book. Madden's introduction of Andrews' work summarizes this sentiment by explaining that the latter "devotes a chapter to Irish newspapers, and in the few pages of which it consists, affords one of the most startling examples of the ignorance that prevails in England on all Irish subjects of an historical character".¹ Madden explains that this positioning of English writers and historians on Irish matters is not unusual and is a reflection of the perceptions English readers had of Ireland at the time.

¹ Richard Robert Madden, *The History of Irish Periodical Literature, from the End of the 17th to the Middle of the 19th Century* (London: T. C. Newby, 1867), 189.

Madden especially takes issue with Andrews' assertion that there were no newspapers in Ireland before 1700. We know that this assertion is not true, because Madden and other historians¹ have described the first newspaper in great detail, and perhaps have less of a bias when comparing the Irish and English press in their early history. The gravest error in Andrews' analysis of the Irish press is his claim that there were only three newspapers in Ireland in 1782. Madden gives a list of seventeen periodicals that existed in 1782, while making the disclaimer that perhaps there were more provincial papers that he was not aware of at the time of his writing.

This critique of an early English writer's work on the Irish press highlights the bias of English historians in at least this aspect of Irish history.² While Andrews is correct that the press in Ireland developed slowly over the eighteenth century, it is incorrect to believe that it grew as slowly as he asserts in the few pages he dedicated to the Irish press.

Stephen J. Brown's volume, *The Press in Ireland*, was first published in 1937 and gives a brief overview of the history of the Irish press. While this author has a decided interest in the Catholic press of the time (he was a Jesuit priest), there is a general overview of notable newspapers from the eighteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century. This text confirms much of what is discussed on the press during the period studied; his only critique is that Madden's work, while the first of its kind, appears incomplete.

Aspinall's work, *Politics and the Press, 1780-1850* (published in 1949), is an exhaustive work on the history of the press in both England and Ireland, discussing in detail all the challenges faced by newspaper proprietors during this period, including the

¹ See R. R. Madden, *The History of Irish Periodical Literature*, 1867; Robert Munter, *The History of the Irish Newspaper, 1685-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967); or Brian Inglis, *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841* (London: Faber and Faber, 1954).

² See Andrews, *History of British Journalism*, volume 1, page 144 (The Irish press's "outward appearance indicated poverty, helplessness, and sloth").

circulation of newspapers, freedom of the press, government subsidies, prosecutions, and other methods of control. Aspinall goes into extreme detail on the different approaches from the two major political parties, though their ultimate goals were the same.

The next work that focuses exclusively on the Irish press is *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841*, which was Brian Inglis' first book, published in 1954 based on the PhD thesis he submitted in 1950. Inglis wrote a review of Aspinall's previously mentioned work in *Irish Historical Studies*.¹ He was a journalist, television presenter, and historian, whose writings on Irish history were well-received. This volume covers a critical time period for the development of the Irish periodical press, when the number of publications was growing exponentially and government control increasing simultaneously. Inglis gives a much-needed in-depth historical context leading up to 1841, supplying the background necessary to understand the Irish press in the 1820s.

Inglis uses a methodical approach to the newspapers of the time period, covering Castle newspapers, commercial and opposition newspapers, and newspapers of the United Irishmen, before proceeding with an analysis of the different methods and periods of control exerted by the various administrations, including brief periods of respite when the government was focused on topics other than the press. This work references a small number of secondary sources, including both R. R. Madden's and A. Aspinall's work. Finally, this book was published as the sixth volume of a series on Irish history. For this research, Inglis' work was indispensable as a source, especially concerning the government control of the press over such a long period of time.

Robert Munter's *The History of the Irish Newspaper, 1685-1760*, is the next source focused exclusively on the history of the Irish press. As David Dickson puts it in *Three*

¹ *Irish Historical Studies* 6.24 (1949): 301-303.

Hundred Years of the Irish Periodicals, the works of Madden, Inglis, and Munter are the only full-length monographs on the history of the Irish periodical press,¹ and these types of critical works have been limited. Munter's work covers the earliest period of the Irish press, while also explaining the difficulties encountered by the newspaper business during the period.

Hugh Oram's *The Newspaper Book, a History of Newspapers in Ireland, 1649-1983*, published in 1983, largely repeats the details put forth in previous works. The uniqueness of this volume is that it includes numerous photographs on nearly every page, illustrating the history of this institution. In his source material, Oram cites the three most important works on the Irish press, Inglis, Madden, and Munter, thus confirming the importance of these works in our own study of the Irish press. Oram studies a great number of Irish periodicals, and his analysis of the major Irish newspapers includes the *Dublin Evening Mail*, *Dublin Evening Post*, *Freeman's Journal*, *Dublin Morning Register*, *Saunders's News Letter*, as well as other publications that were excluded from the present research.

There are no other books that focus on the history of the Irish press during this period. This research intends to contribute to the field of study of the Irish press by analyzing how newspapers of different political tendencies portrayed the debate on emigration and if those publications shared similar views despite these differences. This approach will complement work previously done by Inglis, Madden, Munter, by demonstrating these similarities with regard to emigration and how these views shifted over the decade. None of these works studied the emigration debate in the Irish press, which makes this research essential to filling significant gaps in this subject.

The next section on the History of the Irish press will summarize the beginnings and the development of the Irish press, including some of the factors of its slow

¹ David Dickson, "Introduction." In *Three Hundred Years of Irish Periodicals*, edited by Barbara Hayley and Enda McKay, 10. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1987.

expansion during the eighteenth century, the Stamp Acts, government control of the press, distribution and circulation of newspapers, sources of revenue, the geographical reach, importance of the postal service, political and religious divisions. It will conclude with a presentation of the various newspapers that will be analyzed in this study. This information will explain the background of the press up to the moment we are studying in this research, in order to further elucidate the conditions of the newspapers that were selected for this dissertation, and the extent to which they were influenced by the history of government control and prosecution leading up to the 1820s.

2.1 Beginnings of the Irish Press

The Irish press began in the late seventeenth century with the publication of *The News-Letter*, first printed in 1685 and based in Dublin. This newspaper began appearing shortly after James II became king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. James II's predecessor, his brother Charles, was more than sympathetic to the situation of Catholics and is said to have converted to Catholicism on his deathbed. Leaving no legitimate heir, his death left his Catholic brother James II as the only possible successor. The public, along with legislators, felt that James's reign "would be controlled by men who sympathized with Catholicism, even more than in the previous reign".¹ Despite having significant support for his reign, James quickly faced two rebellions in the months after his coronation. These confrontations, however, only hardened his resolve to defend Catholicism within his three kingdoms. These events surrounding the accession of James II seem to have favored the creation of *The News-Letter* for, as Munter writes, "political tensions always fostered press activity".² This applied to Ireland equally, in that "political and social crises [...] were often accompanied by an increase in titles published".³ This publication had great success for at least seven months, with three issues appearing each week.⁴ *The News-Letter* also had a lasting effect on the format of the newspapers that followed it, which used the folio as a standard of printing.

Following this period, the press in Ireland grew very slowly with newspapers beginning and ending their publication within the same year; by 1784, only ten newspapers were in existence, mainly in Dublin and appearing three times a week. These newspapers were generally composed of four pages, of which three were

¹ Munter, 11-12.

² *Ibid.*, 12.

³ Elizabeth Tilley, "Periodicals in Ireland", in Andrew King, Alexis Easley, and John Morton, eds., *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Periodicals and Newspapers* (NY: Routledge, 2016), 209.

⁴ Munter, 12.

dedicated to advertisements. News was an afterthought, usually copied for free from English newspapers, and, therefore, devoid of Irish news. At least one historian asserts that a 'neutral' publication during this time meant that it was in fact opposed to the administration in power.¹ These format and content characteristics of newspapers continued throughout the period studied here.

2.2 Government Control of the Press

Throughout most of the eighteenth century, the British government was not concerned by the rare opposition expressed in the Irish Press. This changed in the 1780s, however, when a rise in anti-British sentiment and encouragement of violence against government officials began to appear in Irish newspapers as the Volunteer movement began to grow. Several Dublin newspapers began publishing resolutions made by the Volunteers which caught the government's attention, thus launching a period of suppression of the Irish Press through legislation on 'seditious libel'. Many publications simply toed the line, never openly opposing individual Members of Parliament or the government in general.

For those newspapers that supported the government in place,² there were few negative consequences. The government subsidized these publications, paying them substantial amounts of money in exchange for printing government proclamations. The only consequence was that the opposition newspapers openly criticized them for their alliances with the government, frequently printing lists of those newspapers that had dealings with the government. The opposition press,³ on the other hand, encountered

¹ Brian Inglis, *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841* (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), 21. Henceforth, *FOTP*.

² For example, the *Volunteer Evening Post*, or *New Evening Post*.

³ For example, the *Hibernian Journal* (until the 1790s), or the *Dublin Evening Post*.

strong resistance from the government, and their proprietors were subjected to accusations of seditious libel, lengthy trials, severe fines, and even imprisonment. Some of these newspapers took their outrage at the government further, inciting the public to violent acts such as tarring and feathering specific Members of Parliament. The *Volunteer's Journal* was established in 1783 and rapidly increased its attacks against the government until 5 April 1784, when the following 'advertisement' appeared, prompting the administration's war on the press:

In a few days will be published
in the WEAVER'S SQUARE
The whole art and mystery of TARRING
and FEATHERING a TRAITOR
Dedicated to the rt. hon. John FOSTER.¹

This advertisement was provoked by John Foster's refusal to impose protective tariffs on English cloth. Foster's response was to introduce a bill to further restrict the press and to make prosecution of such incitements more certain. Further steps were taken by the British Parliament in order to financially damage the press and curb temptation to voice opposition.

In response to criticism or threats of violence from the press, several methods of censorship were employed by the British government, under the auspices of the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary of Ireland. Prosecution, purchase, and the creation of its own newspapers are some of the methods that will now be discussed.

Prosecution

Newspaper owners were arrested and brought before a judge to face accusations of seditious libels, often spending several months or years in jail. Upon release, they frequently found that government officials had seized their printing materials, or if the

¹ Cited in Inglis, *FOTP*, 23.

libel was severe enough, their printing presses and offices were destroyed. This made it difficult for a newspaper to continue its activities once its owner was released. Publications founded and run by the United Irishmen, however, managed to circumvent this difficulty by having multiple owners, with others stepping in to replace those imprisoned. In this way, newspapers owned by the United Irishmen could only be suppressed with force. The government employed desperate measures, such as spies, bribes, and raids, in order to crush these publications.

The judges who presided over cases of seditious libel were, in effect, an arm of the administration. Naturally, their defense of the government was biased, as promotion to the bench was dependent on the favor of the administration. Many months often passed between charges being filed against a newspaper's owner and the court proceedings for seditious libel. The charges and the threat of prosecution were frequently sufficient to secure a newspaper's good behavior, especially considering the courts' bias in favor of prosecution. In cases against newspapers, the administration preferred to avoid proceedings with juries because of the courts' predisposition to convict. This position is clear when considering that no newspaper faced a jury trial between 1784 and 1785, when the government first began its attack against the press.

The government pressured several newspapers to back down from their positions or be convicted of libel in some cases, in order to maintain some semblance of control over the press. The *Hibernian Journal*, *Saunders's Newsletter*, and the *Dublin Chronicle* were just a few of the victims of this policy of prosecution.

One newspaper that was particularly targeted by the administration was John Magee's *Dublin Evening Post (DEP)*. Despite the legislation and taxes of the 1780s, the *DEP* continued to have substantial circulation and influence after 1785. Generally speaking, this publication, like many others, was filled with advertisements and avoided political controversies. This changed in 1789, however, when Magee used the *DEP* for his

own personal vendetta against Francis Higgins, a “prosecuting attorney in an action against Magee for illegal lottery practices”.¹ Francis Higgins was a jack-off-all-trades. He married an heiress under fraudulent pretenses for which he was prosecuted, convicted, and imprisoned in 1766. Higgins later became well-connected in Dublin society and was admitted as an attorney in 1780 under the influence of attorney general John Scott. He obtained the posts of deputy coroner and under-sheriff for Dublin, and finally in 1788 was appointed magistrate for county Dublin. During this same period, he was working in an editorial role at the *Freeman’s Journal* newspaper from 1779, until it was purchased by the government and put under his management in 1783. The paper apparently suffered under his direction, and in 1789 John Magee began attacking Higgins in the pages of the *DEP*. In 1790, Higgins prosecuted Magee for libel and pressured the jury to render a guilty verdict, though he was soon after removed from the magistracy and struck from the rolls of attorneys. Higgins was well compensated for his work with the government and managed a network of spies (primarily focused on the United Irishmen) until his death in 1802.²

After multiple arrests, Magee decided to abandon this cause and return the *DEP* to its previous disposition by avoiding political entanglements. The treatment of John Magee during this period only increased the popularity of the *DEP*. In addition, the United Irishmen movement took notice of Magee and began publishing its proceedings in his newspaper, alongside one select other, the *Northern Star* of Belfast. Unfortunately for John Magee, this was not the end of the *DEP*’s tribulations involving accusations of seditious libel, though a number of years passed before the newspaper found itself in the spotlight once again.

¹ *Freeman’s Journal*, 11 July 1789, cited in Inglis, *FOTP*, 75.

² *ODNB*, Francis Higgins [called the Sham Squire].

A fresh attack began on Magee and his newspaper after Robert Peel, the new Chief Secretary for Ireland, arrived in 1812. In the edition for 5 January 1813, the *DEP* “informed the lord lieutenant, the duke of Richmond, that his administration was no better than that of the worst of his predecessors, and [...] then proceeded to describe his predecessors’ corruption, baseness, cruelty, and depravity”.¹ This led to a renewed attempt to convict John Magee and to permanently dispose of his publication. Magee was convicted to two years in prison and fined £500 by an exclusively Protestant jury. His punishment was prolonged, moreover, when the *DEP* published the Kilkenny Catholic Committee’s resolutions criticizing his treatment at the hands of the courts. An additional prosecution was initiated, which Peel hoped would strike the Kilkenny Catholic Committee in addition to John Magee himself. The prosecution was again successful, and Magee was sentenced to a further six months in prison and an additional £1,000 fine.

In addition to these two convictions, the government attempted to apply a rarely used statute which prevented stamps from being sold to newspapers convicted of libel, thus hindering the *DEP* until John Magee was able to transfer ownership to his brother James. This, however, put James in the government’s crossfire whenever accusations of libel resurfaced. In February 1814, James was accused of libel for printing Daniel O’Connell’s speech, which “suggested that Catholics were sometimes not sufficiently protected from Orange violence”.² During the prosecution of these charges, the government approached the Magees in an attempt to reconcile, claiming that James would not be convicted if they agreed to moderate the tone of the *DEP* in the future. Severely fatigued by all the arrests and trials, the family accepted these terms.

¹ Inglis, *FOTP*, 137.

² *Ibid.*, 139.

Consequently, the *DEP* continued publication in accordance with the administration's demands, but never fully regained its influence.

As addressed in this section, opposition newspapers had a difficult time in their confrontation with the administration. Through its methods of purchase and prosecution, the administration was able to cow the press into submission for a considerable period of time. The *Dublin Evening Post* and *Freeman's Journal* were the most successful opposition newspapers during this time, though the *Freeman's* allegiance faltered briefly in the 1790s after being taken over by a government agent and receiving significant subsidies for its change in support of the administration. In the 1810s, however, *Freeman's* regained its independence, especially after the persecution of the *DEP*, its chief rival, allowed it to reclaim some of its former success. Despite these attacks from the administration, both publications lasted well beyond the 1820s, with the *Dublin Evening Post* continuing until 1875, and *Freeman's* until 1924.

Castle Papers'

In addition to these attempts to suppress the opposition press, the government endeavored to counteract the influence of the independent press during the period by creating its own newspapers. Few Dublin printers wanted anything to do with these sorts of publications, so the British government sent out its own staff and printers equipped with a press in order to establish a government paper in 1780. The *Volunteer Evening Post* was the product of this attempt, but it was quickly spotted by the independent press as a government-backed publication, and quickly ended its activities. Another attempt was made in 1782 with the appearance of the *New Evening Post*. Once again, the opposition

¹ The term 'Castle papers' or 'Castle prints' was used by the opposition press to distinguish themselves from newspapers sponsored, purchased, and/or created by the government, which was colloquially known as the Castle because it was situated within Dublin Castle.

press denounced it almost immediately as a government publication and it was unable to continue its activities.

In 1806, under a Whig administration, another attempt was made to begin a new paper, *The Correspondent*. This newspaper was given special privileges, such as receiving the English papers before other newspapers, which benefitted them tremendously considering the amount of material that was copied from the British press into the Irish papers. *The Correspondent* was the first Castle paper to achieve commercial success; and though the Whigs, in comparison to the Tories, were generally perceived as more favorable to a free press, Inglis notes "that the [W]hig for all his resonant professions of principle was in practice no better, and sometimes much worse, a friend to the freedom of the press than the [T]ory".¹

After these years of conflict, some publications became less outspoken, for fear of reprisals from the government and the aggressive tactics used against the opposition press. Inglis describes this period and the reactionary legislation enacted in the following terms:

By taxation and by subsidy the executive had secured a greater measure of control over the newspapers. The legislature had shown that when challenged there was hardly any limit to its coercive powers. The judicature had found ways in which to twist the law to the Castle's purpose; they could be used again. The outlook for the press, should it attempt to stage a revival, was unpromising.²

This passive character of the press lasted until the regency crisis began in 1788. The opposition press was less fearful of punishment from the government during the late eighteenth century, as purchase (or sponsorship) replaced prosecutions as the preferred mode of censorship.

¹ Inglis, *FOTP*, 115.

² *Ibid.*, 50-51.

Sponsorship

The dependence on sponsorship grew, which allowed government officials not only to pick and choose publications to support, but also to control their content. The government also regularly increased the 'Proclamations fund', which was used to buy a newspaper's loyalty via an exchange of money for the publication of official government proclamations.

This type of sponsorship was extremely costly to the administration. In one instance, the administration sent their agent, Francis Higgins, to infiltrate *Freeman's Journal* until he was able to take ownership of the publication in the 1780s. Sustaining *Freeman's* cost over £1,500 per year, in addition to Higgins' £300 annual pension.¹

Faulkner's Dublin Journal was another example of an exceedingly costly government subsidized newspaper. Prior to 1788, *Faulkner's* was a conservative publication that avoided conflict and controversy. The proprietor, Thomas Faulkner, then leased the newspaper to John Giffard, an apothecary, who earned additional money by reporting parliamentary debates for newspapers. As publishing parliamentary debates was illegal at that time, his activities attracted government attention and earned him an offer of employment from the administration, which he accepted. The opposition newspapers quickly took notice of this change in character of *Faulkner's*, and, subsequently, the publication's success dropped, though its circulation remained significant. The government invested over £1,000 yearly in *Faulkner's* for government proclamations alone. In addition, Giffard received a £300 yearly pension, and his lease of *Faulkner's* amounted to £500 annually, of which the government paid £300.²

¹ *Ibid.*, 57.

² *Ibid.*, 61.

A third publication came under the control of the administration after being taken over by a government agent, William Corbet. *The Hibernian Telegraph and Morning Star* was originally an opposition newspaper, but quickly renounced its former opinions after ownership transferred to Corbet. The newspaper was a failure, however, with an almost nonexistence circulation and subsisted on Castle proclamations alone. It was ignored by opposition papers and advertisers alike and received £500 a year for publishing government proclamations.

Corbet was later instructed to start a new paper, the *Patriot*, which began publication in July 1810. In an attempt to ensure its success, "liberal financial assistance was promised" in addition to "exclusive access to the expresses",¹ similar factors that had contributed to the success of the earlier *Correspondent*. Despite these advantages and compared to *The Correspondent*, the circulation of the newspaper rose slowly in its first months, at less than 1,000 copies of each issue. *The Patriot* eventually encountered mediocre success, however, and continued publication until 1828.

William Wellesley-Pole, Chief Secretary for Ireland between 1809 and 1812 and a Lord of the Irish Treasury between 1809 and 1811, undertook an investigation in 1810 into the expenses paid by the government for sponsorship of newspapers, government proclamations and advertisements, and pensions. His investigation found that the expenditures for 1808 exceeded the funds designated for this purpose: the Parliament had budgeted £10,500 while over £20,000 were paid in support of a favorable press. These amounts of money show how invested the government was in controlling the press's messaging during this period.

¹ *Ibid.*, 124.

Stamp Acts and Other Legislation

The government had two types of legislation in dealing with the press, direct and indirect. Direct legislation involved regulations concerning printing and the publication of newspapers. Indirect legislation were laws that were passed with the public goal of obtaining revenue. This type of legislation generally took the form of taxes, or Stamp Acts, which directly affected the newspapers themselves and their cost of operations.

Stamps were a way for the government to control and to profit from the circulation of newspapers, pamphlets, books, and other printed materials. Stamp commissioners collected a fixed tax for each copy of a publication and all advertisements within its pages before stamping it, at which point it could be legally sold. After its enactment, the Stamp Act made it illegal to sell any published material without a stamp, and a severe fine was associated with breaking this regulation. The reasoning for enacting the Stamp Act and the subsequent changes made until its repeal in 1855 require some explanation.

In 1712, the British Parliament enacted the Stamp Act, primarily to impede the success of anti-government publications, by levying a tax on nearly all printed materials that published news and other articles. With the cost of publication already high for many newspapers, this tax made it extremely difficult for printers to continue their activities. We can see this through the fact that many publications were started during the period studied, although few continued for more than five years.

In effect on 1 August 1712, the Stamp Act met with great government support, as it

[...] had the advantages of being broadly acceptable to the politicians of both parties; of discouraging the rapidly expanding publishing and printing

trades; [...] and of providing the means by which the circulation rates of newspapers and periodicals could be regularly and officially surveyed.¹

In addition, the monetary success of the Act was considerable, “[t]he total value of the new duties levied [...] amounted to £11,063 in the first year, and just under £10,000 in each of the following three years”.² This Act had little effect on the content of the publications themselves and anti-government articles still appeared.

The liberty of the press was further restricted in April 1784 when a bill was introduced and passed the British Parliament, although it claimed its purpose was “to secure the liberty of the press”.³ This legislation required printers, publishers and proprietors of a newspaper to give their names and addresses to the stamp commissioners. The true objective of this clause was to facilitate prosecution of individuals accused of libel. Furthermore, a clause was included that allowed for the arrest of newsvendors who sold publications containing instances of libel. This clause, however, was amended to exempt newsvendors from arrest if they disclosed where they obtained the libelous newspapers. After passing the Parliament and receiving the King’s assent, the bill became law on June 1, 1784 and, unsurprisingly, met with fierce resistance from the Dublin newspapers. All but the government paper *Volunteer Evening Post* were united in their criticism of this legislation “for ‘securing’ – alias annihilating, the liberty of the press”.⁴ This regulation is an example of direct legislation passed with the objective of limiting and controlling the press.

The insecurity provoked by this Act, however, was only the beginning, as an additional act was passed in March 1785, which increased the rates on newspaper stamps and the advertisement tax. The rates before March 1785 were one-half penny per copy

¹ P. B. J. Hyland, “Liberty and Libel: Government and the Press during the Succession Crisis in Britain, 1712-1716.” *The English Historical Review* 101.401 (1986): 864.

² *Ibid.*, see footnote 2, 864.

³ 10 April 1784 (H.M.C. *Fortescue*, i. 228), quoted in Brian Inglis, *FOTP*, 42.

⁴ Inglis, *FOTP*, 44.

for a newspaper and two pence per advertisement. After this legislation was passed, the rate increased to one penny per copy for a newspaper and one shilling per advertisement. Consequently, the price of newspapers passed from one and a half-penny (1½ d) to two pence (2d). Newspapers were forced to pass the increased advertisement tax on to the advertisers, which made advertising decrease significantly. These increases clearly caused a rise in the costs of running a newspaper, which impaired the quality of the publications.

The opposition press determined that this tax increase was intended to paralyze the independent press, as those newspapers with government sponsorship were exempted from these taxes. Consequently, in February 1786, the newspaper advertisers and proprietors petitioned the House of Commons for a reduction of this newspaper duty. Official government papers showed that this increase led to lower revenue from the stamp duty and revenues from the advertisement tax were lower than the increase in the tax itself. The opposition press went into steep decline; only the *Dublin Evening Post* and *Hibernian Journal* survived.

The stamp duty was further increased in 1810, 1815, and 1816, causing opposition newspapers to increase their price from four pence to five pence. As with previous newspaper and advertisement tax increases, this did more harm to the opposition press than to government-supported papers.

Another Stamp Act was enacted in 1819 under the title of Newspaper and Stamp Duties Act and was intended for those publications that escaped the first stamp duty by only publishing opinion papers. These papers along with all publications, journals, and advertisements, which were not financed by the government, were now subject to the stamp duty.

These Stamp Acts meant that publishers continued to raise the prices of their publications. The price increase was significant, doubling in some cases,¹ considering that after the taxes had been paid, “it meant that a newspaper could not be sold at much less than fivepence a copy”.²

From its enactment in 1712 until it was abolished in 1855, “the tax was increased by various enactments until it reached a maximum of four pence on all newspapers, and of three shillings and sixpence on all advertisements”.³ It has been asserted that this tax was the origin of the demise of the newspaper *The Spectator* in December 1712, just three months after the original passing of the Stamp Act. Support for this assertion is provided by the personal writings of one of the original Stamp Act's framers, Jonathan Swift, who states in his *Journal to Stella* that the aim of this legislation, originally shaped by a Tory government, was to suppress the influence of the press.⁴ This Act was clearly detrimental to many newspapers throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though it had support from both sides of government; indeed, the Whigs took no action to alleviate the burden of this tax while in power from 1806 to 1807 and again from 1830 to 1834.⁵

Despite the harsh treatment by the Peel administration, the Irish press quickly rebounded after the appointment of Lord Wellesley, a liberal Irish Tory, as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1821. According to Inglis, this led to alarm among the Protestant elite, and “an enterprising journalist, sensing the hatred with which the Lord Lieutenant’s liberalism was regarded by the Ascendancy, produced an independent

¹ Such was the case of *The Spectator*, see Lawrence Lewis, *The Advertisements of the Spectator* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), 68-69.

² Brian Inglis, “The Press.” *Social Life in Ireland 1800-45*. Ed. R. B. MacDowell (Dublin: Three Candles, 1957), 100.

³ Joseph M. Thomas, “Swift and the Stamp Act of 1712,” *PMLA* 31.2 (1916) : 248.

⁴ Lawrence Lewis, *The Advertisements of the Spectator* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), 63-64.

⁵ Arthur Aspinall, *Politics and the Press, c.1780-1850* (London: Home & Van Thal Ltd, 1949), 9.

Protestant paper of such character that it jolted the still torpid Dublin press into life”.¹ The newspaper referenced here was the *Dublin Evening Mail*, which encouraged the more liberal and Catholic newspapers to join the press revival of the 1820s. Government spending on newspaper subsidies had decreased from £9000 in 1820 to £6000 in 1825, with the Dublin press receiving £1750. Moreover, the anti-Catholic attorney general, William Saurin, was replaced by William Plunket, a British Whig who supported Catholic Emancipation, which meant the “Catholic newspapers could now resume publication without fear of prosecutions awaiting their first false step”.² We can consider, therefore, that the newspapers studied for this research were not operating under the earlier fears of punishment from the government and were taking part more actively than they had in earlier political debates.

2.3 Distribution and Circulation

The periodical press in Ireland had been heavily concentrated in Dublin since its inception, “the bulk of its circulation being confined to that city”.³ No newspapers were published outside of Dublin until the Cork-based *Idler* appeared in 1715.⁴ This, in effect, kept many people in the country isolated from the happenings in Dublin and outside of Ireland until 1715. Although the periodical press finally made its appearance outside of Dublin in 1715, the majority of Irish papers were still located there. From 1715 until 1760

only seventeen journals were started [outside of Dublin]; two of these were reprints of London papers, while only three, the *Belfast News-Letter and General Advertiser*, the *Cork Evening Post*, and the *Limerick Journal*, lasted

¹ Brian Inglis, PhD Thesis (1950). *Freedom of the Press in Ireland*. UCD, 318.

² *Ibid.*, 327.

³ Munter, 15.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.

beyond a year. By 1760 over 160 newspapers had begun publication in Dublin, with a good third of them continuing beyond their first year.¹

Many Irish newspapers simply reprinted news from London papers, while others covered multiple pages in order to print the current hot topics of the House of Commons debates. Through my own analysis of Irish newspapers of the time, I am inclined to agree with Inglis's description:

Perhaps the most striking thing about the Irish newspapers of the early part of the [19th century] compared with the newspapers of the present day is their dullness. They contain no illustrations, no headlines, few variations of type; just column after column of reports, despatches and articles thrown into the paper with hardly any attempt to "sub-edit" them.²

Inglis suspects that this dullness is due to a lack of capital resulting from the heavy taxation of the Stamp Acts.

Newspaper content was extremely limited: while news from the English press could be reprinted freely, an editor would have to pay someone to write about Irish news.³ This lack of material resulted from an absence of personnel, because a newspaper's proprietor would often have multiple roles within the enterprise, making it a "one-person operation".⁴ The proprietor was often "owner, printer, publisher, editor and manager combined".⁵ This markedly limited the possible endeavors of the publications we are studying, though some Irish newspapers had begun hiring reporters in the 1820s to add more home news to their columns.

¹ *Idem.*

² Inglis, "The Press." 98.

³ *Idem.*

⁴ Mark O'Brien, "Journalism in Ireland: the evolution of a discipline", in *Irish Journalism Before Independence: More a Disease than a Profession*, edited by Kevin Rafter (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2011), ch. 1.

⁵ Inglis, *FOTP*, 19.




Figure 5 - Newspaper Circulation 1823-1841, Brian Inglis, *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland*, 233.

Geographical reach of newspapers

It is not clear exactly how far the reach of the Dublin press extended. Charles Mitchell attempted an estimate in his inventory of the press in the United Kingdom, *The Newspaper Press Directory*. However, this directory first appeared in 1846, making the numbers for circulation in the 1820s more difficult to obtain. A close estimate, though not geographical, of the actual circulation of Irish newspapers during the period studied can be summarized as follows:

In 1821, of eighteen Dublin journals four were over 2,000 per issue, one over 1,500, two over 1,000, four between 600 and 400, and seven below 400; the forty-one stamped provincial papers had three over 1,000, seven between 600 and 400, and 31 below 400. No appreciable change occurred during the next ten years.¹

The Stamp Act had a large effect on the circulation of periodicals at this time. Because the Act effectively raised the price of newspapers, this restricted the number of people who bought newspapers, which was a double-edged sword for the newspapers' success.

This meant, in the first place, that only a small minority of people bought newspapers. An editor thought himself doing well if he achieved a circulation of over a thousand. But if a newspaper only reaches a small audience, it does not attract advertisers. Advertisers were in any case few, in those days, and they were further discouraged by the advertisement tax—which, of course, the newspapers tried to pass on to them. Without reasonable revenue from advertisers, it was impossible for the press to expand—to employ more and better writers. And because the newspapers remained badly written and dull, they did not attract more readers.²

This delicate balance was difficult to maintain, especially for newspapers with low circulation. Low circulation did not necessarily mean low readership, since newspapers were often read and redistributed to other readers in public houses and

¹ Munter, 88-9.

² Inglis, "The Press", 100.

other social gathering places. The relatively low circulation was linked to the exclusion of Gaelic-speaking Catholics, who were largely illiterate.¹ This is confirmed by Graham Law, who contends that during this period these periodicals “were luxury goods affordable only by the wealthy few”.² Access to newspapers in Ireland was further affected by the postal service which underwent some changes affecting the distribution of periodicals.

Importance of the postal service

The slowly developing postal service is another dictating factor in the circulation of the Irish newspapers. Because most publications relied heavily on English papers for the bulk of their content,³ their publication revolved around the routine of the postal service. This routine, in turn, was dictated by the packet service, which was subject to the whims of unpredictable weather, causing news from abroad to often arrive with substantial delays.⁴

Newspaper editors would, therefore, have to wait on the arrival of news from London in order to print their regular edition, at least until a daily mail service began in 1785. Even with this additional crossing, it was, in all likelihood, marginally utilized to post newspapers, due to the prohibitive cost of the service.⁵ We can assume that, because of this excessive cost, the circulation and distribution of Irish newspapers was presumably executed by middlemen hired by newspaper editors to sell individual copies and deliver to subscribers.

¹ Munter, 90.

² “Distribution”, in *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Periodicals and Newspapers*, eds. Andrew King, Alexis Easley, and John Morton (New York: Routledge, 2016), 42.

³ O’Brien, “Journalism in Ireland”.

⁴ Munter., 72.

⁵ *Idem*.

Finally, prior to 1768, only Tuesdays and Saturdays were Irish post days, therefore, most editors limited their publications to those particular days. After 1768, when Thursday was made a post day, some newspapers began publishing editions for this day as well. The examination of papers studied in this dissertation shows that this trend continued into the nineteenth century.

2.4 Sources of Revenue

The circulation of Irish newspapers was concentrated in Dublin, making delivery of newspapers outside of this area quite difficult. Circulation in the country was mainly provided for yearly subscribers, and even then, the cost of subscription did not necessarily exceed the costs of delivering to these areas. In order to be financially successful “a newspaper required a sufficiently large and interested group of readers, and at the beginning of the [18th] century Dublin was the only place in the country where this condition could be found”.¹

The newspapers’ main sources of revenue came from advertisements and were the determining factors in their success:

What was required in order to run a profitable journal was a constant advertisement subscription and an assured circulation. In Ireland, moreover, it was essential to base one's calculations on the size of the Protestant group, for they furnished the majority of the advertisers and probably the bulk of the early reading public as well.²

We can see this dependence on advertisements when we look at periodicals at the time. Whether during the eighteenth or the nineteenth century, newspapers are flooded with advertisements of all sorts, from shipping news to product advertisements,

¹ *Ibid.*, 68.

² *Ibid.*, 17.

from people looking for 'a situation' to someone who lost his wallet. These journals give us a detailed image of what daily life may have been like for ordinary people, as well as illustrating the periodical's dependency on advertisements.

Furthermore, the number of advertisements was often indicative of a publication's success, because of the cost imposed on advertisers. There was a tax associated with advertisements, and editors often circumvented this by displacing the cost onto the price of advertisement space. Advertisers wanted their information to be seen by as many readers as possible; by this standard, we can assume that the newspapers with the greatest number of advertisements were believed to be the most widely circulated at the time.

Newspapers were also heavily reliant on subsidies received for publishing proclamations and government advertisements. Proclamations were the steadiest source of income and were generally granted to newspapers that expressed favorable opinions of the government. The same standard was applied in the funding given to newspapers for publishing government advertisements: those who supported the government primarily benefited from the advertisements and the subsidies that went along with them.

2.5 Political and Religious Divisions of the Press

From the beginnings of the Irish press, most newspapers were admittedly Protestant and conservative. This can partially be explained by the enactment of the Stamp Act and the subsequent importance of government sponsorship. Periodicals that supported Church of England principles and the British government generally had exclusive rights to this type of sponsorship. As we have seen, the British government frequently attempted to

condemn publishers of 'seditious libel' when they expressed an overtly anti-government opinion.¹

From 1685 to 1760 the Catholic majority in Ireland was not represented in the print industry because such an apparatus did not yet exist. The Penal Laws against Catholics and other dissenting churches were still in full effect during this period, largely restricting an openly pro-Catholic voice, not only in Ireland, but in all of Britain. This situation changed in the nineteenth century, most likely with the rise of popular politics in Ireland and the eventual repeal of a significant number of the Penal Laws against Catholics.² This exclusion of the Catholic population most likely had a serious effect on the circulation of the Irish newspapers, since they were the majority religious group in Ireland:

That the Irish newspaper public remained so small was largely due to the tendency toward the division of the country into two major religious groups and the consequent elimination of a potentially large rural market. [...] [T]he failure of Protestant journalists to cultivate or even to cater to this large section of the population and the intolerance of Catholics in general, partially explain the restriction of Irish periodical press circulation.³

We can see that the press's intolerance of Catholics continued into the nineteenth century. This was, however, a difficult bridge to gap, as most of the Catholic rural population were Gaelic-speakers and, moreover, wholly illiterate in both English and Gaelic.⁴

¹ For more on seditious libel, see Inglis, "The Press."

² Munter, 68-9.

³ *Idem.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 69.

2.6 Selected Newspapers

The newspapers involved in this study have varying political and religious leanings, which were examined in Charles Mitchell's guide, *The Newspaper Press Directory*, printed regularly beginning in 1846. This work is organized geographically, with chapters for England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. The chapter on Irish newspapers is further catalogued, again geographically, by county, with all newspapers listed alphabetically therein. Each entry contains the following information about a publication, as observed in Susan Gliserman's 1969 article studying the numerous volumes of Mitchell's Press Directory:¹

- a) establishment date
- b) price
- c) day of publication
- d) area of circulation
- e) interests it advocates (i.e., agricultural, advertising, manufacturing)
- f) politics
- g) religious affiliation if relevant
- h) proprietor and/or publisher
- i) a short description of city where papers are published

The following information is the list of periodicals that will be used as primary sources in this research, along with the information given by the *Mitchell's Newspaper Press Directory* of 1847 and cited in the *Waterloo Directory of Irish Newspapers and Periodicals*, edited by John S. North (1986). The *Waterloo Directory* has become an

¹ Susan Gliserman, "Mitchell's "Newspaper Press Directory": 1846-1907," *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 2.1 (1969): 17.

indispensable source of information on Victorian periodicals and holds extensive details on over 50,000 publications over the nineteenth century.¹

Dublin Evening Mail – 1823-1928

This publication was founded by William Saurin and edited in the 1820s by Timothy Haydn, Remi H. Sheehan, Thomas Sheehan, and Frederick William Conway. The price was one penny in 1823 and increased by 1824 to five pence. It was published daily from its founding and until 1850, when it began to appear thrice weekly. The *DEM* was a conservative newspaper and consistently anti-Catholic, Unionist, Protestant, and supportive of the Orange order.

Mitchell's description of the *DEM* specifies that it

circulates widely through every part of Ireland, and extensively in England, Scotland, and Wales. ADVOCATES agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests; is a political, religious, and literary journal; attached to the principles of the Church of England, and by adhering to consistency, honour, and truth, it enjoys a most extensive patronage.²

According to the Waterloo Directory, it was a "Protestant ascendancy newspaper, strongly anti-O'Connell and anti-Wellesley in 1820's" which "settled down into respectability and prosperity in the 30's, but retained its diehard flavour", opposed to all nationalist and Catholic movements.³

Dublin Evening Post – 1725-1875

The source documents studied for this research shows the price of the *DEP* in the 1820s to have been five pence. The *DEP* appeared thrice weekly and was a liberal

¹ For more details on the history of these publications, see Brake, Laurel and Marysa Demoor, eds. *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland*. (Gent, Belgium: Academia Press, 2009), 162, 181-182, 230-231, 558.

² Charles Mitchell, *The Newspaper Press Directory*, (London: C. Mitchell, 1847), 330.

³ The Waterloo Directory of Irish Newspapers and Periodicals, 1800-1900, 166.

newspaper with a significant readership throughout Ireland, England, and the United States. According to Mitchell, it “ADVOCATES all the national interests; supports free trade; and in religion, perfect freedom and equality of sects; it is a political journal, and literary so far as there are almost constant notices of new publications. The proprietor is a Church-of-England man, but by no means attached to the Anglican Church in Ireland; - it is not the organ of the Dissenters – but rather, as they are the movement party, of the Roman Catholics”.¹

Dublin Morning Register – 1824-1843

The *Dublin Morning Register* was a daily liberal newspaper founded by Michael Staunton, who was proprietor, publisher, and printer during the entire run of the publication. In the 1820s it was priced at five pence and often clashed with other newspapers of the time, including the *Dublin Evening Mail* and the *Morning Herald*. While the number of subscribers in 1825 was only 500, the *DMR* quickly gained influence and rivaled other dailies of the time. This newspaper was classified as pro-Catholic and was believed to have direct links to Daniel O’Connell and the Catholic Association.² Michael Staunton, was considered the “Creator of the Irish press” and became Lord Mayor of Dublin in 1847, representing the Repeal Association.³

Dublin Weekly Register – 1818-1850

During the 1820s, this liberal newspaper cost seven pence and appeared every Saturday. According to the analysis done by Mitchell, the *DWR* “circulates all over Ireland. agents are established, in the principal cities and towns of Ireland; also in Liverpool, Preston, Manchester, Birmingham, Carlisle, Barnsley, Glasgow, &c.

¹ Mitchell, 331.

² Inglis, *FOTP*, 167.

³ Oram, *The Newspaper Book*. (Dublin: MO Books, 1983): 46.

ADVOCATES the general good of Ireland. It is a very diversified paper, embracing a large body of miscellaneous, literary, and political information. It was the organ of the Roman Catholic Association, and the Editor, Alderman Staunton, has lately received the second prize for an essay on the Repeal of the Union".¹ The proprietor was the same from 1820 until at least Mitchell's work done in 1847, Michael Staunton, Alderman of Dublin.

Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser – 1763-1924

Freeman's was Ireland's longest running newspaper. Priced at five pence during the 1820s and published daily, it generally held a critical and oppositional view of the government. At its founding, *Freeman's* was "associated with the 'patriot' opposition in the Irish Parliament, with Charles Lucas and Henry Grattan being instrumental in its establishment".² While the name of the *FJ's* proprietor was not printed in the newspaper itself, the information given in the Waterloo Directory shows that Michael Staunton of the *DWR* was the editor from 1813 to 1824 and Henry Grattan was the proprietor from about 1826 until Patrick Lavelle took over ownership and editing in 1831.

According to the same source, the number of stamps issued in 1831 was 276,500 (approximately 1,772 stamps per issue). *Freeman's* was a highly influential paper all over Ireland and had wide circulation in Dublin. Additionally, *Freeman's* "advocates what are called "national" Irish principles, is the organ of the Irish Repealers, originates all the reports of the Repeal Association, and leads the so-called great national party in Ireland. Devotes some space to literature and the fine arts".³

¹ Mitchell, 337.

² Mark O'Brien, *The Fourth Estate: Journalism in Twentieth-century Ireland* (UK: Manchester UP, 2017), 9.

³ Mitchell, 332.

Saunders's News-Letter – 1767-1878

Saunders's proclaimed itself a neutral newspaper though it was perceived as anti-Catholic and pro-government. *SNL* is one of four daily publications in this study and its price in the 1820s was four pence. The information given in Mitchell's Directory claims it "circulates extensively in Dublin and its suburbs, and also generally throughout Ireland. [And] advocates no particular interest, but is devoted to advertisements, the reports of local occurrences, scientific, literary, and political meetings, and general miscellaneous intelligence."¹




Figure 6 - *The Mitchell Newspaper Press Directory, 1847*

¹ *Ibid.*, 336.

In this selection of newspapers, there is a balance between the different political and religious leanings of the period, in order to have all positions represented in the emigration debate that was playing out in their pages. Of the selected publications, two are 'liberal', one 'conservative', one 'pro-Catholic', one 'neutral', and one 'repeal' (or Irish nationalist). Two of the selected newspapers appeared thrice weekly, three daily, and one weekly.

Part Three will continue with an explanation of how each of these publications addressed the emigration question during the 1820s, and more specifically how they portrayed the Emigration Committees from 1826 to 1827, taking into consideration their specific political and/or religious leanings. First, a detailed explanation of emigration will be required in order to understand the context of this debate which will be discussed in the next section, covering the history of emigration, legislation on emigration, politics, Malthus's *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, and assisted emigration schemes.

3. Emigration from Ireland

3.1 History of Emigration

The Emigrant Trade

The first major study to describe the emigrant trade is William Forbes Adams's *Ireland and Irish Emigration to the New World from 1815 to the Famine*,¹ explaining that once peace was signed between the United States and Britain after the War of 1812, the levels of imports from America to Britain allowed for the continuation of Irish emigration and determined the extent of the emigrant trade during this period. Ships were not provided simply for emigrant use, but were also used for commercial exchanges between North America and Britain. Imports of flaxseed from the United States especially permitted for the profitability of returning with a cargo of emigrants.

Some vessels brought timber and other raw materials to the United Kingdom and returned with passengers to North America. These cargo vessels would drop off the goods they were carrying, then pick up passengers in the main port cities, such as Liverpool, before heading back to the United States or British North America. Many ships would even leave from a port in England with few return exports, only to stop in a port city in Ireland, for example Cobh (Queenstown), Dublin, or Belfast, merely to fill their remaining cargo space with passengers for North America (both the United States and the British colonies in North America).

The conditions of the voyage itself were not always what they were promised to be. The ships used to transport passengers to North America were not constructed for

¹ William Forbes Adams. *Ireland and Irish Emigration to the New World from 1815 to the Famine*. New Haven, Yale UP, 1932.

the emigrant trade. They were primarily cargo ships that were converted to house emigrants on the return journey. Passengers were forced to sleep in extremely cramped spaces below decks, where the close quarters contributed to the spread of diseases, such as smallpox, dysentery, cholera, and typhus.¹ It wasn't until 1803 that legislation was passed to protect emigrants from these conditions.

Furthermore, much of the emigrant trade was conducted by American ships, which we can see in the shipping advertisements of the time. Prior to the 1830s, the majority of Irish emigrants traveled to British North America, embarking at ports in Dublin, Derry, or Belfast before arriving in Canada and continuing their journey to the United States either over land or occasionally by boat. This choice in itinerary can be explained by the cost of passage itself, as travel to British North America was generally cheaper than passage to the United States. It is possible that the more expensive cost of passage to the United States was caused by legislation passed by the British government aimed at ships sailing to that destination. Naturally, the shipping companies affected by this legislation were forced to increase their prices to compensate for this intervention.² We will discuss these Passenger Acts and other government intervention in the next section legislation on emigration.

Thanks to the increase in trade between the United States and Britain combined with the relaxation of the passenger regulations, the price of passage from England decreased. Consequently, many Irish emigrants preferred taking the voyage from Liverpool to New York, though many ended up staying in England for longer than planned, working to accumulate the funds needed for the journey. Kenny estimates that

¹ Kevin Kenny, *The American Irish: A History* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), 58-9.

² *Ibid.*, 56.

“by the late 1830s and early 1840s, two out of every three Irish emigrants who crossed the Atlantic did so via Liverpool”.¹

After passenger regulations were relaxed, the price of the voyage itself (in the mid-1830s) decreased to about £3 10s from Liverpool to New York, which was not much more than the journey from Ireland that cost £2 15s.² This route soon overtook the importance of the voyage from Ireland to Canada due to the growing preference of settling in cities in the United States.

Patterns of Emigration

The impulse toward emigration — already present amongst farmers, weavers, servants and city workers generally — which had been temporarily checked by the difficulties of transportation during the Napoleonic Wars and almost completely stopped by the American War of 1812, now reasserted itself and inaugurated an important chapter in Irish and American history.³

Once the emigrant trade became a profitable economic venture, the number of Irish taking advantage of the opportunity to go to America followed suit. In 1816 and 1817 between six and nine thousand Irish sailed for America in each year, and in 1818 this number more than doubled. After the repeal of the Passenger Act in 1827, the number of passengers climbed to over twenty thousand per year. Emigrants could not sail throughout the year, as “April, May, and June were the recognized emigrant months, and after June few ships carried a full quota of passengers”.⁴

Emigration during this period can be summarized as follows:

800,000 to 1 million left Ireland for North America, twice as many as in the preceding two centuries combined. The rate as well as the volume of

¹ *Ibid.*, 100.

² *Ibid.*, 57.

³ Adams, 66-7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 74.

emigration accelerated sharply during this period; half the emigrants left Ireland in the twenty years from 1815 to 1834, the other half in the single decade from 1835 to 1844. Annual rates of transatlantic emigration from Ireland exceeded 20,000 for the first time in 1819-20, 50,000 in 1830-2, and 70,000 in 1840-2, reaching a peak of 90,000 in 1842.¹

Through these figures, we can see that the trend of emigration varied during the period we are studying, yet these rates remained higher than in previous years and continued to climb until the Famine, when a veritable deluge of emigration commenced.

Adams distinguishes three main periods of emigration to the United States: colonial, early nineteenth century, and recent.² Colonial emigration is somewhat of a mystery, since there are no concrete statistics as to the number of Irish emigrants during the period. Adams claims that the annual average in the 1770s was about four thousand, though the census of 1790 states that there were 44,000 Irish-born in the United States.³

The statistics available for early nineteenth century emigration are more substantial, due to shipping returns and passenger lists provided by the vessels carrying emigrants to North America. Adams thus explains emigration of the 1830s:

The combination of social and economic evils, with special causes in certain years, produced a total emigration from Ireland in the thirties of about 650,000, of whom roughly two-thirds went to America, and one-third to Great Britain. [...] Those who removed to Great Britain were either just able to pay the passage across the Irish Sea, or were sent by public subscription. This movement, therefore, can scarcely have decreased emigration to America, and may ultimately have added to it. Many remained in Lancashire or Scotland only long enough to accumulate the necessary funds for the transatlantic voyage.⁴

As to the 'recent' period of emigration, we can assume this title refers to the period of the Great Famine, as Adams's work covers the years from 1815 to the famine.

¹ Kenny, *The American Irish: A History*, 45-6.

² Adams, 68.

³ *Ibid.*, 69-70.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 175-7.

Timothy Guinnane states that “Mokyr [in *Why Ireland Starved*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1985] estimated that at least 1.5 million people left Ireland between 1815 and 1845”,¹ while Kevin Kenny suggests that during the same period “800,000 to 1 million left Ireland for North America”.² Although the figures vary depending on the source, these estimates show us that a majority of emigrants during this period left exclusively for North America.

Some individual landlords attempted schemes to assist their poor tenants in emigrating to North America, but “assisted emigration never accounted for more than a very small percentage of the total number of departures”, and these ventures generally failed.³ Overall, the emigrants of this period were able to come up with their passage money on their own, or by prepaid passages or remittances from family already settled in the United States or Canada who had found some form of income. We will discuss this aspect of emigration in the following section.

Emigration Demographics

Throughout the eighteenth century the majority of Irish emigrants had been Protestant, despite the fact Catholics largely outnumbered Protestants in Ireland. This can be attributed to a number of factors: their relative economic isolation, a low proportion of English speakers (and readers), and, most significantly, how emigration was viewed by the Catholic population.

In general, the Irish who were most likely to emigrate were from the middle classes, that is individuals, called ‘middling’ farmers and ‘smallholders’, who maintained mid-sized and small farms. The richest among the Irish had few reasons to emigrate and

¹ Timothy W. Guinnane, “The Great Irish Famine and Population: The Long View” *The American Economic Review* 84.2 (1994): 304-305.

² Kenny, *The American Irish: a History*, 45.

³ *Ibid.*, 55.

were therefore unlikely to do so. The poorest in the country had many motives to emigrate but lacked the resources to improve their situation through emigration or other means. This trend changed with the Great Famine of the 1840s, when the extremely poor were able to emigrate.

Most Catholics belonged to the poorest class of Ireland, being mainly landless laborers and other subsistence-based tenants. Protestants, on the other hand, were more likely to be part of the middle and upper classes, and therefore had greater means to emigrate. This economic division had a measurable effect on the religious identity of emigrants until the 1830s, just after the Penal Laws restricting Catholic activities were lifted, allowing more economic opportunities for Catholics. During the nineteenth century this trend was inverted with the majority of emigrants being “overwhelmingly Catholic”.¹ From 1830 onward, Catholics largely outnumbered Protestants in transatlantic migration. This inversion reached its peak in 1840 when, “only about 10 per cent of Irish emigrants to North America were Protestant, a figure that remained fairly constant for the remainder of the century”.²

Protestants and Catholics emigrated to different destinations,³ with the majority of Ulster Protestants emigrating to British North America (Canada) and Catholics emigrating to the United States. This suggestion is confirmed by Adams, who maintains that New England “rarely saw a Protestant Irishman”.⁴ This could possibly be explained by Irish Protestants’ desire to dissociate themselves from the Irish Catholics who were emigrating to North America; this concern indeed is evident in Irish Protestants’ self-identification as ‘Scots-Irish’, rather than simply Irish. Seen as a country founded on

¹ *Ibid.*, 45.

² *Ibid.*, 46.

³ Timothy J. Hatton and Jeffrey G. Williamson, “After the Famine: Emigration from Ireland, 1850-1913” *The Journal of Economic History* 53:3 (1993): 590.

⁴ Adams, 222.

religious freedom, the United States naturally attracted a great number of Irish Catholics, who were facing tremendous religious discrimination at home under British rule.

Protestants and Catholics also viewed emigrating to America differently,

with strong farmers from eastern Ireland and Protestants from Ulster much more likely to see emigration as [an] opportunity than Irish-speaking peasants from the West, who composed only a very small minority of the overseas migration before the Famine. Prosperous middling and strong farmers among the Catholic emigrants [...] were more likely to visualize their home-to-be in terms of individual liberation, family welfare and economic prosperity.¹

Ultimately, the ever-increasing pressure on land was the *sine qua non* that precipitated the mass Catholic emigration of the nineteenth century. We will develop this point further when we discuss motives for emigration.

In Ruth Dudley Edwards's and Bridget Hourican's *An Atlas of Irish History*, Irish emigrants of the nineteenth century are described as different from the European norm, as "the majority of European emigrants were male, but in Ireland women were equally migratory".² Individual women were even more prone to emigrate from Ireland, with two-fifths of Irish emigrants being female prior to the Famine.³ Irish women had an important role in the economy, contributing to the family finances through household work, farming, and cottage industries such as textile weaving and other domestic handicrafts. Despite their economic participation, women were generally strictly controlled by male members of the family, which may have encouraged them, in addition to other factors, to emigrate, especially when the domestic textile industry collapsed in the 1830s.

¹ Kenny, *The American Irish: A History*, 51.

² Ruth Dudley Edwards and Bridget Hourican, *An Atlas of Irish History* 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2005), 132.

³ *Idem.*

James Murphy provides a general description of male and female Irish emigrants at the time:

Most emigrants, male and female, were unmarried adults, and two in five were in their early 20s. Most male emigrants described themselves as labourers, though many were from farming rather than labouring backgrounds. Nonetheless, emigration did contribute to the decline of the labouring and cottier classes in Ireland.¹

With this information, we can visualize what the average emigrant may have looked like during the period we are studying. He or she could have been Catholic or Protestant, was from the lower or middle social classes (though not the poorest) and was probably a farmer or some kind of artisan before emigrating from Ireland.

Prepaid Passage and Remittances

Emigrants' rate of success in the United States can generally be assessed through an evaluation of the number and amount of remittances and prepaid passages they sent to Ireland. Once established, many would save their wages to send as much back home to Ireland as possible, or would prepay for their relatives to come over on the next boat.

“Two of the leading shipping agents at Belfast reported in 1834 that a third of their passages to the United States was paid in America, and added:

The passages of persons going to British America are also frequently paid there, but not to such an extent as those going to the United States. This tends to show the prosperity of the emigrants in the countries to which they have gone; and there is another great proof of the same in the amount sent to the country by emigrants independently of the money paid for the passages of their friends. Mr. Bell has received remittances to the extent of several thousand pounds from persons in America in favour of their friends at home, generally in small sums of from one pound to ten pounds.²

¹ James H. Murphy, *Ireland: A Social, Cultural and Literary History, 1791-1891* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 106.

² Quoted in Adams, 180-1.

Fitzhugh and Grimshaw, “the foremost agents in the emigrant trade”, had over \$12,000 in prepaid passages in 1830, and over \$19,000 in 1833.¹

A system of “chain migration” began to appear, whereby “a single sibling went to America and, once established, did everything possible to bring out other relatives, including parents and the entire family if possible”.² In some parts of Ireland, remittances not only enabled emigration for the most destitute (in Connaught, for example), but also facilitated “various forms of uneconomic existence to survive in Ireland longer than they otherwise might have”.³

Citing Oliver MacDonagh, Kenny notes that “between one-third and one-half of Irish transatlantic emigrants in the period 1830 to 1845 had their passages financed by cash remittances or tickets sent by relatives from the United States”,⁴ while Miller estimates that half of the passages from Ireland in 1838 were a result of remittances.⁵ This is an astounding amount, and it is clear that the emigrants who went out during this period were definitely from the poorer classes if they were forced to rely on family already in America to pay for their voyages. Additionally, the Irish Catholic church also depended on remittances, “solicit[ing] money earned by emigrants to help finance church building and education”.⁶

From these accounts, we can deduce that many emigrants’ first priority was working and saving money to reunite their families in their new home. This is largely due to the ease with which Irish emigrants were able to find employment in the United States and their positive reputation as able-bodied laborers, especially on the canal and

¹ Adams, 181.

² Kenny, *The American Irish: A History*, 55.

³ Murphy, 105-6.

⁴ Kenny, *The American Irish: A History*, 55.

⁵ Kerby Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (New York: Oxford UP, 1985), 200.

⁶ Miller, 128.

railroad development projects underway “In the United States [...] the laborer had no difficulty in getting a job in the ports, and if he were willing to go inland he could be almost sure of securing permanent employment”.¹

Motives for Emigration

Although overpopulation was often the main factor in an emigrant's decision to leave Ireland during the nineteenth century, the true cause was in fact access to land. The landholding system in Ireland was markedly different from the system in England, though the Act of Union was supposed to put the two countries on an equal footing. As seen above in section 1.1, the population of Ireland in 1804 was approximately 5.4 million people, of which only eight to ten thousand were landed proprietors who were almost exclusively Protestant. Indeed by 1775, an estimated ninety-five percent of Irish land belonged to Protestants and by the early nineteenth century, one-third of those landowners were absentees. Despite some similarities with Britain, a number of particularities in Ireland's landholding system made access to land especially difficult for many Irish laborers and farm workers.

Irish estates were extremely subdivided. With a significant number of absentee landowners (meaning that they owned land in Ireland but did not actually live on their Irish estates) a system of renting lands to middlemen developed due to a lack of foreign demand for Irish agriculture in the eighteenth century. Because of the economic circumstances, landowners rented their estates out to middlemen, hoping they would improve upon the land. These improvements included new dwelling houses, farm offices, drainage, and irrigation. The middlemen rented land for a substantial sum of money and their main goal was to make a profit on their investments. To this end, the middlemen would subdivide and rent out small parcels of land to tenants, either for a

¹ Adams, 99.

fixed amount of rent or in exchange for farm labor. Through this system, farm laborers received very little in wages for their work, and the land rented provided between one-half and one acre of potato ground for subsistence.

During the Napoleonic Wars, this system was quite successful in providing for both landlords and tenants. There was a high demand for Irish agricultural products for the duration of the conflict, which led to an increase in the prices of agricultural goods as well as rents. This allowed for enormous profits for middlemen and farmers alike, encouraging middlemen to seek new leases and renewals, while increasing the number of tenants on the land they were subdividing and subletting even further.

This period of economic prosperity did not last as the Napoleonic Wars came to an end. Demand for Irish goods went into a steep decline, prices dropped dramatically, while rents remained high. These events rendered the middleman system untenable, as farmers and laborers received very little for their efforts, yet were expected to continue paying high rents from a period of peak prosperity. Middlemen were not receiving rents, nor were some landowners, and the entire system eventually collapsed. Proprietors realized that the middlemen were only interested in their own profits and not improving the lands they were renting. This led to the end of leases to middlemen and consolidation of estates, as well as government legislation on subletting, and therefore many evictions of tenants upon those lands. Because of this dispossession of many tenants, most poor people in this period thought only of getting and retaining access to land as tenants, rather than owning their holdings themselves.¹ As the majority of Ireland's inhabitants depended largely on agriculture for subsistence, this competition for land access contributed significantly to the decision to emigrate.

¹ Kenny, *The American Irish: A History*, 46.

Population pressure was also a significant factor contributing to the Irish motives for emigrating. Ireland is an island of twenty million acres, of which only thirteen and a half million are inhabitable. In 1821, Ireland had the highest population density in Europe, and from 1785 to 1845, a rapid population increase left the country with over eight million inhabitants.¹ This swelling of the population increased pressure on land access and can be attributed to different causes: landlords who wanted to increase the number of tenants, the influence of priests, soldiers' bounties, and the rise of small tillage farms owned by Roman Catholics.²

Other factors may have had a role in the population expansion from 1780 to 1820, such as “earlier marriages and increased marital fertility, facilitated by greater ease of acquiring land and the expansion of potato cultivation”,³ though the population growth from 1820 on “slowed significantly, due to later marriages and a consequent fall in the birthrate”.⁴ Population growth slowed, but it did not have any serious effect on the number of inhabitants in Ireland: perceived by the elites as overcrowded, the island remained the most densely populated country in Europe and access to land was tenuous.

The influence of the Industrial Revolution on landlords most likely accounted for their interest in increasing the number of tenants. Landlords were increasing their own revenues while at the same time helping their tenants attain a higher quality of life by allowing them access to land. The tenants, who were previously laborers, therefore, became property holders, though the parcels they rented were generally five acres or smaller. They benefited from higher wages, increased employment, and access and use

¹ Adams, 3-4.

² *Ibid.*, 4.

³ Kenny, *The American Irish: a History*, 46.

⁴ *Idem.*

of land, while simultaneously being subjected to an absence of education and early marriages, which together contributed to the rapid increase in population.¹

Another factor that contributed to emigration was high rents. In the climate of postwar depression, prices were inflated and significant economic growth had taken place. However, when unemployment began to rise and prices remained high, tenants found their rents to be excessive considering the state of their declining economy. Many emigrants cited high rents as their motivation for emigration from Ireland during this period.

Economic conditions in both Ireland and the United States influenced emigrants to make the transatlantic voyage. Generally, the United States prospered economically during this period, although some reports of economic troubles reached Ireland, affecting the emigration rate for certain years. William Cobbett, in a letter reprinted in the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, recommends that the average Englishman should reside in the state of New York, should he decide to emigrate to the United States, where he claims "never having witnessed misery of any kind".² This sort of account was most likely quite influential during its time; though there was opportunity for economic prosperity in the United States, the truth of the economic situation in New York may have been somewhat exaggerated by the author.

On the other hand, various accounts of economic and natural disasters in different years had a noted effect on the emigration rates of those respective years. In the *Belfast Commercial Chronicle* one such account reports on the state of employment in 1816:

Great damage has been done in New Orleans by an inundation – trade is extremely dull – and numerous hands are out of employment. Those who

¹ Adams, 4.

² "Living in the United States." *Freeman's Journal* [Dublin] 21 January 1820, p. 4.

emigrate to America, deceived by the flattering pictures held out to them, have but one wish after their arrival – to return to their own country as soon as possible.¹

These types of accounts, coupled with British legislation on American-bound vessels, resulted in reduced levels of emigration for certain years during the period.

3.2 Legislation on Emigration

In this section, we will examine different pieces of legislation and how they affected emigration while they were enforced. We will consider the following policies: the Passenger Vessels Acts of 1803, 1817, and 1828, and the trade blocking mechanisms of the War of 1812.

The Passenger Vessels Act of 1803 was a series of regulations enacted, under strong lobbying from landlords, with the official intention to protect passengers from “suffer[ing] great hardship on ship-board for want of water and provisions, and other necessaries and of proper accommodation on their passage”.² While Parliament’s outward intention was to protect passengers from abuses, some argue that the true motives for this legislation were to raise the cost of passage to the United States (to the detriment of American shipping companies) and especially to prevent the emigration of tenants, who were necessary more than ever in continuing the ‘improvement’ policies that had begun in previous years.³ Upon its enactment on 1 July 1803, this Act tripled or quadrupled the cost of passage, creating a slump in emigration numbers and allowing

¹ “Emigration News.” *The Belfast Commercial Chronicle* 20 July 1816.

² *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. 3, 1815-1816. (London: Ridgway and Sons, 1838), 372.

³ J. M. Bumsted makes this argument in his work, *Lord Selkirk: A Life* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2008), 101.

the government to achieve its objective of preventing tenants and laborers from leaving during the war period, and thereby contributing to the booming war time economy.

The regulations enacted affected several aspects of the emigrant trade and went into effect on July 1, 1803. The number of passengers was limited to one person for every two tons burthen of any ship or vessel, the registered tonnage of every ship having been certified by the customs authorities of the United Kingdom. The punishment for exceeding this limit was substantial: fifty pounds for each person above this limit. This limit was only applicable to British ships, whereas a later regulation applied specifically to foreign ships. A subsequent regulation made it mandatory for the authorities to inspect the ship and the passengers aboard, thereby making it difficult to justify taking the risk of accepting an excessive number of passengers. Additionally, every vessel had to provide a fixed amount of daily provisions for each passenger on board, in the following quantities: half a pound of meat, one and a half pounds of bread, biscuit, or oatmeal, half a pint of molasses, and one gallon of water. Again, these provisions were open to inspection and the punishment was severe: twenty pounds for every quantity missing for the entirety of the voyage. This regulation especially made it more costly for emigrant vessels to travel with passengers, as they had to spend a great deal of money in provisions before taking on passengers and receiving clearance from the customs house. As the number of passengers was restricted, the possibility for profit was reduced and, as a consequence, the cost of passage increased.

Furthermore, every vessel was required to submit a passenger list, with the name, age, sex, and destination, for every passenger on board; submitting a false or inaccurate list would result in a fine of fifty pounds for each individual omitted. Again, this requirement was subject to inspection and could have serious consequences for the master or owner of the ship. If the number of passengers exceeded fifty, the vessel was required to take a doctor on board for the entirety of the voyage. The physician would

have to take a sufficient supply of medicines with him, and was obligated to keep journals of the voyage, recounting the number of passengers on board, and attesting to the distribution of the provisions necessitated by the regulations.

The final significant part of this regulation was that foreign ships were subject to a more restrictive limit on the number of passengers they could carry. Foreign ships were limited to one person for every five tons burthen, with the same fifty-pound fine attached for any person exceeding this limit. This provision was clearly meant to make British ships more competitive and, as the cost of passage to British North America was cheaper than to the United States, I would say that it was a successful one.

This legislation was later renewed and extended in 1816 to apply not only to foreign ships taking passengers to the United States, but also “to British Vessels conveying passengers from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to the United States of America”.¹ This affected the emigration rate and the destination of emigrants in 1817, with many more emigrants going to British North America and proceeding from there to the United States.²

The regulations enacted in 1817 were substantially briefer than the previous Act of 1803, concerning only British ships sailing to British colonies in North America, including Upper or Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Cape Breton, and Prince Edward’s Island. This act continued the provision of providing customs with a list of passengers as required in the previous legislation, with the addition that the same list must be provided to the proper authorities upon landing in the previously mentioned colonies, to be inspected in the twenty-four hours after arriving there. The provisions of food and water are again detailed in this Act as in previous legislation: five pints of water, one pound of bread or biscuit, one pound of beef or three-quarters of a pound of pork

¹ *British and Foreign State Papers*, 373.

² Miller, 194.

per day; and two pounds of flour, three pounds of oatmeal, or three pounds of peas or pearl barley, and half a pound of butter weekly. These quantities were slightly increased compared to the provisions mandated in the previous legislation, which may have had an effect on the cost of passage to the aforementioned British colonies. However, the restriction on the number of passengers was slightly relaxed (one person for every one and a half ton burthen), perhaps allowing for continued competitiveness of ships sailing to the British colonies in North America.

The removal of these regulations in 1827 opened the floodgates for large-scale emigration which “for the first time since 1818 reached an official total of at least twenty thousand”,¹ in that year. The direct result of the repeal of the Passenger Act was the immediate appearance of cheaper fares and more passengers allowed on ships. Previously, the number of passengers was restricted depending on the registered tonnage of the vessel.

This period without regulation did not last long and a new Passenger Act was passed in 1828 that included minimal regulations and was only applicable to vessels sailing to British North America. The requirement for a list of passengers was continued from previous legislation, and was the only regulation that remained identical to its previous incarnation. This new act allowed three passengers for every four tons burthen on board, which is close to the previous regulation restricting the number of passengers per vessel. The new regulation on provisions was minimalistic, requiring fifty gallons of water, and fifty pounds of bread, biscuit, oatmeal, or bread stuffs, for every passenger for the entirety of the voyage. This minimal regulation had little effect on the cost of passage: “In 1827, when the minimum rate from the north of Ireland to the United States remained

¹ Adams, 159.

at £5, and that from Liverpool at £4, fares to Canada dropped to £2 or at most £3. The act of 1828 apparently made no difference, for the same rates are quoted in 1830”.¹

These pieces of legislation had direct influence on the number of emigrants leaving Ireland each year. The Passenger Vessels Acts of 1803, 1817, and 1828 reflected the interests of the influential landed aristocracy, who frequently lobbied Parliament in favor of or against regulations, depending on the economic situation.

The transcript of the House of Commons sitting of March 18, 1828 shows the varying opinions of the Members of Parliament on the issues of emigration and imposing restrictions on vessels. Of the members who spoke during this sitting, it appears as though they were equally divided on the new bill that was being proposed. Some members believed it would encourage emigration while others felt that it would impede it. Mr. Warburton made an interesting comment about the duty of the government to take action on such issues, “[t]his House ought not to stand idly by, and contribute nothing on this subject but reports”.² Ultimately, minimal regulations were adopted and had very little effect on the price of passage.

In addition, the American Congress passed a law regulating the emigrant trade called the Steerage Act of 1819 (its full name was: An Act regulating passenger ships and vessels; also known as the Manifest of Immigrants Act). This act imposed similar restrictions as the British government’s legislation regarding the number of passengers allowed on each ship, as well as provisions. The first condition of the Steerage Act was that all ships or vessels (owned by American citizens or citizens of a foreign country) could not carry more than two passengers for every five tons, which was a specific measurement taken by the custom house in the United States. The punishment was one

¹ *Ibid.*, 161.

² “Passenger Regulations Bill.” Hansard House of Commons Sitting, 18 March 1828. *Hansard 1803-2005*. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1828/mar/18/passengers-regulation-bill>.

hundred and fifty dollars for each passenger that exceeded this limit. The second regulation of this act was related to mandatory provisions for ships departing the United States with a destination of Europe or another distant port. The mandatory provisions were not especially elaborate compared to the British legislation, but the minimum requirement included: sixty gallons of water, one hundred pounds of salted provisions, one gallon of vinegar, and one hundred pounds of wholesome ship bread for each passenger on board.¹ The final provision of this Act made it mandatory for all vessels to submit a manifest detailing the age, sex, occupation, country of origin, and purpose of visit, of all passengers arriving in the United States. This act came into effect on January 1, 1820 and was amended, modified, and finally, replaced, in 1855 by the Carriage of Passengers Act.

3.3 Assisted Emigration Schemes

Peter Robinson experiment

A few emigration schemes were attempted in the 1820s, but no other was more referenced in the Emigration Committees' testimony than the Peter Robinson experiments of 1823 and 1825. Peter Robinson was a Canadian businessman and politician, who met Robert John Wilmot-Horton during a trip to England with his family in 1822. Wilmot-Horton immediately approached Robinson with his ideas for an emigration experiment to Canada and asked him to be the project's superintendent.

Robinson was responsible for selecting those who would participate in the experiment. To that end, he travelled extensively through County Cork (selected by Wilmot-Horton), discussing the project with the impoverished people of the region and

¹ *An Act regulating passenger ships and vessels*. Session II, Chapter 47; 3 Statute. 488. Fifteenth Congress; March 2, 1819, 489.

selecting candidates for potential emigration. One of Wilmot-Horton's criteria for these emigrants was poverty, so those who were selected were truly of the lower classes of Ireland. Robinson was able to assist in the emigration of 568 individuals in 1823 and 2,024 in 1825.

Robinson was equally accountable for the financial aspects of the scheme, including transportation to Canada, provisions, acquiring land, medical care, transporting supplies, and establishing the settlements. Robinson was harshly criticized for his management of the 1825 operation, though the finances for the project were approved late by the Parliament, making it impossible to prepare for the arrival of the immigrants in advance. Despite the difficulties and responsibilities faced by Robinson, these emigration experiments were seen as particularly successful, and the integration of the immigrants remarkably effective. His testimony during the Emigration Committees of 1826 and 1827 was therefore highly respected and well-received by the committee members. Ultimately, though, the experiment was perceived as too costly by the Parliament, and, as we will discuss in the next section, no further emigration experiments were approved despite the original success of the projects discussed here.

Other Emigration Schemes

Other emigration schemes were attempted before the Peter Robinson experiments, but with little regularity or success. Before emigration was viewed as a possible solution for the growing poverty and overpopulation, the Colonial Office under Lord Bathurst and Henry Goulburn undertook small projects to assist potential emigrants in settling in the British colonies (Upper Canada in particular), rather than in the United States. The Colonial Office was not interested in encouraging greater emigration, but in redirecting potential British emigrants from the United States to Canada in order to benefit the development of the colonies.

These experiments took place between 1815 and 1819 and were extremely limited in scope. The criteria for these experiments were different from the Peter Robinson scheme, in that financial requirements were imposed on potential emigrants, in an attempt to exclude the poorer classes – seen as a burden on the colonies – from benefitting from the program. In the earliest scheme, a sixteen-pound deposit was required for every adult male, though this was later raised to twenty pounds, in exchange for free passage to Upper Canada, a substantial land grant, and six months' provisions at an advantageous price. In this way, the emigrants entered into a sort of contract with the Colonial Office; if they broke this contract by crossing the border to the United States, they would forfeit the deposit made in applying for the program.

The Colonial Office had hoped to send two thousand emigrants from Ireland, two thousand from Scotland, and a small number from England in the program's first year. However, political circumstances in 1815 put the program on hold. First, the government would not authorize the expenditure required for this planned emigration until the United States ratified the Treaty of Ghent, effectively ending the War of 1812. The United States ratified this treaty in February of 1815. Napoleon's escape from Elba the same month changed the government's priorities, and the emigration project was suspended indefinitely. The Colonial Secretary, however, felt obligated to keep his promise to those families who had already been accepted for the project and made arrangements for their emigration to Canada. Between 100 and 150 families from Scotland and thirty families from the north of England were conveyed to British colonies in North America, though the circumstances of their emigration were less than ideal.

The English families were sent first, while the Scottish families waited for months before arrangements were finalized for their departure. To their misfortune, the emigrants missed the ideal spring sailing season, not arriving until September, where they were housed in military barracks until they could make the journey to their new

settlements the following spring. In addition, the families experienced crop failures for the three years following their settlement and were supported by the government until 1819. Though the emigrants sent positive reports back to the United Kingdom, which may have potentially influenced future emigrants to go to Canada rather than the United States, this came at an incredible expense to the government, thereby changing their tactics for redirecting emigrants to British colonies.

Though Lord Bathurst and Henry Goulburn wanted to continue the project in 1816, budget cuts following the end of the Napoleonic Wars made this impossible. The Colonial Office, therefore, changed tactics, authorizing the British consul of New York, James Buchanan, to spend a maximum of ten dollars for every immigrant who wanted to settle in Canada. Buchanan achieved some success in this initiative, sending 1,600 people who were granted land in 1817, and by 1820 he had sent about 7,000 people overall, spending well below the ten-dollar maximum allowed by the Colonial Office.¹

As discussed in a previous section, the change in passenger regulations in 1817 had an immediate effect on the routes taken by emigrants to North America, though their ultimate destination, the United States, remained the same. The Colonial Office still wanted to privilege desirable emigrants, and on that basis developed another emigration plan in December 1817. Adult men had to have twenty pounds capital for their families to qualify for the program, and would be granted land in the colonies upon arrival. Free passage was not advertised as part of the program, but was revealed upon further enquiry by the emigrant candidates. Only a few of the applicants were approved in 1818, with between 600 and 700 emigrants being sent to Upper Canada at a cost of £4,000. When compared with the number of independent emigrants who sailed to British North America in the same year (14,500), this was an extremely small number in

¹ H. J. M. Johnston, *British Emigration Policy, 1815-1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 24.

the grand scheme of things. The Colonial Office finally ended its assisted emigration projects at the same time that the Parliament and the public changed its views on emigration and the value of such experiments in curing the ills caused by poverty and overpopulation in the United Kingdom.

3.4 Politics and Emigration

The official government view on emigration changed over time. The 1817 Committee on the Poor Laws made little reference to emigration, merely mentioning, less than explicitly, that they “feel that all obstacles to seeking employment wherever it can be found, even out of the realm, should be removed; and every facility that is reasonable afforded to those who may wish to resort to some of our own colonies”.¹ This attitude began to change during the following committee in 1819. In the Report of the Committee on the Poor Laws of 1819, the committee and its witnesses were more openly supportive of emigration as a means of lowering the poor rates, meaning decreasing the financial contributions required by communities to finance the maintenance of the poor. The Committee wrote of “removing any restraint on the free circulation of labor, and giving every facility and encouragement to seek employment in any part of the King's dominions”.²

The Colonial Office was reluctant to support any assisted emigration schemes during this period. Yet, in the 1820s this view changed slightly due to disturbances among the laboring classes in Ireland and Scotland caused by lack of employment. The Secretary of the Colonial Office,³ Lord Bathurst, was not particularly interested in emigration, even less in the major colonies of the empire. Bathurst was primarily concerned with the colonies of Gibraltar, Malta, the Ionian Islands, and St. Helena, while

¹ *Report from the Select Committee on the Poor Laws 1817*, 40.

² *Report from the Committee on the Poor Laws 1819*, 10.

³ Full Title ‘Secretary of State for War and the Colonies’.

leaving the major colonies of British North America and New South Wales to the administration of Henry Goulburn, his Under-Secretary. Goulburn was part of the Tory cabinet of the administration and later went on to become the Chief Secretary for Ireland (1821-1827). He did not believe that pauper emigration would be beneficial for the colonies, but that, on the contrary, it would be a burden and that poor emigrants would not contribute to the well-being where they settled. His greatest concern was with the advantages or disadvantages for the colonies and not for the benefit it may produce in the home country. The main objective of the administration was to direct emigration that was already occurring to the British colonies so that it would produce some benefit for the empire.

The arrival of the next Under-Secretary, Robert Wilmot-Horton, an independent, though generally supportive of the conservative government, changed the priorities of the Colonial Office. Wilmot-Horton's primary objective was to create a state-aided emigration scheme to relieve the distress in Ireland, Scotland, and England, while simultaneously benefitting the colonies. This led to the creation of the Emigration Committees in 1826 and 1827, which we will discuss in the next part of this dissertation.

Robert Peel, the Chief Secretary for Ireland from 1812-1818 and a Tory, had similar views to Bathurst and Goulburn, and frequently clashed with Wilmot-Horton in parliamentary exchanges on emigration. Lord Wellesley, a Tory and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from 1821 to 1828, thought the Peter Robinson scheme was rewarding lawbreakers. Francis Horner, a Whig member of Parliament for St. Mawes from 1813 to 1817, felt that the government's promotion of emigration was a pernicious enterprise. Lord Dalhousie, the Governor General of Canada, felt the Peter Robinson scheme was a waste of money. Both the conservative and liberal parties of the British government had differing views on emigration, and there were further differences of opinion depending on the person's geographical origins and experience with the laboring classes. The

period studied here was led by Tory Prime Ministers, yet the positions and debates on emigration ebbed and flowed, depending on the living conditions of the poor over time, and were often provoked by disturbances and perceived rises in crime among the poorer classes.

Political economists also had no hesitation in weighing in on the question of emigration and over-population. This led to several important writings on solutions to the many problems affecting the poor in the United Kingdom, none more well-known than Malthus's *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. Though originally published in 1798, this work was relevant to politics in the early 1800s due to subsequent editions that revised some of his arguments in 1803, 1806, 1807, 1817, and 1826.

3.5 Malthus's *An Essay on the Principle of Population*

Although Malthus gained many influential adherents to his principles especially in Whig circles and eventually even among the gentry and aristocracy – support which ensured the legislative triumph of his ideas – what stands out is the hostile, indeed extremely vituperative, response he provoked and the broad spectrum from which such intense opposition originated. Tory paternalists, Romantics, Enlightenment thinkers and advocates for working-class justice assaulted Malthus throughout his lifetime with a venom rarely witnessed by historians.¹

Thomas Robert Malthus was a political economist and an ordained member of the Church of England clergy. In 1798 he anonymously published *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, which was based on discussions with his father on other population theories of the time, notably Godwin's and Condorcet's. His central theory on population concerned its increase in relation to the increase of the food supply; according to Malthus, population grows geometrically (1, 2, 4, 8, 16), while the food supply can only

¹ James P Huzel. *The Popularization of Malthus in Early Nineteenth-century England: Martineau, Cobbett and the Pauper Press* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2006), p 2.

increase arithmetically (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), creating a natural check on population.¹ Malthus described this check on population as acting through various disasters, such as famines, wars, and plagues, in addition to delayed marriages, prostitution, and contraception, which all acted in concert to increase the death rate ('positive' checks) and reduce the birth rate ('preventive' checks). Malthus argued against the poor laws and denied that the poor had a right to be supported. He believed the poor laws should gradually be abolished and is said to have contributed to the reform of the poor laws during his lifetime, though he softened his apocalyptic conclusions in the later editions of his *Essay*. Additionally, two chapters in the first edition that contained radical opinions on theological questions were omitted from later editions.

Malthus's writing was sensational when it was published and faced much criticism from his contemporaries, such as Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Robert Southey, and William Cobbett, who "viewed him as a cruel and heartless apologist for the landed elite who advocated death by starvation for the poor".² Godwin himself, who was mentioned by Malthus as having inspired his *Essay*, published his own response in 1820, after the appearance of the fifth edition. Godwin wrote a methodical refutation of Malthus's doctrine, questioning the basis and sources of his principle that an unchecked population doubles every twenty-five years. He explains that the whole foundation for Malthus's theory is in the first chapter of the *Essay* (containing only 16 pages), and that the next 698 pages consist of explaining away all examples that conflict with his theory, save for the one that supports it, that of a certain region of the United States of America where the population supposedly doubled every twenty-five years for a period of one hundred and fifty years by procreation only. Godwin admits that Malthus's strength lies

¹ Malthus, Thomas Robert. *An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it affects the future improvement of society : with remarks on the speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and other writers*. (London: J. Johnson, 1798), 14.

² Huzel, p xi.

in his writing style of making general statements, but upon further examination, his claims lack any scientific evidence, such as registers of births, marriages, and deaths, which could potentially support his assertions. According to Godwin's own calculations in attempting to prove Malthus's theory, all marriages would have to produce an average of eight offspring to fit into the geometrical ratio put forth in the *Essay*. Being unable to produce any evidence of such a trend existing at any time in human history, Godwin states that, "when this author shall have produced from any country, the United States of North America not excepted, a register of marriages and births, from which it shall appear that there are on an average eight births to a marriage, then, and not till then, can I have any just reason to admit his doctrine of the geometrical ratio".¹

Godwin further argued that Malthus's arguments had a negative effect on the people of England, who began to regard others as a burden on society, and that he felt it his duty for that sentiment to be stopped. He claims that those few who studied political economy were being taught to "look askance and with a suspicious eye upon a human being, particularly on a little child. A woman walking the streets in a state of pregnancy, was an unavoidable subject of alarm. A man, who was the father of a numerous family, if in the lower orders of society, was the object of our anger".² He further uses religious and literary texts to defend the existence of human beings and the necessity of bringing life into the world.

Despite this and other pointed attacks on Malthus's theories,³ his work was highly regarded by many politicians at a time when population and pauperism became

¹ William Godwin, *Of Population. An Enquiry concerning the Power of Increase in the Numbers of Mankind, being an Answer to Mr. Malthus's Essay on that Subject*. (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1820): 35.

² Godwin, 110.

³ See William Hazlitt, *A Reply to the Essay on Population*, first published as three letters in *Cobbett's Weekly Register*, then later as a book (1807).

important subjects of debate.¹ Many of the ruling elite had read Malthus, who thereby “gained increasing influence on the numerous parliamentary committees investigating poverty in the post-1815 period culminating in their dominance as assistant commissioners for the 1834 Poor Law Report which provided the rationale for the legislative Bill of that year”.² In this way, Malthus and his theory permeated the legislative processes in England. He was further invited to testify before the Emigration Committee in 1827 on subjects not expressly written about in his *Essay*.

During his testimony, Malthus discussed aspects of Ireland’s population addressed in his *Essay*. He estimated the population of Ireland to be approximately seven and a half million and doubling every forty years. He claimed that circumstances existed in Ireland that were favorable to a rapid increase in population, and that the subdivision of land in particular had strongly contributed to the high levels of population there. Additionally, he agreed that removal of a certain part of the population could produce an effective check on the population growth, but only recommended emigration if it would cost less than maintaining the same population at home. Ultimately, we can observe in his testimony the disregard for human life that he was accused of when he states that the redundant laborers are of no advantage to the wealth of the country, that their existence is a tax on the community, and that the wealth of the country would not be diminished by their death. Malthus, not unexpectedly, expresses the anti-Irish racism of the time by claiming that Irish migrants to England and Scotland have already lowered wages there, and that their continued influx would introduce the dependence upon potatoes, and eventually, affect their moral and physical manners and conduct.³ Malthus seems to realize the prejudice in his testimony, as he continues by

¹ Some lectures later integrated Malthus’s theories into their courses on political economy. See Nassau William Senior, *Two Lectures on Population*, 1831.

² Huzel, p3.

³ Third Emigration Report, 312-313. Henceforth ER3.

admitting that Irish laborers are not well-treated by their superiors, and that this mistreatment was taking place before parts of the population became redundant, and concluding his testimony by acknowledging that Ireland has the capabilities to develop into a flourishing and prosperous country, and that emigration is one of the best methods of accomplishing that prosperity.¹ This testimony will be further examined along with the other testimonies in Part Two.

¹ ER3, 327.

4. Conclusion of Part One

The aspects of Irish history discussed in this first part are essential to understanding the following two parts of this research, which will focus on the three reports of the Emigration Committees as well as excerpts from the selected newspapers during the 1820s. The socio-economic and political context has been shown to have had a direct impact on the demographics of Ireland, the difficulty of access to land after the Napoleonic wars, and the growing emigration trends that developed in the early nineteenth century.

These interconnected issues give us a more precise understanding of the circumstances that led to the numerous government committees studying the problems in Ireland, particularly the distress of the laboring class and the financial investment and other measures that would be necessary to launch economic growth in the country. While the motivations of the Parliament in appointing these committees is unclear, all of its members were landowners, and therefore, could have been affected by the mismanagement of the middleman system if they owned land in Ireland. This meant that many of them were absentee landowners who leased their estates to land agents and middlemen, who further subdivided the land and rented it to small farmers and poor laborers. Poor tenants very often either could not afford to pay their annual rent or paid with their labor as agricultural labor. Members of Parliament, therefore, had financial interests in Ireland that were suffering due to the distress of poor Irish laborers.

This explains why there was a sense of urgency in the appointment of the Emigration Committee, as a sort of culmination of multiple committees and reports after which no action was taken to solve these issues. There was perhaps considerable pressure on this final Emigration Committee to find some reasonable solution, which seems to have resulted in a multiplicity of issues being examined besides emigration.

Part Two: Emigration Committees and Reports

The Emigration Committees of 1826 and 1827, appointed as we have seen at a time when Ireland's social and demographic situation was perceived to have become particularly urgent, will be the subject of this second part. We will examine the Committees and their reports, beginning with the origins of the committee initiated primarily by Robert Wilmot-Horton, a well-known parliamentarian, Under-Secretary of State of War and the Colonies, and advocate for emigration. The first section deals with the origins, creation and mandate of the committees, as well as their methodology, which was not dissimilar from other committees during this period. The second section will be an in-depth analysis of the summary reports that were written by the committee members themselves and which generally contained suggestions for legislation to be adopted by Parliament. The third section presents the background of the witnesses who testified before the committees. The final section examines the witnesses' testimony, which we have divided into four categories: distress, emigration plans, contribution to emigrate, and Malthus' "vacuum". This analysis will fill in the gaps of the previous research done on these Committees.

1. The Emigration Committees

The Emigration Committees were an important introduction for the general public to the debate occurring in Parliament. The number of witnesses assembled to testify before these three Committees was significant in itself: 35 in the first, 39 in the second, and 46 in the third. Committees studying different aspects on Ireland during this period rarely had such a high number of witnesses testify. These Committees were supported by several members of Parliament, none more so than Robert Wilmot-Horton. Emigration became a serious debate in Parliament during this period and without these Committees, the numerous issues tangentially related to emigration would not have been examined in such detail. This section will begin by retracing the history of the Committees' creation after the Wilmot-Horton and Robinson emigration experiments; it will then continue with an examination of the Committees' mandate and methodology.

1.1 Wilmot-Horton and the Emigration Committees of 1826 and 1827

Robert John Wilmot-Horton was a British politician, born into a wealthy family; through his marriage to Anne Beatrix Horton he inherited a large estate in Derbyshire well-known for its “agricultural improvement and general estate welfare”.¹ Wilmot-Horton had political aspirations and moved to London in 1812 where he spent a few years as a member of Parliament before being recruited to the position of Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies in 1821.

¹ Eric Richards, “Sir Robert John Wilmot-Horton”, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed: 15 May 2011. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13827>>.

Wilmot-Horton soon became obsessed with emigration and believed a state-assisted program was the only solution for the nation's ills, especially for the problems facing Ireland. He wrote a pamphlet entitled "Outline of a Plan of Emigration to Upper Canada", which was printed, though never published, in 1823. This pamphlet was reprinted in its entirety in the Report of the Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland of 1823, of which Wilmot-Horton was a member and for which he gave testimony. Based on testimony provided from 23 June to 4 July 1823 by eighteen witnesses (including three involved with the Emigration Committees – Wilmot-Horton, Robert Stearne Tighe and William Henly Hyett), the report addressed the condition of Ireland's "Labouring Poor [...] with a view to facilitate the application of the Funds of private Individuals and Associations, for their Employment in useful and productive Labour".¹

Wilmot-Horton's testimony began with two particular questions aimed at understanding whether the government was studying the question of emigration from Ireland to the colonies, and why.² His answer to the first question ("Has the attention of the King's government been of late directed to the subject of emigration from Ireland to the colonies?") was affirmative ("It has"). To the following question ("What have been the circumstances which have induced government to turn their attention to that subject?"), he stated that the government wished to resolve the problems caused by excessive population in Ireland and explained that directing these emigrants to British colonies, rather than to other countries, would be more beneficial for the United Kingdom. Reference is made to the emigration scheme that Wilmot-Horton was organizing with Peter Robinson that same year to remove willing Irish emigrants to lands in Upper Canada. This experiment is positively described as "a system which will

¹ *Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland 1823*, 3.

² *Ibid.*, 168.

best ensure their [the emigrants'] immediate comfort and their future prosperity".¹ Also included in Wilmot-Horton's testimony are the terms provided to the emigrants participating in this project. The total cost of conveying the new settlers to their land grants in Upper Canada was to be provided by the government, including all provisions necessary during the voyage and for the first year of settlement, in addition to farming equipment and tools needed to fulfill the requirements of the terms afforded by the government. The terms also established a tax on the lands, in the form of an annual quit rent of two pence per acre, as well as the consequences if settlers could not fulfill their requirements or were to abandon the land granted them.²

It is at this point that Wilmot-Horton's pamphlet "Outline of a Plan of Emigration to Upper Canada" is printed in full. It is mentioned that this plan had been intended to apply to England, but that it could also function well if applied in Ireland and Scotland. The plan includes a method of repayment of any funds advanced by the government for the purpose of emigration. In the case of England, it is proposed that the government give an advance on the parish poor rates, at a four percent interest rate, to be repaid in annual installments over twenty-five or forty-two years, and directed towards the emigration of unemployed paupers. This government loan is calculated to be more beneficial to the parishes than paying for the maintenance of the unemployed, when taking into account the cost to the parish compared to the estimates of conveying the same unemployed persons and their families to the British colonies. The paper calculates that maintaining an unemployed man costs the parish £10 annually, while conveying the same man to Upper Canada would cost £35, a woman £25, and children under fourteen years old £14. It is asserted that the conveyance of the unemployed man would result in a savings of £775 annually for the parish. However, this calculation

¹ *Idem.*

² *Ibid.*, 170.

excludes any cost of transporting the future settlers to the port of embarkation, which would fall on the parish to provide, and assumes that the estimates on the cost of conveyance are accurate. As regards Scotland and Ireland, it is claimed that the plan could also apply, “provided that money was raised there for the purpose by local assessment, or that a specific tax was pledged for money lent for that purpose by the government”.¹

Though the details provided by Wilmot-Horton are admittedly sparse, the plan asserts that the success of the settlers is all but guaranteed based on previous emigration experiments carried out by others, such as Colonel Talbot’s settlement on the banks of Lake Erie, which is supported by testimony given to the Emigration Committee on this subject.² In addition, the plan itself describes a system that would be based solely on agricultural activity, with grants of land being given to each head of household to be developed over a stipulated period of time. Each head of household would receive 100 acres, while single men would receive smaller amounts. After a predetermined period of time, the proprietor would have to pay taxes on the land in the form of a ‘quit-rent’ to be applied to the furtherance of the colonies’ infrastructure (local improvements, roads, etc.). Though admittedly beneficial to the agricultural populations, it is asserted that the plan could apply and be beneficial to manufacturing populations as well.

Finally, it is argued that the plan would necessarily become inactive when sufficient demand for labor existed, “for whenever there should exist at home an adequate demand for the services of able-bodied men out of employ, whether from the increase of productive industry, or from the demands of war, or from any other cause, there would be no longer a temptation to emigrate”.³ Most importantly, this system

¹ *Ibid.*, 172.

² First Emigration Report (Henceforth ER1), 9.

³ *Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland 1823*, 173.

posits to greatly benefit the colonies and, by extension, Great Britain, by defending its colonial possessions, removing the excessive population to a more productive situation, and “augment[ing] the wealth and the resources of the mother country itself”.¹

Wilmot-Horton had a vision regarding how a future state-assisted emigration program would function and, more importantly, be financed. The emigration experiments organized by Wilmot-Horton, under the superintendence of Peter Robinson, therefore, proceeded with government support, and the venture to establish emigration committees began with the objective of analyzing the outcomes of these experiments and proposing solutions for a state-assisted emigration program.

Wilmot-Horton brought up the subject of emigration at every possible moment during debates in the House of Commons and even attempted to introduce an emigration bill in 1828, but to no avail. Eventually, he became more and more disillusioned with the Parliament, who ridiculed his attempts, and he left the government in 1828.

1.2 Creation and Mandate of the Committees

After the experiments of 1823 and 1825 three Emigration Committees were formed by Wilmot-Horton – one in 1826 and two in 1827² – to gather information about emigrants and their reasons for emigrating; to receive testimony from landowners, clergy, members of Parliament and others on the issue of emigration; and ultimately to formulate a system of state-assisted emigration. These committees gathered testimony from more than seventy witnesses, before writing their reports, which were printed in three

¹ *Idem.*

² Richards, *ODNB*, “He set up, organized, chaired, and was the leading spirit in the emigration committees of the House of Commons in 1826 and 1827.”

volumes totaling more than one thousand pages. The committees' final report recommended implementing a state-assisted emigration system and enjoyed support from many prominent economists. However, members of Parliament were especially concerned about the cost of the proposal, and consequently, no system was ever created to put in place the recommendations of the committees.

The members of the first Emigration Committee of 1826 were not made public, at least they were not found in any of the sources consulted. The motion to appoint a Committee for the purpose of studying the question of emigration was submitted by Wilmot-Horton in the House of Commons on 14 March 1826. The Committee's renewal, which took place on 15 February 1827 in the House of Commons, confirmed the names of the second committee's members: "Mr. W. Horton, Mr. Secretary Peel, Sir T. Acland, Mr. S. Rice, Mr. H. Davis, Mr. L. Foster, Lord L. Gower, Mr. M. Fitzgerald, Mr. James Grattan, Mr. F. Lewis, Sir H. Parnell, Mr. John Maberly, Mr. Alderman Wood, Mr. A. Baring, Colonel Torrens, Mr. Brownlow, Sir F. Baring".¹ We can assume the first Emigration Committee had a similar composition, though it is impossible to know for sure, as Parliamentary elections took place in June 1826, and the newly elected Parliament began its session in November of that year. However, if we look at the members listed above and compare them with the members of Parliament during the 1820-26 session, there are only three names that do not appear as MPs during the previous session (Sir H. Parnell, Colonel Torrens, and Sir F. Baring). In addition, as previously mentioned, Wilmot-Horton was the committee chairman, as well as a member of Parliament representing Newcastle-under-Lyme, and held the position of Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies. Finally, Mr. Secretary Peel refers to

¹ *DEP*, 20 February 1827, 1-2.

Sir Robert Peel, who served as Home Secretary from 1822 to 1830, and later went on to serve as Prime Minister.

The committee's mandate was most likely formulated upon its creation, though it appears that this was done outside of the official parliamentary debates as no record of this could be found. The text of the Report of the first committee details the objectives "to inquire into the Expediency of encouraging Emigration from the United Kingdom, and to report their Observations thereupon to The House".¹ This mission was in its nature vague, yet it allowed the committee to collect a variety of testimony related to emigration. The next part will focus on how the committee went about collecting this testimony.

1.3 Methodology of the Committees

While the Report of the first Emigration Committee does not explicitly outline how questions were formed or witnesses called to testify, we can assume that questionnaires were sent out to important people (landowners, clergymen, political economists, allies of Wilmot-Horton, politicians in British colonies, etc.) throughout the empire asking them to give their point of view or share their experience on the subject. This mode of collecting data and witnesses to testify, in practice since the seventeenth century,² also offered a means to inform interested parties of the parliamentary inquiry and allowed them to make arrangements to appear before the Committee to give their official testimony. However, it also limited the number of witnesses who gave their testimony directly to the Committee, as they were obligated to travel to London to do so. This gives

¹ ER1, 1.

² Ó Ciosáin, Niall. *Ireland in Official Print Culture, 1800-1850: A New Reading of the Poor Inquiry*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014), 30.

us a restricted view of the opinions held by average people in the United Kingdom on the subject of emigration, especially of those who were most likely to emigrate during this period.

The geographical range of the witnesses was immense. Many represented the interests of the British colonies in Canada, South Africa, and Australia, in addition, naturally, to local interests in Ireland, Scotland, and England, but also the views of a couple of outliers, who represented a British settlement in Colombia. There are questions about the reliability of the witnesses, who may or may not have had direct knowledge of emigration and its effects or applications in the United Kingdom and its colonies. Several witnesses expressed their ignorance of the circumstances in Ireland before asserting their opinions on the subject, which will be examined in our analysis of the evidence. The witnesses for the Emigration Committees, who will be described in a later section, did not necessarily have expert knowledge on emigration from the United Kingdom, but more frequently relayed their personal experience involving the desire to emigrate in their communities, small emigration experiments, and the need for emigrants in British colonies.

Each report is broken down into three parts: first, the Committee's 'Report' itself, including any conclusions the members came to during the committee sessions; second, the testimony from the witnesses who appeared before the committee; and third, in the appendix, documentation that the witnesses provided to the committee to support their testimony.

2. The Emigration Reports

In this section we will analyze the report of each Committee, how they summarized the findings of their evidence-gathering period, and the legislation they suggested to Parliament. Various witnesses' testimonies will be further examined in a separate section to better analyze the subjects covered by the witnesses, as this information was not organized in any methodical way in the reports themselves.

2.1 Emigration Report 1 – 1826

The first emigration report is about nine pages and begins with a few conclusions the committee has made on the basis of the evidence, or testimony, that it received from numerous witnesses, and which the committee presents as facts. The first of these “facts” is that there are extensive areas, especially in Ireland, but also in England and Scotland, that are afflicted by a lack of employment opportunities. The way this “fact” is reported however, appears to put the onus on the unemployed, as the word “redundant” is used to describe them. In these various districts, they write, “the population is at the present moment redundant”.¹ The Committee here is claiming that this redundant population has an effect on the entirety of the working classes, reducing them to a state of destitution and misery because they consume more than they produce and thereby lower wages as a result.

The second “fact” the committee presents, is that there is a large amount of land available for this “redundant population” to resettle upon in the British colonies of Canada, South Africa, and Australia, where they could become productive and

¹ ER1, 1.

employed, and “for whose conveyance thither, means could be found at any time, present or future”.¹

The third “fact” asserts that the mere presence of this “redundant population” has extremely negative effects upon the communities where they exist. It is claimed that they suppress industry, endanger the peace, and diminish national wealth. The report asserts that the evidence collected by the committee supports the idea of this population resettling in the colonies and that their success will be assured by the nature of the quality of land in these colonies.

The committee recommends that the subject of emigration be debated by the House of Commons in order to find a solution to “correct” this redundancy of population and to cure “the numerous evils which appear to result from its existence”.² However, perhaps for lack of time or incomplete information, the committee admits that it is not prepared to suggest a specific system of emigration for adoption in the House.

They do, however, propose certain principles for any system of emigration the House would consider undertaking. The only system they would be willing to propose to the House would be a voluntary one, or that would affect those “considered to be in a state of *permanent pauperism*”.³ All funds given by the government for the purpose of resettling emigrants in the colonies would eventually have to be repaid (one of the arguments against a government-funded emigration program was the cost, based on the results of the Peter Robinson emigration experiments of 1823 and 1825). Finally, the report states that any emigration program should be beneficial both to the colonies and the mother country.

¹ *Idem.*

² *Ibid.*, 4.

³ *Idem.*

There are a few general statements that appear in the report that most likely refer to specific testimony given to the committee and are included in the “evidence” section of the report, but require further reading, or even study, to determine their accuracy. They are, at best, presumptions, and extremely subjective presumptions at that. First, the evidence given on the resettlements conducted in the experiments of 1823 and 1825 seems hardly enough to convince future potential emigrants to participate in a government-assisted emigration program.

With respect to the disposition of the tenantry ejected under such circumstances, Your Committee have to observe that the uniform testimony they have received from the evidence, from the petitions submitted to them, and from other sources of information, has induced them to believe that the knowledge, which is now generally disseminated, of the advantages which the emigrants of 1823 and 1825 have experienced, will be sufficient to induce not only any paupers who may be ejected under such circumstances, but all of the more destitute classes of the population in Ireland, to avail themselves with the utmost gratitude of any facilities which may be afforded for emigration.¹

Second, the evidence collected by the committee is insufficient to disprove Malthus’s idea that any removal of a population would create a vacuum that would quickly be refilled by other migrants, earlier marriages and births.

Your Committee being fully aware that one popular objection which is continually offered to any system of Emigration on an extended scale, is the argument, that the benefit would be only temporary, and that the temporary vacuum would be rapidly filled up, felt it necessary to direct their inquiries to the consideration of such collateral measures, both of a legislative and of a practical nature, as might be calculated to repress, if not to prevent, that tendency.²

Third and finally, it is unclear how rendering this report and the testimony public and circulating it throughout the empire, would make it easier for future committees to

¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

² *Ibid.*, 9-10.

take up this subject and be able to propose specific legislation on emigration to the House.

Your Committee beg finally to express their decided conviction, that the circulation of their Report, and of the Minutes of Evidence, throughout the United Kingdom and the Colonies, will enable any future Committee to resume the subject with the means of proposing measures sufficiently definite to justify their recommendation of them to the House for its adoption.¹

In order to determine if these “facts”, principles, or generalizations are accurate, we will continue with our own analysis of the testimony given in this report in a later section.

2.2 Emigration Report 2 – 1827

The second Emigration Report is approximately the same length as the first. It is similarly divided into two parts: the ‘Report’, meaning the conclusions come to by the committee itself, and the ‘Minutes of Evidence’, meaning the testimony given before the committee by the witnesses. The particularity of this report is that the text dedicated to the conclusions made by the committee is extremely short, not even five full pages. The committee was only in session for four days in February 1827, for thirteen days in March 1827, and only one day in April 1827. It is not clear what exactly the mission of this shortened committee was and why they only collected evidence over the space of two months. Whatever the reason, this is reflected in the length and substance of the concluding “Report” that was issued by the committee members.

¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

In this shortened report, the committee admit that the text that they are submitting to the House is not a complete or final report.¹ While still acknowledging that there is a serious issue with unemployed laborers, as it relates to the supply of employment, the committee members have slightly changed their vocabulary when speaking of those affected by this state. Instead of 'redundant population', as they were called in the previous report just one year prior, they are now referred to as 'superabundant population'. Perhaps this is because of the 'progress' that is referred to in the report, of the 'transition from Hand-loom to Power-loom weaving', or that it focused particularly on weaver communities in Scotland rather than the distress in Ireland. It may also result from the fact that this report was reprinted in every major newspaper of its time, and certain groups of people did not agree with the committees' characterization of them as 'redundant'. It is impossible to know what changed in the year since the previous report was printed to influence this choice of words.

It would appear, however, that the report's intention was not to give a conclusive suggestion to the House on adopting measures on emigration, but to shed some light on a difficult economic situation that was occurring in these affected districts, as a result of the industrialization of certain industries. The report acknowledges that some of those most affected by the problem of unemployment were in districts that were economically dependent on cotton and weaving industries. The introduction of machines that replaced workers, left many weavers without work; with no other employment available to them, they were abandoned to idleness.

¹ Emigration Report 2 (Henceforth ER2), 3.

2.3 Emigration Report 3 - 1827

The 'report' section of the third and final Emigration Report is significantly longer than the previous two, totaling thirty-nine pages. The first three pages are presented as a kind of introduction, defining terms and asserting certain facts, conclusions, and observations made by the committee. In this introduction, the committee defines redundancy as "a supply of able-bodied and active Labourers with their families, for whose labour there was no effective demand".¹ It also claims that this phenomenon of redundancy was occurring in "extensive districts of *Ireland*, and in certain districts of *Scotland* and *England*".² There is no evidence given in the introduction to support this statement, but the claim that the poor of Ireland were much worse off than the poor of England or Scotland is generally accepted by all those participating in the committee, members and witnesses alike, as well as the majority of members of Parliament and the general public at the time. The committee members believed that redundancy had a significant impact on the economy and social class of the affected country, in some cases, going to the extreme of

deteriorating the general condition of the labouring classes [...] to diminish the national wealth [...] to repress the industry, and even sometimes to endanger the peace of the country, creating mendicancy, outrage, and diminution of occupation, with every attribute of excessive pauperism.³

The Report continues with establishing certain principles put forth by the committee. Firstly, the testimony given within would be enough to persuade parishes in England and Scotland, as well as proprietors in Ireland, to directly contribute to a plan of emigration, because it would explain the benefits of such a plan. Especially in the case of Ireland, where no poor laws existed, but where the poor survived on parochial

¹ ER3, 3.

² *Idem.* (Italics not mine)

³ *Idem.*

assistance, this plan would relieve the contributors of this burden by removing the poorest part of the population. Secondly, the committee refused to support any emigration that would be neither voluntary nor reserved for those in “a state of permanent pauperism”.¹ Thirdly, the vast quantities of land available for development in the British colonies could be converted into productive agricultural land by any emigrant who wished to take part in such an endeavor; the expense for such a plan would eventually be repaid by the future settlers. Finally, allusion is made to the question of the probability of filling the temporary vacuum left by emigration. Though no direct answer is given to this question, the possibility of future legislation to address this potential problem is suggested to the House in its place.

The remainder of the report is divided into eight parts. The first part, “The State of the Population in Ireland”,² totals just four pages, but covers a variety of topics including the state of the poor in Ireland, the evils of excessive population growth, the Sub-Letting Act of 1826, insurrectionary movements, and the rising number of Irish leaving to settle in England and Scotland. The committee notes among the twenty-five witnesses examined in regards to Ireland, five members of Parliament, eleven residents of Ireland, a Mr. Blake who was a member of the Commission of Inquiry into the state of education in Ireland, and Malthus himself. As evidence for their claim on the state of Ireland, they assert that there is a “unanimous feeling entertained by all these witnesses as to the enormous evils existing, and still greater to be anticipated from the unchecked progress of Population”.³

The committee continues with their general observations on Ireland. While not directly addressing the circumstances that led to the situation in Ireland, outside of

¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

² *Ibid.*, 6-10.

³ *Ibid.*, 6.

proclaiming a state of “extreme wretchedness of a great portion of the peasantry in many parts of Ireland”,¹ the committee asserts that “there is that excess of labour, as compared with any permanent demand for it, which has reduced and must keep down the labourer at the lowest possible amount of subsistence”.² Because of this extreme situation among Ireland’s population the committee suggests that any emigration plan should first be administered there, in order to slow the movement of Irish into England and Scotland, which it claims will eventually lead to “the permanent deterioration of the condition of the English and Scotch labourer”.³

Some in the government propose introducing capital into Ireland to solve these problems, though the committee believes this would not be effective against the population problems, stating that “no person will be disposed to establish large manufactories, or to make great agricultural improvements, in a country which has been, and may again be the scene of insurrectionary movements, and where his returns may consequently be affected by such contingency”.⁴ They go even further, by claiming that the previous insurrections, most likely a reference to the 1798 uprising, were instigated by those who were ejected or dispossessed of their farms, and who have remained in a state of pauperism for a prolonged period. By attempting to discourage alternative proposals to solve the problems of Ireland, the committee is building up its argument in favor of emigration as the ultimate solution.

Reference is made to the seasonal migration that took place at this time, when an Irish laborer would travel to England to work while waiting for the potato harvesting season in order to have some income during a period of potential unemployment. These migrants were temporary and would return to Ireland upon earning enough income to

¹ *Idem.*

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.

sustain themselves through this dry spell. The committee claims that these previous seasonal migrations have become permanent, and that this increase would have a catastrophic effect on the English and Scottish laboring classes. The committee thus summarizes the pros and cons of a state emigration plan legislated by the government:

Whether the wheat-fed population of Great Britain shall or shall not be supplanted by the potatoe-fed population of Ireland; whether Great Britain, in reference to the condition of her lower orders, shall or shall not progressively become what Ireland is at the present moment.¹

With this statement, there is a sense of urgency attributed to the Irish situation, though it appears that the committee has more concern for the state of their own laboring classes than the people of Ireland who are suffering this alleged perpetual state of wretchedness and destitution.

The second section of the report, “The State of the Population in England; including the subject of the Poor Rates, and the distinction between an Agricultural and a Manufacturing population in reference to the subject of Emigration”,² only consists of about three and a half pages. The Committee here reports that it examined four witnesses on the state of pauperism in England during the first Committee of 1826. During the second Committee, twenty-two witnesses were examined on the same subject. There was discussion of the cultivation of waste lands to employ the poor, similar to the debate on Ireland, notwithstanding the general opinion that this would not be an effective method to combat the lack of demand for labor in the two countries. It is said that the witnesses agreed on the general principle that part-time work for laborers was detrimental for the entire laboring population and that removing a certain number of them would be beneficial for those remaining, potentially resulting in full-

¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

² *Ibid.*, 10-14.

time employment.¹ The witnesses also purportedly agree that the cost of cultivating the waste lands would be more expensive than relocating the laborers as new settlers to the colonies. Additionally, the report claims that there is apparent agreement upon the suggested system of obtaining a loan against the poor rates in order to fund an emigration project. The next part of the present study will offer further analysis of these claims based on the evidence collected by the Committees to determine whether the witnesses made any statement of this nature.

One distinction is made between England and Ireland, in that the manufacturing districts in England were equally suffering from a lack of demand for employment in industry. It appears that the Committee is attempting to defend an emigration project in the manufacturing districts by claiming that this population's demand for labor "may at any moment be materially lowered by the circumstance of the introduction of new machinery displacing manual labour, or by a diminution of demand in the home or foreign market".² The Committee concludes this part on the situation of England by restating its belief that emigration would prove beneficial to these redundant agricultural and manufacturing populations, provided it succeeds in preventing this situation from recurring in the future.

Overall, this part of the report is rather short, and it seems that the Committee may have felt the mainly English members of the House of Commons were already well-aware of the situation of the poor or under-employed populations of England. Therefore, they may not have felt the need to overexplain the details of the circumstances in that country.

¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

² *Ibid.*, 13.

The third section of this report, “The State of the Population in Scotland”,¹ briefly describes (in one page) the situation in that country. The Committee states that four witnesses testified in 1826 on the subject of Scotland and eleven were examined during the 1827 session. They claim that “the case of Scotland appears to be that which presents the greatest difficulty”;² if this were the case, would they not attempt to detail the circumstances in Scotland that make the situation different and more difficult than that of Ireland and England? It is admitted that Ireland and Scotland share the problem of a superabundant population, while emigration is not supported as a solution to this shared ‘evil’ for Scotland, with the quoted as stating, “[w]here the evils of a superabundant population are found to exist, they are not in general under those circumstances to which Emigration could be applied as a permanent and effectual remedy”.³ Additionally, the Committee reaffirms its assertion that emigration should not be applied in an area where a return to this overpopulation could not be effectively prevented.

On the subject of the agricultural population of Scotland, it is claimed that overpopulation in these areas did not appear to exist as it did in Ireland, and that the Committee received no evidence to the contrary. However, the Committee asserts that the manufacturing districts of Scotland were suffering a similar situation as the agricultural population in Ireland. The witnesses who supplied testimony apparently agreed that emigration would not solve the problems of Scotland and did not support funding such a project for the relief of those affected. In addition, the claim is made that in those areas where a redundant population exists, it is because of the influx of Irish

¹ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

² *Ibid.*, 14.

³ *Idem.*

laborers, as previously discussed, who were accused of lowering the state of the working classes in Scotland and England.

The Committee concludes this part by suggesting that resettling the Irish laborers would be of greater benefit to Scotland than removing a certain number of Scottish laborers to the colonies. In this case, emigration does not appear to be an option being considered for Scotland and its areas of overpopulation, though it appears to present a more difficult situation than England or Ireland when considering possible methods of relief of this population, as the Committee did not give concrete suggestions on how to alleviate the situation in Scotland.

The next part of the report, “Remarks on the application of a system of Emigration to the circumstances of the three countries”,¹ gives a general explanation of the Committee’s view on the establishment of an emigration plan in Ireland, England, and Scotland. The Committee essentially elaborates further on the labor principle to defend their perspective on a system of regulated emigration. This section is about three and a half pages and gives further detail on the economic theory on the demand for labor, using the law of supply and demand. This law is generally accepted as applicable to labor, and the Committee attempts to explain this concept in a somewhat accessible way, insofar as its main readers would be well-educated members of Parliament and landowners who could participate financially in an emigration plan:

The first and main principle is, that Labour, which is the commodity of the poor man, partakes strictly, as far as its value is concerned, of the circumstances incident to other commodities; and that its price is diminished in proportion to the excess of supply as compared with the demand. If the demand for labour be great, the wages of labour are high: the poor man, therefore, sells his commodity for a high price. A contrary state of things produces a converse of results. If this proportion be admitted, it follows that if the supply of labour be *permanently* in excess, as

¹ *Ibid.*, 15-18.

compared with the demand, the condition of the lower classes must be permanently depressed, and a state of things induced which is incompatible with the prosperity of a great proportion of the population.¹

This explanation is a simple way of outlining the purported causes of the state of the agricultural and manufacturing populations of the three countries, while ignoring the societal and structural factors that contribute to this situation, such as the Penal Laws affecting Catholics and other dissenters, the middleman system of subletting land, and the post-Napoleonic War economic slowdown.

In addition, the Committee includes the introduction of machinery that replaces labor when it is cheaper as a further hindrance to the employment of agricultural and manufacturing populations. Furthermore, a criticism is made of popular propositions of the time of setting a minimum wage as coming “from an entire ignorance of the universal operation of the principle of supply and demand regulating the rate of wages”.² A selection of Malthus’s testimony is included in this section to defend the Committee’s belief that the existence of a redundant population in Ireland lowers the wages and living conditions of all laborers in that country and benefits that would ensue if that group of people were removed. These principles will be analyzed in the later section on the evidence collected. The committee concludes this part of the report with a continued defense of emigration as a solution to be considered by government for a number of reasons, “whether with reference to the improved condition of the population at home, and the saving of that expense which as it appears to Your Committee is now incurred in maintaining a portion of them, or with respect to the prosperity of our Colonies, increasing thereby the general prosperity of the Empire”.³ This argument was most likely intended to reach across the aisle of the two major political parties of the time,

¹ *Ibid.*, 15.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 18.

expressing the shared interest of the government and other actors in remedying the respective situations in Ireland, England, and Scotland.

The fifth part of this report, “The expediency of a pecuniary Advance, in the nature of a Loan, for the purpose of facilitating Emigration: The probability of repayment of such a loan, and the inducements which the Colonies would have to facilitate such repayment: The success of former Emigrations, as bearing upon the probability of repayment”,¹ is about fourteen pages and is divided to cover a variety of subjects relating to the financing of an emigration plan. As previously mentioned, the Committee discussed the possibility of advancing a loan to the parishes that wished to resettle their redundant population in the British colonies in order to alleviate the economic circumstances of those remaining in the mother country. The Committee explains how a hypothetical loan would be administered, how the loan would be repaid, and why it believes the emigration plan would be successful in helping repay the loan based on previous emigration experiments.

A plan is laid out to advance a loan of £1,140,000 over three years, which takes into consideration the evidence received on the state of the populations of Ireland, England, and Scotland, and the proposed emigration plan of resettling redundant populations in the British colonies. The Committee does not purport to know the exact number of people to remove in order to solve the problem of overpopulation, but suggests that the number increase by half in each successive year, representing “the first year, 4,000 families; the second, 6,000; the third, 9,000; making in the whole 19,000”.² When considering these numbers, it must be remembered that during this period, a family was considered to be composed of two adults and three children (previous estimates for a family with two children were found to be unrealistic and adjustments

¹ *Ibid.*, 18-32.

² *Ibid.*, 20.

were made in the calculations), meaning these 19,000 families would amount to 95,000 people. It is suggested that this increase in the number of new settlers in the British colonies continue after the first three years if the government were to decide to continue this emigration plan.

It is proposed that each family, after having been settled in the colonies for three years, would begin to repay the £60 advanced for their removal. After three years in their new home, the settlers would have to begin repaying the advance, starting with the sum of ten shillings and increasing by ten shillings every year until reaching the sum of £5, at which point the repayment would be fixed at this amount until the £60 is completely repaid. It therefore would take ten years for the annual repayment amount to reach the limit of £5, and approximately seventeen years for the full advance to be repaid. The report continues with a summary of the testimony of a select number of witnesses on the subject of the probable repayment of this advance, listing the questions posed to each witness and a summary of the answers provided. This testimony will be discussed further in the section on the evidence collected by the Committee.

According to the Committee, the majority of the witnesses' testimony reveals a tendency to believe that the settlers would be able to repay the advance and that the general success of past emigrants justifies their opinion.¹ Despite this claim, the Committee makes clear that they themselves are not willing to guarantee the settlers' repayment of this advance, stating, "they hesitate to express to the House that full conviction of eventual repayment which nevertheless the body of evidence would seem to warrant".² This distancing may perhaps be in relation to some reports that the settlers in Canada and the United States had difficulties in their new home, to which the

¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

² *Idem.*

Committee made direct reference preceding their expression of reservation on repayment.

The Committee continues its discussion of repayment by claiming that this system would only be effective if the colonies were to cooperate with the mother country. According to the witnesses, the colonies would benefit enormously from this system by growing their industries with well-selected emigrants from the mother country and developing new industries upon the uncultivated lands that would be occupied by these future settlers.¹ Furthermore, the Committee states that understanding the testimony of these witnesses would be central to convincing the Colonies “to accept with gratitude an arrangement of this nature”.² They believe the evidence provided in the report on previous emigrations would be sufficient to persuade local colonial leaders to accept this system.

This argument is followed by a summary of the emigration experiments conducted by Peter Robinson in 1823 and 1825 to defend the proposed system. The Committee suggests that emigrations of entire families rather than single men would be more beneficial and that “the more dense the population in the new settled district, the greater the probability of the success of the Emigrant”.³ This statement is designed to bring greater support to the proposed system of regulated emigration which the Committee is lobbying for and that previous emigration experiments would seem to justify.

The next part of the report, “Board of Emigration”,⁴ is two pages long and outlines the Committee’s plan for selecting people to resettle in the British colonies. According

¹ *Ibid.*, 30.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 33-34.

to the report, the Board would be established in London with agents in Ireland, Great Britain, and the British colonies. Its mission would be to create an extensive emigration scheme and to select the most qualified emigrants to participate in the resettlement plan, without going into detail on how the agents would find future participants. The report then summarizes the characteristics of potential emigrants and the particular circumstances under which they would be chosen for this program, thus presented:

No person above the age of fifty years should be accepted as a Government Emigrant, except under very special circumstances. Each head of a family should be in a sound state of health, of good character, desirous of emigrating, and in want of that effective demand for his labour by which he can obtain the means of independent subsistence. Above all, he should be a person, in consequence of whose removal no diminution of production would take place, although by such removal the expense of his maintenance would be saved to the community. The proportion of a man, woman, and three children, must be maintained, in order to give facilities for the regulation of the expense; but if a man, his wife, and six children, were accepted as Emigrants, a man and woman without any child might also be accepted, as preserving the proportion, and so on.¹

These criteria allowed the Committee to address the concerns of such a plan's effectiveness. First, that only individuals in good health and of a certain age would be selected for the program to ensure that they would have the greatest chance of success in the colonies. Second, that the removal of these emigrants would not cause any additional distress on the communities from which they were to be removed. And third, that a reasonable proportion of emigrants would be selected in order to control the expense of resettlement, which was one of the major concerns regarding a potential assisted emigration scheme. Furthermore, they claim that each emigrant would be given a choice whether to remain and cultivate the land offered to them by the program, or to find their own accommodation in the case that demand for labor existed in the community where they would settle. If those who decided to establish themselves as

¹ *Ibid.*, 33.

laborers could find no employment upon arriving in the colonies, they could enter into a new agreement and settle upon lands allocated for the program. In this case, the emigrants concerned “would be furnished with a printed statement, explaining each particular item of the expense incurred on their account, coupled with any other arrangements which may be suggested in the Colonies, for the more effectual furtherance of this purpose”.¹ This proposed practice does not seem effective though, as the majority of the Irish lower classes did not read English at the time.

Following these details, further criteria are detailed for establishing priorities in the selection of participants. Recently ejected Irish tenants would be given first priority, as they were being strongly affected by the new law to prevent subletting, and thereby, overpopulation, of the estates in Ireland. Following this category, priority would be given to tenants who would soon be removed from their lands, then cottiers unable to pay their rents, and finally, similar cases in Scotland and England. This prioritization gives us a clear idea of where the Committee’s greatest concern was placed. It appears that the perceived overpopulation of Ireland was their main focus and that greatest priority would be given to remedying the situation there.

In the seventh section of this report, “The distinction between Emigration and Colonization, and a regulated and an unregulated Emigration”,² the Committee attempts to persuade its readers that the system they are proposing would be the most beneficial to the colonies as well as the mother country. Emphasis is placed on the necessity of a regulated system of colonization rather than unregulated emigration that allows emigrants to establish themselves wherever they choose instead of in the colonies where their presence would be an advantage for the empire. The authors of the report argue that a small capital investment would be extremely advantageous, especially for the

¹ *Ibid.*, 34.

² *Ibid.*, 35-38.

laboring population in Ireland, and would provide a necessary support in the establishment of these settlers in the form of assistance for transportation to their new home, land to develop and cultivate, and selection of the best locations in which to settle. This idea is defended by the Committee which claims that it “is utterly erroneous to suppose that a redundant population of absolute paupers can be removed by casual and unassisted Emigration”.¹ The Committee insists that selection of participants and locations is necessary in order to benefit the colonies and solve the population issues faced by Ireland, Scotland, and England.

The final part of this report, “Concluding observations upon the advantages of a regulated Emigration, both to the Colonies and to the mother Country”,² is a four-page summary of the advantages of a regulated emigration that were alluded to in the previous section. The two main pillars put forth by the Committee are described as follows:

First, the real saving effected at home by the removal of pauper labourers, executing no real functions as labourers, and not contributing to the annual production; Secondly, the probability of direct though progressive repayment from those labourers, when placed as Emigrants in the Colonies, and the indirect consequence of the increased demands for British manufactures, involved in the circumstance of an increasing Colonial population.³

These principles make it clear that the Committee’s main focus was to alleviate the ‘redundant’ population in the effected countries, while simultaneously attempting to guarantee the repayment of any funds advanced for the purpose of emigration. The Committee is steadfast not only in its conviction that emigration is the most advantageous method of addressing the population issues facing Ireland, Scotland, and England, but also in its attempts to persuade the government of the efficacy of such a

¹ *Ibid.*, 36.

² *Ibid.*, 38-41.

³ *Ibid.*, 38.

program. The report's authors want to reassure their readers that the issue of repayment of the funds has been considered at length and is all but guaranteed by the preparation and planning of the emigration project. The Committee's position is further supported by a direct citation from testimony given by Malthus, who is quoted as saying, "no doubt can exist of the expediency of so removing them; and this, independent of any question of repayment".¹

The concluding argument of the report focuses on the benefits that a regulated system of emigration would generate in both the colonies and the mother country, with particular emphasis on the case of Ireland. It is argued that as successive emigration projects would take place, the colonies would be in a better position to accommodate and resettle further emigrants, especially financially. The Committee closes its final report with a reference to their second report to explain the focus on the population of Ireland, stating that it is

their deep conviction, that whatever may be the immediate and urgent demands from other quarters, it is vain to hope for any permanent and extensive advantage from any system of Emigration which does not *primarily apply to Ireland*, whose Population, unless some other outlet be opened to them, must shortly fill up every vacuum created in England, or in Scotland, and reduce the laboring classes to a uniform state of degradation and misery.²

This conclusion shows that the committee members, in considering emigration as a remedy, were extremely concerned about the secondary effects of establishing such a system and, in short, their interests appeared more focused on how this system would affect England or Scotland, rather than Ireland, though they asserted that country was their primary concern.

¹ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

² *Ibid.*, 41.

The value of this report is the extent and diversity of the testimony given by the witnesses, not just on emigration but on various social concerns of the time. As previously mentioned, there was a sense of urgency expressed by the Committee and their reports and the large scope of their investigation reflect this. The evidence given to the Committees gives a much better idea of their ambitions and range than the “report” itself. The following section will describe the witnesses’ backgrounds, further demonstrating the variety of perspectives and fields of expertise represented by these individuals.

3. Witnesses

In over seven hundred pages of testimony, plus several lengthy appendices, more than one hundred witnesses came forward to give evidence to these three committees. The evidence given covered a wide range of subjects, more or less related to the issue of emigration. Among others questions, witnesses addressed emigration plans; previous settlers in Canada; the possibility of settlers repaying any money advanced for their emigration; passenger acts; subletting; contributions to emigration; local distress; the desire to emigrate; the filling up of a vacuum left by the removed population; and the reclamation of bogs and wastelands. The majority of the testimony concerned England, Ireland, Canada, and Scotland, respectively, while South Africa, Australia, and Colombia received only cursory examination.

In the following section we will examine the backgrounds of the witnesses, which will reveal the variety of their origins and “expertise”, thus setting an important frame of reference for their evidence and responses to the Emigration Committees. This biographical information was gathered primarily from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, the *History of Parliament* online, the *Dictionary of Irish Biography*, the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, and the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*.

3.1 Ireland

The first Emigration Committee received nine witnesses for Ireland, which included some Irish MPs, the Bishop of Limerick, landowners, and a Scottish civil engineer active in Ireland. It is essential to be aware of the variety of these witnesses' backgrounds in order to understand their testimony.

First Committee

Members of Parliament

William Wrixon Becher was a Whig member of Parliament for Mallow in County Cork from 1818 to 1826, who supported Catholic emancipation and signed a Protestant declaration in support of Catholic relief in 1828. The Wrixon Becher family were major landowners in County Cork and received a baronetcy in 1831.

William Hare, 1st Earl of Listowel, known as Lord Viscount Ennismore in the evidence, was a member of the Irish peerage and Whig member of Parliament for County Cork from 1812-1827. He died in 1837 and was succeeded by his grandson, who was given a seat in the House of Lords in 1869.

Thomas Spring Rice came from a large Anglo-Irish family with large estates in Munster and was a Whig member of Parliament for Limerick City from 1820 to 1832. He served as Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs from July 1827 to January 1828 and held other administration positions in the 1830s. During his time in Parliament, Spring Rice was dedicated to Irish issues and supported Catholic relief on multiple occasions, for which he published a pamphlet in 1827, titled *Catholic Emancipation*. He went on to become a member of the peerage as Baron Monteagle in 1839. Spring Rice gave testimony in the first and third Emigration Committees.

Landowners

William Gabbett was a landowner in the Limerick area of Ireland.

Thomas Odell was a resident in Limerick. The content of his testimony to the Committee suggests that he was most likely a landowner.

Redmond O'Driscoll was possibly a landowner in the south of Ireland. Additionally, he was a subscriber of the fever hospital of Cork in 1827.

Others

John Jebb was born in Drogheda and became Lord Bishop of Limerick of the Church of Ireland in 1822. His father had a large estate in County Kildare and he inherited £2000 upon his father's death. Jebb was also a writer who focused on church issues. He is credited with maintaining order in the west of Ireland when famine broke out in 1822. Jebb had a stroke in 1827, shortly after giving testimony to the Emigration Committee, and it is said that he never fully recovered before his death in 1833.

Alexander Nimmo was a Scottish civil engineer and geologist, who became a fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1811 and a member of the Royal Irish Academy in 1818. The same year he began working in Ireland in cooperation with the Commission for the Reclamation of Irish Bogs. After some years working on various projects around Ireland, from 1820 on he began working for the Irish Fisheries Board to develop improvement plans of Irish harbors and piers. He contributed to significant construction of bridges, docks, piers, and harbors on the coast. Nimmo gave testimony during the first and third Emigration Committees.

The main focus of these witnesses were the subjects of previous settlers in Canada, subletting, contribution to emigration, distress, emigration plans, and the desire to emigrate. There was less importance accorded to the reclamation of bogs and

wastelands and the vacuum left by emigrants. The topics of repayment of money advanced for emigration and passenger acts were entirely ignored.

Second Committee

The second Emigration Committee had only two witnesses for Ireland; their testimony concerned contribution to emigration, distress, emigration plans, the desire to emigrate, and the vacuum.

Henry Parnell, Baronet, was a Whig member of Parliament and member of the Emigration Committee. He was a landowner and represented Maryborough in the Irish House of Commons from 1798 until the abolition of the Irish Parliament with the Act of Union in 1801. He went on to represent Queen's County in the House of Commons from 1806-1832 and held positions in the Whig administrations of the 1830s. Parnell also wrote numerous publications on financial matters, penal issues and civil engineering. Henry Parnell, who committed suicide within a year of acceding to the peerage in 1841, was the great-uncle of Charles Stewart Parnell, the late nineteenth century Irish nationalist politician. Parnell gave testimony in the second and third Emigration Committees.

John O'Driscoll was a resident in the south of Ireland, most likely a landowner.

Third Committee

The third Emigration Committee had seventeen witnesses for Ireland.

Members of Parliament

John Bodkin most likely refers to John James Bodkin, a prominent landowner from an elite Catholic family in County Galway, who went on to become a Whig member of Parliament for Galway from 1831 to 1832 and 1835 to 1847 and advocate for Catholic Emancipation.

John Leslie Foster was a Tory member of Parliament for Dublin University from 1807 to 1812, Yarmouth from 1816 to 1818, Armagh from 1818 to 1820, and County Louth from 1824 to 1830. He was appointed to the Commission for improving the Bogs of Ireland, which conducted its surveys from 1809 to 1813. Foster was staunchly anti-Catholic Emancipation, which showed through his appointment to the Royal Commission on Education in Ireland in 1824.¹ In addition, from 1818 to 1826 he was part of the Irish Board of Customs and Excise, and from 1825 a director of the Drogheda Steam Packet Company as well as Mayor of Drogheda.

Landowners and Middlemen

Lieutenant General Robert Browne was an absentee landlord in County Wexford.

Hugh Dixon was a land agent in Westmeath employed by Sir Thomas Chapman.

John Markham Marshall was an Irish proprietor who resided on his property in County Kerry “for some years” before his testimony was given to the Emigration Committee in 1827.²

Jerrard Strickland managed part of the estate of the Viscount Dillon. The Dillon family was largely absentee during the nineteenth century and the Stricklands were their agents who lived in one of the Dillon houses, Loughglynn, county Roscommon, in Ireland.

Robert Stearne Tighe was a resident proprietor in County Westmeath.

¹ Richard Lalor Sheil, *Sketches of the Irish Bar*, vol 2. (New York: Redfield, 1854), 261.

² ER3, John Markham Marshall, 407.

John Scott Vandeleur was a magistrate in County Clare who had inherited his father's estate. In 1828 he signed a petition against the election of Daniel O'Connell and lived in fear of his tenants.¹

James West was a land agent in Westmeath.

David John Wilson was resident proprietor in County Clare.

Manufacturers, Engineers, and others

John Richard Elmore was a native Englishman who, at the time of his testimony, had resided in Ireland for the previous twenty years. He was involved in the manufacturing of linens and cottons in Clonakilty (southwest of Cork) and had the largest linen factory in Munster.

William Couling was a civil engineer and land surveyor and the director of the General Association "for the purposes of bettering the condition of the manufacturing and agricultural labourers", who gave testimony on Ireland, Scotland, and England.

Dr. William Murphy was a physician residing at Cork during the period of the Emigration Committee.

Anthony Richard Blake was a lawyer and administrator born in County Galway. He was the first Catholic since the Reformation to hold the title of chief remembrancer of the exchequer in 1823 and held an important advisory position to British ministers on Irish Catholic matters. In addition, he was the first Catholic appointed in modern times to a commission of inquiry, the Royal Commission on Education in Ireland in 1824.

¹ David Murphy. "Vandeleur, John Scott". *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. (ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009. (<http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a8789>).

According to the *Irish Dictionary of Biography*, Blake died in January 1849, “leaving a large bequest to the national education system”.¹

The main subjects covered by these witnesses were subletting, contribution to emigration, distress, emigration plans, the desire to emigrate, and the vacuum. The reclamation of bogs and wastelands was discussed by six of the seventeen witnesses, while the subjects of previous settlers in Canada, repayment of money advanced for emigration, and the Passengers’ Acts went almost entirely unaddressed.

3.2 England

The first Emigration Committee had six witnesses for England, who were all members of Parliament during the 1820s or shortly thereafter. The main topics discussed were contributions to emigration, distress, emigration plans, and the desire to emigrate.

First Committee

Members of Parliament

William Henry Bodkin was a British barrister and Secretary of the Mendicity Society in London. His father was Irish and his family had connections to County Galway. He went on to become a conservative member of Parliament in the 1840s and was knighted in 1867.

Edward Jeremiah Curteis was the assistant chairman at the Sessions of Sussex and a magistrate for about forty years before giving his testimony at the Emigration

¹ Richard Hawkins. “Blake, Anthony Richard”. *Dictionary of Irish Biography*. (ed.) James McGuire, James Quinn. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2009. (<http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a0720>).

Committee. During this period, he was also an independent member of Parliament for Sussex from 1820 to 1830.

Thomas Law Hodges was a liberal party politician who represented Kent in the House of Commons from 1830 to 1852.

Sir John Sebright, Baronet, was an unaffiliated politician and agriculturist, who generally leaned with the Whig party, and represented Hertfordshire in the House of Commons from 1807 to 1835.

John Wilks was a Protestant Whig member of Parliament and vestry clerk at Saint Luke's, from which he was accused of stealing £5000. He was known as a swindler, and ran for the House of Commons to protect himself from prosecution, representing Sudbury from 1826 to 1828. After he resigned in 1828, he was charged with forgery, but was acquitted, after which his family convinced him to live abroad.

Second Committee

The second Emigration Committee had sixteen witnesses for England. The main subjects of their testimony were contributions to emigration, distress, emigration plans, and the desire to emigrate.

Members of Parliament

Walter Burrell a member of the Emigration Committee and Tory member of Parliament for Sussex from 1812 until his death in 1831.

William Fielden [Feilden] was involved in cotton manufacturing and a Liberal (later Conservative) member of Parliament for Blackburn, Lancaster from 1832 to 1847.

Overseers and religious leaders

Thomas Bradbury was overseer of the parish of Great Horwood, Buckinghamshire.

Samuel Maine was overseer of the parish of Hanworth, Middlesex.

James Taylor was overseer of the parish of Feltham, Middlesex.

Reverend John Matthias Turner was the Rector of Wilmslowe, Cheshire.

Lord Bishop of Chester, Charles James Blomfield, sat in the House of Lords from 1824 to 1828 and was a member of the London Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Districts.

Manufacturers and other commercial representatives

William Sudlow Fitzhugh was based in Liverpool where he worked for the American Chamber of Commerce attending to the steerage passengers.

William Hulton was the chairman of Bolton and Leigh Railway Company in 1824 he also delivered coal from his own estate in Bolton, west of Manchester.

John Smith was a banker from Oundle, Northamptonshire, Midhurst.

Relief Societies

William Henly Hyett gave testimony on both England and Scotland. He was a manager and auditor of the Friendly Loan Society, and secretary of the Committee for the Relief of Distressed Manufacturers.

William Spencer Northhouse, of the London Free Press Newspaper, gave testimony on behalf of the Scottish Emigration societies.

Others

Major Thomas Moody of the British Army and the Royal Engineers was an expert on Colonial Government. He was knighted by Louis XVIII for protecting the French colony of Guadeloupe and received the rank of major for his services in the West Indies. He was a close friend of Robert Wilmot Horton, following his appointment to the Commission to study the conditions of slaves in the West Indies, for which he reported his findings to Lord Bathurst, Secretary of State for War and the Colonies.

Thomas Adams was from Mildenhall, Suffolk.

James Homewood resided in Headcorn, Maidstone, Kent.

Thomas Lacoste resided in Chertsey, Surrey.

Third Committee

The third Emigration Committee had nine witnesses for England who had little in common regarding their backgrounds. The main focus of their testimony was distress and emigration plans.

Reverend John Thomas Beecher [Becher] was a Church of England clergyman. Through his visits to workhouses in 1823, he became a poor law reformer and opposed the abolition of the poor laws. He was the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the Newark Division and County of Nottingham for eighteen years and magistrate for twenty-five years at the time of his testimony.

William Richard Cosway was a landowner in Romney Marsh and Weald, Kent, who resided primarily in London and not on his estate.

Thomas Hunton was a master manufacturer in Carlisle in northwest England and had experience in the cotton trade.

Thomas Wright was engaged in the nail trade.

Edward G. Stanley was a Whig member of Parliament for Stockbridge from 1822 to 1826 and Preston from 1826 to 1830. He also succeeded Robert Wilmot-Horton as Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies from August 1827 to January 1828 and was Chief Secretary for Ireland from 1830 to 1833. After becoming a conservative in 1841, he became Colonial Secretary for a second time and then Prime Minister from 1852 to 1869.

Thomas Tredgold was a civil engineer and published works on engineering.

Benjamin Wills was a former surgeon who occupied several hundred acres of land in the counties of Kent and Surrey. In addition, he was the director and honorary secretary of the General Association for the purposes of bettering the condition of the manufacturing and agricultural labourers, the same association to which William Couling belonged.

3.3 Scotland

First Committee

The first Emigration Committee had four witnesses for Scotland who were all members of Parliament during this period. Almost every major subject was mentioned by at least one witness, with the exception of repayment and the vacuum, which were not discussed at all.

Archibald Campbell was a Scottish landowner and Tory member of Parliament for Glasgow Burghs from 1806 to 1809, Elgin Burghs in 1812, Perth Burghs from 1818 to 1820, and for Glasgow from 1820 to 1831. He served as Lord Lieutenant of Renfrewshire

from 1826 until his death in 1838. Campbell gave testimony during the first and second Emigration Committees.

Walter Frederick Campbell was a Scottish Whig member of Parliament for Argyllshire from 1822 to 1832 and from 1835 to 1841. His family owned the island of Islay but were forced to sell it after he incurred large debts to improve the island.

Sir Hugh Innes was a Scottish Baronet and member of Parliament for Ross-shire from 1809 to 1830, then for Sutherland in 1831 until his death the same year. Educated at the University of Glasgow, he became a large landowner and was given a baronetcy in 1819, which became extinct upon his death, as he left no heirs nor will.

George MacPherson-Grant, a Scottish member of Parliament for Sutherland from 1809 to 1812 and 1816 to 1826, was a member of the Emigration Committee. He voted for Catholic Relief while sitting in Parliament and held anti-government positions.

Second Committee

The second Emigration Committee had nine witnesses for Scotland, all but two, who testified together, were members of Parliament or, in the case of one, a sheriff substitute. The main topics of their testimony were contributions to emigration, distress, the desire to emigrate, and the vacuum.

Joseph Foster and James Little were working hand-loom weavers representing the Glasgow Emigration Society.

Henry Home Drummond was a Scottish member of Parliament for Stirlingshire from 1821 to 1831, and Perthshire from 1840 to 1852.

Thomas Francis Kennedy was a Whig member of Parliament for Ayrshire from 1818 to 1834.

John Maxwell was a member of the Emigration Committee and a Whig member of Parliament for Renfrewshire from 1818 to 1830.

Alexander Campbell was the Sheriff substitute for Renfrewshire and resident of Paisley.

Third Committee

The third Emigration Committee had one witness for Scotland, who discussed contributions to emigration, distress, and emigration plans.

Alexander Hunter was the Writer of the Signet and superintended emigration from the island of Rum in 1826.

3.4 Canada and other British Colonies

The first Emigration Committee had eleven witnesses for Canada. The main topics of discussion for these witnesses were previous settlers in Canada, repayment, and emigration plans.

First Committee

Canadian government officials

Henry John Boulton was Solicitor-General of Upper Canada.

William Bowman Felton emigrated to British North America and was granted two thousand acres of land by Lord Bathurst. He was Legislative Counsellor for Lower Canada and agent for Crown lands from 1822. Felton gave testimony at all three sessions of the Emigration Committees.

George Markland was an Executive Counsellor of Upper Canada.

Colonel John Ready was Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward's Island.

John Rolph was a physician and lawyer, and member of the legislature of Upper Canada.

Reverend John Strachan emigrated to Kingston, Upper Canada, in 1799. He was a reverend of the Church of England, Archdeacon of York, a member of the Executive Council from 1815 to 1836, and the Legislative Council from 1820 to 1841. Strachan gave testimony at all three sessions of the Emigration Committees.

Richard John Uniacke was his Majesty's Counsel and Attorney-General of Nova Scotia.

Henry Bliss was an author, lawyer, and agent for the province of New Brunswick.

Others

Alexander Carlisle Buchanan was a landowner in Lower Canada. He built sawmills, grist mills, and flour mills. He brought out British emigrants in New York and resettled them in Lower Canada, with the help of his brother the Consul of New York. Buchanan gave testimony at all three sessions of the Emigration Committees.

Lieutenant-Colonel James Pattison Cockburn was a Royal Army officer, topographer, and author, who was the superintendent of the military settlements established in Upper Canada between 1816 and 1817.

Second Committee

The second Emigration Committee had six witnesses for Canada. The main topics of discussion for these witnesses were previous settlers in Canada, repayment, and emigration plans.

Captain William Marshall was in charge of the Lanark Settlement. He gave testimony in the first and third Emigration Committees.

Captain Henry William Scott was a Royal Navy Officer who previously resided in Nova Scotia.

Captain James Dent Weatherley was a retired captain in the British Army when he emigrated to Canada in 1819.

Third Committee

The third Emigration Committee had twelve witnesses for Canada. The main topics of discussion for these witnesses were previous settlers in Canada, repayment, and emigration plans.

Canadian government officials

John Howe was the Deputy Postmaster General of Nova Scotia and His Majesty's Agent for Packets at the port of Halifax.

Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, Sir Peregrine Maitland, was born in England and emigrated to Canada in 1818. He was an army officer and administrator. He was a personal friend of Lord Bathurst and his father-in-law was governor-in-chief of British North America.

Jonathan Sewell was the Chief Justice of Lower Canada for nineteen years, speaker of the Legislative Council, and president of the Executive Council.

Others

Simon McGillivray was born in Scotland and emigrated to Canada in 1821. He was Chairman of the Committee of Management of the Canada Company.

Roswell Mount was a land surveyor and resided in the Talbot Settlement in Upper Canada.

Peter Robinson was from Canada and visited England in 1822 where he met Robert Wilmot Horton, who selected him to superintend the emigration experiments in 1823 and 1825.

Other British Colonies

The first Emigration Committee had four witnesses who spoke of other British colonies. The main topics of discussion for these witnesses were repayment, contributions to emigration, and emigration plans.

Frederick Carlisle was a resident of the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa. He gave testimony at all three sessions of the Emigration Committees.

Edward Eager [Eagar] was a lawyer and merchant, sent to Australia as a convict in 1811. After receiving a pardon in 1813, though unable to practice law, he began to fight for emancipation of convicts, citing the civil and commercial disabilities that resulted from their status.

Lieutenant-Colonel William Sorell was Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land.

The second Emigration Committee had seven witnesses who spoke of other British colonies. The main topic of discussion for these witnesses was repayment and secondarily repayment and emigration plans.

Richard Webber Eaton was a resident of the Cape of Good Hope.

Henry Ellis spent two years in South Africa, was Commissioner of Customs from 1824 to 1825, and Clerk of the Pells from 1825 to 1834.

David Polley Francis was a farmer and resident of the Cape of Good Hope.

Thomas Pringle was a writer, poet, and abolitionist who emigrated to South Africa from Scotland in 1820.

George Thompson was a merchant in South Africa.

Lieutenant Thomas Charles White was Army officer in the 1820 settlement of South Africa.

The third Emigration Committee had two witnesses who spoke of other British colonies. The main topics of discussion for these witnesses were repayment, contributions to emigration, and emigration plans.

Lieutenant Hanbury Clement[s] was a member of the Royal Navy in Australia.

James Inglis was the director of the Van Diemen's Land Company.

Colombia

The first Emigration Committee had two witnesses who spoke about Colombia. The main topics of discussion for these witnesses were repayment, contributions to emigration, and emigration plans.

Charles Stuart was secretary to the Colombian Agricultural Association.

Sir Robert Wilson was a "radical" member of Parliament for Southwark from 1818 to 1830, and a member of the Company incorporated for the occupation of Colombia.

The third Emigration Committee had one witness who spoke about Colombia. This witness discussed the previous settlement of Scottish emigrants in Colombia.

John Diston Powles was a company promoter and speculator working in Colombia.

4. Evidence/Testimony

The testimony given to the three Emigration Committees covered a variety of subjects which will be discussed in this section. The volumes of this testimony are organized chronologically, with little to no organization of the witnesses by country. The first committee collected its evidence from March 20 to May 26, 1826, the second from February 20 to April 3, 1827, and the third from April 7 to June 27, 1827, with the final printed volume including the testimony from the second committee. While the main focus of the committee appeared to be the state of Ireland, witnesses representing England, Scotland, Canada, and others, contributed important information on the subject of emigration in their regions. The questions and testimony in these reports reveal the primary concerns of these committees with regard to implementing a state-aided emigration plan, particularly in Ireland. These subjects were also focal points on the topic of emigration in the Dublin press, which will be analyzed in Part Three. The overarching themes discussed by the witnesses were distress, the desire to emigrate, emigration plans, contribution to emigration, and the vacuum that could occur as a result of the removal of poor laborers.

Distress was an aspect of particular interest to the committees, especially regarding Ireland, as the initial questions to an Irish witness were most often a discussion of the state of the poor in their region. Distress, in this context, can be understood as a euphemism for the abject poverty that the working classes of society experienced, whether in a temporary or permanent state. When detailing the state of the poor, the witnesses and committee members employed interchangeably the terms laboring poor, paupers, poor laborers, pauper population, peasantry, pauper tenants, lower classes, and redundant, superabundant, or excessive population. This subject was also used to contrast the levels of poverty occurring in Ireland during this period with

the other countries of the Union, England and Scotland, while simultaneously justifying the urgency of creating an emigration plan prioritizing the Irish poor.

In addition, the Committee questioned many witnesses on the emigration plans they envisioned being put in place by government to resolve the distress in their regions. The suggestions made by the witnesses were varied in their details and the populations that they wanted to be targeted by this plan. This discussion included testimony on seasonal migration, voluntary emigration, the government plan, encouraging emigration, and comparing emigration as a remedy versus other solutions, such as employing them at home on the reclamation of bogs and wastelands. Despite having examples of previous emigration experiments, the Committee was perhaps trying to demonstrate that they were open to suggestions on how to develop and implement the most advantageous emigration plan. The further examination of previous settlers in Canada was a way of laying out the potential benefits of certain aspects of those experiments. Within the subject of emigration plans, the desire to emigrate was examined in order to gauge the willingness of different groups to leave their homes and be resettled in Canada or other British colonies. This discussion was an important point to address, as the Committee wanted to be clear that they would not remove anyone against their will, as in the case of transportation of mostly Irish convicts to Australia. Wilmot-Horton also spoke on this point to the House of Commons in 1828, insisting that “the committee never in any way recommended any but voluntary emigration; it set its face against all ideas of emigration by compulsion”.¹ Furthermore, alternatives to a government plan were proposed in this part, such as repealing Passenger Acts to encourage more voluntary emigration, and the reclamation of bogs and wastelands as a

¹ “Emigration”. Hansard Parliamentary Debates, March 4, 1828, Vol XVIII, Second Series, Cols. 938-962.; <http://ied.dipam.ac.uk/records/44293> (Consulted: 15-09-2013).

method of employment. Some witnesses asserted that these would be less costly measures.

The financial aspect of the suggested plan was a major concern of the Committee and the Parliament. The Committee addressed this concern by examining the witnesses on their willingness to contribute to a future plan that, for many, would benefit them directly by removing tenants from their estates who were, in many cases, unable to pay their rents, or were perceived by the landlords as excess population. This subject showed a wide range of opinions, with some willing to contribute large sums or small annual rates, others unable to participate financially, and a number claiming that the proprietors would never agree on an amount or method of contribution. This topic can be combined with the debate on the potential repayment by the settlers of any money expended by government on their passage and resettlement in the British colonies. Similarly, this subject evoked a variety of responses, with some claiming settlers were able and willing to repay, others asserting the contrary, and a substantial discussion on the type of repayment that would be most practicable for all parties. The Committee was clearly trying to calm the anxieties of its members and Parliament on the financial implications of any plan it put forward, though these wide ranges of responses may not have been successful in doing so.

Finally, an analysis will be conducted of the testimony of Malthus and the vacuum he claimed would result from the removal of laborers and that would, he asserted, be immediately filled by others seeking to improve their own situations. Malthus and his *An Essay on the Principle of Population* was an influential text on the elites of society during this period, and his suggestions on how to resolve the problem of a distressed population were taken very seriously by many politicians of the time. Wilmot-Horton was himself in correspondence with Malthus, which was perhaps a reason for him testifying to the Emigration Committee. His testimony was a way for the

Committee to claim some objective analysis of the population issue, in concert with a realistic solution to this problem.

The following analysis of the testimony will demonstrate the intentions of the Committee during the evidence collection conducted by its members, namely to assemble a detailed record on these subjects and present a report to Parliament suggesting an emigration plan to relieve the conditions of the poor, particularly in Ireland. In a way, this committee may have been a way for Wilmot-Horton to justify his own well-developed emigration plan to Parliament using the support and evidence given by the witnesses, as displayed in “An Outline of a Plan of Emigration to Upper Canada” which he presented to the Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland in 1823.¹

4.1 Distress

Unlike the other subjects discussed, distress maintained its level of importance throughout the three Committees. This subject was primarily discussed by the witnesses for Ireland, England, and Scotland. Over the three Emigration Committees, there were 21 witnesses for Ireland, 21 for England, and 10 for Scotland who discussed various topics related to distress in their regions, including the state of the poor, the demand for labor, and the existence of a redundant population. The profiles of these witnesses varied enormously, from the hand-loom weavers representing the Glasgow Emigration Society to Edward G. Stanley, member of Parliament for Stockbridge, Earl of Derby, soon-to-be Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, eventual Chief Secretary for Ireland, and future three-time Prime Minister.

¹ *Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland, 1823, 171.*

Distress in Ireland

On the subject of distress in Ireland, the topics of redundant population, disturbances, the demand for labor, and the general state of the poor were discussed by the witnesses, with particular emphasis on poverty amongst the peasantry through testimony describing their living conditions, habits, religion, and wages. The witnesses who testified to this poverty were all from the upper classes of society, being landowners, members of Parliament, church representatives, and manufacturers.

The state of the poor in Ireland was examined by the majority of the Irish witnesses, who focused on certain aspects of the level of poverty among Irish paupers. The general state of distress in Ireland was agreed upon by the witnesses, with some going into more detail than others. Some of the witnesses confirmed their belief that a redundant population existed in Ireland, while some did not directly address the question of redundancy. The distress was linked with a lack of demand for labor, want of employment, deficiency of the potato crop, and low wages. The witnesses agreed that the distress in Ireland was a consequence of the redundant population they say existed during this period.

Lord Viscount Ennismore, a Whig member of Parliament for County Cork, in his answers to the Committee, appears to agree that a redundant population exists in the province of Munster, which led to a great level of distress among the poor, which was only counterbalanced by the efforts made by the government to employ the poor on temporary public works projects, claiming that, “a great portion certainly of parts of the country are dependent nearly entirely upon the employment given them in those public works”.¹

¹ ER1, Ennismore, 197.

William Gabbett, a landowner in the Limerick area, considered that there was great distress in the region of Limerick City “in consequence of the very high price of all kinds of agricultural produce”.¹ His assessment on the public works projects supported by the government was that they held great interest among the local population, who, he says, “will go any distance” to be employed in such projects.² He continues his analysis of the state of the Irish poor with a shocking, though not unusual at the time, point of view.

The Irish are a very indolent race of people, and they are perfectly satisfied if by two days labour in the week they can get provision for the remaining five; and in the richest part of the county of Limerick they can, without manure, raise potatoes upon which they solely live, and at such little trouble, that they are not disposed to labour.³

This judgment was in response to a question on why the working class were in a worse situation when located on the richest lands in Ireland, compared to the poorer lands. It was not uncommon for the higher classes of society to view Irish laborers in this way; this witness was not an exception. Gabbett, while admitting that he owns the richest lands in the area, was reluctant to acknowledge that perhaps if he changed the management of his own estate, his tenants and laborers might be in a better situation, though the Committee did not reformulate this question in order to get an answer as it did with other subjects.

Alexander Nimmo, a Scottish civil engineer who worked on bog reclamation projects and was acquainted with the state of the poor in the south of Ireland, when asked directly to describe the condition of the people of Clare, answers very vaguely, claiming, “they are not so wretched as people which I have seen in other parts of the

¹ ER1, Gabbett, 125.

² *Ibid.*, 127.

³ *Idem.*

country”, though the subdivision of land had led to a state where “they themselves nearly consume all the produce, and have nothing to give”.¹

Thomas Odell, a resident of Limerick and possibly a landowner, when asked to explain the general state of the poor in the area of Limerick, answers incredibly briefly, that they are “[v]ery miserable indeed”.² Though this answer was especially short, there are more details on the state of the poor scattered throughout the rest of his testimony. He estimates that in the lowest classes in the area, the proportion of Catholic to Protestants is about 25 to one, with about 3,000 people attending Catholic mass every Sunday, with only 25 taking part in Protestant services.³ He further estimates that the population has increased by one-third in the previous seven years.⁴ The final question he is asked on the population is “The population is very great, for the extent of [the] country?”, to which he answers, “Yes, very great”.⁵ The testimony given by this witness is broadly overgeneralized and vague, without giving specific examples or hard evidence to support his assertions, though it reveals his particular bias that the distress in Ireland was caused by religious influences rather than economic or historical factors.

The question of establishing a poor rate in Ireland to support the working classes was discussed in numerous domains during this period, including in Parliament, in local Irish parishes, and in this Committee. John O’Driscoll, a resident of the south of Ireland and possibly a landowner, recounts that in the region of Cork discussions had taken place on instituting a poor rate “which grew out of the very severe distress in Cork, which distress [has] considerably aggravated since that period”.⁶ O’Driscoll asserts that this distress was caused by the lack of employment for the poor. Despite this, and other

¹ ER1, A. Nimmo, 188.

² ER1, T. Odell, 205.

³ *Ibid.*, 207.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 209.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁶ ER2, J. O’Driscoll, 91.

discussions, on the possibility of a poor rate in Ireland, this assistance never came to fruition, due to the “great reluctance to incur a permanent tax of that description”.¹ This perspective on introducing poor law in Ireland was ubiquitous, with Robert Wilmot Horton, the head of the Emigration Committee, himself expressing resistance to poor laws in Ireland as a mode of relief of the Irish poor, though his opinion was couched in common language used in regards to land at the time: “He believed, if the English system of poor laws were established in Ireland, that the whole rental of certain parts of that country would be completely absorbed by it”,² meaning that the rents paid to landlords would be used in their entirety to pay the tax contribution the poor laws would require.

Henry Parnell, a Whig member of Parliament for Queen’s County, approached his testimony on this subject differently. As a member of the Committee, he submitted a statement on the increase of population in Ireland. His analysis of past census data was that those estimates were lower than the actual number of people in Ireland at the time, particularly the censuses of 1695, 1792, and 1821. He asserts the commonly accepted model that the Irish population doubles every 30 years, and that, in that case, the population in 1831, according to him, would be more than nine million.³ Parnell appears to use this argument to suggest that this increase in population was itself the cause of the lack of employment, starvation, disease, and, in his words, “the almost universal prevalence of the most squalid and abject poverty”.⁴ Despite the assumptions made in his testimony, he admits that “a great deal of light may be thrown upon the subject, by calling intelligent witnesses before the Committee, to state principles and facts connected with the causes of the prodigious increase of population in Ireland”.⁵ To

¹ *Idem.*

² See, for example, House of Commons Debate, *HC Deb 24 June 1828 vol 19 cc 1501-18*, <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1828/jun/24/emigration>.

³ ER2, Parnell, 166-7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 167.

⁵ *Idem.*

address his theory on the seriousness of this increase of population, Parnell suggests that checks on the Irish population are necessary to ensure the future security of Ireland and to protect the laboring classes of England and Scotland.

Hugh Dixon, who was identified as a land agent, better known to history as a middleman, and worked in Westmeath for Sir Thomas Chapman, the 2nd baronet of Killua Castle, claims that there was “a great deal of poverty” among the peasantry in his area.¹ He describes the habits of the peasantry, comparing those who are regularly employed with those only occasionally employed. According to his testimony, those who are occasionally employed generally pay for a hut in the countryside and “are very badly off”,² and those who can afford a house with an acre of land “are a great deal better off”.³ Dixon further explains the agricultural practices of those he describes as better off, who plant potatoes, corn, and oats on their one acre plots for subsistence, but that they pay their yearly rent of about £1 through labor. For those only occasionally employed, he claims that “they have on the other side of a bog a poor hut”,⁴ in which case they were undertenants (or subtenants) under the long-established subletting system of land tenure. He further explains that these types of laborers have a small plot for cultivation, a small house made of sod costing about £2 to build, and, because they have so little, pay their £1 yearly rent through their labor, while “half-starving the whole time”.⁵ Dixon describes the habitations of the lowest classes in more detail through a series of questions:

2529. You talk of the cabin of this lowest class costing 2*l.* or 3*l.* for its erection; have you not seen a dry ditch, covered with branches and rushes, occupied by a family? — I have.

¹ ER3, Dixon 256.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 257.

⁴ *Idem.*

⁵ *Idem.*

2530. Is not the habitation you have alluded to as being near bogs, particularly bad? — Very bad, nothing worse.

2531. Are not many of these built upon waste pieces of land? — Yes.

2532. Without paying any rent? — I do not think any are allowed to build without paying some rent.

2533. Are they not built upon the bog itself sometimes? — In many instances on the very bog.

2534. Upon the mere bog sod? — Yes.

2535. Is not the roof formed with a few sticks? — Yes, some sticks thrown across.

2536. Without straw? — Yes, but with bog sods.

2537. What is the nature of the furniture inside one of these huts? — They generally have a pot and a little crock, and very few other articles.

2538. What do they sleep upon; do they have bedsteads of any kind? — In very few instances.

2539. What do they sleep upon? — Very often rushes and straw.

2540. Are these habitations divided into apartments of any kind? — Generally in one; there may be one little partition.

2541. What sort of bed clothes have they? — O, very bad; their clothing is all very bad.

2542. Have they a sufficient covering of common blankets? — They have not.¹

This exchange gives us an intimate view of the living conditions of the lowest laboring classes in this area, and others, of Ireland, compared to the regularly employed laborers who had stone houses which could be built for £10. Dixon believes that the population of this lowest class of laborers had doubled in the previous 20 years, during which time he claims they were better employed. This group of laborers, he asserts, “could not

¹ *Ibid.*, 260.

subsist at home, if they did not go and earn something for their families”,¹ through annual employment migration to England and other parts of Ireland.

David John Wilson, a resident landowner in County Clare, distinguishes his testimony from Dixon’s related to the distress in his area, claiming that, “a great deal depends upon where there is a resident gentry, that alters the situation very much”, though he summarizes that “the general situation of the mass of the peasantry throughout the country is extremely bad”.² He further details the wages for laborers that he employs, stating that he pays 8*d.* per day during the winter and summer for his own resident laborers, and 6*d.* per day for laborers from neighboring lands all year round. He explains that the lowest class of laborers were well-employed during potato sowing and harvest and during turf-cutting seasons, which generally occurred from March to June for sowing, and a short period in the fall for harvest. When asked how many months per year these laborers were without employment, Wilson responded, “I think I could safely say that many of them are without employment for five months in the year”.³ Wilson gives his own description of the living conditions of the lowest class of laborers in his area, also in a series of questions:

2658. How do they support themselves during that time? — The poor people, who have merely cabins and cabbage gardens, have what they call con-acres, or muck ground, set out to them, which they take at a high rate.

2659. Is that for planting potatoes? — Yes.

2660. What rate per acre will they give for that? — It varies from 5*l.* to five guineas.

2661. How do they find the means of paying for it? — Sometimes they get labour from the person from whom they take it; sometimes they buy a pig, and they feed that pig with the offal of their potatoes, or their small potatoes; that is the way it is most generally paid for.

¹ *Ibid.*, 258.

² ER3, D. J. Wilson, 265.

³ *Ibid.*, 267.

2662. With this system, what is the sort of food the people eat? — Potatoes only; that class.

2663. Have they any milk? — In summer.

2664. What state are their houses in? — Wretched.

2665. What do they consist of, and how are they built? — Where stone is convenient, they are built of stone; and when they are by the side of bogs, they are built with the peat sods and mud, sometimes thrown up against a ditch.

2666. How are the roofs of the worst description of them covered? — With very poor slight timber and very small scantling indeed, with sods and rushes thrown over them.¹

John Bodkin, a landowner in Galway, says that the situation in the neighborhoods surrounding Galway is not as bad as in the town of Galway itself. Without going into detail on the condition of the lower classes in Galway, he agrees with previous witness testimony on the condition of these classes.

2800. In the part of Ireland with which you are acquainted, are there a great number of persons who have no other apparently available source of living than begging? — That is a very difficult question to answer; but I can only say that their families are begging, and not the individuals themselves. The practice in the county I live in is, that they have a miserable cabin, and they plant a certain portion of their con acre potatoes, and they cut a little turf; the principal of the family comes to this country to work, the wife and children go to beg, and in many instances he returns with the money he has earned with his labour, and pays the con-acre rent with it, and the family return from begging.²

He continues by claiming that there are many individuals who were begging to support their families, while “[t]he head of the family, the man, comes to this country to work; the wretched wife and children travel through the county and the adjoining counties”.³ This evidence confirms previous testimony on the details of the habitations of Irish

¹ *Ibid.*, 267-268.

² ER3, J. Bodkin, 275.

³ *Ibid.*, 276.

laborers during this period, though it applies to a different region of Ireland. Though these testimonies are a valuable source on the living conditions of the Irish poor during this period, more evidence is necessary to avoid generalizing these characteristics onto all laborers.

In a moment of prescience, Bodkin addressed Irish dependence on potatoes, stating that any failure of the potato crop “would be quite ruin[ous] to the population of the south and the west of Ireland”,¹ and that without significant assistance from England, if such a failure were to occur, “one fourth of the population would in all probability perish”.² This prediction was startlingly accurate, in that the loss of life during the Great Hunger combined with emigration during this crisis was more than two million, about one-fourth of the estimated 8.4 million inhabitants enumerated in the 1841 census. Bodkin continues his testimony by claiming that the population was continuing to increase, creating considerable unemployment. Despite this continued increase, he explains that laborers who live near resident proprietors could find regular employment, though there were very few tillage farms compared to grazing farms, which required very little labor.

An unusual question is posed to Bodkin, on the state of mind of those impoverished Irish laborers.

2774. Are the people themselves at all sensible of their own condition, and of the evils they suffer in consequence of their own numbers? — No; they feel probably 'when they want clothes and food, but beyond that, as to any remedy to be applied to their situation, I believe they never consider it.'³

Though this would be an interesting avenue of research to consider, the evidence given here suggests that the witness is influenced by the contemporary biases against the Irish

¹ *Ibid.*, 271-2.

² *Ibid.*, 272.

³ *Ibid.*, 274.

poor, despite or perhaps tied to being from an elite Catholic family, one of the old Tribes of Galway.

James West, a land agent/middleman from Westmeath, confirms previous testimony that there is “a great deal of poverty among the peasantry in that part of the country”, and that some laborers were only partially employed throughout the year, though he asserts more precisely that “[t]here are more persons employed throughout the whole of the year, than not employed”.¹ West gives a considerably more concise description of partially employed laborers compared to other witnesses, summarizing that “[t]hey are in a poor pitiable condition; their cabins very bad; and for half the year they cannot obtain employment, though very willing to work, if they can get it, and at almost any thing you [choose] to give them”.² Despite most likely having more direct experience with tenants and laborers due to his position as a land agent, West gave an extremely brief account of their living conditions.

John Scott Vandeleur, a magistrate and landowner in County Clare, says that he believes “there are the same gradations of distress in the county of Clare as in other counties”,³ and that previous failures of the potato crop had led to great distress among the lowest class of laborers. Vandeleur also asserts that many landlords in his area are attempting to consolidate their farms, effectively ending leases of small farms which the lowest class of laborers depended on to gain access to land, and therefore, subsistence in one of the few forms available to them.

John Leslie Foster, a Tory and anti-emancipation member of Parliament for Louth, also agreed that poverty existed among the poor in general, but that some counties in the north, Down, Antrim, and Armagh, had less poverty than the rest of

¹ ER3, West, 297.

² *Idem*.

³ ER3, J. S. Vandeleur, 301.

Ireland due to the existence of capital, manufactures, and lack of disturbances because of higher levels of employment. Foster explains that because there was more employment available in these counties and that small tenants were better able to pay their rents because they did not only depend on their labor and small agricultural activities for subsistence. The relative success of these three counties leads Foster to assert that the population could be maintained “if capital and the consequent demand for labour were materially increased”,¹ though he does not predict that any “extensive introduction of capital into Ireland” would be forthcoming to effect such change.²

William Murphy, a physician residing in Cork, explains that laborers in the city could earn from 6s. to 8s. a week, and that to the west of the city laborers could earn from 6d. to 8d. a day (about 3s. 6d. to 4s. 8d. per week). He attributes the higher wages in the city to the activities of the trade unions present in Cork at the time, though he makes accusations that the unions have engaged in murder of non-Union tradesmen who enter the city for employment. While there was some violence linked to the trade unions, the data on violence in the 1820s is incomplete and this violence did not peak until the 1830s.³ As a physician, he reports that due to the crowded population, the city and country areas had experienced an increase of fever, though he claims it was not at a high enough level to affect mortality.⁴

John Markham Marshall, a resident landowner in County Kerry, explains that he employed upwards of 200 laborers on his estate for an unspecified period of time at wages of 8d. per day, though he says he was required to feed them for six weeks before the work could begin, due to “the state of starvation which seemed to prevail among

¹ ER3, J. L. Foster, 308.

² *Idem.*

³ Maura Murphy. “The Role of Organized Labour” (PhD Thesis, University of Leicester, 1979), 3-22.

⁴ ER3, Wm. Murphy, 384.

them”.¹ Marshall claims that many of the laborers he employed came from the surrounding estates up to ten miles away, occupying makeshift lodgings during the week and returning to their homes on the weekend. Further, upon reclaiming his estate, Marshall claims to have removed upwards of 1,100 people, who he says became beggars or were able to find a situation on neighboring estates, though also under the precarious system of subletting. Many of the laborers he later employed, he says, came from this group he removed from his own property.² Marshall was asked a question about the state of mind of the poor, much like a previous witness, though it was of course a subjective perspective he was asked to produce:

4339. Do not you conceive that the people themselves have an impression that their numbers are so great that the country cannot afford them any adequate employment? — Certainly; all that I have conversed with, confessed that.³

His answer, that all the tenants he had spoken to believed “that the country cannot afford them any adequate employment”, assumes that he discussed this issue with a large number of the poor directly and that this would apply throughout Ireland, and not just in his small corner of County Kerry. Though this may well have been the opinion of many, if not a majority, of the laboring poor in Ireland, the historical evidence of such perspective is not complete enough to make such an assertion. Additionally, in his position as a landowner and higher member of society, it is unlikely that Marshall made any kind of serious study of the lower classes and their feelings on the availability of employment and whether they felt it was adequate to sustain them.

¹ ER3, J. M. Marshall, 407.

² *Ibid.*, 408.

³ *Ibid.*, 411.

Robert Stearne Tighe, a landowner in County Westmeath, gave a number of details as to the state of the poor in his district through a series of questions, much like previous witnesses.

4287. What are the general circumstances of the lower class of poor in those parishes? — Their general circumstances are at this moment, and have been for some years, very bad. In the year 1822 I had a list made out, under the inspection of the Protestant and Roman Catholic clergymen, and two farmers of the neighbourhood, and the return was upwards of 200 persons, having families, to the amount of nearly 1,400 individuals, who had not been able to earn three months provisions during the preceding year, and they were then out of work; that list, with the name of every family, is to be found among the papers laid before the Relief Committee in London. I believe the labouring population of those parishes to be at this moment in the same state.

4288. When you speak of those 200 families, does each family rent a certain small quantity of land? — Each family that derives immediately under the proprietor certainly does rent a comfortable garden, at the least; but in the list that I mentioned were included some persons who rented as far as three, four, five, and six acres, and several who had no ground, merely a house or hovel.

4289. Of those 200 families how many occupied land not more than to the extent of one or two roods? — That I cannot at this moment tell, for they were not all upon my own estate; but I have in my pocket a list of persons now applying for assistance to emigrate, to whose circumstances I can speak clearly.

4290. You stated, that they had not the means of labouring more than three months in the year; you did not state whether they had land of their own, from the cultivation of which they might, more or less, derive subsistence? — The most of them were able to derive subsistence from their potatoe crops, but they were all in the habit and under the necessity of working, more or less, when employment was to be had. The great distress occurs in the summer months, before the potatoe crops come in, and when they must go to market with their money to purchase oatmeal, and if they have not work they cannot procure subsistence; and that state of distress is at this moment apparently inevitable to a great extent.¹

¹ ER3, R. S. Tighe, 440.

Though Tighe gives longer answers to the questions regarding the state of the poor, the evidence he gives is not particularly revealing, despite further confirming that those with access to land were obligated to have further employment in order to survive before the potato harvest, and that “if they have not work they cannot procure subsistence”.

Thomas Spring Rice, a Whig member of Parliament for Limerick City, explains that in the counties of Limerick, Kerry, parts of Clare and Cork, the process of “remodelling and clearing of properties” was accepted as necessary, and that this ejection led to vagrancy.¹ Due to the clearing of estates and removal of excess tenants, a number of people had become vagrants, leaving them with two options. Spring Rice explains that those ejected tenants would first venture onto neighboring estates to attempt to gain access to land in the same way they had in their previous situation, though he asserts that these endeavors were difficult. The next attempt was to settle in a village or town using the small amount of money they received from selling all their belongings, including any cattle, upon leaving their small holding. This would only be a temporary solution for these tenants and, according to Spring Rice, the money would only last one or two years after which the individual’s situation would return to its previous state. Furthermore, he asserts the levels of distress in villages and towns would increase dramatically as distress decreased in the countryside from where the tenants were removed. These two possible outcomes would ultimately leave these tenants in identical situations of distress and misery, with little to no possibility of advancing their status in society due to their strict subsistence-level living conditions. Spring Rice suggests that the only alternative to this cycle would be to alleviate the distress of the poor by establishing the state-assisted emigration plan, enabling them to improve their station in life.

¹ ER3, T. S. Rice, 445.

Spring Rice further argues that this movement of the poor population has negative effects on the towns and villages where they settle. He details these effects in the following passage:

it in the first instance lowers the rate of wages considerably in those towns; in the same proportion it diminishes the means of comfortable sustenance and support; by degrees not only is the mode of living lowered, but all articles of furniture and bedding and clothing become sacrificed, and, as the ultimate consequence, disease and fever of the most contagious nature, though not very malignant in its consequences, prevails.¹

Spring Rice defends this argument by giving an example:

An illustration of this will be given in the condition of the city of Dublin; it has been stated from the best authority, that out of the population of that city, consisting of somewhat more than 200,000 inhabitants, 60,000 passed through the hospitals, in contagious fever, during the last year. This calamity is by no means confined to the city of Dublin; an investigation of the circumstances of other cities in the south, and I believe in Leinster and Connaught, made, not in the present year but in other years, would establish precisely the same results.²

Though this testimony illustrates the high rate of fever in the Dublin area, it does not defend the assertion of the witness, namely, that wages and living conditions in general have been in decline since the increase of population commenced. Further study of living conditions prior to and after the introduction of this ejected class of the poor would be necessary to support his argument.

On the subject of the evidence supporting an increase of population in Ireland, the witness is quick to dismiss the existence of any reasonable source, claiming, “[t]here is no positive documentary evidence on which we can reason, because the Population Returns before the last year are so very inaccurate, that it would be impossible to found

¹ *Ibid.*, 446.

² *Ibid.*, 446-447.

any conclusive reasoning upon them”.¹ While it is possible to assume that the census records during this time were very inaccurate, there is little other evidence that would support the witness’s claim, including the witness’s own suggested source, the Reverend Mr. Whitelaw, who appears to have made a study of the population of Dublin in 1798 and compared it to the census made by the district committee in 1804.² Spring Rice explains that Whitelaw’s study showed a decrease in the number of houses in Dublin, which would appear to contradict his own argument that the population had increased, as more housing would necessarily be needed for the incoming poor tenants. Furthermore, this study was conducted many years prior to the Emigration Committee and would likely not be relevant in revealing a large poor population in Ireland in the 1820s. Finally, Spring Rice includes his own personal perspective on this subject, stating, “from my own observation I have no doubt that universally throughout the south the population in the towns, and the misery of that population, is increasing in a most rapid ratio”.³ Unless the witness had presented a methodical scientific study that he himself had conducted, his testimony, like others, cannot be easily received as factual.

John Richard Elmore was an English physician living in Ireland for about 15 years before giving evidence to the Emigration Committee. Elmore went to Ireland as a physician, but soon began a linen manufactory in Clonakilty (southwest of Cork) because he considered “that employment was indispensable for the relief of the population”, and employed, according to him, “directly and indirectly, nearly a thousand people”.⁴ Elmore explains that his linen manufacture enterprise had met with difficulty when competition with power looms was encountered in the market, and that his business declined as a result. He asserts that there were no more than 30 or 40 workers

¹ *Ibid.*, 447.

² See James Whitelaw, *An Essay on the Population of Dublin*. Dublin: Graisberry and Campbell, 1805.

³ ER3, T. S. Rice, 447.

⁴ ER3, J. R. Elmore, 464.

still employed and that the “poor weavers have been supported by voluntary contributions” as competition with the power loom increased in 1826.¹ Because of his own experience in Ireland, he disagreed with the Committee’s premise that “the misery of the state of the lower classes of Ireland [arises] from overpopulation”,² arguing that the state of distress was due to a lack of employment, and further “that the land is capable of supporting more, under a better system of management”,³ noting that most of the agricultural products of Ireland were exported during this period, not consumed by the people. He suggests that the introduction of capital for better machinery, both in agricultural and manufacturing enterprises, combined with “removing [the poor] to places in Ireland where the population is not great”,⁴ might be a sufficient remedy and would certainly cost less. Elmore’s first-hand experience of the lower class of laborers in the region of Cork reveals the pressures of industrialization and increased competition in the manufacturing sector of the economy. Though this part of the Irish economy was admittedly smaller than the agricultural sector, there were significant investments of private capital which were not employed in other areas that could have provided employment, and thereby, improved the living conditions of the poor of Ireland.

Edward G. Stanley, an English Whig member of Parliament for Preston from 1826 to 1830, successor of Wilmot-Horton to Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, and future three-time Prime Minister, testified to his own personal knowledge of his family’s estates in Ireland, though admitting he had little knowledge of Ireland generally. The three estates he gives evidence on consist of 1200 acres in Tipperary, 1200 acres near Cashel, and 400 acres in County Limerick. Stanley explains that he was in the process of consolidating the farms on his estates by removing tenants on smaller farms

¹ *Ibid.*, 465.

² *Ibid.*, 464, Question 4404.

³ *Ibid.*, 464.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 465.

of five acres or less. The only precise details on his personal holdings is that the Limerick estate of 400 acres had 600 people residing there until the removals began, after which about 339 people remained. Stanley describes the remaining population as having “no other occupation or means of subsistence beyond what they derive from the land itself, and the consequence is that they are in a state of the utmost distress and misery”.¹ Despite his important position with significant landholdings in Ireland, the witness did not provide significant evidence on the state of the tenants on his properties. From his testimony, we can see that Stanley was an absentee landowner and, therefore, had little to no direct contact with the poor tenants living on his estates. The only other testimony given by Stanley was his answer to two questions directly addressing emigration as a remedy and the interest among the people regarding this solution, which will be analyzed in these respective subparts.

Distress in Scotland

Hugh Innes, a Baronet, wealthy landowner, and member of Parliament for Tain Burghs, Scotland during the Emigration Committee, testified to the state of the poor in his neighborhood, claiming that he was not aware of distress there, but believed there was distress in the manufacturing districts. Innes further describes the habits of the poor in northwest Scotland who, he says, eat oatmeal, potatoes, and salted herring, and are dependent on the fisheries because they do not have enough land to produce food for their subsistence. He links this lack of access to land to the transformation of the agricultural sector to a grazing focused system over tillage farming, which removed many tenants to clear farms, for sheep in particular, during the period of large-scale improvements on Scottish estates, known as the Highland Clearances. Innes gives a generally positive view of the poor in his area, particularly upon their habitations,

¹ ER3, E. G. Stanley, 460.

claiming that, “[u]pon the whole [...] they are comfortable”,¹ though he does not describe in detail the types of lodgings as other witnesses did for Ireland. This evidence is a restricted view of the witness’s personal observations of two small parishes in Scotland: Kintail and Lochalsh in Ross-shire. Therefore, we cannot apply this view to the whole of the poor population of Scotland, particularly the manufacturing districts, which the witness contends have a distressed population, but does not further explain the circumstances in those districts.

Joseph Foster, president of the Glasgow Emigration Society, gave a unique perspective on the distress of the hand-loom weavers of Scotland, being a hand-loom weaver himself. He confirms previous testimony that their principal subsistence consists of oatmeal, potatoes, and salted herring, and that, “a number of them have not a sufficient quantity of that”.² He explains the labor practices of hand-loom weavers, whose numbers he estimates to be 15,000 in Glasgow and Paisley, who paid for their tools and implements themselves, and whose wages were fixed before the work commenced and were determined by the pieces created and the materials used, not by the time spent weaving. Foster estimates that weavers work 18 or 19 hours a day for approximately 4s. 6d. to 7s. per week. He explains that wages in the year 1800, up until the introduction of weaving machines, were about 20s. per week. He links this decrease in wages to the increased competition from power-loom production. During this time, he says, there were no large factories and all work was done in the homes of the weavers. Despite his firsthand knowledge and experience as a weaver, he only gives a general statement that there is great distress among the hand-loom weaver population, who have, he says, in some cases, sought employment in other industries to support themselves, though he says he has not been able to find employment for himself

¹ ER1, H. Innes, 78.

² ER2, Joseph Foster, 17.

elsewhere. Finally, he points out that the Poor Laws were not operating in Glasgow at this time, which made the distress felt by this population even more acute, with little public assistance available to them to supplement the small wages from their weaving activities.

Archibald Campbell, a Scottish landowner, Tory member of Parliament for Glasgow Burghs, and Lord Lieutenant of Renfrewshire, began his testimony by agreeing with the evidence given by Joseph Foster. His own testimony concerns the county of Renfrewshire, which includes the city of Paisley and borders Glasgow. Though the witness is unable to give evidence on the rate of wages of the weavers, he delivers the report of the sub-committee for the relief of the unemployed operatives of the county of 15 February 1827, which claims a reduction of families dependent on the committee to 1,245. He contends that the distress is decreasing slowly, producing a letter from the chief magistrate of Paisley, who states, "I am most happy to say that matters are, as far as regards the weavers, still improving; the work plenty, with wages advancing; but the laborers, and I may say all other operatives, are very ill off".¹ Despite this assertion, the witness gives no evidence that explains this supposed decrease of distress besides his estimation that many weavers were employed in other sectors, such as public works, while simultaneously not being able to provide data on the difference in wages of hand-loom versus power-loom weavers. Similar to the previous witness, he explains that no poor laws were in operation in Renfrewshire, but that voluntary contributions were raised for the support of the poor.

Thomas Francis Kennedy, a Whig member of Parliament for Ayrshire, Scotland, repeated this assertion, claiming that local relief for the poor was obtained via the philanthropic London and Edinburgh Committees, and that a poor law was necessary

¹ ER2, Archibald Campbell, 20.

for the regular maintenance and relief of the laboring classes of Scotland. Kennedy remains vague in his evidence on the state of the poor, recognizing that he does not have conclusive knowledge of the whole county he represents, while presenting a petition for emigration assistance from distressed hand-loom weavers from his district.¹

Another Scottish witness, Henry Home Drummond, member of Parliament for Stirlingshire, presented similar evidence that supports the previous witnesses, that subscriptions were collected in the county for the support of the poor in addition to contributions from the London and Edinburgh Committees. Home Drummond also submitted a petition for assistance to emigrate from 92 families in a state of distress whose wages were approximately 4s. to 6s. a week at the time of submission.²

John Maxwell, a Whig member of Parliament for Renfrewshire, also claimed to have presented nine petitions for emigration assistance from the county he represented. He further agreed with previous witness accounts and asserted that his father, one of the largest landowners in the neighborhood of Glasgow, had personally contributed to the funds collected for the relief of the poor.

William Spencer Northhouse, of the London Free Press Newspaper, was called to speak on behalf of numerous emigration societies in Scotland. He explained that the cause of the distress among the members of these societies was not lack of employment as in Ireland, but a low rate of wages for the employment available, while about 500 to 600 were out of work entirely. While he does not ascribe the introduction of machinery as a reason for this decline as other witnesses, he contends that it is merely one of many causes for this deterioration, and that it is not the primary cause. Unlike other witnesses, Northhouse gives slightly more detail to his description of the distressed weavers, explaining that they subsist “[b]y charity, or they partly starve; that is, they pass days

¹ ER2, T.F. Kennedy, 23-26.

² ER2, H. H. Drummond, 26.

without food”.¹ When asked to compare the distress in Scotland with Ireland, Northhouse admits that he cannot compare with the south of Ireland because he has only visited the north, which he found was in a similarly distressed situation to Glasgow. Though the witness admits to having no knowledge of the south of Ireland, he is asked to analyze the situation there and to form an opinion on whether Scotland or Ireland is in a more dire situation, more urgently needing a remedy via emigration.

759. But if emigration is to be taken up as a national object, and the means for it supplied by the national funds, do you conceive Scotland, or Ireland, to be the point where the population is most redundant? – I believe that Ireland is the point where the population is most redundant; but I have no hesitation in giving it as my opinion, that Scotland is the point where the emigration ought to commence, for this simple reason, that the Scotch are a people who have been long accustomed to independent habits; that they have never, till recently, been in their present truly wretched condition; that they are not so reckless as the Irish generally are, and that to them it is more acute misery to be dependent on charity, than it is to the Irish; and that the Irish people, from being long habituated to wretchedness, might, in point of charity and good feeling, be suffered rather to remain for some time longer in that condition, than that the Scotch should be suffered to get into the horrid circumstances that the Irish have been so long in.²

Here, though judging the population of Ireland to be more redundant, the witness displays his own biases towards the Irish, claiming that they are more accustomed to their circumstances of destitution and dependence on charity, and therefore, they should be made to wait for relief because the Scottish do not have the same experience regarding the state of distress they find themselves in; thus, he believes, the emigration should begin in Scotland rather than Ireland. Despite his admitted lack of knowledge of the living conditions in the south of Ireland, the witness demonstrates his acceptance of certain prejudices and stereotypes about the habits and general distress of the Irish laborers, which was not uncommon among the social and political elite at this period.

¹ ER2, W. S. Northhouse, 52.

² *Ibid.*, 61.

Alexander Campbell, Sheriff Substitute for Renfrewshire and resident in Paisley, began his testimony by agreeing with previous witnesses on the state of distress there, claiming that “the distress was very great and very general”.¹ He further explains that due to the low level of wages in the previous year, many had not been able to pay their rents and would most likely be ejected from their land upon the annual spring renewal of leases, which was customary in Scotland during this period, effectively increasing the already elevated level of distress. Campbell contradicts previous testimony on the supposed increase of wages, admitting that though a slight increase in demand had occurred, there is “great doubt entertained on all hands, whether trade is likely to become brisker as the season advances”.² He further attributes the distress among the weavers to the cotton spinning industry rather than the introduction of power looms. He asserts that the wages of the cotton spinning industry had always been high because “the employment is considered unhealthy, and the work hours are long”,³ though this explanation does not compare the wages of these two industries nor does it explain why these two considerations would have raised wages in the cotton spinning industry. A discussion on the laws of settlement in Scotland led to a single question on the Irish laborers working and living there:

In reference to your evidence on the present state of distress in Renfrewshire, are you of opinion that there would be no permanent distress in consequence of the present extent of its population, if the inconvenient influx of the Irish could be guarded against?—I certainly think that if natives of Scotland alone were concerned, there would be no surplus population.⁴

This answer was not questioned further by the Committee, to some extent admitting that the low wages and general distress were linked to the conditions of the Irish, who

¹ ER2, Alexander Campbell, 148.

² *Ibid.*, 150.

³ *Ibid.*, 152.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 162.

would migrate to Scotland and England seeking employment, though this migration was seasonal in nature, which was not addressed by the witness. There is no evidence that there were a sufficient number of Irish migrating or settling in Scotland to influence the wages of weavers and other laborers in Scotland, though this was accepted as fact by the majority of witnesses and other elites during this period. The Irish habits were admittedly different from the Scottish and they were primarily agricultural laborers rather than manufacturers, which would not have affected the weavers and other manufacturing classes of Scotland.

William Henly Hyett, Secretary of the Committee for the Relief of distressed Manufacturers, gives testimony concerning two Scottish counties, Lanark and Renfrew, of which he says “[t]here has existed very considerable distress in both those places, particularly in Paisley”, and that the “manufacturing classes have suffered very excessively from the loss of trade”.¹ He claims, like other witnesses, that the hand-loom weavers are unable to compete with machine weaving, which has led to great numbers of unemployment among that class, though he contends that “very few weavers [are] out of employment absolutely at this moment, but the wages that they derive are not adequate to their support”.² This evidence supports previous testimony on wages in this industry during this period, despite the witness giving no concrete data to corroborate this assertion. Alternatively, the witness provided the Committee with reports on the numbers of unemployed (primarily) weavers from various districts in England and Scotland, as assessed by the relief committee. The data concerning Scotland was extremely brief, showing between three and eight percent unemployment when counting those receiving charity fund relief, and comparing the number of unemployed weavers with the total population of the city, and only in the regions of Paisley, Perth,

¹ ER2, W. H. Hyett, 210.

² *Idem.*

Pollockshaws, and Kilsyth (the data from Edinburgh being incomplete). This data is not delivered in a productive way, as we cannot deduce the percentage of unemployment among the weaving class in its entirety, but only as a proportion to the population, which does not reveal much about the weaving industry, and particularly hand-loom weavers who worked out of their own homes and were disproportionately affected by the introduction of machine weaving.

SCOTLAND.				
Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	Out of Employ.	REMARKS.
1827:				
Mar. 22.	Edinburgh - - -	138,235	1,600	adults, at the time the report was made last year. The condition of the poor is now much worse.
29.	Paisley - - -	72,534	835	families on the Charity fund, 31st March 1827.
Jan. 2.	Perth - - -	19,068	1,600	
Feb. 2.	Pollockshaws - -	2,000	127	adults.
Mar. 17.	Kilsyth - - -	4,260	146	D ^s .

W. H. Hyett, Secretary.

Figure 7 - Emigration Report 2, W. H. Hyett, 214.

One final witness gave evidence on the distress in Scotland. Alexander Hunter, who superintended the emigration from the island of Rum in 1826, gave testimony on his experience carrying out an organized emigration plan. Despite having firsthand knowledge of the island, much of his evidence was not accurate. According to Hunter, the island had always been dedicated to sheep farming and was not adapted for agricultural production. Contemporary accounts show that while the island was mainly

mountainous, and, therefore, advantageous to cattle-raising, there were also crops of corn, potatoes, and barley on the island, in addition to seaweed cultivation and fishing.¹

While these witnesses argue that the distress in Scotland was substantial, they also suggest that it differed from Ireland, in that it affected a different, smaller class of laborers, and, by all accounts, was temporary and already improving by the time of the Emigration Committees. Compared to Ireland, where agriculture was the primary industry of the majority who were dependent on the whims of nature, the situation in Scotland, while serious, was not nearly as severe as for the Irish poor, who, as one Scottish witness admitted, had been living through extended periods of poverty for centuries.

Distress in England

The testimony from the English witnesses was different due to the particular circumstances of that country. Unlike Ireland and Scotland, England had an extensive network of workhouses and poor laws in operation throughout the country for the support of the poor. The economy of England was also fundamentally different, having already begun its integration of industrial revolution methods of manufacturing, with Ireland serving as the “breadbasket” for England, exporting the majority of its agricultural products to that country. Therefore, the evidence to follow in this analysis will be distinct from the testimony given by the Irish witnesses.

Among other issues that were addressed by the English witnesses, crime figured prominently. The city of London had a large population of children who lived in poor housing, with little to no education, and a lack of employment. Most children of poor families worked during this time, and, due to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the demand for child labor declined, as demand and prices for many goods and employment

¹ See Denis Rixson, *The Small Islands: Canna, Rum, Eigg and Muck* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2001).

decreased in many industries across England, Scotland, and Ireland. Robert Joseph Chambers, police magistrate for the borough of Southwark, London, testified to the increase of juvenile offences by presenting population statistics from two jails. By his definition, “juvenile offences” concerned both male and female children aged twelve to twenty years old. The first statistics presented were from Brixton gaol from its opening in 1820 to 1825, including the first three months of 1826.

A RETURN of the Number of Prisoners committed to the House of Correction at Brixton Hill, from the year 1820 to the year 1825, both years inclusive; distinguishing those of the age of twenty-one and under:—Also, the like Number, from 1st of January to 31st of March 1826, both days inclusive.

DATE.	Above 21 Years.	21 Years, and under.	TOTAL.
1820 - -	63	60	123
1821 - -	248	325	573
1822 - -	585	640	1,225
1823 - -	666	562	1,228
1824 - -	502	536	1,038
1825 - -	507	541	1,048
1826 - -	111	161	272
	2,682	2,825	5,507

(Signed) *J. Green, Keeper.*

Figure 8 - Prisoner statistics of Brixton Gaol provided by R. J. Chambers, ER1, 84.

While these statistics show a significant increase in the prison population after the opening of the facility in 1820, and indeed demonstrates a considerable number were children (between 46 and 59 percent), these numbers do not give many details on the types of offences committed by this category of prisoners nor the length of their detention. Comparing the length of sentences of children with those of adults would be one way to explain why the percentage of children appears high in contrast with adults.

A comparison can be made with the second set of statistics submitted by Chambers of the House of Correction of Cold Bath Fields Middlesex, located in central

London, founded in the seventeenth century, and intended for inmates serving short sentences up to two years. The information given by Chambers concerned the years 1806 through 1825 and also compared the number of prisoners under the age of 21. When compared with the data from the Brixton gaol, a similar percentage point increase is observed, though the percentage of children in Brixton was significantly higher than at Cold Bath Fields.

**A RETURN of the Number of Prisoners committed to the House of Correction,
Cold Bath Fields, Middlesex, from 1806 to 1825.**

DATE.	Above 21.	Under 21.	DATE	Above 21.	Under 21.
1806 - -	1,600	389	1816 - -	2,875	898
1807 - -	1,452	405	1817 - -	3,667	934
1808 - -	1,271	368	1818 - -	3,962	1,063
1809 - -	1,131	316	1819 - -	3,715	1,161
1810 - -	1,138	352	1820 - -	3,322	1,129
1811 - -	1,348	578	1821 - -	3,379	1,161
1812 - -	1,461	413	1822 - -	4,398	1,718
1813 - -	1,671	459	1823 - -	4,499	1,953
1814 - -	1,691	510	1824 - -	3,658	1,599
1815 - -	2,106	626	1825 - -	4,212	1,875

13 April 1826.

(Signed) *W Hassall,*
Clerk of the House of Correction.

Figure 9 - Prisoner Statistics of Cold Bath Fields, provided by R. J. Chambers, ER1, 84.

According to these statistics, the proportion of children in this prison from 1806 to 1825 increased from approximately 20 percent to 31 percent. Again, without knowing the types of offences committed or the length of their sentences, it is impossible to know whether this indicated a more serious increase in the types of offences committed by children, though the raw numbers do appear dramatic.

The witness draws a link to this increase of population, a want of employment for children, and the discharge of children serving on ships docking in London, especially

following the end of the Napoleonic Wars, when those children were no longer needed for the war effort. In addition to these causes, he asserts that another explanation for the surge in the number of children in the city was due to the passage of the Parish Apprentices Act in 1816, which he says, prevented children from becoming apprentices in parishes more than 40 miles from London.¹ It is in this context that the witness suggests that emigration would be a logical remedy for the city of London, considering his view on the increased concentration of children and the rise of criminal offences during this period.

Another category of evidence given to the Emigration Committees by English witnesses was general descriptions of the towns and villages they represented or observed, with or without statistics supporting their observations.²

Edward Jeremiah Curteis, independent member of Parliament for Sussex, gave evidence on the state of pauperism in Sussex, claiming that there were a number of laborers who were unemployed, though he did not believe that they were unnecessary. His explanation for the lack of employment was the decrease in land cultivation, the failure of country banks, the high level of sheep mortality, and crop failures. Curteis's suggestion for remedying this distress was that, "if the land were in full cultivation, as it formerly was, and if we had capital, I do not think we have more labourers than we have occasion for".³ Thomas Law Hodges, representing Hemsted, county Kent, a parish of about 1,900 people, asserted that there were more laborers than agricultural demands

¹ See *Parish Apprentices Act 1816*, 56 Geo. c. 139. "no such child shall be bound Apprentice to any Person or Persons residing or having any Establishment in Trade, at which it is intended that such Child shall be employed out of the same County, at a greater Distance than Forty Miles from the Parish or Place to which such Child shall belong".

² For the following analysis, witness evidence is based on their personal observations unless noted otherwise.

³ ER1, E. J. Curteis, 114.

required, and that they were primarily agricultural laborers, compared to other regions of England whose populations were principally manufacturers.

Aside from these two witnesses, the remaining testimony concerned parishes comprised chiefly of hand loom weaver populations in distress. Major Thomas Moody, a member of the British Army and the Royal Engineers, and an expert on Colonial Government, collected some statistics from churchwardens and mill proprietors on the state of the poor in Manchester. Moody contends that the number of families receiving weekly relief in Manchester is 3,590, totaling approximately 14,680 persons, of which 7,900 are able to work and only partially employed. The statistics provided by Major Moody show that the amount spent for the relief of distressed families increased significantly over the previous years, as follows:¹

1822	£20,866	
1823	£19,748	4,709 persons
1824	£21,158	4,755 persons
1825	£25,588	5,291 persons
1826	£40,500	14,680 persons

This information shows an approximately 100 percent increase of the expenditure from 1823 to 1826, with an over 300 percent increase in the number of persons receiving relief. These higher levels are attributed to a lack of employment due to the introduction of the power loom, which is confirmed by other witness testimony.

Thomas Adams gave similar evidence on the state of the poor of Mildenhall, Suffolk, a parish of 16,000 acres. He claimed that there were 37 paupers in the workhouse and 87 others receiving poor relief. In addition, he explained that there were 110 who

¹ ER2, Moody, 30.

were employed in useless and unnecessary labor, such as public road works. The increase in poor rates was a point he gave more details on.¹

1822	£2,714 6s. 1d.
1823	£3,151
1824	£3,807
1825	£3,968
1826	£3,420

Unlike Major Moody's testimony, Adams' gave no indication of the number of people receiving this amount of relief over the years, so it is impossible to analyze the increase of relief needed, though a substantial increase in the amount spent for the purpose of relief is noticeable. More information would be necessary to further understand and analyze this increase in poor rates.

William Richard Cosway, an absentee landowner with holdings in Romney Marsh and Weald, Kent, also noted an increase in the number of people receiving parish relief in Bilsington, county Kent. The parish of Bilsington was about 2,700 acres, of which 570 were arable, 1580 pasture, and 550 woods. While the parish experienced an increase in population, from 229 in 1821 to 335 in 1827, a more staggering increase occurred in the number of people receiving relief: from 29 in 1811 to 129 in 1827, with 10 being completely unemployed, meaning approximately 40 percent of the population was receiving relief. These numbers are important to the demonstration of the distress occurring in these parishes, though on a smaller scale than in other towns. Further statistics are necessary to further analyze the trends, such as the population growth in the years between 1811 and 1827.

Reverend John Matthias Turner, the Rector of Wilmslowe, Cheshire, gave evidence on his parish near Manchester, which he estimates that about four-fifths of the

¹ ER2, T. Adams, 200.

approximately 4,000 inhabitants were hand loom weavers. The two primary manufactures of that parish were cotton spinning and hand loom weaving, regarding which he asserts that “spinners have been entirely unemployed, and weavers for about six weeks of the year were totally without employment”.¹ Turner claims that the poor rates, though generally low, had doubled in the previous year due to the lack of employment in their main industries as mentioned above, and that the parish received additional relief from the London Committee. Like other witnesses, he contends that the introduction of the power loom had lowered the wages of hand loom weavers, stating that the average wages of hand loom weavers in the previous year had been 7*s.*, though he does not provide any earlier data on wages prior to that period. Due to this distress, he asserts that about one-fifth of the families received relief in the previous year. Despite lacking some important information for the analysis of this evidence, this testimony gives an outline of the labor conditions among the hand loom weaver populations in England. This perspective is generally supported by other English witnesses who testify on the state of the poor in their different regions of the country.

Thomas Lacoste similarly described the population of Chertsey, Surrey, a parish of between 4,000 and 5,000 inhabitants, as having a large number of unemployed poor. Though he did not specify what the usual occupation of the paupers was, he explains that many of them were employed at digging gravel and breaking stones for roads, simply for the purpose of employing them because no other work was available to them. These laborers were paid 2*s.* per week for a man or woman, and 18*d.* for children employed on the public road works.

The parish of Feltham, Middlesex, having 2,000 to 3,000 residents, was briefly described by the overseer of the poor, James Taylor, as having insufficient employment

¹ ER2, J. M. Turner, 37.

for laborers, especially in the winter. The primary manufacture in the parish was flax spinning. When the poor found themselves unemployed, they were directed to the surveyor of roads for employment on public works (like the unemployed poor of Chertsey), but if no work was available, they would be given direct relief. This testimony was lacking in details as well, but again, supported the overall evidence on the weaving populations of England.

The parish of Hanworth, Middlesex, with a population of approximately 600 spread over 1,300 acres, also had a great number of unemployed poor, according to the overseer of the poor, Samuel Maine. As in the parish of Feltham, the poor of Hanworth were employed on the roads when no other work was available to them. Maine further asserts that the number of poor had increased, due in part to the returns of families from other parishes. Though the witness does not suggest a reason for the distress, he explained that many of the poor did not have sufficient employment for eight months of the year.

Blackburn, county Lancaster, was principally a manufacturing population, with very little agriculture. According to William Feilden, who was involved in the cotton manufacturing industry, the population was dependent on hand loom weaving, which was not a sufficient source of subsistence for those laborers. He agrees with previous witnesses that the introduction of the power loom was the primary source of the distress.

In the parish of Bolton, to the west of Manchester, William Hulton, the chairman of Bolton and Leigh Railway Company, testified that the distress among the lower and middling classes was the worst he had ever witnessed and that it was continuing to increase. It is unclear where the witness gathered this evidence, as he admits to living in the parish of Dean, which is over 100 miles away from the parish of Bolton. Additionally, he claims that there are very few people without any employment, with average wages for hand loom weavers at 8s. per week, with women and children aged 15 to 16 earning

3s. per week. He claims that he himself has given relief to people in Dean in the form of bedding and clothes, further explaining that there are some cases of families starving in the parish,¹ and asserting that the population would not have survived the distress without the support of private charities, such as the London Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Districts.

The Bishop of Chester, Charles James Blomfield, a member of the House of Lords and of the London Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Districts, also testified to the state of the poor in his diocese, which includes most of the northern English manufacturing districts. While he gives a general overview of the state of the poor, his testimony includes very few details, though vaguely supporting the evidence given by other witnesses. Unlike other witnesses, he explains that the hand loom weavers in the towns were more easily absorbed into the newly constructed power loom factories, leaving those in the country districts more distressed. This evidence could have been verified if there had been witnesses from the towns, such as Manchester and Liverpool, to testify to the circumstances of the power loom factories and the hand loom weavers that were able to transition into those facilities.

In Carlisle, northwest England, the depression of the cotton trade was claimed to be mostly due to the introduction of the power loom by Thomas Hunton, a master manufacturer in the town. He asserted that between 18,000 and 20,000 people were dependent on hand loom weaving within a radius of 20 to 40 miles of Carlisle. According to Hunton, the average weekly wages of hand loom weavers was 5s. 6d., for 14 to 16 hours of work a day. This rate of wages was on the decline, he asserts, even within the week prior to his testimony. Hunton gives further details on the habits of the weaver population, whose diet was principally composed of potatoes, a little buttermilk and

¹ ER2, W. Hulton, 183.

herring. He claims that nearly all of them are in arrears on their rent, which is between £6 and £8 annually, and that in this case they could be ejected from their land at any time. He finally explains that the distress had been ongoing for the previous 18 months and that there was no other profitable employment open to hand loom weavers in Carlisle and its neighborhoods.

The evidence given by the English and Scottish witnesses is important to examine here because it puts into relief the testimony given by the Irish witnesses, who report extremely dire circumstances in comparison. This coincides with the Committees' focus on Ireland, which also translated to the press reactions that will be analyzed later, which demonstrated an urgency to establishing emigration as a solution for poverty and the lack of employment in Ireland.

Redundant population

The Committee defined “redundant population” in its first report as “where there exists a very considerable proportion of able-bodied and active labourers, beyond that number to which any existing demand for labour can afford employment”.¹ It further explains the consequences of such a population, claiming that it “not only [reduces] a part of this population to a great degree of destitution and misery, but also to deteriorate the general condition of the labouring classes”.² This definition carried through to the third Emigration Report, in which the Committee states it is “prepared conclusively to confirm and support [...] the existence of a redundancy of Population in extensive districts of *Ireland*, and in certain districts of Scotland and England”.³ The third Report further concluded “that the effect of this redundancy was to reduce the wages of labour

¹ ER1, 3.

² *Idem*.

³ ER3, 3.

below their proper level, by which much destitution and misery were produced in particular places, deteriorating the general condition of the labouring classes”.¹ They make a contrast between the affected countries, admitting that the effects are different in England “where it is supported by a parochial rate”, while Ireland “is dependent for support on the precarious funds of charity, or at times on the more dangerous resources of plunder and spoliation”.² Though this could be mistaken as a justification for implementing poor laws or another support system in Ireland, this suggestion was explicitly excluded as inapplicable to Ireland, not only by the Committee, but also during parliamentary debates on the subject.

The majority of Irish witnesses agreed that a redundant population existed in Ireland. The general style of questioning was very direct, asking whether the witnesses agreed that a redundant population existed, with the answers most frequently being extremely brief and unchallenging.

1979. Have you any doubts as to the fact of the population in the south of Ireland being redundant to a great degree, in the sense of there being no demand for the labour of persons who are both willing and competent to perform it?—There can be no doubt about it.³

2097. Do you concur with the last Witness, as to the fact of there being a redundant population in the south of Ireland? — Certainly I do.⁴

2128. Do you consider that the population exceeds the demand for labour very much? — Very much indeed.⁵

The subject of redundant population in Ireland was discussed by seven Irish witnesses during the first Emigration Committee, of whom one gave a particularly nuanced explanation. Thomas Spring Rice made the distinction that despite the

¹ *Idem.*

² *Idem.*

³ ER1, A. Nimmo, 187.

⁴ ER1, R. O’Driscoll, 195.

⁵ ER1, Ennismore, 197.

evidence already given and the general way of thinking about Ireland, a redundant population was not an issue affecting the whole of Ireland, but only certain districts of the island. He further admitted that some districts had more people than employment to occupy them, though this did not apply to the whole of Ireland, concluding that “there does exist a redundancy, and a very considerable one, in particular districts”,¹ though he does not specify which. This argument is a different way of thinking of the redundancy issue and gives a more realistic perspective on the state of the laboring classes in Ireland, of which the other witnesses made generalizations regarding the topic. The remaining witnesses generally agreed to the existence of a redundant population without as much distinction as was made by Spring Rice.

William Gabbett, a resident landowner in County Limerick, was asked only one question on the existence of a redundant population in his region:

1210. Do you conceive, with respect to the demand for labour, that there is a redundancy of population? – A very considerable redundancy, so much so, that every person that can amass a very few pounds is emigrating as fast as he can from that part of the country.²

His answer, though lacking in details or further evidence to support his argument, reveals the widespread perspective of landowners during this period on the state of the populations on their estates. The difficulty of this perspective is that while many observed large numbers of tenants on their estates, this was extrapolated to the entirety of Ireland and influenced outsiders and politicians on the state of the Irish, who believed that all Irish were living in near to complete destitution in every corner of the island. This widely accepted belief was refuted by Thomas Spring Rice, though his argument was not a perspective shared by other witnesses.

¹ ER1, T. S. Rice, 211.

² ER1, W. Gabbett, 125.

Alexander Nimmo, a Scottish engineer working in Ireland, expressed his agreement that the population in the south of Ireland was redundant in a very direct response:

1979. Have you any doubts as to the fact of the population in the south of Ireland being redundant to a great degree, in the sense of there being no demand for the labour of persons who are both willing and competent to perform it? – There can be no doubt about it.¹

Despite his quick agreement with the committee on the state of the population, he further explained that the high levels of population were not directly linked to disturbances in that country, claiming that, “the greatest disorder in Ireland pervades a district where the population is generally very scanty”.² According to the witness, this is due to a lack of employment in manufacturing and vast agricultural opportunities in those sparsely-populated areas. This testimony comes from the witness’s personal observations in the south of Ireland, which he evaluates in the following way:

for in the counties of Tipperary and Kilkenny, and between Cork and Limerick and Kerry, there are very extensive wastes, perfectly capable of cultivation; I say that, because there is cultivation existing there at present, and those are the chief seats of our disturbances in the south of Ireland. Now on the other hand, in the extreme part of Clare and the southern part of Cork, near Clonakilty, there are two districts which are the most thickly peopled of any that I recollect ever seeing any where in Ireland, and the cultivation is more of the nature of garden cultivation than agricultural, the lots of land are so small; now those two districts are remarkably peaceable, and have always been so. I am not of opinion therefore, that the disturbed situation of Ireland arises from the thick population.³

This perspective was expressed by other witnesses, reinforcing the argument that areas with little population, and therefore fewer employment opportunities, experienced greater levels of disturbance than those regions with a denser population.

¹ ER1, A. Nimmo, 187.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 187-188.

William Wrixon Becher testified directly following Alexander Nimmo, and was asked if he agreed with his testimony:

2024. Do you concur with him in his observations?—As to the fact of the more populous districts having been invariably quiet since I knew it, and the less so being disturbed.

2025. You do agree with him in that respect?—I do.

2026. How do you account for the comparative tranquillity of the more popular districts, rather than in the more thinly populated parts?—I think that there is a more tranquil disposition among them; I do not know how exactly to account for the fact.¹

Though Becher expressed agreement with Nimmo, he did not go so far as to attempt to explain the reasons for the relative peacefulness of more populous districts, unlike Nimmo. His testimony regarding the redundant population in Ireland was much like the other witnesses. Without addressing directly the existence of a redundant population, the Committee asked the following question: “Do you attribute a great part of the misery in the south of Ireland to the redundancy of the population, in the sense employed in the questions put to the last witness?”, to which he responded simply, “I do”.² This is another example of the Committee configuring their questions to obtain a specific answer, in this case, a discreet acknowledgement of the existence of a redundant population without a challenge of the assumption. Becher was asked further questions in this manner, with similarly short and vague answers.

2039. Are you of opinion that sub-letting has a tendency to lead to such a redundancy?—Certainly.

2040. Does not a disposition among the lower tenantry to divide their land among their families prevail to a mischievous extent?—I think there does.

2080. Do you think that the agricultural population, which appears to be that class of society which is in the greatest redundancy, could be trained

¹ ER1, W. W. Becher, 191.

² *Idem.*

to the purpose of manufactures with great facility?—I have no reason to doubt it.¹

This method of questioning continued with further witnesses, beginning with Thomas Odell, whose question and answer was as follows:

2294. Have you often known it to be the case, that where land has been let on life leases, there has been, on the falling in of those leases, found a redundant population, which the landlord was unable to dispose of?—Yes, I have.²

Additionally Redmond O'Driscoll, most likely a landowner in the south of Ireland, was asked directly if he agreed “as to the fact of there being a redundant population in the south of Ireland”, with his answer being simply, “Certainly I do”.³ Though his testimony was brief, O'Driscoll was questioned about possible remedies to the existence of this redundant population. These questions were also posed in a specific way to evoke short, unquestioning responses.

2098. Are you of opinion that any remedy can be applied so effectually and so satisfactorily for the removal of that redundant population, as emigration, carried on upon an extensive scale, and upon a judicious system?—I think not.

2099. Are you of opinion that there is any probability of manufactures being introduced into the south of Ireland, with a reasonable prospect of remunerating the parties to such an extent as would absorb that redundant population?—I fear not; I am sure not.

2100. Do you not think that the introduction of manufactures, under any circumstances, would be more easy after a removal of a part of that redundant population?— No.⁴

While agreeing that emigration would be the best remedy to the perceived overpopulation in Ireland, he did not believe that introducing manufactures into Ireland

¹ *Ibid.*, 193.

² ER1, T. Odell, 209.

³ ER1, R. O'Driscoll, 195.

⁴ *Idem.*

would alleviate the conditions of the poor with or without a system of extensive emigration of those redundant populations.

Finally, the Bishop of Limerick, John Jebb, gave a stark warning that the redundant population was already “in the process of curing itself, in the most painful way, by the ejection, destitution, and starvation of those poor people”,¹ and that emigration was a necessary and immediate remedy to slow the distress. This was not an entirely impossible prediction when taking into account the desire of the proprietors to end subdivision and the tenuousness of the potato crop.

This reflection continued in the second and third Committees. The only two witnesses for Ireland in the second Emigration Committee spoke of the state of distress in Ireland, with John O’Driscoll agreeing that a redundant population existed in Ireland due to the great excess of the unemployed. Henry Parnell continued his testimony on this point, claiming that the increase in population did not coincide with an increase in ability to employ them,² which led to the distress in certain districts that were deemed “overpopulated” or experiencing the evil of an excess population.

The question of the redundant population seems to have been central to the third committee in that thirteen of the witnesses for Ireland spoke about the redundant population in Ireland.

David John Wilson, resident proprietor in County Clare, asserts that the distress of the Irish poor was caused by subletting, early marriages, and the system of elective franchise. Additionally, he considers that these three causes produce a redundant and even further distressed population. Despite the attribution of the redundant population to these factors, Wilson admits that the distress of the poor was not directly linked to the

¹ ER1, Bishop of Limerick, 143.

² ER2, Henry Parnell, 167.

existence of a redundant population, and that “if that population were distributed throughout the country in a judicious manner, I think the country more than ample to support it, not only in comfort, but in comparative affluence with the present state”.¹ This is similar to other perspectives presented to the Committee, reinforcing the idea that while there were some areas that were considered as having a redundant population, it did not apply to the whole of Ireland, and a better redistribution of the population would provide relief to the situation.

This position was further supported by John Leslie Foster, a Tory member of Parliament for Louth at the time of the Committee. When questioned on the existence of a redundant population in Ireland, Foster does not use the term “redundant” in his answer, further considering that Ireland was able to support the population if labor and injections of capital were increased.

3154. Do you consider the state of pauperism in which the peasants are to be found in certain parts of Ireland, is mainly arising from the redundance of population as compared with the demand for labour?—Yes; but I do not mean to say that the actual population of the country is greater than it would be able to maintain, if capital and the consequent demand for labour were materially increased; and I am the rather inclined to make that observation, because those parts of the country in which there is the least of poverty and the greatest demand for labour, are in fact those which are most densely peopled.²

Despite advocating for an increase in capital to increase the demand for labor, Foster admits in the following question that this solution to the population issue does not seem like a likely remedy.

3155. The question was limited to the sense of population as compared with the means of employment; do you think it probable that capital can be introduced into Ireland so as to absorb the redundancy of the population, unless part of that population be previously removed by emigration?—I

¹ ER3, D. J. Wilson, 265.

² ER3, J. L. Foster, 308.

cannot see any probability of such an extensive introduction of capital into Ireland as would be necessary to afford employment to the existing population.¹

This answer further supports emigration as a remedy rather than the introduction of capital or other proposals that were considered during this period.

The questioning method of the previous Committee continued into the third Emigration Committee, with Lieutenant General Robert Browne, an absentee landowner with property in County Wexford, who, perhaps due to his physical distance from his estate, gave short answers to questions regarding the state of the population in the region of his property.

2719. Can you speak of the state of labour in Wexford?—No.

2720. Have you heard the last Witnesses speak of the state of the labouring classes in the counties of Westmeath and Clare?—I have.

2721. Is there any such state of things in Wexford?—I believe not, except in the towns, where there is a redundant population.²

Though admitting that he had no evidence on the state of laborers in Wexford, where he held property, he expressed his belief that the state of the laboring classes in Wexford was not as serious as those in Westmeath and Clare, except in the towns where he claims there was a redundant population. Browne's evidence, like others, remains vague and gives little to no details on his assertions. While there is historical evidence that living conditions were insufficient for the Irish poor, this testimony does not offer any additional facts on this point.

John Bodkin, a landowner in County Galway, was asked questions in a similar format, with equally brief answers:

¹ *Idem.*

² ER3, R. Browne, 271.

2734. Do you mainly concur with them as to that state of distress, as shown by the nature of their food, and the general state of their condition?—Yes, decidedly; I have no doubt of it.

2735. Do you concur strictly as to the causes of the redundant population, which have led to this result, as particularly stated by Mr. Wilson?—Yes, in a great measure; I do entirely coincide with him.

2736. Do you consider the joint-tenancy, forty-shilling freeholds, and subdivisions of farms, have all operated to produce that result?—Decidedly.¹

While Bodkin agrees as to the existence and causes of this redundant population, he adds to this testimony by asserting that the redundancy had been increasing each year he lived there.

Similarly, Doctor William Murphy, a physician residing at Cork, was asked directly if he considered the population of that part of Ireland to be redundant, to which he responded simply, “Very redundant”.² He explained that the crowded population in these areas had led to an increase of fever and mortality yet had not decreased the population.

Other witnesses testified with more precision on the state of laborers in their region. James West, a land agent in Westmeath, attested to the conditions in his region:

3078. Have the goodness to take a special instance of those not employed, and describe the circumstances under which they are placed?—They are in a poor pitiable condition; their cabins very bad; and for half the year they cannot obtain employment, though very willing to work, if they can get it, and at almost any thing you chuse [*sic*] to give them.³

Though these details are somewhat vague, there is still an important perspective illustrated here. The land agent, or middleman, James West, though later agreeing that

¹ ER3, J. Bodkin, 271.

² ER3, W. Murphy, 383.

³ ER3, J. West, 297.

“there is an overgrown population”,¹ contradicts other witnesses and beliefs of his contemporaries, admitting that the Irish laborers are “very willing to work”, which was not a commonly held opinion at the time. Many, especially English, elites held the view that the Irish, due to the chronic lack of employment, had little motivation to work, which was one of the reasons that Ireland was a distressed and disturbed country. Though this witness contributed to the distressed state of the poor through his work as a middleman, this testimony is valuable as to the disposition of laborers to work when employment of any kind could be found.

Robert Stearne Tighe gave a copious amount of firsthand observations on the populations of his own personal estate. In his testimony, he considers that the population upon his estate was redundant, that the population had tripled its numbers from 1781 to the time of his testimony, from 62 to approximately 180, though he claims he did not allow more people onto his estates, but that his tenants sublet or subdivided their lands further. This testimony seems to confirm the impact of subletting on Irish demographics at the time. Tighe further submits a petition for assistance to emigrate as proof that the estate is overpopulated.²

Among the witnesses, there was a general agreement on the existence of a redundant population, not only in Ireland, but also in different areas of England and Scotland. Two English witnesses spoke of a redundant population during the first Emigration Committee. When asked directly if he believed there was a permanent redundant population in the region of Sussex, Edward J. Curteis responds by saying that “there is a great superfluity of population, that is of labourers, who are at this moment

¹ *Idem.*

² ER3, R. S. Tighe, 441.

out of employ”,¹ though he does not go so far as to say that they are unnecessary, as mentioned previously in the section on distress in England.

While most of the witnesses were asked directly if they believed a redundant population existed in their areas, at least one was not and used the term unsolicited. When asked if he thought emigration would have a beneficial effect on the United Kingdom, John Sebright’s long answer included the following statement: “I do not pretend to say what effect it might have upon the redundancy of the population generally”,² while explaining how he himself would conduct an emigration program in his own parish. This testimony shows the eagerness of some proprietors to employ emigration as a way to consolidate their estates by removing a significant number of tenants, some of whom were unable to pay their rents. Emigration may have been seen as a more principled way of removing tenants, as a pure ejection system simply moved people from one estate to another, with some ending up in workhouses or as beggars.

During the second Emigration Committee, there were seven English witnesses who testified on the subject of a redundant population in England. At least five of these witnesses were questioned in a similar way as others, with an acknowledgment of the existence of a redundant population and little to no challenge to this assumption by the respondent.

458. However redundant the supply of labour may be in the parish in which live, you probably are aware that it is still more redundant in Ireland?— I conceive so.³

1148. Supposing that the redundant labourers in the parish to which you belong, were willing to avail themselves of emigration to any of the possessions of the Crown, are you of opinion that there would be a

¹ ER1, E. J. Curteis, 114.

² ER1, J. Sebright, 124.

³ ER2, J. M. Turner, 41.

unanimous desire on the part of the rate payers to contribute to that object?—I have not the slightest doubt about it.¹

1224. Do you not consider that the main reason of the distress of the labourers now, compared with what it was then, arises from the redundancy of labourers, and the consequent depreciation of the price of labour?—Yes.²

1986. Do you consider that the present population is redundant, that it is a permanent tax upon the poor rates, a tax which must be rather expected to increase than to diminish?—Clearly so.³

2086. Is it your opinion that, according to the present state of the trade, the population in your district is beyond all dispute redundant?—Yes, certainly, it is impossible to find employment for them.⁴

These witnesses were generally from the elite of society, from Walter Burrell, a member of Parliament, to Thomas Bradbury, an overseer of the parish of Great Horwood, Buckinghamshire, the Reverend John Matthias Turner, and two industry men, William Feilden, a cotton manufacturer, and William Hulton, of the coal industry. These perspectives, while varied, do not represent the beliefs of the majority of people in England, nor do they present evidence to support this assertion.

Conversely, other witnesses were asked indirectly whether a redundant population existed in their parishes under the guise of a question on remedying the distress of their populations.

2248. Are you of opinion that the rate payers of Mildenhall would be disposed to avail themselves of any legislative measure, to charge themselves with a fund necessary to defray the expenses to get rid of the redundant poor?—I think they would.⁵

1971. Do you therefore contemplate that this redundant population will be left without hope of remedy, as a constant and increasing burthen upon

¹ ER1, W. Burrell, 102.

² ER2, T. Bradbury, 107.

³ ER2, W. Feilden, 177.

⁴ ER2, W. Hulton, 184.

⁵ ER2, T. Adams, 200.

your parishes ? — I see no prospect whatever of relief being afforded to them; it appears to me to be a permanent evil, I do not see how it is to be got over.¹

These questions, which address the possibility of emigration as a remedy to the population issue, reveal further divergences in the suggested solutions given by the witnesses. While many of the witnesses supported emigration in different forms as a remedy, others were less confident in its ability to eliminate the distress caused, as they perceived, by the redundant population. Others, however, maintained that emigration would be the most effective method of relieving the population in a more permanent manner.

It is now decidedly the opinion of the [London Relief] committee, that [emigration] is both the cheapest and the most effectual method. That it is the cheapest, may be proved by a very simple calculation; that it is the most effectual is matter of opinion, about which this Committee are much more competent to form their judgment than we are. We certainly are of that opinion, thinking that it is extremely advantageous to draw off the redundant population, as not only increasing the employment of those who remain, and raising their wages, but also as taking off the materials of future distress.²

The London Relief Committee, like many relief committees in the nineteenth century, was financed through philanthropy and subscription, therefore many of its members had a vested interest in removing their excess tenants. Their contributions to the committee would consequently provide them with a significant financial benefit if their plan to remove these tenants were successful.

The strategy for questioning during the third Emigration Committee was markedly differently from the first two, at least as regards the English witnesses. One witness was asked to analyze the level of redundancy in a mathematical way.

¹ ER2, W. Feilden, 176.

² ER2, Bishop of Chester, 201.

3871. You admit that if eight able labourers were to be employed in a parish only seven-eighths of the year each, or in other words only executed seven-eighths of the labour which they were capable of executing, in consequence of there being no real demand for their labour, that that would be equal to one labourer in complete redundancy?—In figures it would be equal to that; but I think the redundancy is greater than that proportion, because I do not think that the other seven would do what I consider an English labourer's day's work, in consequence of that redundancy of labour.¹

In his analysis, William Richard Cosway, a landowner residing in London and occasionally on his property in Kent, explained how the amount of required work is lowered by the lack of full employment for all laborers. Lack of demand for labor was clearly a central cause of the distress during this period and was more ubiquitous than the question of redundancy of population in the testimony collected during the three Committees.

The following two witnesses were not asked outright if they considered the populations in their areas to be redundant, but they considered whether the population was redundant in their answers to these suggestions of alternatives and effects of emigration.

2882. In the event of an emigration being carried on to a very considerably extent from the neighbourhood of Carlisle, do you not think there would be a tendency to an introduction of a greater number of Irishmen into that district?—I do not see what should induce them to come when we have no labour and nothing to employ them in, if, as we have already, a redundant population; there is no inducement for any new settler to come when we have not employment for those we have.²

Thomas Hunton was a master manufacturer of the Cotton trade in Carlisle, northwest England. In his answer to the suggestion that the removal of a surplus population through the means of emigration would lead to an influx of Irish laborers, he argues that

¹ ER3, W. R. Cosway, 379.

² ER3, T. Hunton, 283.

because of the lack of employment already existing in that region, there would be no reason for the Irish to attempt to find work there.

376i. Then you consider that there are no portions of waste land in England which it would be advantageous to cultivate, by settling persons at present destitute upon them ?—It would be impossible to settle persons upon them without building houses. There are districts in this country where the population does not appear to be redundant, and there are other districts where there is not a sufficiency of population; the idea of the Society was, that it might be possible to have a sort of local emigration by sending parties there; but as it would be necessary to provide them with a Residence, that would take as much money as to bring lands into cultivation.¹

William Couling was a civil engineer and land surveyor, as well as the director of an association for the purposes bettering the condition of the manufacturing and agricultural labourers. On the proposal of the reclamation of waste lands in England as an alternative to emigration as a remedy, the witness considers that it would be impossible to envisage such a proposition without including the necessity of building housing for those laborers. He seems to assert that there was a sufficient population to employ on this project, but that they would have to be relocated, perhaps, from the districts judged as having a redundant population. This would lead to a more evenly spread out population, which is an alternative that was suggested by some Irish witnesses.

During the first Emigration Committee, three Scottish witnesses gave testimony on the existence of a redundant population in their regions. Some of the witnesses responded frankly on their assessment of the existence of a redundant population in their regions.

¹ ER3, W. Couling, 367.

628. Are you acquainted with any part of Scotland, where at this moment the population is redundant to a great degree?—I am; in the northern part of the Western Hebrides the population may be said to be redundant.¹

687. Do you consider that the population of the district that you are acquainted with is redundant?—Yes, or rather likely to be so.²

Walter Frederick Campbell, a Whig member of Parliament for Argyllshire, spoke the most on this subject, asserting that the island where his property was located was not redundant, but that on his estate there were parts that were redundant, “where the land is not particularly good”, and is “capable of improvement”.³ He further discussed the possibility of a resurgence of redundant population in communities where people may have been removed by emigration.

635. As those inconveniencies arising from a redundancy of population have chiefly appeared in those islands where the landlords are not resident, do you think that the evil would not again recur in a short time, from subdivision, though the population might be for a time diminished?—I think it might, but it is not probable; for this reason, that many of the landlords there, whom I have heard speak upon the subject, would take very good care for the future to lay down their laws more strictly upon that subject.⁴

636. Do you think, though they have not the power of enforcing those laws at present, they would have the power of enforcing them if they got rid of some of the present redundant population?—I think they have seen the mischief of it so much now that they would take means to prevent it in future; I do not think in general there is a law to prevent sub-letting, but it is an understood thing; and I think they would take care for the future, in granting a lease, to lay it down so strictly that the tenant should not subdivide his property, that the son would be obliged to go elsewhere instead of settling upon his father’s farm.⁵

¹ ER1, W. F. Campbell, 73.

² ER2, H. Innes, 78.

³ ER1, W. F. Campbell, 75.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁵ *Idem.*

As many proprietors suggested in their testimony, they were prepared to prevent subdivision on their estates to impede a redundant population from forming, which included the case where a select group were removed by emigration per the Committee's proposed plan with the assistance of the parliamentary act preventing subdivision.

George M[a]cPherson-Grant, a member of Parliament for Sutherland and member of the Emigration Committee, explained that he had no knowledge of any redundant population in the interior of the Highlands, though his own property could have been improved by removing the population.

741. Are you aware that the population in any part of Scotland is in so redundant a state that it would be materially relieved by emigration?—I am not aware of it in any part of Scotland with which I am personally acquainted; my personal knowledge is mostly confined to the interior of the Highlands, where there is certainly a large population, and the lands are very minutely divided amongst them; but in my own district, in the interior of Inverness-shire, I could have improved my property very considerably, by converting it into sheep-land; it would be of advantage to myself, individually, if all those tenants were removed from the estate, but I had that feeling towards them that I did not wish to do so, and they live comfortably with regard to their own feelings; they live chiefly upon oatmeal and potatoes, and they are satisfied.¹

This perspective on improvement in the Scottish Highlands and Islands was common during the nineteenth century, though unlike MacPherson-Grant, some had no scruples removing their tenants to replace them with sheep grazing farms.

During the second Emigration Committee three Scottish witnesses testified on the redundant population in their regions. Thomas Francis Kennedy, a Whig member of Parliament for Ayrshire, asserted that the redundant population in Scotland was due to the influx of Irish labor to the region.

¹ ER1, G. McPherson-Grant, 80.

Now, while I should be the last person to say any thing hostile to a free intercourse between Scotland and Ireland, whether or not any restraint could be imposed upon the extent to which the Irish resort to Scotland, by rendering the law of settlement somewhat more difficult, I am not prepared to say; but I do think it is a point somewhat worthy of consideration, in order, if possible, to restrain the Irish from filling up any vacuum that might be created in the population in Scotland, and to check the evils of redundant population, which arise solely from the resort of Irish to the district of which I speak.¹

While other witnesses admitted that Irish laborers, mostly agricultural, had little to no effect on the laborers of their own countries, some contended that an influx of Irish would have a negative effect on the local laborers, and this witness argued that the redundant population and subsequent distress was directly caused by the presence of the Irish.

The final aspect addressed by the two remaining witnesses was the possible effects of a removal of the redundant population through emigration. William Spencer Northhouse, of the London Free Press Newspaper, representing Scottish Emigration Societies, testified on the effects of this removal for “capitalists” and local industries.

647. Are you of opinion that if those weavers who are now in the situation of being redundant workmen were to be removed, that machinery would increase beyond what at present exists, supposing there were a great increase of demand for the article?—I have not the least doubt of machinery increasing.²

648. Do you not therefore, in point of fact, consider that machinery is at this moment kept in some measure in abeyance by the circumstance of there being that redundant population out of employment?—To a certain extent it is; but machinery must always govern the wages of manual labour.³

¹ ER2, T. F. Kennedy, 26.

² ER2, W. S. Northhouse, 52.

³ *Idem.*

Northhouse expresses in his testimony how the manufacturing industries would respond to a removal of redundant laborers, indicating that an increase in machinery would follow. This could possibly lead to an increase in employment for those who remained, though not necessarily for all, considering that the introduction of power weaving in particular led to less demand for labor.

649. Under those circumstances you do not consider that any injury would accrue to the capitalist, from the abstraction of that portion of the population which may be considered as entirely redundant?—Great benefit must accrue to the capitalist, as the capitalist at present, from mere feelings of humanity, has to do much towards the sustenance of those persons whom he cannot employ.¹

He further explains that this removal would have no negative effect on the capitalists investing in the manufacturing industries in Scotland, primarily through constructing power weaving factories.

Finally, Alexander Campbell gave brief testimony on the number of people that should be removed in order to relieve the remaining population.

1740. With reference to the principle, that the removal of the excess of redundant pauper population will materially improve the condition of those who remain, are you enabled to furnish the Committee with any conjectural estimate as to the number of persons (measuring them in the proportion of families of five, consisting of a man, a woman, and three children) who might be removed from the neighbourhood of Glasgow and Paisley, in the course of the present year, and the comfort of those who remain be materially improved by such removal?— I have not turned my attention to an estimate of that description, but I should certainly think that the removal of those who are now applying to this Committee, and who are extremely anxious to remove, would have a decided, though probably a temporary effect in improving the condition of those who remain.²

¹ *Idem.*

² ER2, Alexander Campbell, 149.

Without giving a precise answer to the question of how many people should be removed, the witness contends that those who have petitioned for assistance, and are therefore willing, to emigrate, should be helped to do so, which would inherently lead to an improvement for those remaining.

We can see in these testimonies that there was an overwhelming agreement with little dissonant voices on the existence of a redundant population in Ireland, not only from Irish, but also English and Scottish witnesses.

Subletting

The next topic of subletting was discussed by seven of the nine witnesses for Ireland in the first Emigration Committee. This subject was of great importance during the time of the first Emigration Committee, which began on March 20, 1826, because a new law restricting subletting had been passed and was going into effect on May 5, 1826. The topic of subletting was completely overlooked during the second Emigration Committee, not only by the witnesses for Ireland, but by all others. On the other hand, the third Emigration Committee had greater interest in this topic, as ten of the witnesses for Ireland gave testimony on subletting.

Subletting was discussed by only one of the six witnesses for England in the first Emigration Committee, and two of the ten witnesses for England in the third Emigration Committee. Finally, the first Emigration Committee had one witness for Scotland who discussed subletting. Despite subletting being an important subject in justifying the existence of a redundant population in Ireland, land practices in the rest of the United Kingdom were clearly different which is shown by the lack of interest in subletting, particularly in preventing subletting, outside of Ireland.

Nearly all the witnesses agree that subletting had disastrous effects on the land and the population of Ireland. Two of the witnesses assert that the leases at the time

included covenants to prevent subletting, but in general, were not respected or enforced,¹ despite having been beneficial during the war period which ended in 1815. After the Napoleonic wars ended in 1815, agricultural prices decreased dramatically, which led to significant problems as rents had increased during the conflict and did not drop following the war.²

Multiple witnesses claim that subletting was a cause of the redundant population and general poverty and misery in Ireland,³ and that preventing this type of subdivision of land could slow the increase of population.⁴ This subject most likely became a significant concern because, according to one witness, landlords were beginning to suffer financially due to the subdivision of their estates.⁵ In addition to landlords, middlemen were also cautious about subletting because many had suffered financially after the war period,⁶ most likely due to the potential for lost income because of their tenants' inability to pay their rents.

Five of the witnesses explicitly say that subletting was the cause of the destruction of the soil as well as social problems and redundancy of the population. William W. Becher's testimony asserts that subletting deteriorated the value of property, increased rents, created misery, and led to a redundancy of the population.⁷ The other witnesses mentioned agree that subletting led to extreme poverty and distress, great mischief, and social problems.⁸

¹ ER1, W. W. Becher, 192; T. Odell, 207.

² ER1, W. Gabbett, 130.

³ ER3, J. Bodkin, 271; Wilson, 265.

⁴ ER3, J. Bodkin, 274, Strickland, 335.

⁵ ER3, Dixon, 259.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 264.

⁷ ER1, W. W. Becher, 191.

⁸ ER1, Ennismore, 198; W. Gabbett, 126; and Bishop of Limerick, 146.

With the exception of Alexander Nimmo's testimony, the witnesses agreed that subletting had a negative effect on the soil, with William Gabbett claiming that it led to insufficient produce to support the population. Thomas Odell added to this by explaining that large families led to further subdivision and ultimately starvation. Nimmo claimed that the soil in Ireland had been improved by subletting because of the introduction of spade culture and the extended cultivation.¹ The accuracy of this testimony is questionable because the witness was not an agriculturist, but a civil engineer. What is more, because of subletting, more acreage was under cultivation due to more people being present on smaller pieces of land, which did not necessarily lead to more beneficial agricultural techniques.

Finally, the upcoming Subletting Act was seen as a beneficial step in reducing subletting overall, and was supported by a majority of the witnesses mentioned here.² Despite this support for the act, two witnesses believed the system of middleman management of estates could pose some resistance to the prevention of subletting. Middlemen during this period gained significant profits from subletting and would not be willing to give it up, or to contribute to emigration, as it would reduce their profits from rents collected.³

Anthony Richard Blake, a prominent Catholic lawyer from County Galway, had previously given evidence on landlord tenant relations to the Irish Committees which resulted in the Subletting Act of 1826, which prevented subletting without the landlord's consent. In his testimony, he explains the provisions of the Act in three parts: one, that the covenants in previous leases against subletting were to be enforced, two, the law against subletting applied to all future leases, and three, it protected the tenant in a

¹ ER1, Nimmo, 190.

² ER1, Ennismore, 198; W. Gabbett, 131; Bishop of Limerick, 146; and T. Odell, 207.

³ ER1, W. Gabbett, 129; T. S. Rice, 211.

sublease when landlord permission was given. Blake explains that this Act was in response to the system of subletting that he claims was widespread in Ireland and that had led to a considerable increase of population. Despite the enactment of this Act, there were reports that subletting continued.¹ In addition, he asserts that landlords wanted to prevent subletting due to the fact that when land was overly subdivided, rent arrears were high.

Steps were taken by many proprietors to end subletting on their estates, by ending and not renewing leases upon their expiration, thereby ejecting tenants from their property. Landowners felt that these ejectments were necessary to consolidate their farms, and that they could prevent the further subdivision of land by doing so.² Despite these removals of tenants, some witnesses claim that the population of Ireland in its actual state was not more than could be maintained and that a greater population could be supported if the land were better managed.³

When the testimony turned to the witnesses' own estates, opinions diverged. On the one hand, Robert S. Tighe claims a redundant population exists upon his own estate due to subdivision which he asserts added a great number of tenants. He says that this could be resolved by better management of land to help relieve the distress and prevent a further redundant population.⁴ On the other hand, Robert Browne, who was not resident on his estate, claims there is no redundant population on his property because there is no subdivision allowed. He asserts that there are only two or three tenants who have subtenants and that he plans to end subletting at the end of their leases.⁵ These two witnesses show a divergence in the views of landlords, which can be explained by the

¹ ER3, D. J. Wilson, 293.

² ER3, Wm. Murphy, 386; T. S. Rice, 447.

³ ER3, J. R. Elmore, 464; J. L. Foster, 308.

⁴ ER3, R. S. Tighe, 441, 443.

⁵ ER3, R. Browne, 270.

fact that one was resident on his estate and the other was an absentee, meaning one was reporting on first-hand knowledge of his estate, while the other was reliant on second-hand reports from those managing his property.

The one English witness during the first Emigration Committee who spoke about subletting was from the Kent area, where the practice of gavelkind was active, in which land was equally divided among the heirs upon the death of a tenant.¹ This practice led to an extreme subdivision of property in the areas where it existed, namely in the county of Kent and some areas of Ireland and Wales. Similarly, the single witness for Scotland, Walter who discussed subletting during the first Emigration Committee, Walter Frederick Campbell, signaled a similar practice taking place in the Western Hebrides. He claims that,

A farmer, for instance, in those islands receives from his landlord a lease of a farm, we will suppose sixty or seventy, or perhaps an hundred acres of arable land; he has two or three sons, those sons marry, and to each son he gives a portion of his farm; those sons again divide the farm into a great many subdivisions; and though the farm is quite sufficient in itself to maintain one family, and the children, when they are young, when they come to subdivide it among many, each division having an immense family to support, the farm is not competent to support all their families, though it would one.²

In addition, he states that on his own property this practice is forbidden and that landlords have the power to prevent this type of subletting,³ as previous witnesses asserted.

Finally, despite the importance of Malthus's political influence and testimony during the third Emigration Committee, the only evidence he gave on the subject of subletting in Ireland was to say that this practice contributed to the levels of population

¹ ER1, Thomas Law Hodges, 136.

² ER1, W. F. Campbell, 73-74.

³ *Ibid.*, 74, 76.

in the 1820s and that the Subletting Act should help prevent the filling up of the vacuum left by the removed population.¹

The witnesses who testified on the question of distress, whether in Ireland, Scotland, or England, the existence of a redundant population and subletting, though coming from different political backgrounds, all overwhelmingly agreed on several points. First, that the distress in Ireland was more severe than in Scotland or England, and that this warranted the focus of the Emigration Committees on that country. Second, that a redundant population existed in Ireland, which negatively affected all members of the laboring classes by bringing down wages and generally lower living conditions. Finally, the middleman system of subletting was a major factor in contributing to the existence of the redundant population in Ireland, which justified the recent parliamentary legislation meant to end that institution. The evidence given on the matter of distress was a way the Committees displayed the conditions in the United Kingdom in order to bolster their choice of emigration as a solution to these problems.

4.2 Emigration plans

Over the three Emigration Committees, numerous aspects regarding emigration plans were discussed by the witnesses, who expressed a great variety of opinions on the subject. The testimony covered a range of subjects, including seasonal migration, voluntary emigration, the government plan and suggested plans, previous settlers in Canada, the desire to emigrate, and a comparison of other remedies besides emigration.

¹ ER3, Malthus, 312, 320.

Seasonal migration

Seasonal migration was an important part of the economic activity of the agricultural laborers of Ireland. Every year a number of them would go to England or Scotland to work in those countries until harvest time, primarily for potatoes, in Ireland in the fall. This meant that there were Irish laborers working regularly outside of their home country as a way to complement their annual activity. William Henry Bodkin, a British barrister and secretary of the Mendicity Society in London, who spoke of Irish migrants in London, reported that while the number of seasonal migrants had not increased in the previous three years, they would not hesitate to accept any assistance to emigrate elsewhere.

2348. Do you think that if means were provided, and the offer made to them to emigrate to any of our settlements, and be there provided for, they would be inclined to go?—I think many of them would.

2349. Do you mean that you think those would be inclined to go who have not actually become depraved?—I mean those who are on the neutral ground as it were, just upon the verge of profligacy and vice; I think that a great many under such circumstances would gladly avail themselves of such an offer.¹

Hugh Dixon similarly asserted that some families would agree to emigrate to other parts of the Kingdom if they had the means to do so.

2501. Is there not a disposition on the part of the families to emigrate to other parts of the United Kingdom?—I think they would all go if they could; but unfortunately those people that are for going are the most industrious, and wish to better themselves; but the lowest possible class cannot; I think they would be glad to go, if they had the ways and means.²

¹ ER1, W. H. Bodkin, 215.

² ER3, H. Dixon, 258.

This testimony makes it clear that the Committee was also considering the regular movement of underemployed people when calculating the emigration needs of the Irish people.

Voluntary emigration

Voluntary emigration was how most people left Ireland during this period. It was called voluntary because they were able to leave using their own financial means or prepaid passages funded by their relations who had already emigrated, primarily to Canada or the United States. In the testimony given to the Committee on this subject, many witnesses asserted that a government plan would lead to further voluntary emigration, as those who remained in Ireland and elsewhere would receive favorable accounts from their friends and, thereby, inducing them to emigrate as well. This phenomenon had already taken place in years previous, as demonstrated by the levels of prepaid passages and remittances in the emigration trade, and by the following testimony:

2116. If, therefore, emigration were to be carried into effect as an experiment upon an extended scale, and judicious selections were to be made from all parts of the country where redundant population was found to exist, are you of opinion that voluntary emigration would be the consequence, and that there would be no expense to government?—I have no doubt of it; I have seen those people by hundreds in the brokers' offices at the port of Cork, where they have stated, as the reason for their anxiety to go, the invitations sent over to them from their friends in Canada; there have been also invitations from a great number that have passed to the United States, and they state that that is the cause of their emigration.¹

¹ ER1, R. O'Driscoll, 196.

The evidence from Peter Robinson, who superintended the Wilmot-Horton experiments of 1823 and 1825, gives a more detailed projection for how voluntary emigration would be affected by a government plan.

3665. Supposing the Government of this country, for a succession of five or six years, were to afford facilities to families, comprising eight or ten thousand persons of respectable character, to locate themselves in different parts of the North American colonies, would not that give a facility to a voluntary emigration of individuals almost to the same extent?—More than double the extent; I am convinced that for every 1000 persons you locate, you would get 2000 voluntary emigrants to join their friends.

3666. Then if a system of emigration were carried on to the extent that has been mentioned, of sending out eight or ten thousand persons annually for five or six consecutive years, might not a voluntary emigration establish itself afterwards without any assistance from the Government?—The voluntary emigration would be very much increased by it, but only to the extent of double the amount; probably it would be limited to the extent of the connexions of those people.¹

Despite the Committee asking the same question twice, Robinson clearly states that voluntary emigration would exceed the levels of government assistance for emigrants by two to one, which could be interpreted to mean that every emigrant could influence or assist an average of two emigrants. This would effectively make voluntary emigration part of the government plan and continue the planned reduction of overcrowded regions, which, as previously mentioned, primarily concerned the population of Ireland.

Government plan/suggested plan

On the subject of the government plan, many witnesses testified on this topic and made their own suggestions for the formulation of this plan, with most agreeing that a government plan was necessary and giving their own opinions on what would be most beneficial.

¹ ER3, P. Robinson, 353.

One witness suggested a precise number of laborers who should be removed from Ireland, though others were vaguer in their assessments. Thomas Odell, most likely a resident landowner in County Limerick, recommended removing ten percent of the laboring class, which he claimed “would materially benefit those who remained”,¹ primarily by improving wages, and in conjunction with additional measures to prevent a recurrence of this perceived excess population. Several witnesses agreed with this perspective, that emigration alone would not be sufficient to resolve the distress in Ireland.

Anthony Richard Blake similarly stressed that “a well-organized system of Emigration, acting as auxiliary to a general improvement in the management of landed property, is highly desirable”,² thus agreeing that emigration alone was not the only step to be taken to ameliorate the conditions of the Irish poor, but a method of improving the estates would also be required. However, his own testimony contradicts this point of view when he admits that in order to prevent a further overpopulation, the destruction of cottages and other poor habitations would be necessary to improve the estates.

4370. In the case of a landlord removing his population, and throwing his property into larger farms, would he not necessarily pull down the cabins of those tenants who were ejected?—I should consider such a proceeding to be matter of course.³

This would have advantages exclusively for the proprietors and would likely have little to no benefit for the working poor.

Unlike the previous witness, John Leslie Foster admitted that the removal of the extra population would materially benefit landlords and that the introduction of an emigration system would increase their annual income, stating, “it would be extremely

¹ ER1, T. Odell, 210.

² ER3, A. R. Blake, 459.

³ *Ibid.*, 458.

advantageous to landed proprietors; they are already quite of that opinion, and almost panic-struck at the increase of population”.¹ Further witnesses also testified to the necessity of improving estates together with an emigration program, without providing further detail as to the beneficiaries of said improvements.

4242. Do you not conceive that in order to give effect to the same system of improvement upon which you have acted, in other districts of Ireland equally over-peopled, it would be absolutely indispensable that some system of Emigration should go hand in hand with that improvement?—Undoubtedly.

4243. Do you consider that a growing disposition prevails in landlords in Ireland to get rid of the pauper tenantry ?—Yes, the expulsion of the superabundant population is now generally considered the primary step preparatory to all other improvements, for, without such a measure, improvements would be rendered nugatory.²

This testimony shows that the primary concern of the proprietors was their own estates and not the wellbeing of their tenants. A government emigration plan would simply be a way of avoiding paying for the emigration of their tenants themselves in a scheme to make improvements on their estates with financing from the government.

It was suggested that any plan ought to be superintended by the government, with one witness stating that, “being under the protection and under the superintendence of a direct agent of Government, from the time they embarked on board the ship till they were located, would be a considerable advantage to the measure”.³ When asked how far proprietors would be willing to contribute, the same witness asserted that they would pay the entirety of the cost of passage, though he expressed the wish to “enable Government to have the superintendence of it [...] to have the hand and mind of Government in every part of the plan”.⁴ This perspective is

¹ ER3, J. L. Foster, 308.

² ER3, J. M. Marshall, 411.

³ ER3, R. S. Tighe, 443-444.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 445.

demonstrated by the later analysis of financial contributions to a government plan, upon which few of the witnesses could agree on a single method or source to finance the plan.

The general, yet vague, details of the plans put forth by the Committee were more or less agreed upon by the witnesses. One aspect of the plan was that only people of a certain age and able-bodied would be chosen to participate in the plan, to which most witnesses agreed. John Scott Vandeleur, a magistrate and landowner in County Clare, agreed that a system that selected the proper persons to emigrate would be an advantage to the population and that those persons would have to be in a good state of health and of a certain age.¹ The only other point that the Committee seemed to insist upon in its plan was that the people chosen would be resettled primarily in Canada and possibly in other British colonies where there was a need for laborers. This will be shown by the testimony concerning previous settlers in Canada, which came from Canadian, but also Irish, English, and Scottish witnesses.

Settlers in Canada

The subject of previous settlers in Canada was heavily discussed by the witnesses for Canada in all three Emigration Committees. In the first Emigration Committee, witnesses from Ireland, England, Scotland, in addition to Canada, gave testimony on previous settlers to Canada, contrary to the second and third Emigration Committees, where mostly witnesses for Canada, and three for Scotland, gave evidence on this subject.

Of the nine witnesses for Ireland in the first Emigration Committee, six discussed previous settlers in Canada. Their testimony asserts that they have received positive accounts from the previous settlers in Canada, especially the emigrants taken out by Peter Robinson in 1823. They believe that these positive reports have led to an increase

¹ ER3, J. S. Vandeleur, 300.

in the desire to emigrate of the laboring classes who remain in Ireland, as confirmed by the testimony of William Wrixon Becher, who claims to have received a significant number of applications for emigration assistance after the 1823 Robinson emigration took place.¹ The Lord Viscount Ennismore reinforces this testimony by stating that the positive accounts from settlers in Canada have created interest among the “lower orders” who cannot support themselves in going to Canada.² In addition, the witnesses claim that settlers in Canada have expressly invited their friends and family to join them there via letters explaining the benefits of their new circumstances.³ Ultimately, the testimony asserts that the emigration experiments will lead to significantly more voluntary emigration.⁴

The witnesses for Scotland and England spoke of previous emigrants to Canada, from whom they received positive accounts. George MacPherson-Grant speaks of a group of about a dozen tenants who chose to emigrate to Canada between 1809 and 1810 as a result of changes he made on his estate.⁵ He explains that they sold off their belongings from their farms and, as a result, went to Canada with some money as a result, approximately £30 to £40 each,⁶ though he would have liked more to go.⁷ After four years, he claims that they had all returned, disappointed with their situation, though he did not know where in Canada they had been.⁸ This testimony contrasts with the remaining witnesses, who received only favorable accounts from previous settlers in Canada.

¹ ER1, W. W. Becher, 193.

² ER1, Ennismore, 199.

³ ER1, Bishop of Limerick, 143.

⁴ ER1, W. W. Becher, 193; Ennismore, 199; W. Gabbett, 130; and R. O’Driscoll, 196.

⁵ ER1, George MacPherson-Grant, 80.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 80.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 81.

Joseph Foster, a working hand-loom weaver and president of the Glasgow Emigration Society, says his brother left to live in Grenville Township, Canada, with his wife and two children, where he received a government grant of land after paying his own passage. After spending eight years in Canada, his brother has established himself there and is in a prosperous situation.¹

William Spencer Northhouse testifies that in 1820 a group went to Canada “in a state of utter destitution”, but who are now in a positive situation.² The removal of the group cost £700 for a vessel, averaging about £4 to £5 per person including provisions. In addition, he claims many have gone to Canada with a small sum of money.³

Archibald Campbell says that people wanting to emigrate are aware of the situation in Canada due to correspondence with previous emigrants, which detail extremely favorable circumstance. He has seen some letters from settlers who went out in 1820 giving favorable accounts of their situations in Upper Canada.⁴

The advantages of the different provinces of Canada were exalted by numerous witnesses for Canada. Some were of opinion that the provinces would be improved in prosperity by the absorption of emigrants.

William Bowman Felton, a Legislative Counsellor for Lower Canada and agent for Crown lands, says the prosperity of Lower Canada would be increased by an injection of industrious emigrants,⁵ and that the 20,000 emigrants who arrived in 1827 would be an advantage to the local economy.⁶ The evidence from this witness is not unexpected due to his position as an agent for Crown lands, his job was to advocate for the

¹ ER2, Joseph Foster, 11.

² ER2, W. S. Northhouse, 54.

³ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁴ ER2, Archibald Campbell, 19.

⁵ ER1, W. B. Felton, 30.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 49.

advantages of the region. Jonathan Sewell says that there is very good land for cultivation in Lower Canada,¹ and Benedict P. Wagner expanded on that information claiming that the climate below Quebec is not well suited for growing grains, especially wheat, but that if the emigrants are habituated with fisheries they will prosper in the area.²

In addition to the advantages of Lower Canada, Richard Uniacke, the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, reports that the region has greater advantages than Upper Canada, citing the less expensive passage.³ He continues by claiming that the cost of provisions for the new settlers would also be less, estimating a savings of one-third,⁴ basing this estimation on his own experience transporting and settling people there in the past. Henry Bliss, a land agent for New Brunswick, makes similar claims, stating that emigrants could be directed to New Brunswick more easily due to the shorter passage than to Quebec, more opportunities than in Nova Scotia in the form of employment and assistance for settlement.⁵ Furthermore, Captain HW Scott, a land surveyor, who resided in both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, states that there are numerous tracts of unsettled land in both regions, which he believes could receive a large number of settlers (300-400).⁶

Several witnesses gave additional evidence on the outcomes of emigrations to Canada preceding the experiments of 1823 and 1825.

Alexander Carlisle Buchanan, a landowner in Lower Canada who testified during all three Emigration Committees, reports that the settlers in Upper Canada have generally prospered⁷ and that previous emigrants to Canada could encourage more

¹ ER3, J. Sewell, 391.

² ER3, B. P. Wagner, 358.

³ ER1, R. J. Uniacke, 37.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 37.

⁵ ER1, Henry Bliss, 112.

⁶ ER2, Captain H. W. Scott, 221.

⁷ ER1, A. C. Buchanan, 169.

voluntary emigration,¹ a perspective echoed by other witnesses. He further asserts that emigration from Londonderry since 1815 had exceeded 30,000 to Canada and that arrivals in Quebec had been between 10,000 and 12,000 annually in the previous ten years.² This assertion is not inconsistent with the historical record, which shows that at the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the War of 1812, emigration resumed its previous pace, when approximately 6,000 to 9,000 left Ireland for North America in 1816 and 1817, with that number quickly doubling and growing further in the following years.

Lieutenant-Colonel James Pattison Cockburn was the superintendent of military settlements in Upper Canada, which were established between 1816 and 1817. These military settlements were established for discharged soldiers and their families, who received between 1,200 acres for the highest-ranking officers and 100 acres for a private soldier.³ The earliest settlers had varying improvements upon their lands, with some meeting with great success and others having difficulties due to unexpected circumstances, such as illness, injury, fire, or simply a crop failure.⁴ While the settlement continued to welcome newly discharged soldiers for six to seven years after being established, a few left their lands to go to the United States. Overall, the settlement grew and was prosperous.

Captain Henry William Scott, a Royal Navy Officer, helped establish the Dalhousie Settlement in Nova Scotia. This settlement originally accommodated 300 settlers who were voluntary emigrants principally from Scotland, and who had furnished their own money to pay for their grants of land. Each settler received approximately 100

¹ ER2, A. C. Buchanan, 74.

² ER1, A. C. Buchanan, 169.

³ ER1, J. P. Cockburn, 147.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 148.

acres and general reports were positive which led to the growth of the settlement through further voluntary emigration.¹

Numerous witnesses for Canada gave positive views of the new circumstances of the settlers who emigrated during the 1823 and 1825 experiments. George Markland, an Executive Counsellor of Upper Canada, recounts that he has had generally positive news of the settlers, “[t]hat they were managing exceedingly well, and were very comfortable and happy, both those who went first, and those who went afterwards”.² This information was gathered secondhand, as the witness had not seen the settlers himself and did not reside in the same area as the settlement. Likewise, Henry John Boulton, who had not seen the emigrants in their settlements, reports that they are in good health and well clothed. Their houses were warm, square log buildings made of tree trunks that were better than what they left in Ireland.³ Boulton, in his role as Solicitor-General of Upper Canada, had occasion to see some of the settlers as a result of some disturbances that took place amongst themselves and between them and some previous inhabitants, but that there had been no disturbances since then.⁴ John Rolph, member of the legislature of Upper Canada, says that the emigrants of 1823 and 1825 have been an advantage to Upper Canada,⁵ though it is unclear if he himself has seen them on their lands.

A similar number of witnesses gave firsthand knowledge of the emigrants in their new settlements. The Reverend John Strachan, Archdeacon of York, Upper Canada, saw some of the 1823 emigrants who he says are well settled and pleased with their new situations.⁶ In addition, he says the settlers have been so successful as to have surplus

¹ ER2, H. W. Scott, 218-220.

² ER1, George Markland, 34.

³ ER1, H. J. Boulton, 22.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁵ ER1, John Rolph, 204.

⁶ ER1, Reverend Dr. John Strachan, 157.

produce to sell,¹ and claims that previous settlements in Upper Canada have also been successful.² Captain James Dent Weatherley, a retired captain of the Royal Army, resided near the 1823 settlement and testified during the second Emigration Committee. He claims that there had been a high level of success of the settlers, who have made improvements on the buildings and the grounds they occupied.³

Finally, Peter Robinson, who was personally selected by Robert Wilmot-Horton to be the superintendent of the emigration experiments of 1823 and 1825, gave testimony to the third Emigration Committee. He recounts the details of his selection of the emigrants and other details of the arrangements he made for their settlement. The settlers were supplied with fifteen months of provisions after their arrival, after which time they were able to provide for themselves.⁴ Since their settlement, he reports that the settlers have prospered greatly, and he estimates that the value of the produce of their labor was approximately £11,272 sterling in 1826.⁵

The significance of this testimony is that it came on the heels of the second emigration experiment organized by Wilmot-Horton and Peter Robinson, compared to the second and third committees, where this subject was of less significance to the witnesses for Ireland. The first committee's main objective, as decided by Wilmot-Horton, was to develop a government-aided emigration plan on the model of the experiments that took place in 1823 and 1825. The testimony provided here generally suggests the settlers were in a better situation than they were in their home countries, while simultaneously supporting the proposed government plan based on the principles set out by the 1823 and 1825 experiments.

¹ *Ibid.*, 158.

² *Ibid.*, 164.

³ ER2, Captain J. D. Weatherley, 88-89.

⁴ ER3, Peter Robinson, 349.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 350.

Desire to emigrate

Due to previous instances of forced removal, particularly in the case of Irish convicts, the desire to emigrate was a perspective that the Committee was concerned with to reassure the public that the government plan would not be enacted with force. The following testimony will show the varying degrees of willingness expressed by the witnesses, which went from general agreement that their communities wanted to emigrate to an unawareness of the desire of the populations they represented.

The seventeen Irish witnesses who testified generally agreed that the poor in their communities were willing to emigrate. In a similar fashion to other questions, the witnesses were directly asked if they were aware of the people's willingness to emigrate, often employing the words "willing", "disposition", and "desirous". The formulations of this question varied only slightly from one witness to the next:

1212. You have stated, that there is a disposition to emigrate?—A very considerable disposition.¹

2072. Is there a disposition among the lower class of persons to follow their countrymen?—I think there is a feeling of that kind.²

2174. Do you think that the lower classes would be ready and willing, upon any encouragement given, to emigrate in great numbers to the same district from which they have already received accounts?—Perfectly willing, and very desirous.³

3066. Can you inform the Committee, whether, in your opinion, there is a great anxiety to emigrate among those who remain?—I think there is.⁴

These answers, though not precise, reveal a general desire to emigrate among the distressed populations, which contrasts with the testimony of the Scottish and English witnesses, including the questions they were asked by the Committee. This line of

¹ ER1, W. Gabbett, 125.

² ER1, W. W. Becher, 193.

³ ER1, Visc. Ennismore, 199.

⁴ ER3, D. J. Wilson, 296.

questioning involved the willingness of individual parishes and proprietors to take advantage of any emigration plan instituted by government.

Scottish proprietors voiced willingness to take part in the government plan to remove their tenants, as expressed by Walter Frederick Campbell, himself a proprietor and member of Parliament for Argyllshire:

645. Do you think that the proprietors, who have not the convenience of a large proportion of spare land, would be glad to embrace the offer of an advantageous scheme of emigration for some of the redundant population on their estates? — I certainly think they would.¹

This perspective was repeated by English witnesses regarding parishes wishing to utilize a government program for removing paupers in their communities, including Thomas Law Hodges, a landowner in county Kent:

1379. Are you of opinion that the parishes would be disposed to avail themselves of any facilities for the purpose of effecting the emigration of those paupers to any British colony? — I have no doubt whatever of that fact; in short I have made inquiry throughout several parishes lately, and I found them all most desirous of having the opportunity.²

This view is not unexpected, as many of the proprietors who testified expressed their desire to remove their surplus tenants on their estates.

Interestingly, some witnesses testified that the mere existence of the Emigration Committee was raising expectations among the population that they might receive assistance to emigrate, particularly in Scotland, which was demonstrated by the number of petitions to the government for this type of assistance.

232. Do you think that the appointment of this Committee is likely to create an expectation among the persons desirous of emigrating in your part of the country that they are to get great assistance from Government to enable them to go to America? — There can be no question that the

¹ *Idem.*

² ER1, T. L. Hodges, 134.

petitions I have presented are founded upon a hope that something of the sort may be done; and there can be as little doubt that the reference of those petitions to a Committee expressly appointed upon that subject, must excite a very general hope and expectation.¹

262. Does it consist with your knowledge that the appointment of this Committee has created much expectation on the part of persons desirous of emigrating, that they are to get considerable assistance from the Government to carry them to North America?—I am inclined to think it has created expectations.²

Petitions were a way for the general population to bring their concerns to Parliament, as their local representative would present their interests to government with the view of assisting their constituents. While some witnesses reported few or no petitions were made from their regions, others testified that they had received and presented several, with one Scottish witness reporting that he had presented nine petitions for emigration assistance for different communities in the county of Renfrew.³

Some English witnesses asserted that their populations were not particularly interested in emigration, but that they could be induced to emigrate if the advantages of the government plan were presented to them.

1568. Do you think that if the advantages which might be looked to in removing to a British colony, were explained to the paupers, some families would be induced to make the experiment? – I have no doubt of it.⁴

1712. Do you think that if the prospect of relief from that state of dependence, by being sent out to Canada, were held out to those persons, they would be ready to avail themselves of it? — I think, if they generally understood it, they would feel it a very desirable thing, for there are a great many of the parishioners who are able-bodied men, who are willing to get work, and cannot get work to do.

¹ ER2, T. F. Kennedy, 24.

² ER2, H. H. Drummond, 27.

³ ER2, J. Maxwell, 50.

⁴ ER2, T. Lacoste, 138.

1713. And that class of persons, you think, would feel disposed to assent to the proposition? – I think so.¹

2090. Would it, in your opinion, be advisable for parishes and townships situate as those you have described, to get rid of a certain proportion of the population, supposing them to be charged with a sum equal to two or three years purchase of the poor rates laid out upon that family? — Speaking as a landed proprietor, I should be very happy to see such a measure carried into effect; and I have no doubt that, by proper explanation to the people themselves, they would be willing to avail themselves of it.²

This assessment could perhaps be explained by the desire of the proprietors to remove tenants on their estates, while the laborers did not perceive themselves as being in such dire circumstances as to envision emigration as a solution to their plight.

On the opposite side, some witnesses claimed their communities were outright unwilling to emigrate. One Scottish witness, George MacPherson-Grant, explained that 17 or 18 years previous, a dozen of his tenants emigrated to Canada, but after they all returned to Scotland within four years, “from that moment [he] could not get one from that district to agree to emigrate”.³ Further, James Taylor, the overseer of Feltham, Middlesex, asserted that the poorest in his community would not agree to emigrate to Canada, and moreover, that they would not be successful if they were to do so:

1629. Do you think those degraded paupers, whom you call profligate, would be ready to go to Canada, and commence clearing land? — They are not so likely as those I should call the industrious poor, and I do not think they would be likely to succeed so well. I believe there are a number of industrious poor in our parish, and men who would put up with a great deal of privation to keep off the parish.⁴

¹ ER2, S. Maine, 146.

² ER2, W. Hulton, 185.

³ ER1, G. MacPherson-Grant, 81.

⁴ ER2, J. Taylor, 142.

Others, surprisingly, claimed to be unaware of the desire to emigrate in their communities. William Henley Hyett, while traveling through Lancashire had not heard any expression of desire to emigrate, but only upon returning received communication from a proprietor there “who stated there were fifty families in his neighbourhood, who were wishing for the means of emigrating”.¹ Others simply reported that they had never had a conversation on the subject:

378. Did there seem to you to be a very strong wish on the part of the distressed inhabitants of Manchester, to emigrate? — It was a question I never asked any one of them; I was desirous of exciting no feeling upon that or any other subject; I was there as a private individual.²

1179. Do you think there is a strong disposition on the part of those persons unemployed in this parish to remove to North America of their own will? — I do not know, I never asked any body upon the subject; I only know, as far as the farmers and landowners are concerned, they would be very glad to send them.³

1229. Have you ever happened to hear this subject of emigration talked of? — Yes, we have read it in the papers.

1230. Have you ever heard any expression on the part of these poor people, that they would be disposed to go? — No.⁴

It is curious that these witnesses traveled to London for the purpose of testifying on the subject of emigration in their communities, yet had no awareness of whether the people who would be affected by a government emigration plan would want to participate and agree to be resettled in Canada. This may demonstrate the class separation between the elites and the poorest members of society in a very stark way, that those advocating for this program did not appear concerned about the preference of those whose lives would be altered by this plan.

¹ ER2, W. H. Hyett, 217.

² ER2, T. Moody, 35.

³ ER2, W. Burrell, 104.

⁴ ER2, T. Bradbury, 107.

Emigration vs. other remedies

Some witnesses went so far as to suggest alternatives to establishing an emigration plan, most notably a repeal or revision of the Passenger Vessels Acts and the reclamation of bogs and wastelands, though some advocated for a combination of these as the best solution.

The Passenger Vessels Acts were a form of legislation intended to protect emigrants by limiting the number of passengers allowed depending on the size of the vessel, as well as requiring a certain number of food and water provisions and a surgeon to accompany the voyage. Some witnesses argued that the result, or possibly the intention, of this legislation was to raise the cost of passage, leading to lower levels of voluntary emigration, as was the case, for example, with the testimony of Richard John Uniacke, His Majesty's Counsel and Attorney-General of Nova Scotia:

The Acts that gave rise to that regulation were calculated, I have no doubt, upon principles of humanity and principles of great benevolence, nobody can find fault with the principles that gave rise to those Acts; but in their operation I am confident that they have operated directly the reverse of what the legislature intended, for it has kept people at home in a state of actual starvation, whose little means, if left to themselves to make use of, would have enabled them to escape from that state. They would have perhaps encountered much difficulty in the outward voyage, but it would have at least taken them away to a country where they would have been removed from any kind of starvation; but the expense is now so great that the voluntary emigration is almost put an end to.¹

This evidence suggests that one of the unintended consequences of the establishment of these regulations was that it led to a reduction in voluntary emigration and, according to this witness, a higher level of distress in places where people were no longer able to

¹ ER1, R. J. Uniacke, 38.

emigrate. Others suggested that the increase in the cost of passage was the direct intention of government in establishing these regulations:

599. Is there any other regulation in the Act, which you conceive to have tended to put a stop to this kind of emigration, other than the limitation of the number of persons to the tonnage of the ship?—The whole Act is calculated to raise the expense.¹

735. The original Passage Act of the 43d of the late King was framed with reference to the suggestions of the Highland Society; was it not part of the object of the Highland Society, by increasing the expense of the passage, to check the spirit of emigration which at the date of that Act prevailed?—I rather think it was.²

While the annual statistics on emigration during this period were mainly based on approximations and observations, documentary evidence, in addition to witness testimony, shows an increase in the cost of passage to North America following the passage of the Passenger Vessels Act in 1803, with a relaxation of the regulations in 1817, followed by amendments in 1823 and 1825 reinforcing the requirements of the Act. The Committee appeared to be considering suggesting to Parliament a repeal of this Act in order to lower the cost of passage and, thereby, increase the emigration of the poor.

600. Do you conceive that the repeal of some of the provisions of that Act would have the effect of renewing that tide of emigration, without the assistance of government?— I am confident that if each governor was authorized to give to the master of every vessel, who landed in the colonies his passengers in good health, say twenty shillings, or ten shillings a head, as a kind of premium for his exertion in taking care of them, that the passengers would be brought in in as good health, and as well, as they are now under the parliamentary regulations. There was certainly one or two instances of great abuse, in carrying out passengers to Canada, by which the passengers suffered very much; but these cases were of rare occurrence, and I believe the thing might not happen again for half a century.³

¹ ER1, R. J. Uniacke, 71.

² ER1, H. Innes, 80.

³ ER1, R. J. Uniacke, 71.

The only other testimony on this subject in the first Emigration Committee regarded the provisions afforded to passengers, which the Committee and the witnesses appeared to view as excessive.

733. Are you aware of the regulations in the Passage Act of the 4th of the King, c. 86, requiring certain quantities of provisions to be laid in for the use of the emigrants?—Yes.

734. Do those regulations appear to you to provide more largely than the necessity of the case and the habits of the people would require?— The people certainly are not accustomed to live so well.¹

Though few witnesses testified on the subject of the Passenger Vessels Act, after the first Emigration Committee in 1826, this Act was repealed. This led to further discussion of the Act and a proposal for a new Act in the third Emigration Committee in 1827. The most poignant testimony on this topic was given by William Sudlow Fitzhugh, who was appointed in 1823 by the American Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool to assist poor emigrants leaving from that port city. He also worked as a shipping agent, working as a sort of intermediary between the shipowners and the passengers, helping to arrange their transport. Fitzhugh asserted that legal protection of poor emigrants is necessary, particularly because those passengers were unaware of the provisions of the law and had insufficient recourse in the case that they were taken advantage of in contracting passage, which he claimed he had witnessed since being appointed to his position.² Following the repeal in 1827, a proposal of new regulations was being debated by Parliament and a new draft bill was formulated, which Fitzhugh had analyzed in detail. He expressed that the new bill would be insufficient to protect passengers before explaining his critique of the bill in a long, detailed answer, going clause by clause throughout the proposal.³

¹ ER1, H. Innes, 80.

² ER2, W. S. Fitzhugh, 189-190.

³ *Ibid.*, 190-191.

2163. Have you read over the printed paper, entitled, A Bill to repeal certain parts of what has been called the Passengers Act, and the manuscript draft of another Bill for the same purpose?—I have.

2165. Do you think that the last mentioned Bill, in manuscript, if passed into a law, would be sufficient to afford fair and adequate protection to the poorer class of emigrants?—I think not quite.¹

Fitzhugh's analysis covered a range of details of the bill, including the food provisions suggested in the new legislation. He suggested that potatoes should be included in the provisions for emigrants, though the 1803 Act only required 1½ lb. of "breadstuffs", ½ lb. of meal, and ½ pint of molasses daily, while the 1817 amendment slightly altered the food provisions required for vessels and also changed the application of the previous legislation, exempting British vessels carrying passengers to the Canadian provinces.² Further amendments adjusted the requirements for food provisions in 1823 and 1825, though none of them included potatoes in the requirements.

Fitzhugh further suggested precision on the qualifications of the surgeon onboard the vessels and the requirements of the medicine chest, inclusion of clauses on the airing of bedding and fumigating of the vessel, and, finally, legal protections for all emigrants, not only those traveling to British possessions abroad. Overall, his advice to the Committee was a return to the more detailed regulations of the 1803 Act. Despite his advocacy for the revision and strengthening of passenger protections, these regulations were repealed two months after his testimony in a very brief piece of legislation.

¹ *Ibid.*, 190.

² 57 Geo. III. c. 10 (1817) *An Act to regulate the Vessels carrying Passengers from the United Kingdom to certain of His Majesty's Colonies in North America*. [17th March 1817.]

C A P. XIX.

An Act to repeal an Act of the Sixth Year of His present Majesty, for regulating Vessels carrying Passengers to Foreign Parts. [28th May 1827.]

6 G. 4. c. 116. ' WHEREAS an Act was passed in the Sixth Year of the Reign of His present Majesty, intituled ' *An Act for regulating Vessels carrying Passengers to Foreign Parts*; and it is expedient to repeal ' the said Act; Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That the said Act shall be and the same is hereby repealed.

repealed.
Proviso for Penalties already incurred, and Actions commenced.

II. Provided nevertheless, and be it enacted, That all Penalties, Fines, and Forfeitures heretofore incurred under the said Act, shall and may be prosecuted, sued for, and recovered; and that all Actions, Suits, Indictments, and Informations heretofore brought under and by virtue of the said Act, shall and may be proceeded with in such and the same Manner, to all Intents and Purposes, as if this present Act had not been made; any thing herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

Figure 10 - Repeal of the passenger protections 7 & 8 Geo. c. 19.

The remainder of the emigration season of 1827 was left completely unregulated because of the repeal of this legislation. No other protections were passed until May 1828, which gave a very vague description of the food provisions required compared to previous Acts:

a Supply of pure Water to the Amount of Fifty Gallons for every Person on board such Ship, the Master and Crew included, such Water being carried in sweet Casks; and a Supply of Bread, Biscuit, Oatmeal, or Bread Stuffs, to the Amount of Fifty Pounds Weight at the least for every Passenger on board such Ship.¹

As an alternative to instituting a government run emigration plan, relaxing the costly Passenger Acts would have indirectly allowed for further emigration and made it more accessible for the poorest laborers, though its effects may not have been observed immediately. Another option was suggested by a number of witnesses and also discussed by the press during this period.

The reclamation of bogs and wastelands was a suggestion made by several Irish and English witnesses as an alternative to an organized government emigration plan. This was not a new question nor the first time the bogs of Ireland were studied by a governmental committee. According to K. H. Connell, the draining of bogs slowly began in the late eighteenth century and began to accelerate toward the end of the Napoleonic Wars, as "the peasants' potato patches necessarily covered more and more of the

¹ 9 Geo. IV. c. 21. *Passengers in Merchant Vessels Act 1828*.

mountain and bog”, and “the rate of population increase quickened and with it the peasants' anxiety to cultivate fresh land”.¹ This subject was further studied by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the nature and extent of the several bogs in Ireland from 1809 until their final report in 1814. While K. H. Connell asserts that the objectives of reclamation were to increase the income of proprietors and a reaction to growing population pressure,² the Commissioners claimed theirs were the study of “the practicability of draining the Bogs of Ireland [...] and of cultivating them once drained.”³ The Commission consulted engineers and surveyors to map the bogs lands, which, according to the first report of the Bog Commissioners, amounted to approximately one-fourth of the island. The process of reclamation was a fairly simple process: drainage, fertilization, and then cultivation of the land; however, the process was labor-intensive and could be time-consuming and costly. One estimation in the first report calculated the reclamation of one large bog, of approximately 22,490 Irish acres or 36,480 English acres, would cost £70,014 to drain. While this was a substantial amount of money at the time, the estimated increase in the value of the land could cover the original outlay, according to the Commission, after twenty years.⁴ Finally, it is important to note that the main fuel source of the poor during this time was peat moss which was sourced from the dry portions of bog land. The reclamation could therefore lead to a shortage of fuel for poor families dependent on this natural resource, though this point was not elaborated upon by the Commission.

The testimony of the Emigration Committee on the subject of the reclamation of the bogs, or “waste lands” as they were often known, generally fell into two categories:

¹ K. H. Connell. “The Colonization of Waste Land in Ireland, 1780-1845.” *The Economic History Review* 3,1 (1950), 46.

² *Ibid.*, 45.

³ First Report of the Commissioners of the Bogs of Ireland 1810, 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

that these projects would be either more expensive or less expensive than establishing a government emigration plan as a remedy to the growing population pressure.

William Gabbett considered that employment could be provided to the poor in the form of road making and the improvement of waste lands, bogs, and mountains, and that “the landed proprietor would sooner contribute to give employment to the poor of the country by an expenditure upon the land itself, than contribute to emigration”.¹ Despite the possibility of that leading to a greater increase in population, the witness asserted that the “reclaiming of those lands would feed that population”.² Unlike the Irish Bog Commissioners, Gabbett admitted that this improvement would be most advantageous to the landowner and not the laborers:

1357. The result is to be the benefit of the landlord's estate, is it not?—It would certainly be a benefit to the landlord's estate.³

Alexander Nimmo, an engineer who worked as a surveyor for the Irish Bog Commissioners, advocated aggressively for the practicability of the reclamation of bogs, though he did not suggest it as an alternative to emigration. He claims that “extensive bog districts of the West of Ireland have already had a great step made toward their improvement, by the expenditure of the Government; within the last four years a considerable quantity of land has already got into cultivation in those districts, in consequence of that outlay”, though there is little reliable evidence to confirm that assertion.⁴ Nimmo managed a reclamation project on Lord Palmerston's (an absentee landowner, who only visited Ireland on a few occasions in his lifetime) estate in County Sligo of about 50 acres of bog, which he claimed cost about £7 per acre to transform into arable land, and further asserted that this investment would pay for itself through the

¹ ER1, W. Gabbett, 131.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 132.

⁴ ER3, A. Nimmo, 328.

cultivation of the land after only three years.¹ Again, the witness does not relate this subject to emigration, but he argues that a reclamation of the millions of acres of Irish bogs would be financially profitable, and more importantly, that it could be funded by private capital and not by government.

Jerrard Strickland, an estate manager in County Roscommon, mainly agreed with Nimmo's evidence, though he claimed that the reclamation could be achieved at a lower cost. Unlike the previous witness, Strickland linked the reclamation of bogs to the subject of emigration, claiming that it would be more beneficial a remedy than emigration. Unlike William Gabbett, who admitted that reclamation would be a financial benefit to landlords, Strickland asserted that it would be beneficial to "the redundant poor [because] their labour would immediately become valuable, it would be in demand for the improvement of those bogs".² This witness also projected what the benefits would be for the laborers after the bogs were put back into cultivation.

3489. Your intention is, therefore, that the poor should be benefited by being employed as labourers in the reclaiming of those bog lands, and in their cultivation after they are reclaimed?—Yes.

3490. Do you mean in their cultivation after they are reclaimed, as labourers, or as small farmers occupying small portions?— I look upon it that the condition both of landlord and tenant will be exceedingly altered by the operation of the late Act of Parliament, and that the facility of subdividing land will be so much diminished, that small farms will not be so common some years hence as they are now; and if the state of the country generally improves, large farms will be the consequence, and those bogs will be peculiarly adapted for large grazing farms.³

This answer remains characteristically vague as regards the state of the laboring classes of Ireland. While the witness asserts that the poor would benefit from the demand for their labor, he admits that their access to land would be further restricted due to the

¹ *Ibid.*, 329.

² ER3, J. Strickland, 331.

³ *Ibid.*, 332.

legislation preventing subdivision, and that, in fact, the reclamation would be a manner of consolidating farms and improving the estates of the elite class of society.

Another witness also admitted that no reclamation project would be invested in unless it were to be a financial benefit.

3746. Are you aware of any employment of capital in this country whatsoever, that is not founded upon the presumption that the returns will repay for the expense of cultivation?—No; I apprehend capital would not be advanced for that or any other purpose, unless there was a prospect of an ultimate return.¹

This reinforces the admission of William Gabbett, that the ultimate beneficiary of any such project would be the proprietors or those who advanced capital for this purpose. Despite the previous answer on the benefits of reclamation, William Couling admits having “no doubt whatever that the location of persons in Canada would be much cheaper” than relocating them near a reclamation project.²

John Leslie Foster, who served on the aforementioned committee that studied the Irish bogs, explained the living conditions of those laborers employed on the reclamation projects:

3583. Will you be good enough to inform the Committee the general process that takes place in the settlement of paupers in the neighbourhood of one of those, bogs?—Settlement it can hardly be called; a pauper often takes possession of a spot upon the bog, and builds a house of sods, perhaps of the value of twenty or thirty shillings, he pays no rent, and subsists there as miserably as possible, partly upon alms and partly by depredation.³

The Committee does not ask further questions on this subject until after addressing the cost of reclamation, the legal claims of tenure, and how the process would be profitable. When they came back to this subject, John Leslie Foster explained that the poor laborers

¹ ER3, W. Couling, 365.

² *Ibid.*, 368.

³ ER3, J. L. Foster, 342.

would not benefit from the employment offered by the reclamation nor once the land was reclaimed and ready for cultivation.

3597. Whatever advantages might result to individuals, or to Ireland generally from the reclamation of their waste lands, are you of opinion that such an extent of employment could be afforded to the pauper population of Ireland, under the contingency of such reclamation, as in any degree to restore the proportion of the supply of labour to the demand, in the manner which is contemplated under a system of emigration ?—Most certainly not, even if you could suppose a reclamation of the bogs to be attempted to-morrow.

3598. Supposing that those 2,800,000 acres of bog land were brought into a state of cultivation, that circumstance would involve the employment of a considerable number of labourers for that purpose ?—Of course to a considerable extent; but I apprehend that the bog, when reclaimed, would be principally employed for meadow and pasture; I do not apprehend that it would be much used as tillage, a portion of it would; rape, and some green crops, are found to answer particularly well in it.¹

With this answer, the witness expresses that the reclamation of the bogs could not replace a system of emigration to give the laborers a stable source of employment and opportunity.

Much like other topics discussed during the Emigration Committees, there were conflicting opinions on the vast subject of emigration plans. This variety in points of view meant that the government could have found support for whatever measures it decided to take or not. It could have established the government assisted emigration plan elaborated in the third report of the Emigration Committee, decided that an alternative, such as reclamation projects, would have been a more reasonable remedy, or chosen to do nothing at all, and it would have found evidence in these three volumes of witness testimony to support any number of positions. Ultimately, the government undertook none of the suggestions laid out in these reports, though this did not deter Wilmot-

¹ *Ibid.*, 343.

Horton, who continued to petition Parliament and government to institute his plan, to no avail.

4.3 Contribution to emigration

While the prevailing interests among the participants made a majority of them support a government emigration plan, there was less agreement concerning the possibility of their own contribution to such a plan. Opinions on this aspect were almost evenly split, with only a slight majority of Irish witnesses expressing a willingness to contribute, amongst both resident and absentee proprietors.

Witnesses

Eight of the nine witnesses for Ireland in the first Emigration Committee discussed contribution to emigration in their testimony. The opinions on whether or not Irish proprietors, landlords, and middlemen would be willing to contribute to emigration were varied. During the second Emigration Committee, as previously mentioned, there were only two witnesses for Ireland, of whom one gave testimony on contributions to emigration. Nine of the seventeen witnesses for Ireland in the third Emigration Committee discussed contributions to emigration. The debate on whether or how much landlords would be willing to contribute divided these witnesses into two distinct camps: those who believed they would contribute and those who believed they would not, though a few of the witnesses gave mixed opinions on this subject. The witnesses were in particular concerned with the question of how to finance these future emigrations, while a smaller number of witnesses spoke equally about the topics of contributing depending on the expense, previous contributions, and the financial benefits of advancing money for emigration.

The English witnesses in the first and second Emigration Committees were particularly concerned with this question. All six who participated in the first committee and twelve of the sixteen in the second committee gave evidence on contributions to emigration. The English witnesses in the third Emigration Committee were less concerned with this question, as only three of ten testified on this subject. Overall, these witnesses primarily discussed the willingness to contribute, while giving varied evidence on the possible methods of financing.

The witnesses for Scotland, particularly in the second Emigration Committee, appeared interested in this subject, as eight of the nine gave evidence on contributions to emigration. Two of the five witnesses in the first committee and one of the three in the third committee gave evidence on the subject, significantly fewer than the second committee. The Scottish witnesses were especially divided on this question, with half expressing a willingness to contribute and the other half unwilling to contribute.

The interest for this subject varied for the witnesses for other British colonies. During the first Emigration Committee, all six of the witnesses for South Africa, Australia, and Colombia gave evidence on the subject of contributions, while the second committee had no witnesses representing these countries speak on this subject. Two of the four witnesses for these regions spoke of contributions during the third committee. Though there were few witnesses representing these regions, they primarily discussed a willingness to contribute to emigration, with very little discussion of methods of financing.

Finally, the Canadian witnesses showed the least interest for the subject of contributions, with only two of ten in the first committee and two of twelve in the third committee giving any evidence on the subject. These Canadian witnesses were concerned with other subjects, though they did speak on a willingness to contribute and previous contributions to emigration.

Not willing to contribute

The evidence from the witnesses expressed reservations concerning the willingness to contribute to emigration described different reasons for this reluctance. While some witnesses simply expressed a general unwillingness to contribute, others claimed they were unable to contribute anything to such a plan or that some landowners would be unaware of the benefits that would result from removing their “surplus” tenants.

First, the Bishop of Limerick explains that he hopes that landlords will contribute to emigration, but that he believes there will be some reluctance at first, until the information regarding the benefits of emigration plans spreads, then the landlords would be more willing to contribute.¹ This perspective demonstrates how inaccurate information about the government’s plan could influence public opinion on the matter. There were questions at this time about whether those to be resettled in Canada would have to be willing or if the government, with the help of landlords, would force certain tenants to be removed. Wilmot-Horton clarified this point in a later parliamentary session when he said “that the committee never in any way recommended any but voluntary emigration; it set its face against all ideas of emigration by compulsion”.² In addition, the Peter Robinson-Wilmot-Horton experiments most likely gave the impression that any proposed government plan would function identically to theirs, despite the fact that the Emigration Committee was formed for this exact purpose: to develop a state-assisted emigration plan that would benefit both the removed population as well as those who remained, while simultaneously benefitting landlords

¹ ER1, Bishop of Limerick, 143.

² “Emigration” Hansard Parliamentary Debates, March 4, 1828, Vol XVIII, Second Series, Cols. 938-962.; *Irish Emigration Database*, accessed 15 September 2013. <http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/44293>

and making the possibility of the introduction of capital into Ireland more appealing, though the details of such a plan had not yet been decided upon.

Second, a number of witnesses dismissed outright the landlords' willingness to contribute, with vague, and sometimes simple, answers in response to particularly long and detailed questions. These queries were formulated in different ways but appear to have been seemed to encourage particular answers regarding the landlords' contribution.

Can you state whether the landlords in that part of the country would be anxious to promote any system of emigration, by contributing money towards the removal of the people? – I should rather think not.¹

Are you of opinion that the evil arising from a redundancy of population, whether produced by sub-letting or other cause, is such as to induce the landlords and the proprietors of land to concur, to a certain extent, in the expense necessary for removing by means of emigration a certain portion of this redundant population? – I doubt the existence of that disposition to any great extent among the landlords with whom I am acquainted.²

Speaking generally, do you think it would be to the interest of the landlords of Ireland, to contribute towards the removal of that class of under-tenants, who may be on their property on the determination of a lease?—I think it would be to their interest to induce those persons to emigrate, but I doubt very much whether it would be to their interest to contribute any thing towards it, because they can get rid of them now by law.³

Do you not think that the landlords would be willing, under that system, to come forward with a given sum of money for the removal of those persons whose removal is necessary to carry those plans into execution? – I should fear that the description of gentry alluded to there would shake their heads most wofully [sic] before they assented to that.⁴

Have you any reason to suppose that if assistance were given by government to those persons to emigrate, it would be met by

¹ ER1, Hugh Innes, 80.

² ER1, W. W. Becher, 191.

³ ER3, J. S. Vandeleur, 300.

⁴ ER1, T. Odell, 208.

corresponding assistance from private or public funds, in the neighbourhood from which they came? – I have not.¹

These pointed questions were formulated in a way to give a general answer to the unwillingness of different parties to contribute in some fashion to emigration from their regions, which can be disputed by the later testimony of witnesses who claimed that landlords and others would be willing to finance this removal under different proposed methods, whether lump sum, annuity, land tax, or mortgaging of poor-rates.

The ability of landlords to pay any kind of contribution was called into question by several witnesses. The distress of this period was not limited to Ireland, but also reached England and Scotland. During the first Emigration Committee, two Scottish witnesses expressed the possibility that landlords would have difficulty contributing, with W. F. Campbell claiming that some proprietors are better off and could pay more, while Hugh Innes asserts that because of the differences of how they use their land, it would be harder to convince certain proprietors to contribute. Innes further explains that some proprietors have few or no tenants, preferring to use their land for pasture, in particular for sheep, though he admits, when asked whether "a landlord finding a superabundance of population of the poorest class upon his property [...] would be disposed to accede to a voluntary contribution to the amount of twelve pounds, for the removal of four persons, to place them in a better situation in the colonies", that the said landlord would.² William Feilden, a cotton manufacturer in Lancaster, further supported the inability of landlords and others to pay any kind of contribution because, he says, "the whole community is impoverished".³ A second industrialist in Manchester, William Hulton, further bolstered this argument with his evidence, stating, "I am quite certain it

¹ ER2, Archibald Campbell, 20.

² ER1, Hugh Innes, 80.

³ ER2, Feilden, 180.

is quite in vain to look for aid from voluntary contributions, for the demand has been such on those who have had the means and disposition to give, they have not any longer the means of giving".¹ Henry Home Drummond, member of Parliament for Stirlingshire, Scotland, when asked, "Do you conceive that the gentlemen in your part of the country would be willing to aid those persons in emigrating?", responded similarly, "I think very little assistance can be looked for from that quarter, they have made such great exertions already".² A second Scottish member of Parliament reaffirmed this, stating, "they have already made great sacrifices, and there is a considerable pressure upon the upper ranks in that country".³ This position is most likely linked to the populations who were in the most distressed districts for whom assistance was given, in addition to the poor-rates to which some were entitled.

An important distinction was made between resident proprietors and absentees in distressed districts. Thomas Spring Rice, who explains that distress is not rampant throughout the whole of Ireland, asserts that absentee landlords and middlemen would not be willing to contribute, specifying that, "in cases where there are intermediate tenants with a greater number of middlemen, the benefit of the future productiveness of the land by due cultivation and partition would be divided among so many individuals, that it might not be for the interest of any one of those classes to come forward and secure the whole of the annuity or contribution".⁴ John Leslie Foster further supported this distinction when asked about the willingness of landlords to contribute, that "where the ejector of the tenant is a middle-man, possibly the last in a series of half a dozen intermediate landlords, I should not entertain such an expectation".⁵ This could be explained by the precarity of the situation of middlemen, as some were in financial

¹ ER, Hulton, 185.

² ER2, H. H. Drummond, 27.

³ ER2, T. F. Kennedy, 24.

⁴ ER1, T. S. Rice, 211.

⁵ ER3, J. L. Foster, 308.

difficulty due to the distress of the tenants and their inability to pay rent. Middlemen stood to lose significant financial opportunities if their management of estates were unsuccessful. On the question of absentee landlords, it is unclear if they were fully aware of the situation on their estates or if they were enforcing the laws and covenants regarding subletting. In addition, because of the nature of absentee landlords, they most likely used middlemen for the management and the promise of improvement of their estates. The difference of land occupation in Ireland seems to have made this question difficult to answer, as many witnesses claimed that certain classes of landlords would be willing to contribute, while others, who were not interacting regularly with tenants or present on their estates at all, would not, without counting the middlemen who managed these estates on a daily basis.

One final opinion was offered by Thomas Spring Rice on the question, which he submitted in the form of a series of questions posed to “one of the most extensive Land Agents in Connaught” on the willingness of landlords to contribute.

Do you know many cases in which it would be worth while for a landlord to contribute 20l. (or 3l. 10s. for seven years,) in order to ensure the removal and comfortable location of a man, his wife and two children, in Canada; and so for a greater number? – I know not of such a case; I consider the evil exists to an extent too great to admit of a sensible impression being made by any sum a landlord could in prudence undertake for.¹

We can assume from this testimony that the majority of landowners in the region of Connaught were of the same opinion, if the respondent was in fact in close contact with a great number of landowners at that time. The respondent’s identity is not detailed in the testimony, although, in addition to answers given to Foster’s query, a detailed statistical account of an area of the county Mayo was submitted that Foster asserts was conducted by the respondent and which shows an intimate knowledge of the area and

¹ ER3, T. S. Rice, 278.

its inhabitants. The statistical account includes the rents paid in each village, along with the amount of arable land divided into various categories, the number of families, the population numbers by age group, and the quantity of livestock.

Willing to contribute

The following witnesses agreed that landlords, parishes, and others would be willing to contribute to emigration, with all but two of the English witnesses agreeing, and Irish and Scottish witnesses split on this question. While some witnesses were in general agreement that landlords and parishes would contribute, others gave more detailed explanations for their position.

Walter Frederick Campbell, a Whig member of Parliament for Argyllshire, Scotland, testifies that a positive relationship exists between landlord and tenant, and that, because of this, landlords would be willing to contribute to emigration if they felt that it would benefit their tenants.

There is a sort of affection between landlord and tenant in that country, and if the bonus held out to those people was such that the landlord thought it for the interest of those people to go out, I think, in many instances, they would do something for them; the people themselves would make great exertions to scrape a little money together, and the landlord, I have no doubt, would assist them, having that end in view, provided, from the affection that subsists between landlord and tenant, the bonus is such that he shall think it of advantage to the persons to accept it.¹

His insistence on the word “affection” is not questioned by the Committee, which follows this testimony with a question on the recurrence of the “evil” of a redundant population due to the continued practice of subdivision. The only other questions he was asked about contributions to emigration were regarding his own willingness to contribute, to

¹ ER1, W. F. Campbell, 74.

which his general response was yes, but it would depend on the expense. This answer was given by several witnesses, which will be analyzed in a further section.

Another angle of argument was presented by a few witnesses, namely, that they would agree to contribute if the government plan allowed them to remove a certain group of individuals from their estates. John Sebright, an unaffiliated M.P. for Hertfordshire and Baronet, was asked if the type of person he would select would be the industrious sort, prepared to succeed if resettled in Canada. His response was as follows:

The first class of persons I should select would be persons having large families, the next would be men of bad character, and families of bad character; there are families in which the children are brought up from their infancy to steal turnips, wood, &c. and it is thus by degrees they become regular thieves. My first object would be, and perhaps with me it would be a greater object even than the getting rid of the redundant population, to send away those families. I strongly recommended to a parish, at any expense, to get rid of those bad families, but I could not induce them to do so. There were, in one of them, five of the children, boys and girls, afterwards transported.¹

This testimony explains his claim that he would contribute considerable expense for the removal of selected persons for emigration, citing the amount of £15 or more. Though we could imagine that this testimony regards Irish laborers, he prefaces his testimony by stating that he “is entirely unacquainted with Ireland”,² and in further testimony, he refers to the Irish in England as having “meritorious conduct”.³

Thomas Spring Rice, a Whig member of Parliament for Limerick City, asserts during the first Emigration Committee that resident proprietors in distressed districts would be willing to contribute to a proportion of the expense of removing the redundant population and resettling them in Canada.

¹ ER1, J. Sebright, 124.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 125.

Where the inheritor of land is immediately in contact with the occupier, and where under those circumstances a redundancy of population has taken place, I conceive it to be so strongly the interest of both parties that emigration should be encouraged, that I believe we should find the population not only willing, but anxious to emigrate, and the landlords not only willing, but anxious to contribute towards that emigration, not merely upon the principle of benevolence, but upon the principle of deriving in the future productiveness of their land a greater benefit in increased rent than any sacrifice in the shape of pledged annuity or fixed contribution; but in cases where there are intermediate tenants with a greater number of middlemen, the benefit of the future productiveness of the land by due cultivation and partition would be divided among so many individuals, that it might not be for the interest of any one of those classes to come forward and secure the whole of the annuity or contribution.¹

This evidence suggests that those landlords in direct contact with their tenants were more aware of the distress in their districts and were therefore more willing to contribute to emigration as a method of relief. John Leslie Foster, a Tory member of Parliament for Louth, further supported this position with his testimony during the third Emigration Committee, stating:

It would depend at least as much upon their ability as upon their good feeling; where there are proprietors in fee of large estates, not heavily encumbered, and who are in immediate contact with the tenantry, I have no doubt you might look for contributions; but where the ejector of the tenant is a middle-man, possibly the last in a series of half a dozen intermediate landlords, I should not entertain such an expectation, nor should I even where the tenant in fee was in contact with the occupying tenant, if he was a person embarrassed in his circumstances; such is very frequently the case in Ireland. I beg to add, that the disposition of the proprietors would be very much influenced by whatever opinion they might form as to the reasonableness of the sum proposed for their contribution.²

William Gabbett, a landowner in Limerick, makes a point in his testimony that landlords would contribute, though he also distinguishes between resident and absentee

¹ ER1, T. S. Rice, 211.

² ER3, J. L. Foster, 308.

landlords as previous witnesses have, claiming that “it would be very hard to put the resident gentleman, who takes all the proper measures to prevent a redundance of population on his estate, upon a par with the absentee proprietor, on whose property that excess of population exists in a greater degree, from his having taken no such measures”.¹ Here, he implies that resident landlords make greater efforts, and possibly financial investments, to prevent overpopulating their estates due to the direct contact they have with their tenants. This confirms previous testimony that Irish proprietors who were aware of the distress of their tenants would be more likely to contribute to emigration to alleviate their circumstances and financially benefit themselves.

Some witnesses discussed their own willingness to contribute or to advise other landlords to contribute to emigration. James West, a land agent in Westmeath, says he would advise a landlord to advance money to remove tenants in a distressed situation, though he says that “there are many landlords who could not afford it; most of them have their rents very badly paid”.² Hugh Dixon, also a land agent in Westmeath, says he would advise a landlord to contribute money for the purpose of emigration, confirming they have a financial interest in removing their excess population.³ John Markham Marshall, a resident proprietor in Ireland, admits that he would be willing to contribute to emigration himself, stating that, “for my own part I should be willing to contribute; and I think others, on the same principle, would be willing to do the same”.⁴ As to the question of parishes contributing, William Henly Hyett, a manager and auditor of the Friendly Loan Society and Secretary for the Committee for the Relief of Distressed Manufacturers, agrees that parishes would likely contribute to emigration as a form of relief, basing this opinion on his previous experience working with parishes, stating, “we

¹ ER1, W. Gabbett, 126.

² ER3, J. West, 298.

³ ER3, H. Dixon, 262.

⁴ ER3, J. M. Marshall, 409.

have made terms with parishes where we employed persons on the road, by which they readily agreed to furnish a certain quota of the men's wages in aid of our fund".¹

The Lord Viscount Ennismore, in two questions addressing this issue, responds diplomatically to the questions without giving very detailed answers:

2125. Do you consider that it would be desirable to Irish landlords, to meet a proportion of the reimbursement of the expense attending the plan?—I think it would be very desirable.

2126. Do you think that, generally speaking, they would consider that the expense of twenty pounds, for the migration of a family consisting of four persons, would be a matter of interest to them as proprietors?—I think it would to many of them.

These types of answers were not uncommon regarding this question on contributions. Detailed questions were often asked of the witnesses, who frequently gave vague and noncommittal answers coupled with their opinions, rarely giving evidence-based testimony. We can assume that the witnesses who responded in this manner did not do much research in their communities when preparing their testimony to the Committee.

One of the two witnesses for Ireland in the second Emigration Committee, John O'Driscoll, resident landowner in the south of Ireland, spoke of contributions to emigration, stating that he knew gentlemen who "are very willing to contribute towards it, without having any specific plan upon the subject",² though he claims that there would be difficulty in raising contributions, and therefore, a general measure would be preferable to gather the funds necessary for the emigration plans. He suggests that general taxation or another mode would be acceptable for this purpose.³

¹ ER2, W. H. Hyett, 217.

² ER2, J. O'Driscoll, 90.

³ *Ibid.*, 91.

Furthermore, the question of contributions from the British Colonies was discussed by some witnesses. William Shepherd, a witness for South Africa, attests to the willingness of residents there to contribute to the emigration of new settlers to the region. Despite his assertion of their willingness, he claims that many would not be able to contribute due to it being a new colony, but that, in general, “it would be worth while, by those who are established there”.¹ Canadian witnesses also gave evidence on this point, though they nuanced their testimony by saying that it would depend on the expense and, further, proposing alternatives to direct individual contributions.

William Richard Cosway, a landowner in the Kent area residing in London, exposes his own willingness to contribute to the emigration of some of his tenants, with the condition that “this call shall not be repeated within four or five years [...] My wish is to impress upon the Committee, that unless we have some security by Act of Parliament, we should have to go over the same ground again, leaving all the disabled and helpless upon our hands”.²

John Maxwell repeats this sentiment, saying that proprietors would contribute “provided [they] saw that by so doing [they] would be protected from a new accumulation of labour for which there is no demand”.³ This appears to have been a common concern of the witnesses who discussed these financial contributions, which led to numerous types of proposals of financing these possible future plans. This will be discussed in the section on methods of contribution.

In addition, Lieutenant-General Robert Browne, an absentee landlord holding property in County Wexford, says he himself would contribute to emigration if a tenant

¹ ER1, W. Shepherd, 226.

² ER3, W. R. Cosway, 380.

³ ER2, J. Maxwell, 51.

“willingly and voluntarily surrendered his lease”,¹ and that it would be in the interest of landlords to contribute if their tenants were in rent arrears. This testimony confirms the general desire of proprietors to end subdivision and consolidate their estates.

Finally, one witness summarizes the general feeling of Irish landlords on this subject, saying that Irish proprietors would generally be willing to contribute something for the purpose of emigration, without going into further detail.²

Depends on expense

A number of witnesses affirmed that landlords would be willing to contribute on the condition that the expense would not be too high, though they did not give any fixed amounts. This perspective applied particularly to individual contributors, but also as an option for London parishes, and a possibility for Scottish counties and for Canadian provinces. Irish witnesses primarily supported this point of view, though it had marginal support from other witnesses as well.

The Lord Viscount Ennismore, a Whig member of Parliament for County Cork, claims that Irish proprietors would be willing to contribute to a portion of the expense of emigration and that £20 for a family of four would be a reasonable expense, though the lower the expense the more likely a landlord would be to contribute.³ The figure of £20 for a family of four came from the debates about previous experiments where the estimated costs reflected this figure. However, the actual cost of the Peter Robinson experiments was calculated to be approximately £22 for a family of four, with many families consisting of two adults and three children on average, meaning that the overall cost of the experiments was more than had been estimated. Similarly, Walter Frederick Campbell, a Whig member of Parliament for Argyllshire, Scotland, does not suggest an

¹ ER3, R. Browne, 270.

² ER1, T. S. Rice, 212.

³ ER1, Ennismore, 197-8.

amount of money to contribute, but says that, “If an amount were fixed, I would try, if I could afford it, to pay the sum that was demanded”,¹ claiming that some proprietors are better off and could pay more. Finally, Alexander Nimmo, a Scottish engineer and architect working in Ireland, testified that Irish proprietors would be willing to contribute depending on the expense, but that, “It must depend upon the expense, and the sum which he would be called upon to contribute; I think there must be many cases where a proprietor would be willing to pay a considerable sum, to remove from his estate, without trouble or inconvenience to himself, a part of the population”, though he stipulates in later testimony that they would be unwilling to pay a tax for the purpose of emigration or parochial relief.²

John Leslie Foster, a Tory member of Parliament for Louth, Ireland, repeated his earlier testimony that Irish landowners would be willing to contribute, but that “their disposition would be very much influenced by whatever opinion they might form as to the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the terms offered to them by Government”.³ He explains that a proprietor willing to contribute would compare the costs of contributing through a government plan versus giving money directly to individuals desiring to emigrate and gives examples of previous emigrations from his region, where some landowners contributed directly to the individuals emigrating.⁴ Foster’s testimony, that

unless the Government should offer such terms as would accomplish some saving to them, they would be as well pleased to attain the end in their own way, by simply giving the money to the individuals. They never would contribute to the Government more than what they should feel and know by experience to be sufficient for the object,⁵

¹ ER1, W. F. Campbell, 75.

² ER1, A. Nimmo, 190, 195.

³ ER3, J. L. Foster, 337.

⁴ *Idem.*

⁵ *Idem.*

is consistent with the debate taking place on the most cost-effective way of financing future emigration plans, while some proprietors were taking it upon themselves, outside of government-funded plans, to organize the removal and emigration of their tenants perceived as superabundant population on their estates.

The question of whether London parishes would contribute to the emigration (i.e. removal) of homeless and orphan children, in addition to unemployed Irish laborers in London, was addressed by two English witnesses. William Henry Bodkin, Secretary to the Mendicity Society, asserts in his testimony that London parishes would contribute depending on the amount. He explains this in his answers to the following two questions, where he is quick to rule out the proposed sum that had been debated all throughout the Committee.

2360. Is it your opinion that the London parishes would be inclined to avail themselves of the plan of emigration which has been suggested, to such an extent as to saddle themselves with a certain proportion of the expense?—It would depend, in a great measure, upon the amount of expense.

2361. It is proposed that they should provide the means of emigration for a man, his wife and two children, by charging themselves with the payment of 3l. 10s. a year for seven years?—I do not think that the London parishes would avail themselves of such an offer.¹

In additional testimony from Robert James Chambers, a police magistrate in London who testified to the level of criminality of twelve to twenty year-olds, the latter explains that the parishes would contribute no more than £5 per child, which was the apprentice fee at the time, to resolve the issue of homeless and orphan children in the city.² He suggests sending the children to Canada to be apprentices, and that for such a plan he believes the city would be willing to contribute in some capacity.

¹ ER1, W. H. Bodkin, 216.

² ER1, R. J. Chambers, 86.

Asked to testify about the possibility of future distress in Renfrewshire, Sheriff substitute Alexander Campbell asserts that his county would most likely contribute to emigration in the case of starvation in the area, depending on the extremity of the pressure.

1839. Supposing that after the 24th of May a very considerable number of persons were in a state of starvation, do you not conceive that the county would be ready to contribute more for the purposes of emigration than merely for their temporary support?—It would depend very much, I think, upon the extremity of the pressure, whether the county would be disposed to contribute or not; because in no ordinary circumstances do I think that the county of Renfrew would choose to establish such a precedent as might eventually bear against them at some future time. I feel perfectly sure they would not do it at present, the distress being so considerably abated.¹

Campbell appears to assert that the economic distress in the region had been resolved, therefore any question of financial contributions to emigration in the place of temporary support would not be relevant.

As to the question of contributions from Canada, Richard John Uniacke, Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, testifies that many in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would pay the expense of taking out fishermen from Scotland if the expense of passage were not too high, though the question he was asked specifically included the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Scottish fishermen. He further explains his belief that a person who wishes to emigrate will find a way to do so, giving the example of a practice of indenture that he claims was common in earlier years, though the Committee redirected his attention to the possibility of settling Scottish fishermen in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.²

¹ ER2, Alexander Campbell, 163.

² ER1, R. J. Uniacke, 72.

Previous contributions

Over the three Committees, the topic of previous contributions to emigration was discussed by eight witnesses, with some citing examples where proprietors, emigration societies, parishes, and others contributed financially to the emigration projects of tenants and other laboring groups. This evidence is significant in that it demonstrates the willingness of people to directly finance these types of projects and gives the Committee a clearer picture of the numbers of emigrants, the cost of the plans, and the involvement of the community in these previous emigrations.

Alexander Hunter, who superintended the emigration project from the island of Rum in Scotland, testified to his experience in assisting the tenants to resettle elsewhere. According to his testimony, in July 1826, about 300 tenants were given money directly by the landlord to emigrate to Cape Breton, an island in the province of Nova Scotia, the cost of which was £5 14s. per person and was paid in full by the landlord, approximately £2,000 for the entirety of the project.¹ This emigration project was part of the second phase of the Highland Clearances, when forced emigrations took place in Scotland on estates that considered their laboring population as redundant. In the case of the island of Rum, the witness claims there was no other industry but sheep farming, as neither crops nor kelp could be found there. Furthermore, the willingness of the residents to emigrate was questioned, and Hunter admitted, that “[s]ome of them were, others were not very willing; they did not like to leave the land of their ancestors”.² This perspective was not surprising, as the Highland Clearances are now remembered more as forced evictions than assisted emigrations as the witness would have us believe.

Edward Jeremiah Curteis, an independent member of Parliament for Sussex, in his testimony, claims that in the Sussex area, the parishes have previously contributed

¹ ER3, A. Hunter, 289.

² *Ibid.*, 289.

£30-40 for the emigration of families, including a man, his wife, and five to six children, to the United States.¹ He goes on to approximate that about one in four of those who emigrate return to the area, “finding that he must work when he gets to America; the object is idleness, or rather so expectation of gaining a livelihood more easily than in this country”.² For the purposes of this research, we have not studied the question of return emigrants, though for Ireland, this phenomenon was minimal. The same witness suggests that it was more common for England, due to the system of poor-rates in place that would assist those in difficult financial situations.

William Sudlow Fitzhugh, an agent for the American Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool who was appointed to oversee the proper application of the passenger protections, says he knows of parishes contributing to passages to North America. According to Fitzhugh, “there was an overseer of a parish in Kent engaging a passage for a number of poor people in his parish to go out to New York, and during the last two years the passages to the United States of a considerable number have been paid by parishes”.³ The witness does not give any further details on these emigrations, despite claiming that there have been numerous projects financed by parishes, which were in charge of poor relief and may have advocated and assisted emigration in order to lessen their own financial burden.

James Homewood, a resident of Headcorn, near Maidstone, Kent, describes his parish’s investment in the transport and resettlement of 80 residents to Canada and the United States.⁴ Of the 80 paupers who were resettled, the parish paid the full amount for 23 who were dependent on the poor-rates, for which the parish borrowed funds to finance their resettlement in March 1824, at the expense of £179, approximately £8 per

¹ ER1, E. J. Curteis, 115.

² *Idem*.

³ ER2, W. S. Fitzhugh, 194.

⁴ ER2, J. Homewood, 144.

person. The remainder of those who were resettled “had friends who assisted them, and gave them part of the money”.¹ Because of the removal of this group of people, the parish saw a decrease in their poor rates starting in 1824, no longer having to pay for the subsistence of these individuals. Homewood elaborates the decrease in the poor rates as follows: “In the year 1823, we raised 2,308*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*; in the year following, 1824, we raised 2,025*l.*; in the year 1825, we raised 1,925*l.* 6*s.* 1*d.*; and the present year is 1,919*l.* 16*s.*”, a 17 percent decrease in just three years.² He suggests, however, that there remains a further redundant population in the parish, and that there is a desire to further remove an additional 40 people, which he calculates as ten families of four, due to the impossibility of finding employment for those who require assistance.

John Thomas Becher (spelled “Beecher” in the report), a Church of England clergyman and magistrate for the county of Nottingham, testified that the arrangements for the 1818 emigration to the Cape Colony in South Africa were organized entirely by himself. During a period of acute distress in the county, the Duke of Newcastle (also Lord Lieutenant of the county) was entreated to attempt to resolve this issue, to which he responded by offering “the means of emigration to such distressed workmen as might be disposed to colonize at the Cape of [Good Hope]”.³ A subscription was organized to finance the arrangements, and additional funds and land grants offered by the government, in addition to a small participation by the parishes of the settlers. Becher estimates the number of settlers as between 200 and 300.

Henry Bliss, an agent for the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, and author and lawyer, testifies about the emigration society in the province, which he says is supported

¹ *Idem.*

² *Idem.*

³ ER3, J. T. Beecher, 400.

by subscription and a small annual grant from colonial revenue, to encourage and assist the poor emigrants to that region.¹

There exists in this province an Emigrant Society, supported by subscription and a small annual grant from the colonial revenue, whose objects are to encourage and assist the poor emigrant, in which they have been very useful, and, considering their limited means, very successful. They have planted several little settlements in different parts of the country, which are doing extremely well, and will soon possess comparative comfort and abundance. Indeed the whole colony is little more than an aggregate of similar instances of success; and the encouragement it holds out to emigration may be learned as well from considering the nature and situation of the country, as the history of its settlement.²

This testimony shows the role that Canadian provinces were willing to take on to support the actual and future poor emigrants in resettling in their territories, while simultaneously offering to assist the political initiatives of the British empire.

Alexander Nimmo says he knew of cases when a lessee would contribute to emigration for their neighbor in order to enlarge their own farms. This testimony qualifies his previous testimony, that proprietors would be more or less unwilling to contribute to emigration, by explaining that in these cases, the tenants would find other methods to finance their emigration plans.

2082. ARE you of opinion that the immediate lessees from the landlord might be disposed to contribute towards emigration, should the landlord be unwilling? — I have known instances where a lessee has given money to his neighbour to give up his farm, and to enable him to go to America; and in that way I think it is possible that a fund might be raised from the land to promote emigration; but I could hardly conceive that the landlord of himself, who conceives that he has a right to turn the tenant out of possession without any thing whatever, would consent to pay any thing towards it.³

¹ ER1, H. Bliss, 113.

² *Idem.*

³ ER1, A. Nimmo, 194.

John Diston Powles, chairman of the Colombian Agricultural Association and company promotor and speculator, testifies on the emigration project conducted by the association, bringing out Scottish settlers to the British colonies in South America. The association brought out approximately 44 families to undertake agricultural activity on the land where they were placed. Included in the appendix of the report of the third Emigration Committee is a petition from these Scottish settlers in Colombia who wish to be resettled in the British colonies in North America, claiming that the Colombian Agricultural Association failed to meet the terms of the commitment it made to the settlers.¹ This section also contained a letter from Robert Wilson, a member of Parliament for Southwark and member of the company incorporated for the occupation of Colombia, who expresses concern about the circumstances of the settlers and the accusations against the association, and encourages the Emigration Committee to call J. D. Powles and secretary Charles Stuart to testify. Powles, representing the CAA and defending the superintendence of the project, submits numerous reports from different sources on the settlement, stating that, “[e]very engagement which the Association entered into with settlers which they were the means of sending out, has been most scrupulously performed”.² He further claims that it was the settlers who did not uphold their side of the agreement asserting “that those persons were given to great intemperance and the most indolent habits, and that they were persuaded that so long as they could be maintained by the Company, they would do nothing for themselves”.³ With the benefit of hindsight, we know that the Scottish settlers were not satisfied with their situation upon arriving in Colombia:

Within a short time of their arrival at Topo the colonists realised they had been deceived, but their demands for better land or compensation were

¹ ER3, Abstracts of Petitions, 509.

² ER3, J. D. Powles, 467.

³ *Idem.*

rejected by the Colombian Society and by the British consul at Caracas, Sir Robert Porter.¹

In addition, the stock market crash of 1825 effectively bankrupted the CAA, which led to the end of the support for the settlers, at which point the British consul undertook to relocate them in Guelph, Upper Canada, with the assistance of John Galt, a Scotsman and the first superintendent of the Canada Company. This episode can possibly demonstrate the significant differences between emigration projects undertaken by private companies compared with official government programs. The private interest involved in this project, though maintaining that it was getting little to no benefit for its settlement of these laborers, was in a way proclaiming to act for the good of the settlers and not for the profit of the company. These events were a strong argument for organizing an official government program of emigration, rather than allowing private companies to develop their own plans and possibly take advantage of the suffering and destitute laborers of the United Kingdom for their own pecuniary benefit.

These witnesses show that there were numerous methods for contributing to emigration plans in the years preceding the Emigration Committees. Whether direct contributions during an organized removal plan, Canadian organizations assisting emigrants, or neighbors assisting neighbors, these examples demonstrate that different arrangements had been used to finance emigration plans in the past, which illustrates how different people could contribute to a government plan at the conclusion of the Emigration Committee and, consequently, their eventual proposal of a state-assisted emigration plan.

¹ Marjory Harper, Review of *Topo. The story of a Scottish colony near Caracas 1825-1827*, Hans P. Rheinheimer (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1989), 94. In *Northern Scotland*, Volume 10 (First Series) Issue 1, 94-95.

Financial benefits

The witnesses who testified to the financial benefits of the removal of poor tenants generally agreed that this would have a positive effect in most cases, though the responses to questions on this issue were admittedly short and without great detail.

The Bishop of Limerick spoke of the “evil” of the superabundant population of Ireland, asserting that it required “an immediate remedy”,¹ and that emigration would be such a remedy. In this way, the witness addresses the positive effects for the emigrants themselves and not just the financial benefits for the landlords and other property-holders. He explains that “[t]he sufferers are at once taken away; and, be it observed, from a country where they are a nuisance and a pest, to a country where they will be a benefit and blessing”.² While most of the witnesses gave few details on the subject of the financial benefits, the Bishop of Limerick went into the most detail, claiming that landlords would at first be reluctant to contribute financially to the emigration plan, but “[a]s information grows, it will be seen that a small annual payment, instead of involving a pecuniary loss, will, from the consequent improved state of things at home, be a source of profit”.³ Overall, this witness had the most positive outlook on the effects of this kind of organized emigration plan, and asserted that the people affected by it would have a positive outlook as well.

At present they are in a state of hopeless, despairing recklessness; therefore they scruple not the worst. Give them hope, and they will endure; particularly if it is known that good character will be a recommendation.⁴

Thomas Spring Rice asserts in his testimony that the existence of the “well understood interest” of the landlords would motivate them to contribute financially to

¹ ER1, Lord Bishop of Limerick, 143.

² *Idem.*

³ *Idem.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 144.

the emigration plan, which slightly contradicts the Bishop of Limerick's testimony that the advantages would not be immediately obvious to them. Spring Rice explains that the landlords have the power to remove any superabundant tenants they wish, "with the authority [they have] derived from the legislature by the Tenantry Act",¹ which allows the landlords to resolve the problem of subletting on their estates by preventing further subdivision of the land. He further suggests that contributing to the emigration of the superabundant tenants, in combination with preventing future subletting, would be the best way of resolving the population issues facing landlords, and that these contributions would be a guarantee that the landlords would stop subdivision from occurring on their estates.

As in previous lines of questioning, some witnesses were asked very general and pointed questions on the financial benefits of contributing, without going into much detail, to which their answers were sometimes truncated. It is possible that the committee was formulating these questions in a way to obtain a certain answer, as these questions were not neutral and often already assumed what the answer would be.

2104. Are you of opinion that the best interests of the Irish proprietors ought to induce them to concur, to a certain extent, in pecuniary contribution for the express purpose of emigration?—I do; I think that their interests ought to induce them to contribute largely.

2105. In fact, in other words, do you believe that property in general, both with respect to value and security, would be materially benefited by such contribution?—Certainly.²

2179. Do you not conceive that a landlord who relieved himself from a pauper population subsisting on his ground, without receiving any adequate compensation therefrom, would obtain an actual pecuniary benefit by their removal?—I think he would.

¹ ER3, T. S. Rice, 447.

² ER1, R. O'Driscoll, 195.

2180. Would it not render so much of his property, now unproductive, productive?—I think the landlord would be very well repaid, for the money subscribed or given by him, by the improvement of his estate.¹

2296. If they now contributed to such a purpose, is it your opinion that that would be done on a principle of charity and humanity, rather than on a principle of self-interest?—Certainly.²

3584. In the case therefore of those poorer class of persons paying rent direct to the landlord, you think he would have a positive pecuniary interest in removing them?—Yes, there is not a doubt of it, when he had not employ for them as labourers.

3585. In such a case as that, do you think he would have a pecuniary interest in removing them?—There is not the least doubt of it.³

These answers demonstrate that the witnesses were in general agreement on the financial benefits of such contributions, but whether they differed on the details of the benefits, and to what extent a landlord could benefit, is unknown from this testimony, especially because of the way the questions were formulated which did not give much room for personal opinion.

All this testimony is in conflict with a final witness, Robert Stearne Tighe, who says he would willingly contribute to emigration, though he himself would not benefit from the removal of his tenants, due to the debts that his tenants owed him.⁴ His willingness to contribute stems from “the evident benefit that would result to the poor creatures themselves, and for the manifest benefit and indeed necessity of removing them and others in the same situation for the peace and security of the country and the neighbourhood”,⁵ despite the financial loss he expects to incur, though he asserts that other landlords who would not benefit may not be so willing to contribute.

¹ ER1, Ennismore, 200.

² ER1, T. Odell, 209.

³ ER3, H. Dixon, 263.

⁴ ER3, R. S. Tighe, 441.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 442.

[A]ny effort I could make to contribute to it, I should feel it my duty; but, if I am asked as to the question of my pecuniary advantage, I must say that I do not conceive that I should derive much pecuniary advantage from the measure¹

but at the same time I am quite ready to incur that loss, for the evident benefit that would result to the poor creatures themselves, and for the manifest benefit and indeed necessity of removing them and others in the same situation for the peace and security of the country and the neighbourhood, though, I must add that the individuals in question are and always have been well conducted.²

Overall, the first Emigration Committee's Irish witnesses agreed that the removal of a portion of the laboring classes via emigration would be a financial benefit to the landlords, as well as to the removed families and those who remained.³ There was a slight divergence between two witnesses on the landlords' possible motives for contributing, with one stating that any contribution would be done on the basis of charity rather than self-interest,⁴ and the other claiming that Irish proprietors would contribute based on their interests, but would not agree on a method of taxation for those contributions to emigration.⁵ This difference is not unexpected, as each witness had his own perspective on all aspects of this topic, which continues in the discussion of the methods of contribution, whether a tax, land charge, voluntary contribution, direct contribution to tenants, or large lump sum contributions.

Methods of contribution

Because of the previous emigration experiments and their cost, the Emigration Committee was preoccupied by this issue. The evidence given on contributions to emigration often concerned how the future emigration plans would be financed and

¹ *Ibid.*, 441.

² *Ibid.*, 441-442.

³ ER1, Ennismore, 200.

⁴ ER1, T. Odell, 208-9.

⁵ ER1, O'Driscoll, 195-6.

how much landlords and others would be willing to contribute for those plans. While some witnesses did not give precise details on how much they would contribute, others were specific on this topic.

The possible contribution via an annual sum, tax, annuity, or charge, was particularly supported by the Irish witnesses. Though different terms were used to describe this method, we can think of it as a kind of tax, but whether it would be levied against all proprietors or only those whose tenants were removed through this scheme was not developed upon in the testimony.

William Wrixon Becher, a major landowner in county Cork and Whig member of Parliament for Mallow, testified to the willingness of Irish proprietors to contribute via an annuity. Becher expresses that reasonable terms would convince proprietors to agree to an annuity, though the language he uses is noncommittal, saying, “*I should think* the annuity would be preferred if it were favourable, or according to the terms of it, *I should think* it would tend to induce them to assent to it”.¹ He is, however, firm in his assertion that proprietors would prefer this method of contribution rather than paying a lump sum of money, “providing the rate of the annuity were reasonable, and spread over a considerable surface of years”.²

When questioned on the willingness of proprietors to contribute financially to remedy the perceived “evil” of excess population on their estates, the possibilities of “an advance of money, or by submitting to a taxation, or reimbursement by an annuity chargeable upon their estates”,³ were proposed to William Gabbett. Much like William W. Becher, Gabbett, a landowner in Limerick, responds extraordinarily generally to the questions he was asked on this subject. His response to these options is equally judicious,

¹ ER1, W. W. Becher, 192. (italics mine)

² *Idem.*

³ ER1, W. Gabbett, 127.

stating, “I think it would be politic for them to do so; I am satisfied the generality of the Irish gentlemen would concur in it with the greatest willingness”.¹ In the two additional questions he was asked on this subject, he asserts that a tax on their estates would be the most advantageous method for proprietors to contribute to the emigration of their tenants.

Hugh Dixon also agrees in his testimony that landlords would prefer to pay a small sum, such as a subscription, rather than a lump sum. Dixon, who worked as a middleman in Westmeath for Sir Thomas Chapman, explains that “very few landlords would contribute the 20*l.* [for a family of four]”, but that he would counsel them to contribute in small amounts, and believes that the landlords “would be disposed to subscribe something towards bettering them [their tenants] and taking them out of their poverty”.² This testimony is most likely based on his own experience as a middleman working for a large landowner in Westmeath, where he could have come into contact with some other resident proprietors in the region, though the witness does not specifically mention how he came to this opinion and does not give any detail on how much of a “small sum” a landlord would actually be willing to pay.

Robert Stearne Tighe, a resident proprietor in county Westmeath, agrees that an annuity of £3 10*s.* for seven years, approximately £20 for a family of five, compared to the proposal by the committee of £1 for 60 years. Though he was questioned on the willingness of proprietors to contribute under this plan, he answered as to his own disposition to finance the government’s emigration plans. Contrary to other witness, Tighe spoke at length when responding to this question, adding his own opinion on how the plan should be implemented, expressing that a large and sudden emigration would not be his preference:

¹ *Idem.*

² ER3, H. Dixon, 262.

I contemplate the continuance of Emigration for several years, and I would rather have a gradual emigration continued for a greater number of years, than attempt a more rapid and greater emigration in the first instance.¹

Furthermore, he asserts that the experiments that took place previously should be expanded equally to all corners of Ireland where there is a need, and that, as the emigration plan progresses over time, the plan would correct itself in time, and would be applied where necessary: “I think every county in Ireland should have a fair prospect of having a proportion of the benefit”.²

William Hare, 1st Earl of Listowel and named as “the Lord Viscount Ennismore” in the source text, was asked a few questions about the Irish landlords’ willingness to contribute to the proposed emigration plan, despite being a large landowner himself, to which he answers most likely based on his experience and exchanges with other landowners. He agrees that the expense of £20 for a family of four would be an acceptable amount for many landowners.³ As to the proposal of £3 10s. for seven years, referred to by previous witnesses, he admits that he would agree to the terms, while professing that, “I cannot say whether other landlords would be anxious to avail themselves of it, but I think many would [...] and it would depend upon the circumstances I have before mentioned, the character of the persons you wish to get rid of, and the situation of the estate”.⁴

Contrary to the other Irish witnesses, Thomas Spring Rice claims that he would prefer a large fixed payment of £100 instead of the annuity proposed by the committee of £6 a year for sixty years. He asserts that an immediate payment would be preferable to “subjecting their estates to annuities”.⁵ Unlike other witnesses, Spring Rice brought up

¹ ER3, R. S. Tighe, 443.

² *Idem.*

³ ER1, Ennismore, 197.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 198.

⁵ ER1, T. S. Rice, 212.

the inefficiencies of government projects as a reason for his opinion: “I think the system of immediate payment would prevent possible abuses in the efforts made at emigration, and would evidently prevent any deficiency arising to the public from a nonperformance of the engagements entered into”.¹ As this effort would involve a considerable amount of money, this point of view is not unexpected, and Spring Rice was especially straightforward with his responses on this and other subjects.

The idea of mortgaging or charging the poor rates was deliberated extensively by the English witnesses; all but one supported this source of financing. Ireland had no system of Poor Laws at the time, and Scotland’s Poor Laws had not been significantly updated since the sixteenth century, while England’s system had been more frequently updated, therefore it is not unexpected that the English witnesses would discuss utilizing all sources available to them to finance this project.

Edward Jeremiah Curteis suggests that parishes would be willing to mortgage their poor rates, in the following question, accompanied by a very succinct answer:

1172. Are you of opinion that in the event of the labourers being disposed to emigrate, the parishes would be disposed to mortgage the poor-rates, in repayment of the whole or part of the sum advanced for the purpose of emigration?—I think certainly.²

Thomas Law Hodges also supports this form of financing, as long as it would be “spread over a convenient space of time to allow the parish to raise the rates, to reimburse government for so large an amount”.³ Furthermore, Thomas Adams, of Mildenhall, Suffolk, was asked similar questions by the committee on the willingness of the parish to charge the poor rates to finance emigration; for both questions, his answer was “I think

¹ *Idem.*

² ER1, E. J. Curteis, 115.

³ ER1, T. L. Hodges, 135.

they would”.¹ Thomas Bradbury, previously the overseer of the parish of Great Horwood, Buckinghamshire, gives vague agreement to the suggestion of mortgaging the parish poor rates without going into any further detail.²

Like other questions posed by the committee, Samuel Maine, overseer of the parish of Hanworth, Middlesex, was asked a single question on contributions to emigration, which was long and detailed:

1730. Supposing a system were adopted, under which pauper families could emigrate, and that the parishes were willing to charge their rates for the purpose of emigration in the manner suggested; after such a plan had been fully explained to the poor, and when they understood all the advantages it offered to them, are you not of opinion that practically you would be able to keep at a less expense those able-bodied paupers who preferred staying in the parish upon their parochial rights, to taking advantage of the facilities held out to emigration?³

As previously documented in other examples of this type of question, the witness’ answer was a brief and ambiguous “certainly”.⁴

Likewise, John Smith, a Tory member of Parliament for Midhurst and banker in Oundle, Northamptonshire, was asked a specific and lengthy question on the desire of a parish to charge their poor rates to remove pauper families. Though his answer was equally long, his response mainly concerned the desire of the parishes to remove the families concerned, while concerning the actual financing, he responds, “I am scarcely able to give an opinion upon the subject, but I think they would be willing to pay a charge of that description”.⁵

¹ ER2, T. Adams, 200.

² ER2, T. Bradbury, 106.

³ ER2, S. Maine, 147.

⁴ *Idem.*

⁵ ER2, J. Smith, 93.

Unlike other witnesses on this aspect of financing, Thomas Lacoste gives a specific amount that the parish would be willing to pay to mortgage their poor rates. On the proposal of £8-10 a year, Lacoste asserts, “I think the parish would be glad to pay eight or ten pounds during the term of years mentioned [ten years], in order to get rid of them [pauper families]”.¹ No other witnesses gave further details on what parishes would be willing to pay annually for the mortgaging of their poor rates.

The idea of other sources of financing outside of government was proposed by four witnesses: two Scottish, one English, and one representing Australia. Alexander Campbell, the sheriff substitute for Renfrewshire, Scotland, believes financing should be a national not county-level question, and that it would be difficult to impose a tax on Scottish landholders because they have been “more deeply affected than most others by the late general depression of trade”.² Further, Campbell expresses that among the landlords, despite the proposals of the committee of establishing a county rate to remedy poverty through emigration, “the very strongest objections will be felt to any such assessment”,³ and they would insist that the proprietors who benefit most should be responsible for most, if not all, of the financing.

Joseph Foster, a weaver and representative of the Glasgow Emigration Society, gives the perspective of those wishing to emigrate, which was not expressed by many witnesses. The kind of financing that he says they expect, and that they petitioned Parliament for, is that “His Majesty’s Government, with the assistance of Parliament, would give a grant of land, and the means of occupying it, with a passage out”.⁴ Additionally, he specifies that each individual family would receive separate assistance from government for their passage and land grants. During this period, many petitions

¹ ER2, T. Lacoste, 137.

² ER2, Alexander Campbell 151.

³ *Ibid.*, 153.

⁴ ER2, Joseph Foster, 14.

were submitted to Parliament, primarily via Members of Parliament, which seems to be one of the reasons why the creation of a committee to study the question of emigration became necessary, particularly on how this kind of assistance would be organized and distributed.

Another alternative source of financing was put forth by the Bishop of Chester Charles James Blomfield, who was a member of the House of Lords, and represented the London Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Districts when speaking to the Emigration Committee. Blomfield explains that the London Committee made a resolution regarding emigration at its previous meeting, stating,

that the sum of 25,000l. [would] be appropriated to promote the object of emigration; it being understood that twice that sum will be furnished from some other source, and that it is to be appropriated in such a manner, under the direction of the Emigration Committee, or of persons appointed by the proper authority, as may be satisfactory to the Relief Committee.¹

The Bishop affirms to the Emigration Committee that the amount to be granted would only be forthcoming if it were matched, and in fact doubled, by another source, though he does not specify where that financing should come from, whether parishes, individual contributions, or the government.

Edward Eagar, cited in the Emigration Committee as “Eager”, was an Irish convict sent to Australia in 1811 for forgery, who later became an advocate for convict emancipation. Eagar’s testimony suggests a parliamentary loan to finance the emigration of voluntary laborers to Australia. The detailed question shows the committee’s prior knowledge of Eagar’s plan: “You propose that a loan should be raised, bearing four per cent interest, to be secured by stock created on the parish rates, and guaranteed by Parliament?—I do”.² This evidence, along with others, shows that each

¹ ER2, Bishop of Chester, 201.

² ER1, Edward Eager, 94.

witness was promoting a plan that corresponded with his own interests. We see a further example of this in the testimony of one witness representing British commercial interests in Australia.

A former lieutenant of the Royal Navy, Hanbury Clements, cited as “Clement” in the report, proposes to “take out 500 families free of all expense to His Majesty’s Government”,¹ and settling them and finding employment in Australia, in New South Wales, which he claims is lacking in artisans and farm laborers. The only thing he asks the government to provide is a land grant of about 200,000 acres in New South Wales. Clements asserts that laborers are needed for two reasons, “[o]ne of the purposes would be the growth of flax; another is for the purpose of manufacturing the extract of bark”,² which is how he says the 200,000 acres would be developed.

In addition to these alternative methods of financing emigration, many witnesses had mixed opinions on how landlords would prefer to contribute or expressed a general unwillingness among landlords to agree on a method, with most agreeing that a tax would not be acceptable to them.

Thomas Odell, resident of Limerick, was repeatedly asked if landlords would be willing to contribute in some form or another to the emigration of their tenants, whom they perceived as superabundant. He first asserts that landlords would be unwilling to pay a sum of money to remove surplus tenants. The question that followed was another example of the Committee’s pointed and detailed questioning, and as often received a short and noncommittal response:

2290. Supposing that absentees were to subscribe for the purpose of removing this population, and supposing the more intelligent of the local gentry were to subscribe for that purpose, do you not think the effect of those examples would operate upon the minds of those persons to whom

¹ ER3, H. Clement, 395.

² *Idem.*

you have specially alluded in a former answer, and that they would, for their own interests, be disposed to contribute to that expense in a certain degree?—I apprehend that some would.¹

Odell vaguely agrees in this response that both resident and absentee landlords would possibly be willing to subscribe for the removal of their tenants, meaning that each individual would promise to pay a small amount with no variation, for example depending on the size of their estate. Alternatively, he was asked whether instead of paying a larger lump sum, landlords would be willing to pay a small annual tax on their estates. On this iteration of the question, he responded with a detailed answer on the complicated financial burdens of the estates, more particularly on the tenants.

I conceive that a great proportion of the properties in Ireland are under the control of the courts above, under custodians and elegits and other processes of law, and that there is a succession of four or five rents, there is the quit and crown rent payable in the first instance, which the tenant must pay; there are then the county charges he must pay; there are then the church rates, those he must pay; there is then the clergyman's tithe; he then comes to pay the head landlord, that makes five rents; and in most instances, there is an intermediate tenancy of two or three more.²

In this response, Odell appears to be justifying the unwillingness of proprietors to financially contribute in any way to emigration, by claiming that tenants are responsible for a number of taxes and other charges, which he asserts, in few words, leaves very little for the rent that goes to the landlord. He answers a later question that further defends his position, stressing that landlords would be willing to contribute to the emigration of their tenants, "if they had it in their power",³ redeeming the elite class of landowners by agreeing with the committee's question that they would contribute on the basis of charity and humanity rather than self-interest. Odell is asked a further three questions

¹ ER1, T. Odell, 208.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 209.

on this aspect of the question, again in the form of a pointed and detailed question that was formulated to obtain a specific answer.

2298. In cases where the pauper tenant may have a legal title to remain on the property until the termination of the lease, and consequently where the landlord has no immediate legal power of ejectment, are you of opinion that if opportunities of removing them satisfactorily by emigration were to be afforded, the landlord would not be prepared to anticipate the period of ejectment, by contributing towards their removal, provided the tenants were equally disposed to remove?—I apprehend the Irish landlord would not do so.¹

2314. Is the Committee to understand that in any system of emigration undertaken by government, though a portion of the interest may be repaid from Canada, a very small portion of the original outlay can be procured from Ireland, from either landlord or emigrants?—That is my opinion, for the reasons I have before given.²

2315. You think that the whole, or nearly the whole of the original outlay, must come from government?—I should apprehend so; I know that the people expect it.³

With his answers, he further confirms his opinion that Irish landlords were not in a situation to contribute to the emigration of their tenants in any case whatsoever, and that they were expecting the government to be the primary underwriter of any scheme that would be a financial benefit to them and their estates. These questions were possibly formulated in this way to present the landlords' position on contributing to emigration, without taking into account the fact that many of them were able to contribute, due to their large holdings of land in Ireland, in addition to their estates in England or Scotland where they preferred to live due to their fears of the instability and rare disturbances that occurred in Ireland against the ruling elites.

¹ *Idem.*

² *Ibid.*, 210.

³ *Idem.*

John O'Driscoll, resident and most likely a landowner¹ in the south of Ireland, was asked no less than nine questions on different proposals of contribution that would or would not be acceptable to the landowners in that area. His answer to the second question illustrates the general character of the majority of his answers on contributions. He is asked if he has

had any opportunity of forming a judgment as to the disposition which exists among the gentlemen in the south of Ireland to meet a proposition for Emigration with any contributions in any shape, for the purpose of carrying the measure into effect.²

To which he responds, "I have conversed with a number of gentlemen [...] and they are very willing to contribute towards it, without having any specific plan upon the subject".³ This perspective reflects the responses of a number of the witnesses whose testimony has been examined, who generally and vaguely agreed with the committee's different proposals, but said very little on their own proposals or original ideas, if they had any. On this witness, the committee appeared to run through a number of proposals for contributions, starting with asking if charging a county rate would be beneficial to the Irish proprietors, to which his response was, "I would consider it so, certainly".⁴ In a separate question on the feasibility of charge such a county rate, his answer was similarly vague: "I am sure some individuals would contribute, but there would be a difficulty as to the mode of raising that voluntary contribution".⁵ He expresses that he is "sure many [landowners] would be very willing [...] either by general taxation or by some arranged mode of contribution",⁶ again, without firmly consenting to such a proposal or giving further detail. While all questions posed by the committee were adapted to each

¹ Due to the addition of "Esquire" at the end of his name.

² ER2, J. O'Driscoll, 90.

³ *Idem.*

⁴ *Idem.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁶ *Idem.*

witness's circumstances, Odell was asked a particular question on the willingness to contribute of landowners who did not believe there was a superabundant population on their estates. This question was not posed to any other witnesses.

1042. In every county in Ireland it is supposed that there may be many properties which have too great a number of people upon them, and others, which have not too many; in that case are you of opinion that the gentlemen in these relative situations would be equally willing to impose a permanent burden upon their property, for getting rid of a general excess of people in the country?—I am inclined to think that all the parties would contribute; for this reason, that the property which has only a sufficient number of population, is very much injured by a contiguous property which has too much. The pauper population of an overpeopled estate prey upon the population of the neighbouring estate, which has not more than its due proportion of people; they live upon their charity, and often steal from them; they are a great nuisance to the neighbourhood; and it would be nearly as great a relief to the estate that has not more than its proper population, to get rid of the superabundant population upon the neighbouring estate, as it would to that estate itself. I have found it to be the case in the country, that a neighbouring property over-peopled, was a great nuisance.¹

Though the question was somewhat detailed in describing the contribution proposal for landowners with or without a superabundant number of tenants, Odell's answer ("I am inclined to think that all the parties would contribute") is decidedly ambiguous, and he continues with an unsolicited opinion on the estates that are in these circumstances, without providing any evidence of a willingness to contribute. Altogether, his various answers gently agree with many of the proposals of the committee without giving hard evidence or, at the very least, a firm approval of any method suggested. Though Odell was not the only witness to approach this line of questioning in this way, this type of discourse demonstrates that some witnesses perhaps did not want to appear to agree to a proposal, and then have to be accountable for engaging in a plan, once developed by

¹ *Ibid.*, 92.

the government. In other words, they did not want to commit before the government decided what the official program would be.

John Leslie Foster, Tory member of Parliament for Louth, Ireland, similarly gives multiple proposals for persuading landowners to contribute, explaining in a more nuanced argument in his testimony, that generally “proprietors would prefer advancing the money payment in all cases where they are able” directly to their tenants to be removed,¹ but where it is not possible he recommends that the government would have to get consent from the proprietors when levying a tax for the purpose of emigration.² He explains, however, that this would be difficult, as agreeing upon and applying a tax to fund emigration would be nearly impossible, though the collection of such a tax would work efficiently within the established framework of tax collection in the counties.³

If an annuity were charged upon one or more townlands with such distinctness as to make it certain to the collector what land was to be resorted to, the ordinary machinery for the collection of the county rates might be applied, and the money might be transmitted through the county treasurer to the Government; but I must beg to add, that I should apprehend great preliminary difficulties in defining the lands to be charged with the particular annuities.⁴

This perspective demonstrates the knowledge of the witness as to the functioning of the tax collection system of the period. As a representative for Louth, he may have had more experience in how these systems operated, and how this type of tax would have been difficult to implement. Also, as a member of the Emigration Committee, perhaps he was making all the proposals he could to see which would be the practical or popular among the other witnesses.

¹ ER3, J. L. Foster, 339.

² *Ibid.*, 340.

³ *Ibid.*, 339.

⁴ *Idem.*

Further witnesses express a general unwillingness to agree on any kind of method of contribution, particularly on the question of a tax. Alexander Nimmo says that Irish proprietors generally would be unwilling to pay a tax for parochial relief for the purpose of emigration.¹ Redmond O'Driscol, when asked two questions on the suggestion of either a lump sum or a small annuity, responds with "I do not know what would induce the country gentlemen in Ireland to do any thing personally for the purpose of assisting emigration", and "I cannot form an opinion".² Furthermore, he admits that though the landowners would agree to the advantages and financial benefits of emigration, one can "doubt whether they would concur as to any mode of taxation upon themselves [...] to assist in that object".³ This opinion is somewhat fatalistic in its repetition of the unwillingness of landowners to contribute, though it is not unlike other opinions expressed to the Committees.

David John Wilson, a resident landowner in county Clare, expresses that "[a] great part of the landholders would be able to contribute something",⁴ contrary to other witnesses who claim that Irish landlords either would not be able or willing to contribute anything. He proposes an alternative tax, which would most likely have been unpopular, arguing that "the fairest fund that could be raised in addition to that, would be a tax upon the money drawn out of Ireland by the absentees, to increase in proportion to the sum of the money drawn away".⁵ As a large proportion of landowners were absentees during this period, and there was general agreement that they would not agree to a tax, this proposal, though sensible from his perspective, most likely would not have received

¹ ER1, A. Nimmo, 195.

² ER1, R. O'Driscol, 196.

³ *Idem*.

⁴ ER3, D. J. Wilson, 296.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 295.

much support from the absentee landowners, though he asserts that it should be a voluntary tax.¹

John Markham Marshall, a resident landowner in county Kerry, expresses primarily his own opinion on the method of contribution that Irish landlords would prefer, which conflicts with other testimony on the subject. He agrees generally that landlords would be willing to contribute, and that the amount of £4 per person would be considered an acceptable sum. Despite agreeing on the sum mentioned, he disagrees with the principle of a small annuity for the duration of sixty years, claiming that “they would be disposed to prefer advancing the money at once”,² though he contradicts himself by saying: “I can only answer for myself. I never heard the question started in Ireland, therefore I cannot answer for the opinion of others”.³ This perspective was little represented in the evidence, as only one other witness advocated for the willingness of Irish landlords to agree to a payment of a lump sum, while at the same time expressing a similar level of evasiveness as other witnesses. In some ways, it appears that many of the witnesses did very little to prepare for their testimony before the Emigration Committee or that their testimony seems to reflect a very lukewarm Irish response to a reflection that seemed disconnected from the real problems in Ireland.

This debate on the method of contribution was a point of dissension among the witnesses for Ireland, though the majority of witnesses say that Irish proprietors, both resident and absentee, would be willing to contribute something for the purpose of emigration, with the greater part willing to do so for their own self-interest.

As previously mentioned, this inability to agree on a method of financing this future emigration plan was not unexpected, as the question of the cost of the plan was

¹ *Ibid.*, 296.

² ER3, J. M. Marshall, 409.

³ *Idem.*

one of the most pressing for the Emigration Committee and Wilmot-Horton, who was on the receiving end of a number of questions as to the cost of the emigration experiments from the Parliament when requesting that an Emigration Committee be formed.

The witnesses for Ireland were asked about landlords and individual contributions rather than contributions from parishes or mortgaging poor rates, which did not exist in Ireland at the time. English and other witnesses were not asked about the possibility of landlords or manufacturers agreeing to contribute something to the emigration of their poor tenants despite their having distressed conditions, especially in the manufacturing districts of England. The questions directed to the English witnesses were primarily focused on possible contributions from the parishes, in the form of a mortgage or charge on the poor rates, and other alternative sources.

Irish witnesses testified more than others on the possibility of contributing to emigration depending on the expense, which perhaps shows a reticence to contribute, whether under an official government plan or giving funds directly to individual tenants wishing to emigrate. Irish witnesses were also primarily concerned about the financial benefits of contributing to the emigration plan. Of those witnesses who testified to the financial benefits of contributing, all seven were Irish.

Of the other witnesses representing Scotland, Australia, and Colombia, they proposed alternative sources of financing, from relief committees, government loans, and land grants.

Finally, on the debate on potential methods of contribution, a small annual sum, tax, or annuity was the most commonly supported, though there were many opinions expressing a general unwillingness, among Irish landlords especially, to agree on a single method of contribution.

This focus on the possible forms of contributions shows a willingness on the part of the committee to explore all possible avenues to encourage and finance emigration projects, which was clearly seen as a serious solution for most witnesses to the contemporary problems of poverty and overpopulation primarily in Ireland. The tension between the desire to encourage emigration and the general reticence to contribute financially to it was not reconciled during the evidence gathering phase of the committee, though they ultimately supported a loan to be repaid by the emigrants themselves, once established in their new homes.

4.4 Vacuum

Another major concern of the Committee was that if large numbers of the poor population were removed from their communities, that would create a vacuum, which would be filled almost instantly, thereby making the original removal of paupers insignificant and a waste of resources.

In the analysis of the evidence on this subject, three ideas are discernable: that the vacuum would be filled by the Irish who remained, that there were or were not means to prevent the vacuum from being filled, and that the landlords had an interest in preventing the vacuum from being filled. Another analysis dedicated solely to Malthus' testimony to the Emigration Committee will also give further insight into this subject and the general reverence of Malthus and his theories during this period.

Many witnesses believed that Irish laborers would fill any vacuum left by the emigrants. This assumption could have been due to general prejudices toward the Irish, which wavered during this period between pathological laziness and determined industriousness. This point of view was first presented in the report of the first Emigration Committee:

Your Committee being fully aware that one popular objection which is continually offered to any system of Emigration on an extended scale, is the argument, that the benefit would be only temporary, and that the temporary vacuum would be rapidly filled up, felt it necessary to direct their inquiries to the consideration of such collateral measures, both of a legislative and of a practical nature, as might be calculated to repress, if not to prevent, that tendency; they have therefore pursued their inquiries very extensively, and have been fortunate enough to collect very valuable evidence on this branch of the subject.¹

With this brief introduction to the concern of the vacuum, the Committee makes it clear that their intention is to address this subject directly, asking witnesses if the vacuum would be filled and what could be done to prevent it. With legislation already going through the parliamentary process during this time,² there was almost a guarantee that the witnesses would agree that this new law would be the best means of stopping any openings in a community from being repopulated by other laboring poor, and therefore reassuring any proprietor with this exact apprehension.

First, there was expressed by several witnesses the belief that the vacuum would be filled immediately, with most asserting that it would be Irish laborers who would fill the vacuum. Edward Jeremiah Curteis, member of Parliament for Sussex, however, was the only witness who gave slightly more precise evidence on this subject:

With respect to those who have gone abroad, I have not seen any good effect from it, for our cottages are increasing in number immensely, and some how or other the cottages are instantly filled; as soon as a family is taken out of a cottage and sent abroad, another family instantly comes to supply the vacuum; perhaps this may be ascribed to the eager desire of the owners to get rent, and they get enormous rents; and I am sorry to say that the parish too often pays the rents, which is a great abuse.³

¹ ER1, 9-10.

² This resulted in the *Assignment and Sub-Letting of Land Act* of 1826, which only allowed subletting under the express consent of the landlord, which could have potentially prevented a vacuum from being filled in the case that a large number of tenants were removed for emigration.

³ ER1, E. J. Curteis, 116.

He explains that he had witnessed this phenomenon, of families going abroad and new families coming to instantly take their place. Curteis explained that the proprietors were motivated by financial interests to have tenants on their estates to collect rents, even those that were paid by the parish, which was sometimes the case in England due to the operation of the Poor Laws there, though they did not function in the same way in Scotland, and did not exist in Ireland. This account gives a logical explanation for his observations on the filling of the vacuum, which contrasts with the additional evidence given on this subject, which, like other answers, remained vague and brief for some of the witnesses. Archibald Campbell, MP for Glasgow and Lord Lieutenant of Renfrewshire, for example, was asked a particular question about the vacuum in Scotland being filled by laborers from Ireland, to which his answer was characteristically brief:

219. If one thousand weavers were removed from Glasgow and its neighbourhood, and wages rose, have you any doubt that the vacuum so created would be filled up from Ireland in a very short time?—I entertain not the least doubt upon the subject.¹

On the subject of the vacuum in Glasgow, William Spencer Northhouse addressed the probability of the vacuum being filled by the Irish, but with a nuanced argument:

739. If by the abstraction of 1,000 families from the neighbourhood of Glasgow, the condition of the remainder of the working population was improved by a rise in wages, have you any doubt, the state of Ireland remaining the same, that that vacuum would be instantly filled up from that quarter?—I have much doubt that the vacuum would be instantly filled up from that quarter, because the rate of wages must be so low, for some time to come, as to offer little temptation even to an Irishman to come over.²

¹ ER2, Archibald Campbell, 22-23.

² ER2, W. S. Northhouse, 60.

Northhouse's answer, that wages were too low in Scotland for the Irish to be interested in migrating to find work, appears a bit short-sighted when considering that wage levels in Ireland were even lower, meaning that any slight increase in living conditions would have been a marked benefit for the Irish laboring poor.

Other witnesses gave longer answers to these questions on the vacuum, including Thomas Francis Kennedy, a Whig member of Parliament for Ayrshire, Scotland, who explained in his testimony that removing a number of the distressed population and, thereby, improving the conditions of those remaining, would draw other laborers and “that the space created by their removal would be instantaneously filled up”.¹ He further agreed that this vacuum “would be instantaneously filled up by the resort of Irish to that part of the country”, though he specified that he had no negative feelings towards them, that “their conduct, generally speaking, is good, and that the country has derived very great benefits from the labour they have afforded”.² Kennedy made the further point that the influx of Irish already taking place “is a source of great calamity [...] and is not a source [...] of advantage to those poor people themselves”.³ Whether this witness had a bias toward Irish laborers notwithstanding, he still considered that removing a part of the distressed laborers of Scotland would create a vacuum that would instantly be filled by the Irish. One additional witness agreed with this standpoint in answering a question on whether he considered that emigration would be a temporary or permanent relief in Scotland:

1787. As long as the law and circumstances of Scotland remain what they are with respect to the impossibility of preventing the influx and settlement of the numerous bands of Irish that come there, do you conceive that any emigration, however desirable on other accounts, and however desirable as a means of temporary relief, would afford any permanent relief to that country?—I do not believe that it would afford any permanent

¹ ER2, T. F. Kennedy, 24.

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 26.

relief. A temporary relief I certainly think it would afford, for it is not in one month, nor perhaps in one year, that the vacuum could be filled up by persons able to do the work of those who had gone away; [...] those Irish who happen to be weavers of cotton or linen goods in Ireland, and who may hope for better wages in Scotland, would have the strongest temptation to come over.¹

This witness, Alexander Campbell, the Sheriff Substitute for Renfrewshire, expressed similar beliefs that Irish laborers or weavers would come and fill any vacuum created almost immediately. These opinions communicate a general view that this vacuum would be filled and that, therefore, emigration would only be a temporary relief to the communities from which settlers would be chosen, though the majority of these witnesses were Scottish, presenting only a limited view on the question. The witnesses convey a pessimistic view, without giving evidence to demonstrate what they suggest would happen, while others contended that there were measures that could be taken to prevent this vacuum from being filled and for an overgrown population to once again establish itself on the estates that endeavored to remove their tenants.

The witnesses who testified on the measures to prevent filling the vacuum were primarily Irish, with one English witness adding his perspective to the question. While most agreed that there were methods that could be employed to avoid a recurring overflow of population, one Irish witness disputed this opinion, arguing that nothing could be done to prevent it.

3947. Supposing a considerable emigration to take place from Cork and its neighbourhood, do you conceive that any effectual means could be devised for preventing the vacuum being filled up?—I fear not; in fact there is no law by which strangers can be kept from coming into the parish, as there is in England; in Ireland the poor laws do not exist.²

¹ ER2, Alexander Campbell, 157.

² ER3, W. Murphy, 387.

Doctor William Murphy, a physician residing in Cork, expressed his anxiety, though brief, that there would be no “effectual means [...] for preventing the vacuum being filled up”, as the question was posed by the Committee. This perspective could be due to his own personal observations of the poor in the region of Cork, which he testified about, explaining that the population was extremely overcrowded and suffered high levels of fever for this reason.¹

The other witnesses, however, considered that there were possibilities to prevent this problem from occurring following a successful emigration plan. Henry Parnell, Baronet, landowner, member of Parliament for Queen’s County, and member of the Emigration Committee, insisted on the necessity of legislation, as he explained it, “to prevent England and Scotland from being overrun by Irish labourers by any ordinary means”.² Parnell provided a rationale for the study of emigration by asserting that

grounds will be laid to justify and call for the carrying on of Emigration from Ireland, on a large scale, at the public expense; and also for such measures as will make sure of preventing the vacancies occasioned by it, from being filled up.³

This testimony, given in the form of a statement, meaning no questions were asked, confirms the intentions of the Committee, namely, to gather the support necessary to establish a state-assisted emigration plan, in particular for Ireland, by acknowledging the question of the vacuum, which could complicate the success of any plan.

On a question related to the financial contributions to emigration from parishes, William Richard Cosway, a landowner in County Kent, expressed a willingness to contribute, “[p]rovided the Act of Parliament that we expect to come out will, in our

¹ *Ibid.*, 384.

² ER2, H. Parnell, 167.

³ *Idem.*

opinion, sufficiently protect us”.¹ Cosway elaborated on the protections he wanted to see in this legislation:

It being understood that he can have no further claim upon the parish if he were to return. I apprehend that a tax on cottages, to a very considerable extent, would be the best means of preventing early marriages.²

This witness is advocating further legislation to accompany any emigration plan, that those who are chosen to resettle in the British colonies would not be able to return to their home country and receive parish assistance, and that taxes on cottages, which were numerous on estates to house the laboring population, would induce landowners to demolish them after they were vacated, and therefore prevent them from being inhabited by newcomers.

Finally, Thomas Spring Rice contradicted Cosway’s answer, by claiming that the means already existed to prevent the vacuum from being filled up in the form of the Assignment and Sub-letting of Land (Ireland) Act (or Landlord and Tenant(Ireland) Act) of 1826, enacted on May 5th of that year, during the proceedings of the Emigration Committee.

4323. You think that the law, as it now stands, gives him the means of providing against the recurrence of that, that where the vacuum now occurs, the means are afforded to the landlord of preventing that vacuum being filled up?—I have no doubt of it; in a property with which I am acquainted, in one county, consisting of between six and seven thousand English acres, on which I think the population is nearly 4,000, I have no hesitation in saying that if a certain proportion of that population were removed, by the ordinary management of the estate for the interests of the parties concerned, there would be no real difficulty in preventing a recurrence of the evil.³

¹ ER3, W. R. Cosway, 380.

² *Idem.*

³ ER3, T. S. Rice, 448.

With this testimony, Spring Rice determined that no additional legislation would be required in Ireland to effectually prevent the filling of the vacuum as a result of the removal of a portion of the population. He further confirmed that it was in the general interest of the landlords to prevent it, as their objective appeared to be the consolidation of their estates and farms, reducing the number of tenants. Spring Rice claimed there was a feeling amongst the farmers, that the consolidation of farms was more important to the landlords than the livelihood of their tenants.

It is a common phrase amongst them, "We now discover that dairy cows are more profitable than cottager tenants." The feeling, in short, is universal, and there is a disposition to act upon that principle, except where checked by moral and political causes.¹

This aspect of the vacuum was primarily discussed by Irish witnesses, with the exception of one Scottish witness, Henry Home Drummond, a large landowner and Member of Parliament for Stirlingshire, who explained that a feudal system remained in parts of the country where rents were the highest priority of those managing the land.

A great proportion of the houses in the country villages do not belong to the landed proprietors, but to what we call feuars; that is to say, the house is the actual property of a person who has no other property but that house; and an individual of that inferior station will generally let it to the person that offers him at the moment, without even good security, the highest rent.²

This witness was arguing the less popular point of view that the landlords and proprietors were more interested in collecting their rents than the status or survival of their tenants, and, in some cases, the improvement of their estates through the consolidation of farms.

¹ *Idem.*

² ER2, H. H. Drummond, 27.

The Irish witnesses, however, presented a different perspective, which was that proprietors were willing to prevent the vacuum being filled in order to successfully consolidate their farms, and, as a result, reduce the number of tenants living on their estates. William Gabbett, an Irish proprietor from County Limerick, testified during the first Emigration Committee that it would be in the interest of the landlords to prevent a recurrence of an overgrown population, as they would be unwilling to contribute to further emigration plans.

1283. If in consequence of the encouragement given to emigration, either by the landlords or by the government, a considerable proportion of the people were tempted to emigrate, do you not think that the vacuum created in that way would be soon filled up? — I think every landed proprietor would take care then that the population did not increase, otherwise he would be taxed for an emigration again of his overgrown population.¹

Hugh Dixon, a middleman from Westmeath, gave a similarly vague response on the question of the vacuum during the third Emigration Committee:

2594. Do you think that if any number of this class of paupers were to be removed, there would be either the means or the disposition to prevent the vacuum being filled up?—I think it would be guarded against; I think landed proprietors and others would guard against it.²

Though these testimonies do not specify how the proprietor would prevent a vacuum being filled, they express a general desire to stop the population from increasing after removing a proportion of them for emigration.

The final witness, Anthony Richard Blake, a Catholic lawyer, former commissioner on Education in Ireland, and member of the Tribes of Galway, gave more precise methods on how landlords should proceed to arrest a new influx of Irish paupers

¹ ER1, W. Gabbett, 129.

² ER3, H. Dixon, 263.

who might take up residence in recently vacated dwellings, namely, the demolition of cabins and cottages occupied by the laboring poor.

4370. In the case of a landlord removing his population, and throwing his property into larger farms, would he not necessarily pull down the cabins of those tenants who were ejected?—I should consider such a proceeding to be matter of course.

4371. Would not that, in your opinion, be in itself a practical prevention against the vacuum being filled up, as it is termed?— I take it that it would be most effectual, and indeed the only means either of giving effect to his wish to consolidate his farms, or to prevent other collections of paupers from getting upon his estate.

While this method may appear extreme, it is logical that proprietors who wished to consolidate their farms, perhaps to transform the land from tillage agriculture to pasture, would remove excess buildings on their properties. This method would effectively prevent further tenants from taking up residence on these estates where a selective emigration project had been implemented. Furthermore, Blake confirmed previous testimony that the Landlord and Tenant Law in Ireland would be sufficient protection for landlords to stop a recurrence of an overgrown population on their estates.

4372. Do you not think that under the operation of the existing Landlord and Tenant Law in Ireland, an Irish proprietor has full power to prevent the subdivision of land upon his estate, if he is so disposed?—I think he has.¹

These testimonies show some divergence in opinions on the subject of the vacuum, though the witnesses generally expressed a willingness on the part of the proprietors, as well as employable methods, to avoid having to make further financial contributions to emigration projects if the vacuum were to be filled.

¹ ER3, A. R. Blake, 458.

An additional analysis of Malthus' testimony will further demonstrate how influential his writings and theories were on the elites of society and the Emigration Committee during this period.

Malthus

Despite having only visited Ireland once in the year 1817, according to his own testimony to the Emigration Committee, which he admitted was a short visit to Westmeath and Lake Killarney, Thomas Robert Malthus had much to say about Ireland during his submission on May 5, 1827. His evidence included a variety of subjects discussed in this dissertation, in particular, the rapidly increasing population of Ireland, subdivision of land, the consolidation of farms, distress, the effects of Irish migration on English laborers, emigration as a remedy, and the vacuum that would result.

Malthus's testimony was substantial, totaling seventeen pages. The only other witness testimony that was as long was that of Peter Robinson's, who as we saw had been superintendent of the 1823 and 1825 emigration experiments, though his evidence predominantly contained settlement plans for future emigration projects from the United Kingdom. This in itself shows the importance granted to Malthus's statement by the Committee.

The benefit of Malthus's testimony is that there is an extensive written record of his theories on population in the form of his various editions of *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. In total, six editions were published in 1798, 1803, 1806, 1807, 1817, and 1826, though it is said that the third through sixth editions did not differ much from the second, with an additional tome published in 1830 entitled *A Summary View on the Principle of Population* which was a 77-page defense of his *Essay*.

Some aspects of his theories changed from one edition to the next and conflicted with the evidence he gave to the Emigration Committee, which was recently analyzed

by Eric Richards.¹ Richards summarizes Malthus's position on emigration, which was that "[e]migration alone was entirely inadequate to affect the level of population; it could not reduce the population permanently and consequently would never lead to depopulation",² meaning that it could only be used as a temporary remedy to the increasing population pressure. This coincides with Malthus's assertions in his *Essay*, though from one edition to the next he sometimes contradicted himself. In the second edition, a much longer version he called "very much enlarged",³ he added an entire chapter on emigration, in which he stated:

It is evident, therefore, that the reason why the resource of emigration has so long continued to be held out as a remedy to redundant population, is, because, from the natural unwillingness of people to desert their native country, and the difficulty of clearing and cultivating fresh soil, it never is, nor can be, adequately adopted. If this remedy were indeed really effectual, and had power so far to relieve the disorders of vice and misery in old states, as to place them in the condition of the most prosperous new colonies, we should soon see the phial exhausted, and when the disorders returned with increased virulence, every hope from that quarter would be for ever closed. It is clear, therefore, that with any view of making room for an unrestricted increase of population, emigration is perfectly inadequate; but as a partial and temporary expedient, and with a view to the more general cultivation of the earth, and the wider spread of civilization, it seems to be both useful and proper.⁴

This directly conflicts with a line of questioning from the Committee on the financial advantage of removing a part of the population compared with employing them at home.

3246. If therefore it can be shown that the removal of those labourers by emigration could be effected for an infinitely less sum than is necessary to maintain them in existence, is it not true that, in a national point of view,

¹ Eric Richards. "Malthus and the Uses of British Emigration." *Empire, Migration and Identity in the British World*. Eds. Kent Fedorowich and Andrew S. Thompson. (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2017): 42-59.

² Eric Richards, 44.

³ Malthus, second edition (1803), Title page.

⁴ Malthus, second edition (1803), 394-395 (*italics mine*).

it would be a wise measure to remove them, provided that the removal was attended with benefit to themselves and their families?—No doubt.

3247. Would you not admit, that if the expense of removing them was equal to what might be calculated, upon the average of their lives, the expense of maintaining them, supposing there was no chance of their services being called for such expense would be legitimately applied?—Most legitimately.

3248. A fortiori, if it could be shewn that that expense was considerably less than that of maintaining them, you would admit the expediency of removing them?—Certainly.¹

Though Malthus's answers to these questions were admittedly brief, it shows that the Committee was looking for confirmation on the financial advantages to providing relief in the form of emigration. This is further outlined in their questions on the necessity of combining strategies of improvement with emigration, meaning that improvement would not be possible without removing tenants from proprietors' estates.

3318. Is, therefore, not the first step towards improvement in Ireland necessarily to be accomplished by an alteration of the present state of the occupancy of land? – I think that such an alteration is of the greatest possible importance, but that the other should accompany it; it would not have the same force without.²

This sentiment was expressed by other witnesses, that in order to improve their estates they would be obligated to remove an indeterminate number of tenants. Strategies of this nature had been used in Ireland, and particularly in Scotland, for many years as a way of improving, consolidating, or clearing, their estates.³

In agreeing with the clear interest of the proprietors to remove their tenants, Malthus asserts that removal would be the quickest way of alleviating the poor conditions of the laboring classes.

¹ ER3, Malthus, 314.

² *Ibid.*, 319.

³ This strategy was called "Highland Clearances" in the case of Scotland.

3322. If the people increase considerably, and continue to be in so wretched a state, what prospect can we have of any increased degree of tranquillity and security in Ireland?—Very little prospect indeed.

3323. Under those circumstances, and also taking into consideration the influence of a great increase in the population of Ireland on the population of England, what upon the whole, is your opinion with regard to the expediency of attempting to introduce emigration on a very large scale from Ireland?—I should think it was very particularly expedient at present, if, as I understand, there is an intention on the part of the landlords to make that change in the management of their lands before adverted to.¹

The idea that emigration combined with better land management would remedy the distress, poverty, and misery of the lower classes was not an unusual proposal, though there was little to no evidence given by Malthus or other witnesses to support this assertion. This testimony further confirms the suggestions made by other witnesses that the management of the land by middlemen was a factor in the increase of the population, and that, in order to make a significant change, a different kind of land management would be necessary to avoid the continued increase and, additionally, the filling of the vacuum.

The issue of the vacuum, though not always asked directly, was addressed in Malthus's answers to numerous questions regarding other subjects. For instance, when asked if a parish mortgaging their poor rates for ten years to finance the emigration of a number of unemployed laborers would be a more financially sound solution than supporting them over that same time period, Malthus responded: "I think so, if the vacancy were not filled up within the ten years".² In a similar fashion, when asked if "further improvements in the administration of the poor-laws may be much more practical after the introduction of the system of emigration, than they are at the present moment?", a variation of the previous answer was given, "Yes, I think they might be so,

¹ ER3, Malthus, 320.

² *Ibid.*, 322.

certainly, *particularly if it is supposed that the vacuum is not filled up*; in that case, I have not the least doubt that every thing would be very much improved".¹

Malthus eventually directly answered his preoccupation with the vacuum, but only briefly when addressing emigration from Ireland and the vacuum that would be created by such a project.

3379. Can you form an opinion as to what extent of the population of Ireland ought to be removed, in order to produce any very material effect on the comforts of the remainder? – It is very difficult to form any precise opinion upon that subject; one does not know the proportion of the population that is actually unemployed.

3380. Supposing that by any means half a million of the population of Ireland could be suddenly removed, do you not think that there is in the existing state of things a strong natural tendency to fill up the vacuum? – No doubt there is always a very strong tendency to fill up the vacuum; and you might even encourage a greater proportion of births by an emigration, unless it were accompanied by some measures of the kind before referred to.²

Despite this answer, the matter of the vacuum occasioned by emigration was not addressed directly in any version of Malthus's *Essay*.

The remainder of Malthus's testimony to the Emigration Committee encompassed emigration from Ireland and the benefits it would engender, especially if measures were taken to prevent the vacuum being filled and improvements of the living conditions of the laborers were to take place.

3382. Do you not think, as a general proposition, that every system of emigration from any country must be ultimately ineffectual, unless accompanied by some measure that will more or less counteract the natural tendency that exists in all society to fill up the vacuum so artificially created?—If without any pressure with regard to expense you could effect a constant emigration to a large extent, you would no doubt keep the

¹ *Ibid.*, 323, italics mine.

² *Ibid.*, 324.

population in a better state; but if such a current of emigration were to stop at any time, you would have a still greater tendency to a redundancy.¹

In this statement, Malthus asserted that while a system of emigration would improve the circumstances of the laboring poor, it would necessitate continuous emigration, without which the redundancy would reoccur. This explanation coincides with Malthus's belief that the vacuum would be immediately filled and that emigration on its own could not lead to depopulation. Malthus similarly asserted that the vacuum would be filled quickly following a period of famine, which was particularly pertinent to the case of Ireland, though Malthus's evidence came from an example of pestilence in Prussia, about which he gave no concrete facts.²

In spite of his reservations on the effectiveness of a state-aided emigration plan, Malthus expressed that any system would be advantageous to Ireland, when accounting for its rapidly increasing population.

3388. If that is the case, taking into consideration the tendency that this population has to increase at present, do you conceive that the emigrating of half a million would produce any very sensible effect on the condition of the remainder? – It is impossible to say what effect; but I think it would still produce a very sensible effect, and that it would be very beneficial if accompanied by the measures before referred to.³

This answer, while admitting that emigration would be positive for the population of Ireland, further insists on the necessity of introducing measures to prevent the continued growth of the population, by stopping the filling of the vacuum, restricting the practice of subletting, and generally improving the conditions of the laboring poor. Malthus further asserted that when comparing the situations of the nations of the United Kingdom, that Ireland was most in need of emigration as a remedy to their distress.

¹ *Idem.*

² *Idem.*

³ *Ibid.*, 325.

On the subject of distress, Malthus made a number of assertions about the lower classes of the population of Ireland. First, that the presence of Irish laborers in England and Scotland had the effect of lowering wages for working classes of those countries, though other witnesses who addressed this issue were split in their opinions. Next, in acknowledging the dependence on the potato for their subsistence, Malthus claimed that the influx of Irish laborers into England and Scotland would lead to a transformation of those laborers' habits, that they too would become dependent on the potato, and that, due to this change, their moral habits, physical manners, and conduct would be altered as well.¹ Though he did not explain what was meant by these changes, one can look to his writings to find a more detailed description of what Malthus called "moral degradation".² This analysis on the morality of the Irish poor was where the introduction of Malthus's religious position became evident, suggesting "moral restraint" would be a sufficient preventative to the continued increase of population. His opinions on this issue were highly subjective, coming from his own Church of England background, in addition to widely held beliefs about the Irish during this period. This "moral degradation" was addressed first by the Committee, and in analyzing Malthus's writings on population, in the case of Ireland, this was due to early marriages, a high birth rate, and a lack of education. He concluded that higher wages and better living conditions ("comforts") would correct this problem.

3403. The only hope of diminishing that moral degradation would be to improve the comforts of the people?—Yes; if by raising their respectability you can inspire them with a taste for comforts, after they have had the means of experiencing those comforts for a short time, by the removal of the redundant population.

3407. In order to improve the comforts of the people in Ireland, is it not essentially necessary that the average rates of wages should be increased?—No doubt.

¹ *Ibid.*, 313.

² Malthus (1803), 513.

3408. That difficulty being got over, must it not also happen, that even though possessed of more wages, their habits must change also, to apply also in the way of being attended with an increase of comfort?—Just so.¹

Though his answers remain brief, Malthus did not disagree with the premise that raising wages would improve conditions and, moreover, the habits of the Irish laboring classes.

Finally, Malthus addressed the island of Ireland as a whole and the future of the country.

3433. What is your opinion of the capability of Ireland to become a very rich and flourishing country?—My opinion is, that it has very great capabilities, that it might be a very rich and a very prosperous country, and that it might be richer in proportion than England, from its greater natural capabilities.

3434. Do you think any one circumstance would more tend to accelerate that state of things, than a judicious system of emigration put into force in that country?—I think that a judicious system of emigration is one of the most powerful means to accomplish that object.²

Therefore, despite having reservations on the feasibility of emigration as a means of ameliorating the conditions of the poor, he concurred with the main objective of the Emigration Committee, specifically, to gather evidence that establishing a system of emigration for Ireland would be advantageous for Irish paupers, proprietors, and the future prosperity of the country.

While it is clear that Malthus, through his writings, had serious concerns about the practicability of emigration as a means of relief for the poor, his testimony to the Emigration Committee contradicted these opinions. It was perhaps due to the influence of Wilmot-Horton himself, with whom Malthus had extensive correspondence over the years, even after the Emigration Committee's final session, and Wilmot-Horton's later withdrawal from government work. A deeper analysis of their personal correspondence

¹ ER3, Malthus, 326.

² *Ibid.*, 327.

would be required to fully understand the context and motivation of Malthus's testimony to the committee.

5. Conclusion of Part Two

While these Committees were like others in their methodology, the wide objectives and the number of witnesses make these three Committees and Reports consequential to understanding the debate on emigration during this period. It is possible that having an advocate in Wilmot-Horton made these Committees attempt to respond to a wider scope of investigation to strengthen or further justify their suggestions to Parliament, which required a greater number of witnesses than other committees with a more focused objective. The reports of these three Committees conclude from the evidence gathered that the redundant population in Ireland is a serious problem for the progress and prosperity of that country and that conditions among the laboring class suffers because of its existence. Therefore, they argue, a solution is necessary to alleviate the poverty conditions experienced by this class. Though the first Committee does not suggest a specific emigration system to be adopted by Parliament, it is clear by the third report that they support a system based on the experiments of 1823 and 1825, superintended by Peter Robinson, and advocated for in Parliament by Robert Wilmot-Horton.

The third Emigration Committee report further emphasized the existence of redundancy in “extensive districts of *Ireland*, and in certain districts of *Scotland* and *England*”,¹ which can be seen in the testimonies given into evidence. The focus on distress in these countries was a serious focus of these committees, though the causes were not investigated thoroughly by the members or the witnesses.

It is clear, however, that the greatest preoccupation of this committee and its witnesses was the financing of this proposal to establish a government emigration plan, especially when we consider that the summary of the third committee included fourteen

¹ ER3, 3.

pages on this subject. Though the Committee suggests in its summary that the plan be financed by a governmental loan and repaid by the emigrants themselves, the methods of contribution proposed by the witnesses varied significantly. There was little agreement amongst the witnesses on this subject, with a similar number claiming they would be unwilling to contribute, willing to contribute, or would contribute depending on the expense.

Despite mostly agreeing on the financial benefits of such a plan, the witnesses expressed concern about the infamous vacuum that would result from removing any number of poor laborers from any community. The Committee itself agreed that some legislation would be necessary to prevent the vacuum from being immediately filled and suggested that the subletting prevention legislation in place could assist in that endeavor. This suggestion was generally agreed upon by the witnesses, yet the Committee invited the initiator of the theory of the vacuum, Thomas Robert Malthus, to testify about his knowledge on population and the potential benefits of emigration. As was discussed in this part, and will be seen in the next part on the press discourse, Malthus' testimony conflicted with his own theories and writings: while in his writings he described emigration as only a temporary solution to the distress in Ireland, he asserted to the third Committee that emigration would be an expedient solution to the problems in that country. The Irish press remarked upon these contradictions and based part of its criticism of the Committee's work on those inconsistencies.

Furthermore, alternatives to emigration were also examined by the Committee, notably the repeal of the Passenger Vessels Act, the regulations that protected emigrants by providing food, water, space, and medical provisions, and as a side effect, raised the cost of passage, and the reclamation of bogs and wastelands, which had been studied previous by a commission and was suggested as a viable option to employing the poor and bringing those lands into cultivation.

As we can see in the excerpts of testimony, the Committee mostly represented the landed interests, possibly the reason for its focus on emigration rather than other solutions. This focus on emigration seems to have been, to a certain extent, a means to ignore deep structural problems, as the Dublin press was to point out in its criticism of the reports and evidence collected by these Committees.

All of these themes were discussed in the press in a variety of forms, from reprinting the Emigration Committee reports, to letters to the editor and opinion pieces from the newspapers themselves. Part Three of this dissertation will examine how these different aspects related to emigration were portrayed by the press and whether this discourse on emigration influenced the Parliament's decisions on emigration, or vice versa.

Part Three: The Dublin Press's Discourse on Emigration

As was explained in part one of this study, the Dublin press of the 1820s was a well-established form of media during this period, due to its rapid expansion in the seventeenth century, though many publications lasted for only a short period. Some periodicals were well-known for their criticism of the government, including those used for this study. These political positions often dictated the opinions expressed in the articles written and selected for reprint in these publications. In most of the articles collected on the Emigration Committees' reports, the texts were copied in their entirety without comment or criticism. This was perhaps due to an agreement with the reports and evidence provided by the Committees. This will be ascertained in the analysis of further articles from the selected publications discussing the subject of emigration as a means of relief for Ireland.

This part of the study will examine how the Emigration Committees were portrayed by the Dublin press during this period, the common discourse shared by these newspapers, the shift in discourse over the decade on the subject of emigration, the influence of the press on the emigration issue, and the press as a medium for debate. These analyses will demonstrate the importance of the press during this period and will allow us to fill an important gap in the study of the Emigration Committees, by giving a significant insight into the response of public opinion in Ireland to their discussions and conclusions. We will see that the conservative and "neutral" newspapers were primarily against emigration as a remedy in the early years of the decade and the more liberal leaning newspapers were more open to emigration, and even expressed an urgency in finding a solution to the distress in Ireland. As the decade went on, however, these opinions shifted, with most of the publications finding emigration unlikely to be a sufficient solution to the complex problems in Ireland, especially after the Emigration Committees' Reports were published and other ideas were being entertained and advocated for in Parliament and in the press.

The newspapers used for this study are *Dublin Evening Mail* (*DEM*), *Dublin Evening Post* (*DEP*), *Dublin Morning Register* (*DMR*), *Dublin Weekly Register* (*DWR*), *The Freeman's Journal* (*FJ*), and *Saunders's News-Letter* (*SNL*). More information about these publications can be found in Part I.2 "Selected Newspapers". The articles collected for this research were found principally at the National Library of Ireland, followed by the British Newspaper Archive (at Colindale and online¹) and the Irish Newspaper Archives (also online).² The number of articles collected from these publications for close analysis are: *DEM* 42, *DEP* 145, *DMR* 100, *DWR* 84, *FJ* 107, and *SNL* 36, and include different types of texts, such as the Houses of Parliament's debates, meeting notes (from, for example, the Catholic Association), Committee reports, opinion letters, letters to the editor, general information, advertisements, and editor's notes.

¹ www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk

² www.irishnewsarchive.com

1. The Portrayal of the Emigration Committees and Reports

1.1 First Emigration Committee

Of the six newspapers in this study, only one announced the formation of the Emigration Committee as decided upon by the Parliament. *Saunders's (SNL)* published a transcript of the House of Commons debate of March 14, 1826, when Robert Wilmot-Horton made his appeal to that body to establish a committee to examine emigration to Canada. In his plea, he explained the facts of the previous emigration experiments of 1823 and 1825 to outline the necessity of a committee: “[h]ere the House would see, that for 20l. a head, they would have the satisfaction of placing a number of poor persons in circumstances which, when contrasted with their situation in Ireland, could not but prove highly gratifying”.¹ This text shows that no opposition was expressed on this occasion and the House carried the motion to form a committee which, after only six days, began its first session, on March 20, 1826. Despite describing itself as a neutral publication, *SNL* showed in its selection of this brief debate in Parliament that it had an interest in the subject of emigration and possibly in the outcome of the committee.

No further articles appeared on the Emigration Committee until after the publication of its first report. From August 21 to 26, five of the six newspapers printed all or part of the report summary of the first Emigration Committee. *SNL* printed the first article on the subject, summarizing the report as follows:

“the report contains a statement of the evils which emigration is calculated to remove, but contains no definite plan, and the Committee apparently look forward to a resumption of their enquiries in the next Session”.²

This assessment, while somewhat neutral, is followed by a general agreement that

¹ *SNL*, March 18, 1826, “House of Commons – March 14. Emigration to Canada”, 1.

² *SNL*, August 21, 1826, [No Title], 1. (Appendix B, 543).

“to make any general improvements in the condition of the labourers, the diminution of their numbers must be considerable; and even then, unless some alteration took place in the habits of the people, the improvement would be of short duration”.¹

Agreeing with the general objectives of the Committee, and some of the prejudices of the witnesses on the customs of the Irish poor, such a statement appears to confirm the contemporary belief that this publication supported the government’s position on a number of subject, including emigration.

The article from the *Dublin Evening Mail (DEM)* (on the same date)² had nearly exactly the same text as *SNL*’s article. Such a choice is coherent with the publication’s conservative anti-Catholic position, in that it expresses the same prejudices and stereotypes about the Irish poor. The only part of the *SNL* article that was excluded was the last paragraph, part of which is cited above.

For the three following days, *SNL* published articles on the Emigration Committee report. On August 22 and 23, *SNL* copied the report of the first Emigration Committee and selected evidence from Henry James Boulton, William Bowman Felton, Richard John Uniacke, Charles Hayes, and Edward Eager, with no preamble or commentary, apart from the brief column that appeared the day before (that also appeared in the *DEM*). On August 24 and 25, additional select testimony from Henry John Boulton, George Markland, Richard John Uniacke, Lieutenant-Colonel William Sorell, Edward Eager, William Henry Bodkin, and William Bowman Felton was published, also with no challenge to the evidence presented to the Committee. Furthermore, *SNL* recopied an article from the *London Courier* which gives a brief description of the first Emigration Committee’s report.

¹ *Idem*.

² *DEM*, August 21, 1826, “Emigration”, 3.

LONDON, AUGUST 19.

The Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, of which Mr. Wilmot Horton was the Chairman, has just been printed, and we lay it before our readers in our preceding columns. It will be found a document of great importance, embodying much information, and many interesting calculations, derived from a laborious inquiry, conducted with that zeal, judicious attention, and searching knowledge, which we have a right to look for wherever the exertions of that Honourable Gentleman can be traced.

In the outset, the report assumes that for which we lately contended, that, at present, there are many able labourers in this country, for whose productive industry there is no immediate demand, and who, in consequence, become, in some way or other, chargeable to the country.

It then proceeds to set forth the results of the experiments made to induce labourers to emigrate in 1823 and 1825, and the expense attendant on them.

The average expense of emigration appears to have been 22l. 1s. 6d. per head; but it is supposed that lengthened contracts, and other arrangements now practicable, may effect some reduction for the future.

Proceeding on this assumption, it is then calculated that a family of four persons, a man, a woman, and two children, may be conveyed to Canada for 80l.

It next inquires whether those interested in reducing the superabundant labouring population, can advantageously avail themselves of the facilities afforded for emigration, and the affirmative is assumed. The Committee suppose that 80l. could be raised on an annuity of 3l. 10s. 9d. for sixty years. Security being given for the payment of the annuity for the first seven years, it appears from evidence, that it may be fairly calculated, that, at the expiration of that term, the head of an emigrant family will be in a state to pay it for the remainder of the sixty years, or to effect its redemption within a shorter period.

The mode in which this may be done, is pointed out; and it is shewn that parishes in England, and proprietors of land in Scotland and Ireland, are interested in contributing to the removal of unemployed labourers from a part of the empire where they endure distress and constitute weakness, to other parts, where they may maintain themselves, and add to the strength and security of our foreign possessions. – Courier.¹

¹ *SNL*, August 22, 1826, [No Title], 2. (Appendix B, 544).

As mentioned in Part One on the history of the Irish press, it was not unusual for Irish newspapers to copy articles from the London papers, which was free and an effective way of filling up blank space in their pages. This short article demonstrates support for the Committee's plan to establish an emigration system in the United Kingdom, which was similar to the opinion expressed by *SNL* on this topic.

Though *Freeman's* was considered an anti-government and nationalist Irish newspaper, it also printed the entirety of the report of the first Emigration Committee, without comment, on the fourth and final page of its edition of August 23, 1826. This was *FJ's* only mention of the report, and no further articles on the subject were printed until February 1827.

Unlike the previous articles mentioned, the *Dublin Evening Post (DEP)* printed an article on August 24 explaining the main points of the emigration plan of the Emigration Committee before printing the report on the following page. The *DEP's* assessment of the report ended with the following lines:

We still think the subject encompassed with difficulties, as it is worthy of further examination. Great as the effort necessary to improve the condition of the people would be, it would be, probably, not equal to those which have been made with no other result than impoverishment and bloodshed. A preliminary inquiry would be necessary, to ascertain the number of unemployed, or half-employed labourers in the different Parishes, and the sacrifices which the Parishes would make to be rid of them. It is well, that if to be undertaken at all, it should be entered upon with a full view of its expensiveness and extent; for, as far as the people at large are concerned, the plan of emigration which will be most decidedly useless will be a small one.¹

This shows that the *DEP* was not satisfied with the first Emigration Committee report because it did not take into account the difficulty of establishing the emigration system it envisioned for Ireland, and that further study of the question would be necessary

¹ *DEP*, August 24, 1826, "Emigration", 3.

before implementing any measures. The *DEM* also gave an overview of the main points of the first Emigration report, though unlike its main rival, the *DEP*, it did not give any criticism or suggestions to further study the subject. This lack of challenge from the *DEM* further demonstrates its support for the government.

The *Dublin Morning Register (DMR)*, a liberal pro-Catholic publication, reprinted an article from the London *Times*, which presented a skeptical view of the first Emigration Report:

At first sight it appears very plausible to recommend the transporting, to other countries, of large bodies of the King's subjects, who possess no means of decent subsistence at home. When, however, we proceed a little further into the subject, the immediate application of such an experiment to practice presents us with two points for consideration: - 1st, The injustice of the proposal, without striving, by some inquiry into the causes of the redundant population, to ascertain whether a remedy less heart-breaking than the final abandonment of their native country might not be found effectual for a portion at least of the paupers of England, and for a certain time – 2nd, Whether the real difficulties, in the way of an experiment, on a scale corresponding to the acknowledged nature of the exigency, have been fully taken into account by the Committee.¹

The fact of selecting this article with these points of view reveals that the *DMR* agreed with the premise of this article, if not the entirety of its assertions. The final article discussing the first Emigration Committee report also appeared in the *DMR* and was copied from the *Sunday Times*. The possibility of legislation being passed in accordance with the suggestions made by the report was thought to be unlikely.

It is generally surmised that some measures will be proposed as soon as Parliament meets, to be founded on the Emigration Report. We do not think it likely to succeed. If tried at all, it should have been tried when the finances of the country were in a more prosperous state, for the poor rates now consume so much money that few parishes can command the necessary means for promoting emigration. The money could be better employed at home. We still think that the proposed emigrants might be

¹ *DMR*, August 26, 1826, "Emigration (*From the Times*)", 3. (Appendix B, 472).

more advantageously occupied in the cultivation of waste lands here. We should like to see a Committee of Inquiry into the feasibility of this suggestion appointed.¹

This article appeared one month after the previous one and was the last time the first emigration committee was discussed in the selected newspapers until the second and third emigration committees began their work in 1827.

These articles are a demonstration of the mild interest aroused in the press by the first Emigration Committee, despite a general interest in the subject of emigration, which will be shown in the next section. The same five publications published some articles on the subject in the month after the Emigration Report was printed and for one newspaper, the *DWR*, it is not known if any articles were printed in 1826, as those editions have been lost.

1.2 Second Emigration Committee

The press was significantly more active following the publication of the reports of the Emigration Committees of 1827, with about seventy articles dedicated to the details of the report. The first article of 1827 was published by *Freeman's* on February 17. Though it was copied from a London paper, it reported on Wilmot-Horton's intention to reconvene the Emigration Committee for further study of the question of emigration from the United Kingdom. This article also detailed a pamphlet published by one of the witnesses, Dr. John Strachan, Archbishop of York, Upper Canada, who summarizes the findings of the committee therein:

The following facts appear completely established –

1. That there is a redundant population in the United Kingdom.

¹ *DMR*, September 26, 1826, [No Title], 2. (Appendix B, 477).

2. That the Colonies to which this redundant population may be sent, are well adapted to their reception, offering good neighbourhood, health, independence, and even opulence.
 3. That the experiments made, both by Government and individuals, have been eminently successful.
 4. That pauper emigrants will, after seven years, be able to repay, with care, the expense of their emigration and settlement.¹
-

The article appears to be attempting to gather interest in the subject of the Emigration Committee, especially in light of the fact that little had been discussed on the subject for the previous five months. This could be a strategy of getting their readers ready for a series of articles on this subject, of which they could possibly benefit personally or want to hear more about, especially in regards to parliamentary decisions. These readers did not have to wait long for more information on the second Emigration Committee, which submitted its report on February 26 and the first articles appeared in the press in early March, beginning with the *Dublin Weekly Register* on March 3. This first article on the second Emigration Committee report was simply a reprint of the parliamentary session of February 26, when Wilmot-Horton submitted the committee's preliminary report to the House of Commons, and gave no editorial or supplementary information.

Mr. Wilmot Horton presented a Report from the Committee on Emigration, to the following: "That the Committee, in prosecution of their inquiries, having ascertained from evidence that a considerable portion of the laboring population entertained the expectation that they should be transferred to, and located in, the British American Colonies, exclusively at the public expense, and being desirous to remove such misapprehension at the earliest period, have adopted the following Resolution: - That this Committee is not prepared to recede from the principle which is distinctly laid down in the Report of the Committee on Emigration in 1826, that private or local contribution in some shape ought to form the basis of any system of Emigration to which it may be expedient for this Committee to recommend any assistance from the national funds." The Report was ordered to be printed.²

¹ *FJ*, February 17, 1827, "Dublin, Saturday, February 17", 2. (Appendix B, 527).

² *DWR*, March 3, 1827, "Emigration", 1.

This brief resolution from the Emigration Committee was completed by the full report of the second Emigration Committee, though it was significantly shorter than the others (just barely over four pages, not including the testimony), and ordered to be published on April 5.

Leading up to that date, a few articles appeared on the subject of emigration in these publications, including parliamentary debates on emigration. As little progress was made in Parliament on the question of emigration, at least one publication printed an article on the lack of action of government, notably in the *DMR*.

After all the talk about the tens of millions, which it was gravely contended that Parliament would do and to endeavour to raise, in order to encourage Emigration on a *grand* scale, we find that the sum to be actually applied to this magnificent undertaking, in 1827, is only £20,480, very nearly *one-half* of which is to be expended in “surveys and enquiries,” now in progress in Canada and Nova Scotia!!

This is the *Parturiunt montes*, with a vengeance!¹

This article demonstrates the frustration felt by advocates for emigration and the slow motion of government that was unable to establish its own plan for emigration from its distressed communities due to the division inside of Parliament on this question. The reference to the “*Parturiunt montes*” (a reference to the fable Belling the Cat) can be understood in this instance as a criticism of the ineffectiveness of political dialogue. This same article was published in the *DWR* in its weekly edition of March 31. This further confirms that the editor of these two publications, Michael Staunton, had skeptical views of government and its abilities to find solutions to the issue of distress, particularly in Ireland.

¹ *DMR*, March 29, 1827, “Emigration, 3. (Appendix B, 478).

The next articles to appear followed the publication of the second Emigration Committee report, on April 12, 13, and 14; three in *Freeman's*, two in the *DEP*, and one each in the *DEM* and the *DWR*.

The *DEM* article, unlike its previous articles, briefly summarized the report, which again was just about four pages, and issued some light criticism on the ability of the government to enact any emigration plan.

Though no definite plan has yet been presented by which emigration can be resorted to on so large a scale as to affect beneficially the general condition of the working people in the United Kingdom and though the difficulties in the way of any such plan are so great as to prevent us from entertaining any sanguine hopes on the subject, the appointment of the Emigration Committee has been of great importance, as a pledge given by the Government, that the improvement of the condition of the people shall be attended to – that the care for them shall not be confined to the doing out of alms, which rather suffice to prolong than to remove misery. The Committee has made one step towards improving the condition of the people, by placing in the clearest light the immediate cause of their misery, and the circumstances which tend to perpetuate it.¹

Though the *DEM* expresses skepticism on the future of an emigration plan, they go on to show their support for the Emigration Committee and accept the reasons outlined by the committee for the distress of the communities described within, without offering any opposing views for their suffering and, moreover, their need for a solution such as emigration. This perspective certainly projects the conservative, pro-government point of view of this publication, and perhaps others like it.

The remaining articles were from the more liberal and anti-government newspapers. Despite the liberal leanings of the *DEP*, the two articles on the second emigration report expressed no criticism of the committee or its assertions. The first

¹ *DEM*, April 13, 1827, "Emigration", 4. (Appendix B, 443).

article was a reprint of the entire report of the committee and was followed on the next page by an extremely short paragraph on the appearance of the report.

We insert the Second Emigration Report. Notwithstanding our misgivings as to the ultimate effect of Emigration, or rather, as to the means of carrying it on to the extent contemplated, we confess we concur most heartily in all the views of the Committee, and particularly in their present recommendation.¹

The *DWR*, however, showed skepticism beginning with the title of the article from April 14, "Another 'Emigration' Report". This criticism is linked to the central topic of the second Emigration Report, that of the distress of weavers in Scotland and England.

In these districts, (says the Report) and more especially in Lancashire, there appear to be among the hand-loom weavers, two classes almost wholly distinct from each other: the one, who though they take in work in their own houses or cellars, are congregated in the large manufacturing towns; and the other, scattered in small hamlets or single houses. Upon the latter class it is, that the distresses of the times have fallen with peculiar hardship. While the decline of their manufacturing business has utterly disabled them from supplying those rents which were due from them as agriculturists, they have found themselves called upon to give support, as liable to the rates, to those of their fellow weavers who were engaged in manufacture alone; and a remnant of honest pride and shame has prevented many of those in the extremest distress from applying for parish relief; while others, being from their remote situation less immediately under the eyes of the regular authorities, have lingered on, *till found accidentally, as has been proved in evidence, in the last stages of misery and disease.*²

After first explaining the situation of the weavers, as detailed in the second report, the article criticizes the lack of awareness on the part of the Committee as to the existence of distressed populations throughout the kingdom. The author further emphasizes the

¹ *DEP*, April 12, 1827, "Emigration Report", 3.

² *DWR*, April 14, 1827, "Another Emigration Report", 2. (Appendix B, 499).

lack of awareness of the state of the population of Ireland on the part of the English in particular, exclaiming,

Here is England for you! – the once boastful and imperious England!! The Bible and the *new* Reformation will rectify the evils of Ireland, but what will cure this? What will restore to the condition of the people of any other country but “envy of surrounding nations,” those miserable creatures who are reported to have the feelings of “honest pride and shame” about them – but who are, at the same time, in “*the last stages of misery and disease!*”

This appears to be a criticism of government in general as regards its lack of action on the distress of Ireland. The second Emigration Committee received Scottish hand-loom weavers who were experiencing a period of distress as witnesses, though no Irish laborers were called upon to testify to the conditions they had lived through for generations, despite the focus of the committee on the situation in and possible remedies for Ireland. This was the only critical analysis of the second emigration report found in these publications. The others all printed the report without challenge, and/or reprinted other somewhat critical articles from other newspapers.

This was the case for *Freeman's* as well, which printed the full report of the second Emigration Committee on April 12, then followed up on the two subsequent days with different articles from the London *Times* and *Globe*.² This approach is not typical for the *FJ* and these other liberal-leaning newspapers; it appears, however, that emigration was perceived as a viable remedy for the distress of the Irish poor, and that these publications put aside their generally anti-government tendencies in order to show their support for this solution.

¹*Idem.*

² *FJ*, April 13, 1827, “Emigration Committee”, 4; April 14, 1827, “Emigration Committee”, 2.

1.3 Third Emigration Committee

No further articles appeared until after the third Emigration Committee's report became public in October 1827, when most of the articles were published. Of the forty-five articles that were printed in that month, only one came from the *DEM*, on October 3, in which the first part of the report (including the section on Ireland) of the third Emigration Committee was recopied. No analysis of the report was made by the *DEM*. Despite being of different political stripes than the *DEM*, the other five newspapers studied here also printed the third report of the Emigration Committee, though they added articles of their own and from other publications analyzing the findings of the Committee.

Due to the length of the third Emigration Committee's report (39 pages), each of the newspapers dedicated several editions, and often several pages, to the reprinting of the report, which were followed by alternative points of view on the subject. The *DEP*'s articles criticizing the Emigration report were provided in the form of letters from George Ensor, an Irish political writer and lawyer, who wrote many pamphlets critical of government and submitted at least two letters which were printed. In his first letter, Ensor describes the report itself as "a strange document", "among it ill assorted expressions in the repetition of 'an excess of labour' [which] by excess of labour, the Committee means excess of labourers, that is, more men than can be usefully occupied".¹ He further explains that there could be other reasons for this so-called excess of labor, besides the principle of population, which he calls "the worrying cant of the Malthusian economists".² Ensor questioned the premises laid out by the Committee on the redundant population, which it proposed to cure by removing 90,000 families over three years and commissioning bog reclamations as a mode of employing the poor, which was

¹ *DEP*, October 13, 1827, "Remarks on the Third Report of the Emigration Committee", 3.

² *Idem*.

rejected as a remedy for the English poor. Furthermore, he rejects the Committee's questioning of Malthus, in which, he states,

the Committee are moderate Reformers, and thus escaping the truth, they immediately submitted to the Reverend Professor a quere about Emigration, promoting the riches, &c. of Ireland, to which Mr. Malthus echoes – *I think a judicious system of Emigration is one of the most powerful means to accomplish that object* – though in his work on Population, he reputes *Emigration only a slight palliation for redundant population*.¹

This criticism was repeated by others who questioned Malthus's testimony to the Emigration Committee, which does, in effect, contradict with his essays on population. Ensor summarizes his critique with a statement on the mismanagement of Irish affairs by England, asserting that this is the true cause of the distress of the Irish poor.

The misery of Ireland has been as old as England's misrule in Ireland, and with the Union, the ills of Ireland have been multiplied, and they must increase indefinitely by the increasing abstraction of its Proprietors. Its chief Cities are declining, they resemble a suburb or a Jew's quarter. The Country mansions are unoccupied, or tenanted by agents and bailiffs. – And the People multiply – for as a Nation becomes poorer (till it sinks to destitution) it increases in People, reduced to many – and for this, Emigration is the felicitous remedy.²

In this passage, Ensor appears to doubt the assessment of the Committee, particularly on the notion that emigration would be the best remedy for Ireland, while suggesting that other measures could be taken to improve the situation of the Irish poor, such as the reduction of the trend of absenteeism on the part of landowners.

Ensor's second letter, published on October 27, directly addressed the question of emigration, by first scrutinizing the introduction of political economy into the debate on emigration as a remedy for distress.

¹ *Idem.*

² *Idem.*

Another plague is added to Ireland – Political Economy. The scribes of this great pretension are comparable to nothing modern or ancient, unless it be to Aaron’s rod, which swallowed up all other rods. How infinitely they compliment each other, and when any one, not of the school of Edinburgh, or a Ricardite, or of the London Club, attempts to doubt or inquire in opposition to this confederacy, or to any one of them, he is assailed, not by argument or disproving statements, no, but by furious dogmatism. They may quarrel with one another, and about most subjects of their craft, they are in happy opposition – but if another, not recognised or qualified interfere, he is held an interloper, a trespasser – and should he doubt the beneficial effects of transporting a million of men, to relieve the distress of the Irish, he is reputed a public enemy – hateful to Emigrants – cursed by the children of all Irishmen, who might have emigrated, and hostile to the Emigration Committee, who have, in their love to Ireland, proposed a felicitous scheme conformable to the soundest principles of political economy.¹

Here, Ensor criticizes the resorting to political economists for the ills of Ireland’s population and poor communities. Adam Smith defines political economy in *The Wealth of Nations* as

a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator, [which] proposes two distinct objects; first, to provide a plentiful revenue or subsistence for the people, or, more properly, to enable them to provide such a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and, secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with a revenue sufficient for the public services. It proposes to enrich both the people and the sovereign.²

Keeping in mind this definition, Ensor appears to be accusing the political economists of focusing on the second objective of this governmental science, enriching the state, rather than on improving the situation of the Irish poor. He asserts that anyone who questions the feasibility of the proposals made by these scholars is treated as a public enemy, and therefore not objective in his assessments of the remedy of emigration. Ensor takes particular aim at Malthus, more so than in his previous letter, when he

¹ *DEP*, October 27, 1827, “Irish Emigration”, 3.

² Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, vol. 2 (London: Cadell and Davies, 1812), 138.

asserts that Malthus was “the *faculty* that was especially consulted on this occasion [who] still blooms, though he is dead at the root”.¹ He accuses Malthus of contradicting himself when he writes in his *Essay on the Principle of Population* that, “men press against the means of subsistence”, while affirming in *Principles of Political Economy*, “that such are the productive powers of laboring men, that it required a body of idlers to consume the surplus produce”.² Ensor had much to say about Malthus and this letter was significantly longer than the previous one, most of it dedicated to refuting Malthus and other political economists’ views. He finally addresses the question of emigration in the final paragraph of his letter, when he states:

It appears that the export of a million of men from Ireland alone was after long deliberation thought too much – for the Select Committee of the House of Commons that is the quintessence of the collective wisdom, proposed Emigrating about 90,000 persons in three years. This is the great restorative for the poverty and hunger of Ireland, from which are forced wealth and provisions that would feed and enrich a numerous People. Shall our rulers never have even memory. This very remedy was tried in 1819, when fifty thousand pounds were voted to settle a body of Emigrants at the Cape of Good Hope – and how has that ended? Canada had also been resorted to a few years since. Yet Mr. Goulburn in the name of the Colonial office, declared “that his Majesty’s Government had ceased to give encouragement to individuals desirous of proceeding as settlers to his Majesty’s Colonies abroad,” – and Mr. Vansittart added, that the North American Provinces of Great Britain were overloaded with Emigrants. However Mr. W. Horton is again *Canadianizing* – thus one Secretary runs the foiled scent of his predecessor, and the experience of yesterday is lost on to-day. Oh! prophetic poem of muse unknown how did you describe in vision the Emigration project began, abandoned, and revived.

Here we go up up up,
And there we go down down downy,
And now we go backwards and forwards,
And straight to Dublin towny.

¹ *DEP*, October 27, 1827, “Irish Emigration”, 3.

² *Idem*.

Between the Emigration project and the “New Reformation,” I, for my part, declare for the Bible without note or comment, to remedy the ills of Ireland.¹

Here, Ensor expresses extreme cynicism of the possibility of emigration as a cure-all for the ills of Ireland, without acknowledging that the witnesses for the Emigration Committee fell on both sides of the question. In mentioning previous emigrations to different British colonies, he shows that the distress in the home countries was not relieved by these experiments, and therefore, there would be no reason to think a systemic emigration plan would produce any different effect. The selection of these two letters by the *DEP* shows that they were open to criticism of the government’s emigration plan, though no opinion pieces were printed by the editor of the newspaper nor any other source with a different point of view on the question.

The other liberal-leaning publications also offered different perspectives on the question of emigration. The *DMR* published three articles in October 1827 that were not reprints of the third Emigration Committee report, including an article entitled “Emigration Report – the Depopulating System”. This article raised alarm at the system proposed by the Emigration Committee, in particular by referring to the testimony given by John Leslie Foster to the Committee on the State of Ireland of 1825, where he testified that there were great levels of distress in that country and that the poor would wander to towns to find a day’s work or to beg. His cited testimony in this article ended with “their resort to those towns produces such misery as it is *impossible to describe*”.² The author of this article takes issue with the government taking no action to assist the poor of Ireland, having had this information for three years.

All this was stated, *on oath*, to the Legislature, and, we may say, to his Majesty’s Government, nearly three years ago, and the witness then spoke of evils of two years’ standing. Yet there has not been one *offer* at a remedial

¹ *DEP*, October 27, 1827, “Irish Emigration”, 4.

² *DMR*, October 2, 1827, “Emigration Report – The Depopulating System”, 2. (Appendix B, 481).

or precautionary measure!!! – Even the Emigration Committee are unable to say how soon something dreadful may break out; – and we can well conceive, if the vile Tories were in power, how much they would affect to be astonished and horrified if Captain Rock, driven to frenzy by mere hunger and despair, had interrupted the peace of one townland out of all the parishes of Ireland.¹

This article shows the disdain for the Conservatives in government on the part of the *DMR*. It expresses that the situation of distress in Ireland had been well known long before the Emigration Committees, and that, despite this knowledge, nothing concrete had been done to alleviate this suffering. It is this circumstance that the publication defines as the “depopulating system”, meaning that the misery and destitution that existed was effectively killing off the poor population.

Two additional articles were reprinted from two other sources, the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Glasgow Free Press*. The first article (from the *Morning Chronicle*), describes the testimony of Henry Parnell who, the article reports, says that “the distress of the lower classes is so great that there is a growing indisposition in the higher to reside in the country”. The article further offers a citation from Parnell’s testimony:

I have received letters of late which induce me to believe, not only that it contributes to produce an indisposition among absentees to return to Ireland to reside there, but that it contributes very much to induce those gentlemen who are now resident to become absentees.²

The article concludes with a criticism of the committee, claiming that,

the Emigration Committee have proposed no remedy to meet the evil. They have, however, done great good in exhibiting the evil to the country in all its hideous magnitude. Whether this awful prospect before us will stimulate the country to any corresponding exertions remains to be seen.³

¹ *Idem*.

² *DMR*, October 9, 1827, “Prospects for Ireland!”, 3. (Appendix B, 482).

³ *Idem*.

In the same way as the other articles, this one condemns the government, and in particular the Emigration Committee, for implementing no concrete actions to remedy the situation in Ireland. The final article (from the *Glasgow Free Press*), explains the general points of the report of the third Emigration Committee before beginning its evaluation of the committee. The article transitions to this assessment with this assertion: “In the face of all these facts, it were absurd to suppose that Government will, for a moment, listen to the proposed scheme of Emigration to Canada”.¹ Furthermore, it asserts that the only reason that emigration was being considered was because of the distress in Ireland:

It is admitted by every one, and even by the Emigration Committee, that it is alone owing to the rapid increase of population in Ireland, that emigration from the United Kingdom has become at all necessary. From this it of course follows, that, could some plan be adopted to remedy the evil of superabundant population in Ireland, there would cease to be any cause for such unnatural parturitions of our “body politic” in future.²

A suggestion is made, that the reclamation of the bogs and wastelands would be a more efficient and reasonable method to relieve the poor communities of Ireland. It asserts that this would be a more financially sound alternative to emigration and easier to implement.

Why is a plan so efficacious, and at the same time so easy of accomplishment, not instantly preferred to the visionary and impracticable scheme of foreign emigration? Schemes, as well as prophets, have no honour in their own country; else, in providing for the wants of an overgrown community, our eyes would not, under these circumstances, have both turned to any other spot than Ireland.³

¹ *DMR*, October 10, 1827, “Opinion in Scotland Relative to Emigration and the Irish Wastes”, 1. (Appendix B, 483).

² *Idem*.

³ *Idem*.

This assertion that the cultivation of the bog lands would be a better solution than emigration was advocated for by some witnesses of the Emigration Committee, though with varying opinions as to its viability. This article shows continued skepticism of the emigration plan proposed by the committee and, thereby, the reluctance of this publication to fully support this measure.

The article printed in the *DMR* on October 2, 1827 was also printed on October 6, 1827 in the *DWR*, with the following title: “Emigration Report – The Depopulating System”. This article was followed in its next weekly edition on October 13, by an article entitled “The Depopulating System, and ‘The Law’”, in which the testimony of John Scott Vandeleur to the Emigration Committee was examined. This article, though short, is direct in its assessment of Vandeleur’s testimony:

John Scott Vandeleur, Esq., of the County Clare, after being interrogated by the Emigration Committee, as to the advantages likely to arise to the country from the thinning of the tenantry, which advantages he is disposed to rate very highly indeed, is asked (question 3, [123 OR 128], p. 300) “Speaking generally, do you think it would be the interest of the landlords of Ireland to contribute towards the removal of that class of under-tenants, who may be on their property on the determination of a lease?” What is the reply of Mr. John Scott Vandeleur? “I think (he said) it would be their interest to induce those persons to emigrate; *but I doubt very much whether it would be their interest to contribute any thing towards it.*” Why? Oh, do pray attend to Mr. John Scott Vandeleur – “BECAUSE THEY CAN GET RID OF THEM NOW BY LAW!!”¹

The reference to the Act preventing the practice of subletting from continuing in Ireland is clear in this article, as it allowed landlords to remove tenants more easily than the law had previously. This text further demonstrates the political leanings of this newspaper, suggesting that not only did it support emigration, but also the improvement of the living conditions of the poor.

¹ *DWR*, October 13, 1827, “The Depopulating System, and ‘The Law’”, 4. (Appendix B, 502).

Freeman's offered one article from the *London Courier*, one from the *Morning Chronicle*, as well as one other opining on the contents of the third Emigration Committee's report. The *Morning Chronicle* article is the same one that was recopied by the *DMR* (as well as *SNL*) in their edition of the same date, though only select excerpts of that article were selected for print, expressing skepticism as to the efficacy of the government's emigration plan, stating that it would "only serve to give a stimulus to population; it [would] be beneficial to the individuals removed, but [would] not be felt in the way of diminishing the redundancy".¹ One article, simply titled "Emigration Report", expresses sharp criticism of Malthus and his assertions to the Emigration Committee.

The first thing which strikes us, and that too very forcibly, is the glaring inconsistency of which the Report convicts Mr. MALTHUS. Speaking of Emigration as a remedy in case of a "redundance" of the human species, that political economist observes, in his *Essay on the Principle of Population*, "As these parts (the uncultivated portions of the earth) are of great extent and very thinly peopled, this resource (emigration) might appear on a first view of the subject an adequate remedy, or at least of a nature to remove the evil to a distant period; but, when we advert to experience, and to the actual state of the uncivilised parts of the globe, *instead of any thing like an adequate remedy*, it will appear but a *slight palliative*".²

This criticism of Malthus's testimony can be applied to much of the witness testimony of the three Emigration Committee reports, which collected contradicting evidence on nearly all topics. This is expressed in the final line of the article: "We stand upon a stronger foundation, and that foundation derives additional solidity from the countless irrationalities which we have met with in the Emigration Report".³ As this is the only original article from this publication, it can be inferred that, while they may have

¹ *FJ*, October 9, 1827, "State of Ireland", 2. (Appendix B, 533).

² *FJ*, October 20, 1827, "Emigration Report", 2. (Appendix B, 536).

³ *Idem*.

supported emigration, they were pessimistic as to the conclusions and plans of the Emigration Committee.

Saunders's was the only publication which did not publish any original articles giving its own opinion on the subject or offering criticism of the Emigration Report. This was most likely an attempt to remain neutral on the question of emigration, although it did copy articles from other publications with clear opinions on the subject, most of which were also recopied in the other newspapers in this study.

After this period of numerous articles on emigration, there were few analyzing the substance of the Emigration Reports. There were numerous articles that were copies of Parliamentary debates, which sometimes covered the subject of emigration, in addition to opinion articles on the subject of emigration as a remedy to distress outside of the context of the Emigration Committees. More generally, the topic of emigration grew in significance in the 1820s and the Dublin press reflects the evolution of public opinion on the question in that decade. In the next part, a study of these six newspapers' discourse on emigration will compare their positions on the subject of emigration, including different proposals and alternatives suggested by these publications with varying political tendencies.

2. Common Discourse on Emigration

Though each of these publications had distinct political views, their opinions on the subject of emigration converged more often than not. This can be seen through the original articles published by the newspapers, in addition to their selection of articles recopied from other journals. As was seen in the previous section, the choice to present the reports of the Emigration Committees without any analysis was not neutral but exhibited the newspaper's leanings. Besides these reports, the process of selection yielded diverse articles, particularly letters to editors and to specific members of society, emigrant letters, and parliamentary debates. The analysis of these various types of newspaper articles will demonstrate the common discourse held by the various newspapers on the subject of emigration.

2.1 Encouragement of Emigration

In the early part of the decade, prior to the first experiment undertaken by Robert Wilmot-Horton and Peter Robinson, there were very few articles dedicated to the subject of emigration. These articles generally focused on the changing position of government on encouraging emigration from the United Kingdom, as well as the success of previous emigrations.

Accusations of inconsistency in emigration policies could be found in a variety of newspapers and were based on a diversity of justifications, such as the fact that the government's messaging was at times contradictory. As evidenced in this article from the *DWR* printed in 1820, the government had advertised that it would provide assistance and land grants for emigrants to Quebec, though upon receiving an inquiry from an interested party, disputed this proposal of assistance.

EMIGRATION.

It having been stated in the public prints, that it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to give to emigrants from this country, on their arrival at Quebec, the sum of 10*l.* sterling, independent of 100 acres of uncultivated land, and some doubt being entertained on the subject, a person in Annan, interested in this matter, made application to the Colonial Department for the necessary information, and Lord Bathurst has been pleased to direct the following answer to be returned:

"Downing-street, June 6.

"Sir. – I am directed by Lord Bathurst to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ult. stating, that you were informed it was the intention of his Majesty's Government to allow ten pounds to each settler proceeding to North America; and acquaint you that there is no intention of generally making such an allowance as that to which you refer. I am, &c. your most obedient humble servant,

"HENRY GOULBURN."¹

It was common at this time for letters to be published in various newspapers, revealing correspondence of public officials with individuals, as in this case. This article shows that the government position on encouraging emigration was perceived as contradictory in some instances, though the liberal politics of the publication may have played a role in their selection of this letter from Henry Goulburn, a notable conservative in British politics who was not a supporter of assisted emigration.

This accusation of inconsistency on the policy of encouraging emigration was mirrored in *Freeman's* earlier that same year, which claimed that "the policy of our old laws was to discourage Emigration – that of our new is of the opposite kind". The article gives the example of an emigration stopped by Charles I in the seventeenth century.

The following extract from the fourth volume of *Robertson's History of America* shews the unfortunate predicament in which Charles I. became involved by stopping a *radical* emigration: –

¹ *DWR*, June 24, 1820, "Emigration", 2.

“The number of the emigrants to America drew the attention of Government, and appeared so formidable, that a proclamation was issued, prohibiting masters of ships from carrying passengers to New England, without special permission. On many occasions this injunction was eluded or disregarded. Fatally for the King, it operated with full effect in one instance. Sir Arthur Haslerig, John Hampden, Oliver Cromwell, and some other persons, whose principles and views coincided with theirs, impatient to enjoy those civil and religious liberties which they struggled in vain to obtain in Great Britain, hired some ships to carry them and their attendants to New England. By order of Council, an embargo was laid on these when on the point of sailing; and Charles, far from suspecting that the future revolutions of his kingdoms were to be excited and directed by persons in such an humble sphere of life, forcibly detained the men destined to overturn his throne, and to terminate his days by a violent death.”¹

While Charles I supported preventing emigration, it is impossible to extrapolate on whether this ultimately led to his beheading in 1649, though the source of this excerpt appears to make a direct link between the two and *Freeman's* was willing to accept this interpretation. In this article, *Freeman's* was clearly agreeing with the contemporary criticism of the government's shifting policy on the encouragement of emigration.

One final article from *SNL* in 1820 was a report of the debate in the House of Commons on April 28 of that year, when the subject of distress in Scotland and the government's policy of encouraging emigration was discussed. No commentary was offered by that publication on the subject.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.
HOUSE OF COMMONS – APRIL 28.
REPORT OF THE ADDRESS.

On the question that the report be brought up, Lord A. Hamilton took the opportunity of impressing on Ministers the state of the Manufacturing Districts of the West of Scotland, so lately the scene of disturbance. It was said that time was the only, though the slow remedy for preventing evils, but Government was bound to do its utmost to mitigate the suffering; last year, 50,000l. had been voted for emigration, and something else ought to be tried. The Honorable Member for Glasgow, now in his place, well knew

¹ *FJ*, January 14, 1820, “Emigration”, 2. (Appendix B, 509).

the urgency of this case, and the necessity existing, that steps should be taken to promote emigration, or afford other relief. At this moment there were too many whose existence was a burden, and without food or raiment, what remained for them to hope. Assistance of any kind would tend more than any thing to put down the turbulent spirit which had lately evinced itself. He feared that Ministers were not aware of the extent or intenseness of the evil, and attributed too much to disaffection, and too little to distress. He wished to know, before he sat down, what had been done with the 50,000l., how far it had been effectual, and whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer was prepared to proceed further in the same course.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer did not wish to go into any detail with regard to the particular question as to the measures Ministers meant to pursue for encouraging emigration. He thought the Noble Lord miscalculated the means of the country. Considerably more than 50,000l. had been expended in shipping 5000 persons for the Cape of Good Hope. Emigration to America he considered very injudicious, from the present condition of the United States, and the severe distress there prevailing. In the British Colonies land had been granted to a considerable extent, but in consequence of the immense number of emigrants, the strongest representation had been received from Canada. He was not at present prepared to recommend any new plan. Before a fresh Colony was sent out to the Cape of Good Hope, it would be wise to wait until some accounts were obtained from the Settlement lately made there.

Mr. Finlay concurred in what had fallen from Lord A. Hamilton on the distresses in the West of Scotland. In addition he had to state, that if emigration were not a boon, without any payment whatever, the distressed manufacturers in Scotland would not be able to take advantage of it. It was only necessary to bring forward the subject in a plausible shape, for Ministers to give the plan their warmest support; a comparatively small sum of money was all that was necessary.

After a few words from a Member, whose name we could not learn, and who spoke under the gallery, the Report was brought up and received. – It was ordered that the Address should be presented by the whole House.¹

This exchange demonstrates that members of Parliament were advocating for government assistance for emigration of distressed populations, and that, while government in the past had supported this form of relief, their willingness to further

¹ *SNL*, May 2, 1820, "Imperial Parliament. House of Commons – April 28", 1.

expend resources for this purpose was viewed by the press as changeable. There was no consistent policy on this matter, despite the fact that the government was led by Tory politicians from 1783 through the period studied here, with the exception of one year from 1806 to 1807 when William Grenville, a Tory who supported the Whig Party, was Prime Minister.

One final article was published in the *DWR* in October 1822, describing the details of the government's previous assistance to emigrants.

EMIGRATION TO CANADA.

(From the last Edinburgh Review.)

Some years ago, when the condition of the working classes was in the highest degree miserable, Government afforded many facilities, and gave liberal encouragement to such as were disposed to settle in Canada. Besides granting each person a certain portion of land, they gave them a free passage across the Atlantic, and provided them with provisions and agricultural implements for one year after their arrival. But, with the exception of the free grant of 50 acres of land, these encouragements are all now withheld, owing as it is said, to the conduct of worthless individuals, who abusing this bounty, frequently sold whatever they received, and went to the United States. We agree that Mr. Hewison (author of a late work on Canada) in thinking, that though the former plan offered too much temptation to pursue this line of conduct, yet if the assistance of government were extended only so far, as to lessen the expense of the voyage and journey to the interior of the country, it would operate as a great relief to the honest poor, and remove a serious obstacle to the prosperity of the settlement, without any danger of such abuse. If vessels were occasionally despatched for Quebec for this purpose, Mr. H. calculates that the passage money, including provisions, might be made so low as 2l., while Government would incur no other expense than the hire of the vessel. This arrangement, together with the establishment of an agent at Quebec, to whom the emigrant might immediately, on his arrival, apply for advice and information, would, we are convinced, greatly relieve the difficulties of the poor, who, from the want of such assistance, frequently linger in the Lower province, wasting uselessly those funds which would have enabled them to reach comfortably their ultimate destination. The evils arising from this ignorance and want of information are well known, [both in] Montreal and Quebec, where benevolent individuals have united in establishing Emigrant Societies; but their

influence is of course extremely limited; and nothing short of the interference of the supreme power of Government can effectually remedy the evil. If this were done, and a regular, direct, and cheap conveyance established between Quebec and York, it would greatly diminish the disasters which are now so common.¹

Though this article does not critique the government for its changing position on encouraging emigration, it provides an argument for continued assistance for emigrants to Canada. This aspect of the debate on emigration was discussed further by the press in the years leading up to the Peter Robinson experiments.

2.2 Previous Emigrations

The success of previous emigrants and emigrations was discussed profusely up until the Peter Robinson experiments beginning in 1823. These articles were perhaps used to persuade the public (and maybe the government also) that assisting these emigrants would be a good financial investment for government and had been positive in the past.

About a dozen articles on previous emigrants were published between 1820 and 1822, discussing primarily Scottish emigration to Canada, English emigration to Canada and the United States, and general emigration to Canada, with two additional articles about Irish emigrants to Maine and an English emigrant to South Africa.

On the question of Scottish emigration to Canada, the press focused on the necessity of assistance due to the distress being experienced during this time amongst the paupers and weavers of that country.

¹ *DWR*, October 26, 1822, "Emigration to Canada", 55. (Appendix B, 496).

EMIGRATION.

The associated emigrants for Canada, who sailed on Sunday se'nnight from Greenock, in the ship Broke, amounted to 151 individuals, of whom 52 are heads of families. The whole sea expenses amounted to about 600l.; or 4l. a head, young and old. The total number of those who have gone with the assistance of the country is about 900l. The whole expenses to Government will be about 9800. The Gentlemen, to whom this measure is principally due, are Lord A. Hamilton, Mr. Finlay, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Wilberforce, and Mr. Dalglish. The greater part of the emigrants belonged to the Abercrombie, Transatlantic, and Bridgeton Societies – members and their families who had been balloted out of the said Societies. Being all poor, they were unable to pay for their own transport, not having raised more money amongst them than about 1-10th of the expenses; the fund which enabled them to proceed was raised in London, with a little assistance in Glasgow. – *Glasgow Chronicle*.¹

This article, recopied from another newspaper, was selected by this publication to portray a sense of urgency in explaining that the families could not afford their travel, while emphasizing that the assistance was provided by a subscription raised in London. This could have been an attempt by this publication to insist on the necessity of participation from London (and perhaps Parliament) in assisting the distressed population in Scotland.

A second article, published in *SNL*, also recopied from the *Glasgow Chronicle*, explained that there were numerous petitions submitted to government for assistance to emigrate. This article explains that an earlier emigrant to Canada returned to Scotland with a favorable account of his resettlement there, lacking only the companionship of society. He returned to Scotland “to persuade others, to follow his example; anxious to be surrounded with happy, intelligent, and social neighbours”.² In its analysis of this emigrant’s experience and the existence of high numbers of petitions for assistance, the author surmises: “Let us hope that Government will see the necessity of attending to the

¹ *FJ*, July 22, 1820, “Emigration”, 2.

² *SNL*, January 20, 1820, “Emigration”, 1.

applications of these people”,¹ before detailing the benefits of the Canadian provinces. Despite the asserted neutrality of *Saunders’s*, the selection of this article to be reprinted in their newspaper shows a certain support for the principles of emigration, in addition to government assistance for distressed communities desiring to emigrate.

Newspapers also published accounts of groups of emigrants on their journey to and after settling in Canada. One article gives the account of an emigrant ship cast away on an island called Anticosti, located in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence in Quebec and a frequent location of shipwrecks.

Extract from a Newfoundland Paper of the 16th October: - “His Majesty’s cu[t]ter inspector, commanded by Mr. Wm. Bullock, astronomical surveyor, having on board Lieutenant Bullock, his brother, touched at the island of Anticosti, and found encamped there the crew and passengers of the ship Earl Dalhousie, to the number of one hundred and forty persons, who had been cast away in that ship on their voyage from Scotland to Quebec. Those unfortunate emigrants, although they had plenty of provisions saved from the wreck, yet were in a situation truly distressing, owing to the uncertainty and despair of getting off that desolate island for the winter. Fortunately the Inspector, in the course of the service, went there, and revived their spirits by a promise on the part of those gentlemen, to call at Sydney and procure a vessel to take them to Quebec. On her way to Sydney the Inspector fell in with a large brig in ballast, bound to Quebec, the master of which very cheerfully and humanely undertook to call for them in his way. It is therefore to be hoped they have, before this, been relieved from their dreary situation.”²

While there exists extensive documentary evidence of this shipwreck and the rescue that occurred in the weeks that followed, the way these events are portrayed by this Canadian newspaper, and the choice to reprint it in *Freeman’s*, demonstrates that these publications had a positive view on this occurrence, notably that there were sufficient provisions recovered from the shipwreck to sustain the 140 passengers and the crew for more than a week while waiting to be rescued; though it was, perhaps, intentionally

¹ *SNL*, January 20, 1820, “Emigration”, 2.

² *FJ*, November 24, 1821, [No Title], 3.

vague on the time it took to rescue all 140 passengers (the article does not mention the date when the shipwreck occurred nor when the passengers were recovered). Other sources explain that the ship was wrecked on September 6, 1821 and the first survivors recovered on September 21, with additional recoveries taking place over a period of weeks, the final remaining passengers rescued on October 12.

Freeman's published an additional article, similarly espousing the great benefits that the emigrants experienced on arriving in Canada, originally published in the *Glasgow Herald*.

EMIGRANTS TO CANADA.

Extract of a letter from the Gentleman who took the charge of the Emigrants to Upper Canada, dated Lanark, in Canada, September 5, 1822: - "I am glad to be able to state, that the Lanarkshire Emigrants have surmounted the greatest difficulties; there has been an abundant crop in the settlement, and plenty prevails with all who are able to work and exerted themselves: be assured they are happy and contented. Upon the whole, considering the description of people who came out, the experiment has succeeded better than could have been expected; for many of them, from age, infirmities, and former habits, are very unfit for such an undertaking. Some appear to have entered the societies solely for the purpose of getting to the States; they abandoned us after receiving the first and second instalment. There is a considerable manufactory of coarse woollens and cottons, and cotton yarn spinning, carried on in many parts of the State of New York. Last summer many of the settlers of the year 1820 went to these places, 1 and 200 miles distant, to obtain work, as the means of supporting their families in the intervals between planting and reaping; it was only necessity that forced them; they prize their lands too high to relinquish them. Other emigrants who came here on their own means, and there are a great number, have generally done better than the society people, and perhaps on less means; money is better taken care of when hardly earned." – *Glasgow Herald*.¹

¹ *FJ*, November 19, 1822, "Emigrants to Canada", 4.

This article further demonstrates support for emigration generally, more particularly for settling emigrants in the British colonies in Canada, and even the advantages of the United States.

There were significantly fewer articles concerning English emigration to Canada, with only one discussing the subject through a question and answer session with a previous wealthy settler in that country.¹ The questions were varied, from land available for purchase to the climate of the territory, in addition to questions on what sort of material emigrants should bring with them on their journey. This one article shows that there was indeed interest among the English in the possibility of emigrating and settling in the British colonies of North America, while also giving details that make it appear to be quite simple to establish oneself in that territory. These articles demonstrate that while the government may have been flipflopping on the question of encouraging emigration during this period, *Freeman's* and other publications were firm in their belief of the potential remedy that could be afforded by emigration.

English emigration to the United States was discussed more extensively, especially regarding the Birkbeck settlement in the state of Illinois, settled only a few years earlier. These articles largely extolled the advantages and prosperity of the settlement, which further confirms the perspective of the newspaper that published them (*Freeman's*).²

As demonstrated by these articles, the press, even in Ireland, was mostly preoccupied by the emigration of English and Scottish populations, and very little by Irish emigration. There was only one article addressing Irish emigration during these first few years of the 1820s:

¹ *FJ*, January 10, 1821, "North America – Settlers", 4.

² *FJ*, August 24, 1822, "Emigration", 2., *FJ*, October 26, 1821, "Birkbeck's Settlement", 4.

IRISH EMIGRANTS.

Our New York Journals are to the 24th July, and they mention, among other things, that many hundreds of Irish Emigrants had landed at Eastport, on the Spanish Maine, in order to form a Settlement. Many of them were women and children.¹

This lack of articles published on the Irish emigrants and the potential of emigration being a remedy for the poor Irish suggests that, prior to the work of the Emigration Committees, the Irish press was not yet considering the possibility of the government supporting, encouraging, or assisting the Irish in emigrating to other British colonies, whether in North America or elsewhere. This lies in juxtaposition with the articles regarding English and Scottish emigrants and the assistance and encouragement they received from government.

2.3 Criticism of Malthus

One final type of article that could be found in these publications in the early 1820s involved discussion and refutation of the population theories of Malthus. The discussion was based on William Godwin's *Of Population: An Enquiry Concerning the Power of Increase in the Numbers of Mankind*, published in 1820 as a refutation of Malthus and his widely accepted theories (Malthus's essay was a response to Godwin's theories on the perfectibility of society). Though these articles predate the Emigration Committee and Malthus's testimony, they provide an alternative view to Malthus's ideas that had rarely been refuted for the previous 20 years. Two of these articles appeared in the *Freeman's*, which demonstrates their reluctance to accept the principles put forth by Malthus, unlike most of the elite and political class of the period. The first article, published in November 1820, was an analysis of the new publication from William Godwin, beginning

¹ *FJ*, August 22, 1822, "Irish Emigrants", 2.

with an explanation of Godwin's refutation of Malthus's assertions on population growth.

Mr. Malthus had assumed, from some hypothetical calculations of Sir William Petty, on the number of children which teeming women can bear – some loose notions in the writings of Dr. Styles, &c. – a calculation of Euler, shewing the various periods of doubling, according to the rate of excess of births over the deaths, that the population of a country, if left unchecked, could double itself, by propagation alone, every 25 years. The Censuses of North America were confidently appealed to in support of this doctrine, which has been received by all the political economists of Europe.

Many a silly declamation has been poured out against Mr. Malthus, but no one before Mr. Godwin thought of examining the data on which Mr. Malthus's structure rests, to see whether they really bore him out in his conclusions.

Mr. Godwin has been at some pains to ascertain the extent of female productiveness. A variety of data on this subject are to be found in the work of the laborious Susmulch [Süssmilch], and the most accurate Tables, containing all the information which a philosopher would wish to obtain respecting the progress of population in a country, have been kept in Sweden for more than half a century. The lists from every part of Europe, town as well as country, give four children only to a marriage. In Sweden, in particular, as appears from its lists, almost every female, on attaining the marriageable age, changes her condition. If this is the rate of productiveness in Europe, what is it in North America? The returns obtained from that country, as might be expected, exhibit precisely the same result; and in America, as well as Europe, the number of children to a marriage is four.¹

This analysis of the data itself demonstrates more firmly that the assumed population growth of North America could not be practically applied to Europe, especially since living conditions and the circumstances of access to land were materially different. Godwin makes his own calculations and consults his own sources, which reveal that the rate of growth was not as Malthus asserted in his essay. Furthermore, the article explains that Godwin analyzed census data in his research, concluding:

¹ *FJ*, November 21, 1820, "From the *Weekly Freeman*. Doctrine of Population", 4.

Finding, therefore, that the number of children to a marriage is the same in America as in Europe, and that the mortality is not less in America than in Europe, that the increase in America is clearly demonstrated to have arisen chiefly from emigration, we must exclude America from all reasonings on the rate at which mankind can increase in number.¹

It is clear that this article and the newspaper that published it did not support the theories of Malthus nor his views on emigration. The article agrees with Godwin's assertion that if the population increases noted in North America were accurate, it was due to emigration, not to excessive levels of births (as contended by Malthus).

The second article on this subject was a select excerpt from Godwin's book on the desire of the poor populations of Europe to emigrate to North America. The excerpt, after expressing this desire to emigrate, explains the few reasons that prevent them from leaving.

"First, the strange and nameless love which a great majority of mankind feel for the spot of earth on which they were born. To see it no more, to meet no more the old familiar faces, never to behold again the trees and the hedge-rows, the church, the hamlet, the chimney corner and the oaken board, which have been our daily acquaintance through life, is a divorce hardly less severe than that of soul and body. In this respect man is for the most part a vegetable, with a slight shade of difference, and clings to his native soil with almost equal pertinacity.

"A second reason why our poor do not generally remove to America, is that those to whom removal would be in a manner the necessary of existence, do not possess the means of accomplishing it. Without the possession of a little sum of money, they may look a thousand times with eager aspirations upon the waves of the Atlantic, but they can never ascend the bark that should waft them over."²

This poetic discourse describes how attached to their home country the poor Irish were perceived to be at the time, though in many cases, they were anxious to emigrate to North America due to the distress in Ireland. Like much of the evidence given during the

¹ *FJ*, November 21, 1820, "From the *Weekly Freeman*. Doctrine of Population", 4.

² *FJ*, January 6, 1821, "Emigration", 4. (Appendix B, 509).

Emigration Committees, this excerpt confirms that the poor did not have the resources to undertake any such project of resettlement.

These articles, when taken together, show a foundational support for emigration from these publications, in particular from *Saunders's*, which purported itself to be a neutral newspaper and was viewed at the time to be pro-government. From this, we can perhaps presume that the other pro-government newspapers in this study were similarly positioned on the subject of emigration, meaning that they too held some support for the idea of emigration as a remedy for distress. In the next part, we will see how these positions and discourses on emigration shifted through the 1820s, in particular how other remedies were proposed as an alternative and we will examine the debate that was carried on in these publications.

3. Shift in Discourse over the Decade

In the previous sections, it has been established that the newspapers during this period began their analyses of emigration and the Emigration Committee with criticism of the government policy on encouraging emigration, examples of previous emigration, some refutation of Malthus, and reporting of the Emigration Reports with little commentary or criticism. During the period of the Peter Robinson experiments and for the remainder of the decade, the discourse on emigration appeared to shift to further encouragement of emigration, but also explanations of the distress in Ireland, and therefore, the necessity of a solution, and finally, alternatives to implementing a state-run emigration system.

3.1 Encouragement of Emigration

As established in the previous section, the press had previously criticized the government's inconsistent encouragement of emigration, sometimes supporting emigrants through assistance and at other times giving none. The articles that appeared during the period of the Peter Robinson experiments also analyzed the government's policy toward emigration assistance, in addition to other sources of supported emigration.

Dublin Evening Post

A series of letters were published in the *Dublin Evening Post*, addressed "To the Marquis of Lansdowne", who, at that time, was Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice, 3rd Marquess of Lansdowne and 4th Earl of Kerry (Irish Peerage), and was not a member of government in the 1820s until he became Home Secretary in 1827 with the new administration of George Canning, though he briefly served as Chancellor of the Exchequer under the

Ministry of all the Talents from 1806 to 1807. Fitzmaurice was a supporter of Catholic Emancipation, the abolition of slavery, and free trade. It is not clear why this individual was directly addressed by this series of letters, though it is generally understood that while he was not holding any official position, he continued to be outspoken on the issues he supported during this period.

This series of letters primarily addressed the state of the Irish poor and encouraged the Marquis to take specific steps to move along the political process to encourage emigration in order to alleviate the distress in Ireland. In these letters, however, the author presents a contradictory view on the policy of emigration as a remedy. In the first instance, on August 21, 1823, the author writes:

Emigration, though very advisable for those who emigrate, can effect little or nothing for the Country. The Poor *cannot* emigrate, unless they render themselves obnoxious to the Insurrection Act, as some of them actually did with this view, but were unhappily disappointed in their object. - Still, even upon the most extensive scale in which it could be practical to carry on a system of Emigration, it could not be felt even, as a temporary expedient.¹

Here, they justify using the Parliament to enact a means of assisting the poor to emigrate, as they do not have the means themselves to do so, though, ultimately, admitting that it would only afford temporary relief and would not be a permanent solution to the circumstances of the Irish poor. This slightly contradicts with the successive letter, published on October 21, 1823, which addresses emigration as a more positive possible fix:

Then, there is Emigration. We should approve of this method by all means, if it could do any good [for] those who were left behind, or rather if the exportation of fifty-thousand persons annually could have the slightest effect upon such a Population. We have a plan, certainly not [more] difficult of execution than Swift's modest proposal, which [we] are sure – and what projector is not sure of his own panacea – would tend materially to facilitate Emigration. Parliament is omnipotent. Let it pass an Act to

¹ *DEP*, August 21, 1823, "To the Marquis of Lansdowne", 3. (Appendix B, 451).

remove Ireland through the Atlantic Ocean to the coast of America. Let the state non disemogue in the same waters with the Susqueh[anna] and the Suir mingle her bright stream with the Potomac. Then, indeed, would Emigration proceed swimmingly and there would be some chance of being relieved from superabundant mouths. And yet, my Lord, we doubt whether even this, though bearing the characteristics of a radical remedy, would accomplish the object, at least as far as Emigration is concerned.¹

This second letter suggests that Parliament has the power to enact legislation that would facilitate and encourage emigration to relieve the superabundant population. The author supports emigration, whether it would positively affect the emigrants themselves or those who remain. Unlike other sources, whether from newspapers or parliamentary reports, this article admits that the reason for considering emigration was not as a remedy for the poverty experienced by Irish laborers, but to remove the perceived superabundant population that was a major concern of Irish proprietors. On October 25, 1823, a further letter asserts that “Emigration, as we think we have shown, can effect little, if any thing. At the same time, we are friends to the principle, because we are persuaded it will prove highly beneficial to the industrious Poor who emigrate”.² A fourth letter further addresses emigration, in particular the Peter Robinson experiment of 1823, which it criticizes as expensive and impractical to expand to the whole of the country.³ This series of letters was openly skeptical of the benefits that emigration would confer on the remaining population, though it supported the relief it would afford the emigrants themselves.

This position was further illustrated by the articles published in the *DEP* in 1824 on encouragement of emigration through the Peter Robinson experiments. This began with the publication of a letter from Peter Robinson to Wilmot-Horton explaining all the intricacies of the process of recruiting emigrants to their final settlement in Canada,

¹ *DEP*, October 21, 1823, “To the Marquis of Lansdowne”, 2.

² *DEP*, October 25, 1823, “To the Marquis of Lansdowne”, 3.

³ *DEP*, October 28, 1823, “To the Marquis of Lansdowne”, 3.

including a description of the expenses of the venture, published on August 14, 1824. This letter was followed by an article critical of different government policies, that ends with support of the emigration experiments.

It is clear that Government has been most anxiously considering the subject; and, as far as we can judge, one of the results has been judicious. We allude to the Emigration Project. A most interesting letter appeared on this subject in our last, from a Gentleman who was employed by Government to locate certain Emigrants from the most disturbed districts of the South of Ireland, in Upper Canada. It appears that he was enabled to bring out and to settle more than 500 individuals, at an expense of less than £12,000 in that Province. His account is not only instructive, but very amusing. The expense amounted to £35 a-head. According to this estimate, 50,000 would cost more than a million of money. Could Government – could the Country allocate so much, to Colonise at such a rate as this? Surely it could not. And, as to the plan suggested by the Limerick Observer, namely, that the Landlords should subscribe half, our well-informed and ingenious contemporary knows very well, that he might as well ask them to pay off the National debt, or their own. If the thing, to any reasonable extent, could be put in execution, it would be the most effectual means of superseding the necessity of introducing the Poor Laws into Ireland. But, to any extent, be it never so inconsiderable, it must prove decidedly advantageous to those who go.¹

This excerpt shows that the press was concerned about the cost of a plan to resettle poor laborers in the British colonies, perhaps foreshadowing the principal priority of the Emigration Committees, which discussed this very aspect extensively, while simultaneously hinting at a possible alternative to emigration, such as introducing poor laws in Ireland. This is a complex position that the *DEP* was holding on the subject of emigration, despite appearing supportive of emigration as a means to relieve the poor; it seems that perhaps the publication was more critical of the government's ability to enact such a program and the expense necessary to carry it out, which was more in line with its general anti-government stance.

¹ *DEP*, August 17, 1824, "Political Prospects of Ireland", 3. (Appendix B, 458).

As noted in the previous section, *Freeman's* appeared to fully support emigration assistance for distressed Scottish populations earlier in the decade. When addressing the question of assistance for Irish emigrants in the following article, its position was radically different, in that it considered the £15,000 grant from government for the purpose of emigration to be insignificant, asserting that it would be insufficient to relieve the poverty experienced in Ireland among the poor laborers. In effect, these funds were employed almost immediately after being approved in Parliament on June 23, for the first Peter Robinson experiment, when only 568 Irish emigrants departed Cork in early July to be resettled in Canada in the autumn of 1823.

When, indeed, every means of employment that human ingenuity can devise are exhausted, and there still remains an excess of population unemployed; then, indeed, the exportation of the superabundance of the human species, appears to be the direct and proper remedy. But to resort to it in the present state of the country, has no character of a comprehensive, liberal, and enlightened policy. Under any circumstances, this mode of cure, which does not come at the root of the disease, is at best merely a palliative; but applied as now proposed, in a grant of 15,000l. it is trifling with the complaint. We can easily conceive the great benefit a country might derive from the weeding of its population, from the culling its bad and noxious members, and expending 15,000l. upon their exportation. This operation would improve its peace and tranquillity. It would be eminently beneficial in a moral point of view; but to transport a parcel of poor people, who are only poor and distressed, because they want employment, can have little effect upon the morals of the country; and as to any material reduction of a population of seven millions to be produced by number which the present grant would dispose of, it can have no sensible effect at all.¹

In effect, this article contends that another means of remedying the problems in Ireland is necessary, such as further attempts at employing the people. During the parliamentary session when this grant of £15,000 was being debated, a number of members addressed

¹ *FJ*, July 5, 1823, "Emigration from Ireland", 3. (Appendix B, 510).

this very alternative, introducing capital into Ireland to create more employment for the poor as a means of relief rather than transporting them elsewhere.

Freeman's went on to reprint an article from the *London Courier*, in which support for the government's encouragement of emigration was expressed through the example of the Robinson experiment of 1823 which was viewed as a success in the evidence given to the Committee on the State of Ireland in 1825. This article summarizes that testimony as follows:

Our readers are probably, aware, that, in 1823, his Majesty's Government was induced to make an experiment, upon a very small scale, of conveying emigrants from Ireland to our North American colonies; and it appears, from the evidence of Mr. Wilmot Horton, and of Mr. Peter Robinson, who was employed as superintendent, that the experiment was attended with every success that could be fairly anticipated. The average expense for carrying out the emigrant, locating him, and his maintenance for a year, was about 22l. per head. It is obvious, however, that it would require a very large sum (though the largest sum would, in our opinion, be wisely expended) to promote emigration at this rate, to such an extent as would produce any sensible effect upon the existing superabundant population of Ireland; and hence it is, that we are led to consider the Colombian Agricultural Association as a Company whose professed objects might become most beneficial auxiliaries in the prosecution of the proposed plan.¹

The article connects the success of these experiments with the proposal of the Colombian Agricultural Association, which was attempting to organize a British settlement in that country. Continued adulation for the Colombian plan is followed by an explanation of the benefits that emigration scheme would confer on Ireland and England.

But it is chiefly in connexion with Ireland, and with the desirable opportunity thus afforded, of facilitating the execution of any general plan of emigration which Government may sanction, that we feel disposed to direct public attention to this Association. Relief would thus be obtained

¹ *FJ*, April 5, 1825, "Emigration", 2. (Appendix B, 515).

for Ireland; England would have her share of the general benefit; while the rising Republic of Colombia would have its prosperity advanced, by the infusion of a new spirit of industry, enterprise, and ingenuity.¹

This publication clearly held the view that removing any number of poor laborers from Ireland would be a relief for that country, for England, and for the future prosperity of Colombia. Though there was no commentary from *Freeman's* on the content of this article, perhaps it was chosen to demonstrate the opinions held by English papers on this subject. Insofar as concerns the *DEP* and *Freeman's* up to this point, they were both more or less skeptical of the benefits that would be felt in Ireland by removing a portion of the poor laborers.

This position was further expressed in an article following Wilmot-Horton's second request to Parliament for a grant of £30,000 on the 15 April 1825 to continue the experiment that had begun in 1823. While the House of Commons agreed to the request, under the condition that a committee be appointed to investigate the subject, some members and newspapers were less certain of the efficacy of such a plan.

On Friday night, Mr. Wilmot Horton proposed in the Committee of Supply, a vote to facilitate emigration from Ireland to Canada, which was agreed to.

The misery under which a large part of the population of Ireland suffers is so acute, that the House of Commons is justified in the attempt to alleviate it by expedients, even if they promise no lasting benefit.²

This article goes on to cite some of the evidence of the report on the state of Ireland, in a way explaining that the distress in some communities was so severe, that simply removing paupers to another locale would not necessarily provide any long term benefit to those populations, but that providing employment of any kind would be the more efficient remedy.

¹ *Idem.*

² *FJ*, April 20, 1825, "State of the Population of Ireland", 4. (Appendix B, 516).

Freeman's, though supporting emigration for distressed Scottish laborers and manufacturers, appears more reluctant to endorse the possibility of emigration as a remedy for the ills of the poor laborers of Ireland. The *DEP* and *Freeman's*, the two major newspapers during this period, both approached the subject of state-assisted Irish emigration in a similar fashion, asserting that the levels in poverty in Ireland could not be addressed by simply removing a portion of those suffering, but that a new investment in the Irish economy would be necessary to grant true relief to its people.

Dublin Evening Mail

The *Dublin Evening Mail* was similarly critical of the government's encouragement of emigration, despite its conservative political stance.

With regard to the benefit of giving occupation to the people, that is very manifest; for it is clear that, if from a population of 300,000, when 200,000 would be competent to do the work, we remove 100,000, we relieve the remainder; but if, instead of sending them out of the country, we give them employment, we render them comfortable, besides affording relief to the others. I have been told of an arrangement making by Government for the emigration of seven hundred families, at an expense of 3*l.* for every individual. Suppose these people go out of the country, the nation receives no further benefit from their labour: whereas, if they were supplied with employment, they would contribute to the support of the revenue, by the consumption of taxed articles.¹

Much like the more liberal-leaning newspapers, the *DEM* also appeared skeptical of emigration as a permanent solution to poverty, insofar as it would remove laborers and consumers who could contribute to the economy in the future.

These articles on encouragement of emigration show that despite their political differences, these newspapers seemed to agree that the government's plan to remove poor Irish laborers would not be an efficient remedy for the situation of poverty in

¹ *DEM*, December 24, 1824, "Meeting at the Exchange to take into consideration Mr. Cropper's plan", 4.

Ireland and would potentially remove an important group of potential contributors to the economy. The next part will analyze the articles that further address the particular situation of distress in Ireland.

3.2 Distress in Ireland

This period was also a time of great parliamentary study of the state of Ireland; both houses of Parliament conducted their own research into the distress in Ireland via three committees: Employment of the Poor in Ireland 1823 (House of Commons), State of Ireland 1824-5 (House of Commons) State of Ireland 1825 (House of Lords). This subject was studied extensively by these committees, which did not escape the attention of the press, who also wrote and published many articles regarding the distress in Ireland, the most prolific number from the *Dublin Evening Post*, followed by *Freeman's*.

Dublin Evening Post

The first few articles from the *DEP* that discussed the distress in Ireland were the series of letters “To the Marquis of Lansdowne” as previously mentioned, which used the high level of distress in Ireland to advocate for a remedy to the situation. Here, the author first explains that the distress is due to the fact that

Ireland is *not* a Manufacturing Country; she, has, comparatively, less Taxes; she has not, so to speak any commerce or credit; she would have been bankrupt long since, had not England undertaken to pay the interest of her Debt; she is almost strictly agricultural. Nay, we maintain, that, had the same policy been adopted towards Ireland as Elizabeth judged it necessary to use with respect to the Poor of England in the early part of her reign, this Country would not have exhibited the deplorable scenes which have since occurred. Their interest would have knitted the upper and the lower ranks together.¹

¹ *DEP*, August 21, 1823, “To the Marquis of Lansdowne”, 3.

The author is clearly criticizing the difference in treatment of the respective populations of England and Ireland and linking this difference to the deep distress felt by the Irish poor during this period.

The next letter in this series continues by addressing the biggest concern of landlords and political elites: the population of Ireland. The author asserts that these concerned elites argue that “this Population is the great cause of the misery of Ireland – and, that until this Population been reduced, there exists no reasonable probability that Ireland can be relieved”.¹ Here, in reading this point of view, the emphasis on emigration as a remedy for Ireland can be better understood. The upper classes of society were fearful of the growing poor population of Ireland and, instead of investing capital to employ them, emigration appeared as the only justifiable option to resolve this demographic and social issue. The theory of Malthus is further addressed when the author confronts the food supply part of the equation, which they assert is an invalid concern.

While the People of Clare and Mayo were starving in 1821-2 – while aid was coming from the banks of the Thames, the Seine, and the *Ganges*, these Counties were supplying the markets of Liverpool and Glasgow with Corn [...] There is no *physical* necessity, therefore, that the Irish Peasant should perish for want of food – there is food in abundance; and, as the markets of Liverpool, Glasgow and London can testify, enough to spare.²

Similar assertions were to be made concerning the events that led to the severity of the Great Hunger that began in 1845; many farms were growing abundant amounts of agricultural produce which continued to be exported to the markets of England, despite the desperate need of the poorest communities of Ireland. From the information

¹ *DEP*, October 21, 1823, “To the Marquis of Lansdowne”, 2.

² *Idem*.

presented in the letter, it is clear that this was not the first time such a practice was accepted when small localized crop failures occurred prior to the 1840s.

According to another article, the government was considering numerous solutions to the problems in Ireland, further supporting the creation of the multiple parliamentary committees studying the various aspects of distress. This article directly addresses the precarity of the potato crop in relation to the measures required by government to relieve the Irish poor, and thereby, avoid a catastrophe if further crop failures were to occur.

There was an assertion in one of the Orange Papers, that Government had it in contemplation to introduce a system of Poor Laws into Ireland. This assertion was flatly contradicted by one of the Castle Prints – no doubt, on authority. We rather think the latter was right to the letter, but we are satisfied notwithstanding, that the state of the Poor in Ireland must have occupied the most serious attention of the Government. The recurrence of such a season as that of 1822, must be calculated upon as one of those periodical visitations, to which such a Population as ours, depending upon the returns of so uncertain a crop in such a precarious climate, as the Potatooe – and calculated upon, there can be no doubt, that a Government, not altogether existing upon shifts and expedients, must, most anxiously, have engaged itself, in a consideration of precautionary measures.¹

These articles from the *DEP* appear to be arguing a counternarrative to the government line, who claimed that they were primarily concerned with relieving the distress in Ireland purely for the benefit of the poor. This publication, through these articles, clearly did not support emigration as a panacea for all the ills off Ireland and, moreover, considered that further innovative solutions would be required to truly address the distress experienced for years by the Irish poor.

¹ *DEP*, August 17, 1824, "Political Prospects of Ireland", 2. (Appendix B, 458).

As the £15,000 grant for emigration was being discussed in Parliament, the subject of the causes of distress were evoked, particularly excessive population, which *Freeman's* addressed in an article published on July 5, 1823 by refuting this premise used to justify emigration as a remedy for the Irish poor.

In this case the disease and the remedy require more consideration than has been bestowed upon them. The population of a country is not to be measured by its number of acres, but also by its means and capabilities, and if these be taken into account, Ireland is able to sustain a much greater population in proportion to its size than England or Scotland. While there are mountains and bogs in Ireland now in an unproductive state to be reclaimed, and mines in the bowels of the earth to be explored, it appears preposterous to complain of distress arising from excessive population.¹

This assertion, that Ireland could have supported a greater population than it contained during this period, was not a new argument and had been put forward by others, such as Robert Owen, who developed a socialist communal living plan,² and Thomas Spring Rice, who testified during the Emigration Committees.³ This capability, however, was hampered by the necessity of access to land that was dependent on absentee landlords. *Freeman's* article further criticizes the system of absenteeism which it asserts led to more severe distress in Ireland.

While, however, absenteeism prevails to its present extent, and capital is deterred from settling in the country, by the insecurity of property and civil dissension; we fear that no remedy or combination of remedies can prove adequate to the removal of the evil, and place the people in a state of comfort, even approaching in a remote degree, the state of the population of England. – The Union has served to increase the former of these evils.⁴

¹ *FJ*, July 5, 1823, "Emigration from Ireland", 3. (Appendix B, 510).

² See *Select Committee for the Employment of the Poor in Ireland 1823*, 70-103, 156-158.

³ See testimony of Thomas Spring Rice, *ER1*, 210-214, and *ER3*, 445-450.

⁴ *FJ*, July 5, 1823, "Emigration from Ireland", 3.

This article, though recopied from a London newspaper, demonstrates the *Freeman's* position that emigration was not the first priority in alleviating the distress of the Irish poor, which is shown in other articles.

A second article copied from a London newspaper similarly demonstrates the position of *Freeman's*, through a criticism of the House of Commons *Report on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland*. The article, originally published in the *Morning Chronicle*, examines the report of this committee and summarizes that its primary conclusion was that emigration was the best solution for Ireland, as opposed to actually employing them at home. In assessing the report, the author of this article contends that while excessive population may be a cause of the distress in Ireland, the cause of excessive population was the system of land tenure.

The great subject of complaint is, that no employment can be found for a very large portion of the people, on account of their numbers being excessive. [...]

Ireland contains 7,000,000 of people, of which, according to the evidence appended to the Report, 2,000,000 at the least have no sort of employment beyond what the landlords exact for rent, and what they make for themselves by cultivating potatoes; and nearly twice that number have no employment or occupation by which they can obtain as much clothing, in addition to the meanest sort of food, as will keep them in a state which, in England, would hardly be called decent. It is this population which the Committee think can be reduced by emigration. The Committee say the cause of the poverty and distress is mainly owing to the rapid increase of the population, and this, again, they say, is "partly from political motives, in adding to the freeholders, and partly from the ease with which high rents were paid for land, causing an extraordinary subdivision of farms. Many of the evils of Ireland, moral and political, as well as the depressed state of the peasantry, may, in the judgment of your Committee, be traced to the mischievous and frequently fraudulent multiplication of the elective franchise." – Fol. 7.

If, then, the causes of the excessive population be the subdivision of tenures for the purpose of obtaining enormous rents, and the possession of Parliamentary influence, by making "half-crown" freeholders, the first step towards a remedy should be the doing away with these causes; for it must

be evident at the first glance, that while these causes remain in operation, the population will continue to increase, until every spot of land capable of growing a potato is converted to that purpose, and until it shall be impossible for another human being to find enough of this miserable food to exist upon.¹

As has been demonstrated in the previous analysis, emigration was considered a potentially effective solution to the distress in Ireland and other communities in the United Kingdom by the majority of the witnesses who testified to the Emigration Committees. Many newspapers, however, were skeptical of this proposition and argued that a closer analysis of the causes of poverty was necessary to develop a successful plan to remedy the situation, disagreeing with the assumptions made by the governmental bodies assembled to study these issues.

This position is further demonstrated and developed in an article published in 1824, in which *Freeman's* expresses criticism of the government's attention on Ireland, asserting that they cannot fully understand the problems in Ireland unless they consider and treat that country as entirely part of the United Kingdom. In addition, this article presents an argument for the necessity of the press in informing the public of the issues affecting Ireland and, thereby, influencing government on its consideration of Ireland.

IRELAND may note the progress of her amelioration from that time when her evils, and the causes of those evils, may arrest the attention of the British people. We mean their *serious* and *fixed* attention; for a superficial and occasional observation can never detect the source of those ills which strike their roots so deep, and which so many are interested in concealing from view.

Whether the Parliament of the United Kingdom represents the opinion of the public inadequately or otherwise, it is certain that in every strong case of an extensive grievance, or an extensive interest, if the public mind be well informed upon it, and if the public press echo that impression, the public and the press become too strong for the Parliament; and the latter, yielding to or confessing the influence of general opinion, or general

¹ *FJ*, October 30, 1823, "Emigration of Irish to Canada", 3.

interests, feels it no derogation from its wisdom or authority to give at least an occasional victory to improved ideas and common sense. Therefore much benefit may be hoped for Ireland, by informing Great Britain respecting her condition.¹

[...]

One position for which we contend is this: - That it befits not only the characteristic benevolence, but the protecting dignity of the British people, and makes *a part of their own interests*, - to turn a steady and scrutinizing attention on the unexampled misery of the sister island.²

This excerpt makes it clear that the author finds the government's examinations of Ireland disingenuous, in that it was not searching for a genuine remedy for poverty nor was it seeking the true causes of suffering. The article goes on to describe the negative effects of charity in addressing poverty and evokes the continuous cyclical struggle that the Irish poor experienced annually:

Charity may meet the temporary evil of an occasional famine: but what is to meet the *continual* deficiency of human sustenance which exists generally and at all times in Ireland? a sort of lingering famine is habitual to that country. There is not any hour in the day in which there are not *millions* in Ireland *suffering* the pain of positive hunger.³

This description of the poor Irish laborers continued in an article responding to the second grant of £30,000 to facilitate emigration, petitioned for by Robert Wilmot-Horton on April 15, 1825 to finance his second experiment that took place that same year, again under the superintendence of Peter Robinson.

The misery under which a large part of the population of Ireland suffers is so acute, that the House of Commons is justified in the attempt to alleviate it by expedients, even if they promise no lasting benefit. The picture given of the poor of the neighbourhood of Carlow, by Dr. Doyle, exceeds in wretchedness any representation we have seen of the ordinary or continually recurring condition of any people in an European country. In the parish of Killishean, where the Doctor resides, and which contains

¹ *FJ*, November 10, 1824, "State of Ireland", 3. (Appendix B, 51).

² *Idem*.

³ *Idem*.

between 3000 and 4000 people, the poor whom he enumerated last year as actually in a state of starvation, were upwards of 700. In addition to those paupers, the distress among the bulk of the people was so great, that men having cabins and a few acres of land, were obliged to sell the furniture of their houses, and to pledge their beds in order to procure subsistence; and this subsistence, says the Doctor, that is the subsistence of this *better class* “consisted of a few potatoes supplied to the family once in each day, for about six or eight weeks or perhaps longer.” The last year, he states, was a year of more than ordinary, but not very extraordinary distress. The greater or less extent of this period of starvation, which recurs every summer, depends upon the scarcity or abundance of the potato crop.

“The poor people in general,” says Dr. DOYLE, “collect a little dung (they have no land); this dung they put upon a piece of land given them by a farmer, and it produces a little stock of potatoes. This, with their earnings, supports them until, suppose, March or April, then their entire stock is exhausted; and when the summer advances, particularly the latter part of it, before the harvest comes in, they have no means at all of support; they have no employment; they have no food, and are actually dying of hunger.”¹

This selection of the article is an effective way of communicating the testimony on the level of poverty experienced by the Irish poor to the general public, although, because *Freeman’s* was a Irish nationalist and radical newspaper, it catered to a certain political viewpoint; therefore, it is perhaps less likely that those unaware of the difficulties in Ireland would be informed of the situation via this newspaper, despite its popularity.

These articles, in addressing the distress in Ireland, demonstrate a skepticism of the government’s inquiries into the situation of the Irish poor, while further reminding the public of these earlier inquiries that resulted in no marked change to resolve the problems in Ireland. It is notable that the two publications that discussed this aspect in depth were the more liberal leaning and widely circulated newspapers, *DEP* and *FJ*.

¹ *FJ*, April 20, 1825, “State of the Population of Ireland”, 4. (Appendix B, 516).

3.3 Alternatives

Some publications additionally focused on proposed alternatives to emigration, focusing on sources of employment, including the reclamation of bogs and wastelands, upon which there were prolific parliamentary studies from 1809 to 1814, and which could provide employment to millions of unemployed or underemployed laborers. Another alternative proposed was the establishment of poor laws in Ireland, which was highly disputed by Malthus and others, including in the Emigration Committees.

Employment

The first article to address the question of bog reclamation appeared in the *DEP* in 1822 in a letter reprinted from the London-based journal *The Courier*, extolling the benefits of employing laborers for the purpose of potentially transforming the land into arable farm land.

“We should not overlook the return made by the Commissioners for ascertaining the extent and quality of the bogs of Ireland, from which it appears, that there are nearly three millions of acres now waste, capable of improvement upon moderate terms, and the greater part of which could be converted into excellent land. Not only are those lands improveable, but, in general, the means of improvement are contiguous. – All that is required is labour; and, therefore, the present amount of the Population, so far from being an injury, would be the greatest advantage, if there were capital and disposition to employ it on those unoccupied lands, together with a concurrent and cheap security of possession and title.¹”

This was the perspective on bog reclamation for many years in Ireland, beginning with the Bog Commissions, continuing through the Emigration Committees, and debated in Parliament in the later years of the decade. The main purpose of this proposal, however, does not appear to have been the employment of the Irish poor, but to reclaim land in Ireland that could be used to extend farms and bring greater profit to proprietors, who

¹ *DEP*, October 22, 1822, “Ireland. To the Editor of *The Courier*. Letter III”, 4.

were, in large part, absentees living in England and elsewhere outside of Ireland. Another article, published in *Freeman's*, similarly described the vast acreage of bogs waiting to be developed while the poor continued to experience regular starvation on an annual basis.

While there are mountains and bogs in Ireland now in an unproductive state to be reclaimed, and mines in the bowels of the earth to be explored, it appears preposterous to complain of distress arising from excessive population.¹

Further articles discussed other alternatives to employ the people, emphasizing the necessity of this effort. The following excerpt from the *DEP* was part of a letter “to the Marquis of Lansdowne”, the abovementioned series published in October 1823. The letter uses some of the testimony of the *Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland* of that year, which presented 18 witnesses, some of whom testified to the Emigration Committee, and one of whom, unusually, was a woman, the Countess of Glengall.

Well, but if Emigration will not do, we must endeavour to find some employment for the People. This, my Lord, always a difficult problem, is, with regard to Ireland, as at present circumstanced, one off tremendous importance. Mr. Denis Browne admits that Ireland would be much better off, if it had two millions of People less. This is saying, in other words, that there are two millions of men for whom no employment can be found. We are not sure that if Mr. Browne doubled the number he would be very materially wrong. - Another Gentleman examined before the Committee, Mr. Pierce Mahony, goes even farther than we should be willing to carry our hypothesis; he says that the People have “not one-tenth of the employment necessary.” How is employment to be obtained for such a Population as that Population of 400 persons for every square mile, or of about one person, as a Contemporary suggests, to every two acres – a Population just twice as dense as that of England and Wales? The Countess of Glengall, a Lady who is an honor to her sex, and who, within the sphere of her influence, has done more good than all the titled Ladies of Ireland, recommends spindles and reels. Her Ladyship, in short, wishes to

¹ *FJ*, July 5, 1823, “Emigration from Ireland”, 3.

introduce the Linen Manufacture into the South of Ireland. We have not the slightest objection, and should be glad to see it flourishing in Tipperary, Kerry, Limerick and Cork. But your Lordship need not be told, that, before this could be accomplished, before, in fact, a Manufactory could be set at work, so as to employ any considerable portion of the People there should be a market for the commodity. In a word, my Lord, if there were a demand for more Irish Linens than are not exported, there would be a supply. It is only the demand we want.¹

This author's main preoccupation in this portion of the letter is the employment of the Irish poor, which is made clear by the chosen excerpts of evidence of the committee. The proposal of the introduction of spinning manufacturing into the south of Ireland was one that was examined by others, since the northern province of Ulster had large manufactories that employed many people and the living conditions of the inhabitants were more positive than in the south, due to the absence of dependence on agriculture for subsistence.

Another development project was suggested by an article in *Freeman's*, in which the author proposes developing the coastal areas of Ireland to improve ports and fisheries to provide employment and greater industry in those regions.

If the two Noble MARQUESSSES,² as they seem inclined to reside a good deal on their estates, take a lead in the improvement of the sea coast, many sources of productive labour will speedily present themselves, when the inhabitants, being collected together, can employ their joint exertions in various branches of useful industry. The great engine on which the prosperity of the new colonies and towns, already enumerated, is considered to be grounded, is that of the extensive power of circulating navigation by steam-vessels. The western coasts of Ireland, and those of the Highlands, and Isles of North Britain, possess advantages of a maritime nature beyond all the countries of Europe. The soil near the coast is capable of being rendered very productive and THE FISHERIES in all their branches present an indefinite source of productive labour. The turf with which these coasts every where abound, can be compressed, we understand, and freed from its moisture, by the operation of the steam-engines which

¹ *DEP*, October 28, 1823, "To the Marquis of Lansdowne", 3.

² Marquess of Clanrickard and Marquess of Sligo.

navigate the vessels, so as to afford a constant supply of fuel for the boilers, without having recourse to coals. Vast numbers of people may be usefully employed, and those districts on the Atlantic, hitherto neglected and waste, may be rendered flourishing parts of the empire; many new towns and villages may be erected, to which the steam vessels can speedily supply all materials for carrying on the fisheries and various branches of manufacture. The cotton manufacture, for which the demand in South America is greater than can be at present supplied, may be carried on with great facility. The linen trade may be also greatly [i]ncreased. The complaints of a redundant population will soon vanish. We shall be happy to see these views realized, and we confess that they do not seem to us to be visionary, but founded in true views of political economy.¹

This article, in proposing the development of fisheries and the introduction of textile industries, asserts that many possibilities had not yet been considered as regards the necessary relief of the Irish poor, and that these proposals would be practical and efficient and could potentially employ many people and solve the major issue of a redundant population in Ireland.

Poor Laws

On the question of subsistence, proposals were made to introduce poor laws in Ireland as a way to support the Irish poor. William Cobbett, the editor and proprietor of the *Political Register*, wrote numerous scathing critiques of government and its treatment of Ireland, which were occasionally reprinted in Irish newspapers. One such critique was published by the *DEP*, in which Cobbett asserts that he advocated in his newspaper for many years for the introduction of poor laws in Ireland, and that the other journals of the time were disciples of Malthus and, therefore, for the abolition of the Poor Laws in England and against the establishment of Poor Laws in Ireland.

The Reader will bear in mind, that I have frequently said, that the way to keep the People in Ireland from starving, was, to cause Rates to be raised on the lands of Ireland, as they are on those of England, for the relief of the Poor. This is a great subject, a really great subject – but it cannot be fully

¹ *FJ*, October 27, 1825, "Colonization of the Sea Coasts", 3. (Appendix B, 519).

discussed by me in the present Register. [...] We have heard nothing, for several years past, but attacks upon the Poor Laws. It has been quite a fashion, a raging fashion, ever since Malthus published his at once atrociously cruel and exquisitely stupid book. His proposition, was, to put an end to poverty by putting an end to parish relief. He laid it down as a principle, that, to give parish relief was unjust as well as foolish; that it was the giving of parish relief that had made the People poor; that the paupers must continue to increase if you gave them parish relief; and that, therefore, he would put an end to that relief.¹

Here, Cobbett contends that few questioned the principles put forth by Malthus, a criticism previously leveled by William Godwin, but that his own position had been clear for many years. Repealing the poor laws, as proposed by Malthus, he claims, was antithetical to the responsibility of the state to support its suffering populations, and, according to him, it was illogical not to extend these protections to the chronic annual starvation experienced by the Irish poor.

One final alternative, presented in an article from the *DEM*, proposed opening up Ireland's economy to the world market, which was an idea developed by James Cropper, an English merchant and abolitionist, who traveled to Ireland and, as a result of his visits and firsthand observations of the poverty there, established cotton mills as an attempt to employ at least some of the Irish poor. The article, which took the form of a transcript of a meeting to discuss Cropper's plan, vaguely connects the abolition of slavery with the relief of the Irish and further links the distress in Ireland to the introduction of machinery into the manufacturing industries of England.

It is true, distress does exist at home, but I have found, in my other pursuit, that the two objects are inseparable, and that the relief of slavery in the West Indies is the only source of alleviation for the distress in Ireland. To open the markets, to give her a free trade, an unrestricted commerce with the world, is the only way in which the wants of her population can be supplied. With these impressions, I did intend to have visited this country earlier in the season, but ill health obliged me to postpone my coming until lately, when, although I had heard much of the misery of the Irish

¹ *DEP*, July 24, 1824, "Poor Laws in Ireland", 4.

population, I found those accounts far surpassed by the wretchedness which I witnessed in the South of Ireland, to which my attention was principally directed. Thirty or forty years ago, the population in the South of Ireland had full employment, in the hand-spinning of worsted. The town of Clonmel alone, at that period, as I learned from a gentleman whom I met there, was able to afford employment to forty thousand hands in that manufacture, and such was the anxiety to procure spinners, that they were often paid their wages before-hand. At present the case is totally altered. What is the reason that Ireland, possessing such natural advantages as she does, should be in a worse condition than any other country in Europe? The reason is obvious: it arises from her vicinity to the machinery of England. When machinery was introduced, the demand for manual labour, of course, declined, while the population of Ireland increased. [...] With regard to the benefit of giving occupation to the people, that is very manifest.¹

Cropper, in his analysis, makes it clear that employment is the central objective that should be addressed to relieve the Irish poor. In 1825, Cropper went on to publish a 60-page pamphlet on the condition of the poor in Ireland and details his plan for relief. In the introduction to his pamphlet, he explains that,

If employment be not given to the people in Ireland, there will be an increase in the number who come over to share in the employment of the people of this country. In short, if the comforts of England be not extended to Ireland, we shall partake of her misery. In the nature of things there can only be two modes of relief; either to lessen the number of the population of Ireland, or to give them employment; and to point out the mode of effecting the latter, is the chief object of the following pages.²

While Cropper and the *DEM* were looking to employment as the principal method to relieve the poor in 1825, the government went another direction when it began the Emigration Committees at the conclusion of the experiments of 1823 and 1825.

¹ *DEM*, December 24, 1824, "Meeting at the Exchange to take into Consideration Mr. Cropper's Plan", 4.

² James Cropper, *Present State of Ireland: with a Plan for Improving the Condition of the People*. (Liverpool: G. & J. Robinson, 1825), iv.

In discussing these topics, the Dublin press demonstrated a shift in the discourse on emigration in the years leading up to the Emigration Committees. While until then most of the newspapers either supported assisting emigration or were critical of the government's shifting position on encouraging emigration, their positions became more skeptical or changed their stance dramatically when the subject concerned Irish emigration. *Freeman's*, for example, in the early years of the decade supported government assistance for Scottish emigrants, but when Irish emigration became the center of focus, their opinion shifted, becoming more skeptical of emigration as a solution for Ireland's ills. In addition, a documented shift in focus took place, with publications focusing more on the ongoing distress in Ireland, and the need for a solution to the suffering experienced by the Irish poor on a cyclical basis. This focus on the necessity of a remedy for the Irish poor led to more expanded debate in the newspapers on the various possible solutions, with alternatives to emigration presented, such as bog reclamation, introduction of new industries, and other development projects, coupled with an expansion of social protections for the poor. These suggestions continued with debates in both houses of Parliament, in addition to other proposals, beginning a shift away from emigration as a remedy for the situation in Ireland, which will be examined in the next section.

4. Influence of the Press

While this next section does not focus only on emigration, it does examine the influence of the press on parliamentary debates in particular. In the years following the Emigration Committees, the debate in the press and in Parliament shifted away from emigration to other remedies to the situation in Ireland, such as Catholic Emancipation and the introduction of Poor Laws in Ireland. One of the questions being addressed by this research is the assessment of the role played by the Dublin press in this evolution.

While the influence of the press in general is arguable, the Dublin press may have had some impact on the progression of these parliamentary debates that moved beyond emigration as a solution for the ills of Ireland, which will be determined by analyzing those selected for publication by the newspapers during this period. These debates, much like the articles that discussed emigration, deliberated on similar aspects, such as the encouragement of emigration, passenger vessels regulations, the state of Ireland, alternatives to emigration, and emigration generally. Though there were some articles that printed parliamentary debates in the early years of the decade, the majority of them were published after the Emigration Committees were held in 1826 and 1827. It is important to note that during this period the principal subject concerning Ireland was emancipation. Daniel O'Connell had made headway towards representation in Parliament, which led to a number of articles discussing the situation of Irish Catholics and the struggle for emancipation, overtaking in some respects the debate on emigration. While parliamentary debates on the subject continued and were printed in the Dublin newspapers, original articles concerning emigration coming from those publications themselves decreased significantly. As the decade was coming to a close, the priorities of the press and Parliament appeared to be more focused on the debate around Catholic Emancipation and Daniel O'Connell, rather than on the subject of emigration, further focusing the debate on alternative remedies for the distress in

Ireland. In the following analysis, we will assess the role of the press: whether it was used simply as a means to communicate information to the public, or if it had an impact on the debate taking place in Parliament.

4.1 Encouragement of Emigration

The first article that raised criticism of the encouragement of emigration was published in the *DEM* on March 7, 1828, when the debate on emancipation was nearing its peak. The criticism focused on Francis Burdett's call in Parliament to transport Irish Catholics rather than grant them emancipation.

Really Sir Francis Burdett is much to blame. He has done worse than fling the Papists overboard. They ask for Emancipation – free, full, and unqualified Emancipation. They say that it is the panacea for all Irish ills – the great sedative for all national grievances – the measure upon which the stability of the State and the continuance of the British Constitution depends. What says Sir Francis? Transport the knaves, transport them. The following is an extract from his speech on Tuesday night, during a discussion upon the expediency of transporting certain numbers of Irish Papists to places beyond the sea, brought forward under the imposing title of “Emigration:” –

“No question which Parliament could take up was of equal importance, neither that of Free Trade, the Corn Question, or the question of Catholic Emancipation. Not one of them was of equal importance to this.”

While this article is primarily focused on the question of emancipation, it suggests that the debate has shifted to this being the panacea for the problems of Ireland rather than emigration, which had been extolled in previous years. Whether this was the suggestion of Francis Burdett or not, the original source of this excerpt must be examined. Furthermore, this article highlights the connection between the role of the press in communicating political debates and its influence on the latter. Here the author directly

¹ *DEM*, March 7, 1828, “The Poor Papists”, 2. (Appendix B, 444).

attacks the parliamentary speech of Francis Burdett, who had claimed to be pro-Emancipation, for his suggestion that removing Catholics via emigration is the more important subject for Parliament to debate rather than other aspects that would concretely affect the economics and living conditions of Irish people, such as free trade, Corn Laws, and, ultimately, Catholic Emancipation. In this way, the article is communicating to the public the discourse happening in Parliament, while simultaneously attempting to influence the debate by holding members accountable for their discussions. Though the *DEM* was a conservative publication and anti-Emancipation, this article suggests that it was attempting to discredit pro-Emancipation politicians when they expressed contradictory opinions on subjects related to Ireland.

The *Dublin Morning Register* (*DMR*) reprinted the abovementioned debate, which included a long intervention by Robert Wilmot-Horton, and in which Francis Burdett spoke for a very short time.

Sir F. BURDETT said, he fully concurred with those who thought that this subject was one which demanded the most serious attention of the House. It had never been discussed in such a manner as to enable the House to form any judgment of the details. He rose principally for the purpose of saying that he did not yield to the Right Hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. Horton) or to any other person, in his conviction of the great importance of this subject, and of its being the only plan for effectually relieving the distresses both of England and Ireland. It was as much an English question as an Irish, perhaps more so. (Hear.) No question which Parliament could take up was of equal importance, neither that of Free Trade, the Corn Question, or the question of Catholic Emancipation. Not one of them was of equal importance to this. The Right Hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. Horton) deserved great credit for his exertions. He showed, in following up this subject through so many difficulties and obstacles, perseverance, ability, and wisdom. At first it was very difficult to get any person to pay attention to it. The Right Hon. Gentleman, however, at length succeeded in bringing it under the consideration of the House, and he trusted that ere long, it would be fairly and fully discussed.¹

¹ *DMR*, March 8, 1828, "Imperial Parliament. House of Commons – Tuesday", 1.

This excerpt of the Parliamentary debate referenced by the *DEM* shows that Burdett was placing great importance on emigration over the cause of emancipation that he himself was a supporter of, having proposed laws to remove the restrictions on Catholics in Parliament in 1825, 1827, and 1828.

The *DEM* was not alone in its criticism of the parliamentary debates on the subject of emigration. The *DEP* leveled its own admonishments of the Parliament's discussion of emigration on the same date as the article previously scrutinized by the *DEM* as mentioned above. This criticism was leveled at the debates themselves and insisted on how complex the circumstances of Ireland were, especially due to the fact that few English members had knowledge of the particularities of that country and the members resident in Ireland had become the primary advocates for Irish affairs in Parliament. This further demonstrates how the Parliament had moved on from the subject of a system of emigration as the central solution for Ireland, and suggests that the few resident Irish members continued to raise alternatives to make some progress in addressing the levels of poverty of that country. The article summarizes this point by contending that "Irish Affairs cannot be satisfactorily arranged by a Parliament which holds its sittings in another country", further asserting the lack of knowledge of Ireland was preventing progress from being made. Furthermore, much like the previous article, the *DEP* does not condemn emigration as a solution to the distress of Ireland, though it asserts that requiring landlords to contribute would be a sufficient way to obtain the funds to finance their tenants' emigration.

We do not object, we say, to Emigration – we only doubt its advantages *to those who remain*, but if Gentlemen wish to get rid of their tenantry, let them enable them to emigrate. Mr. James Grattan, than whom there is not an honester member in the House of Commons, observes, that it will be impossible to obtain the funds necessary from the Irish Landlords for this purpose. Impossible, certainly it will be, except, *upon compulsion*. But the

People must not be allowed to perish, notwithstanding, in the midst of plenty.¹

It appears from these articles that both conservative and liberal leaning newspapers were critical of the Parliament's later position on emigration, evolving from its previous stance when the government was considering putting in place the proposed emigration system, suggested primarily by Robert Wilmot Horton. The evolution of the Parliament's consideration of emigration appears to have been accompanied by a similar shift in the newspapers.

While encouraging emigration did not appear to be the position of the Parliament during these final years of the decade, numerous petitions were presented to that body requesting assistance to emigrate. Most of the petitions were from groups of distressed Scottish laborers pleading for assistance to emigrate, though they were only briefly mentioned, generally as an introduction to a deeper parliamentary debate on the subject of emigration and the proposals being made, often by Wilmot Horton, to legislate on the issue.²

Despite not having established a state-aided emigration system he proposed in the Emigration Committees, Wilmot Horton continued to make new proposals in Parliament regarding different aspects of emigration. The proposals he made to establish new passenger vessels regulations led to an intense debate both in the press and in Parliament, with a great diversity of opinions expressed. These discussions will be further studied here, as they may illustrate the interactions between the Dublin press and parliamentary debates.

¹ *DEP*, March 8, 1828, "State of Ireland", 3.

² *DEM*, March 7, 1828, "Emigration", 3. *DEM*, March 31, 1828, "Emigration", 3. *DEP*, April 5, 1828, "Emigration", 4. *DEP*, May 10, 1828, "House of Commons – May 6", 4. Also available in Hansard Parliamentary Archives: <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1828/index.html>.

4.2 Passenger Vessels Regulations

As previously discussed, the Passengers Vessels regulations were modified on several occasions during this period leading up to the 1820s and finally repealed in May 1827, which was supported by the third Emigration Committee Report.¹ In 1828, the Parliament was debating new regulations which did not go unnoticed by the press. This began with a brief article from the *DMR* on this debate, listing the headings of the act without going into detail, remarking upon the lack of regulations concerning the requirement of a surgeon on every ship, as the previous regulations had required.

We publish elsewhere a communication from a correspondent on this subject. It alludes to the repeal of an act requiring the attendance of medical officers on board passenger ships, and the consequent departure of vessels from Dublin without such precautions against the worst evils of disease. We observe that there is a bill now before Parliament “to regulate the carriage of passengers.” The blanks are not yet filled up, but the following are the heads of the intended enactments, and it will be seen that amongst them there is nothing relating to medical arrangements.

1. Vessels not to sail with more than a certain number of passengers.
 2. Regulating quantity of water and provisions to be carried.
 3. No part of cargo or provisions to be stowed between decks.
 4. List of passengers to be delivered to collector of customs.
 5. To prevent passengers being improperly landed.
 6. Fine on master for carrying more passengers than allowed by act.
 7. Master of vessel to enter into bond.
 8. Act not to affect post office packets.²
-

This article was followed by the aforementioned letter on the subsequent page of this edition of the *DMR*. The letter was signed from “Nauticus” and similarly addressed the lack of medical provisions in the proposed act, beginning with communicating a sense of urgency on undertaking the question seriously.

¹ ER3, 36.

² *DMR*, March 21, 1828, “Emigration”, 3.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING REGISTER.

Sir, – Influenced by feelings of commiseration for my fellow-men, I venture to solicit a portion of your columns in order through them to attract the public notice to a subject of the most appalling interest.

The season of emigration is just now commencing, and the harbor of Dublin already is crowded with shipping, waiting the first favourable wind, to transport from their native country hundreds of her most active and speculating children. With the abstract merits of the question, or with the ultimate fate of the Emigrants, in a communication of this nature, I have nothing to do, but, Sir, if so they must, it at least becomes a duty, that the utmost attention be given to their accommodation on their route, that the asperities of the path leading from all they love should be softened, at any rate that independent of the dangers of the sea, some little security should be given for their lives.¹

The author goes on to explain the medical challenges of an emigrant ship traveling to North America, using the example of a ship that sailed for Halifax and succumbed to typhus fever before arriving at its destination, thereby encouraging the Parliament to pass a bill to resolve the issue.

In a newspaper we find the following statement, addressed to the Colonial Office, by Sir J. Kempt, the British Governor at Halifax: -

“The ship James, left Ireland for Halifax, with 160 passengers, five of whom died on the voyage, - thirty-five men left at Newfoundland, unable from illness to proceed further; the remaining 120, as well as the whole of the crew, arrived at Halifax, laboring under typhus fever.”

It now, alone remains for me to state the almost incredible truth, which principally calls forth this communication, namely, that the law requiring it being repealed, the passenger-ships are sailing without medical officers. – Good God, Sir, is this to facilitate emigration by relieving the brokers' of expense, or are we justified in believing it a link in some conspiracy to annihilate the growing population. Your space, Sir, is too valuable, to be longer encroached on; - a word to my emigrating countrymen, and I have done. If they care not to bury themselves in these floating pest-houses, let them at least reflect on their offspring and their wives – their health, their lives should be dearer to them than their own; they should, at least for them, require the assistance of medical

¹ *DMR*, March 21, 1828, “To the Editor of the Morning Register”, 4. (Appendix B, 488).

superintendence [*sic*], and only embark in such vessels as in this respect are adequately supplied.¹

The parliamentary debate on this subject on March 18, 1828 reveals that very little was understood about the necessity of having medical personnel on board these emigrant vessels. During this period typhus was the most serious illness that could occur on these long voyages in cramped conditions. The few members of Parliament who discussed typhus did not consider that a doctor would alleviate the occurrence of this malady, but, for some, that more space per passenger would be beneficial, and for others, not allowing poor Irish emigrants onto the vessels would solve the problem.² Though the true causes of the different kinds of typhus were unknown during this period, the inclination to provide more space per passenger would have been helpful to prevent the spread of the disease, as it was attributed to lice, fleas (from rats), mites, or ticks, in the early twentieth century. Ultimately, when the act was passed on May 23, 1828, there was no provision made to require a medical officer or surgeon onboard passenger vessels, unlike previously repealed versions of these regulations. The primary concern of the act was the space provided to passengers as well as food and water provisions. Debates on this proposal were printed by all six of the newspapers included in this study which shows a certain level of interest in the outcome of these debates, as well as communicating to the public how the Parliament was approaching this subject.

The importance of communication to the public through the press was further emphasized in an article from April 19, 1828, in which Robert Wilmot Horton responds to a letter from an individual inquiring into the assistance available for emigrants upon arriving in the colonies.

¹ *Idem.*

² See Hansard Archives for March 18, 1828, "Passengers' Regulation Bill": <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1828/mar/18/passengers-regulation-bill>.

Sir – I have received a letter from you, stating that you are fitting up vessels for the ‘Emigration Trade,’ as you call it, and requesting me to afford you information of various sorts upon the subject; among others, ‘the nature of the domicile of the Emigrants in Canada,’ and ‘the sum allowed to each.’ I am extremely surprised that any person in your situation should be so totally ignorant of what the Newspapers clearly explain, with respect to what is passing in Parliament. The Bill in question, when passed into a law, will transpire as other Bills do; but that Bill has no reference whatever to any assistance of Emigrants; it is [merely] a Bill for the regulation of passage vessels, as to certain proportions of space and certain quantities of food. At present no public money has been voted for the assistance of Emigrants in any shape; and it is of the utmost importance that this fact should be distinctly understood throughout Ireland, so that parties may not be deceived as to their real situation, and not be induced to embark under an impression that assistance of any sort awaits them in the colonies.¹

Wilmot Horton makes it clear in his response to this letter, that no assistance would be included in the legislation being debated by Parliament at that time. It was clearly important for him to submit his response to the newspapers in order to communicate that the Parliament was not considering assistance as suggested by the author, and that no financial support had been approved either. In printing his response in the *DEP*, *DMR*, and *DWR*, therefore, he is using the press to communicate the official position of government on the point of emigration assistance during this period, which was, in fact, nonexistent.

Further proposals were made in Parliament concerning the establishment of Poor Laws in Ireland to alleviate the distress of impoverished Irish laborers. As previously mentioned, no legislation existed for the support of the poor in Ireland during this period, unlike in England and Scotland, despite Ireland being part of the United Kingdom. The debate on this issue was similarly divided in both the Parliament and the press, with those supporting it being adamant of the necessity of the legislation, and

¹ *DEP*, April 19, 1828, “Exportation of the Poor”, s6.

those opposing forewarning the failure of the policy before it was ever established in Ireland.

4.3 State of Ireland

One of the first debates in Parliament in 1828 took place on March 14 and was reprinted in the *DEM*, *DEP*, *DMR*, and *FJ*. Many of these publications reprinted various parliamentary debates on this subject, with some adding editorial content and others simply presenting the debates as they happened. While this debate was not followed with any criticism from the newspapers in which it was published, it demonstrates the general outline that the presentation of a petition solicits. First, James Grattan, an Irish Whig member for Wicklow, presents a petition from a group who, in this case, wish to extend the Poor Laws to Ireland. After a long speech on the state of employment in Ireland and the general distress there, General Isaac Gascoyne, a British army officer and Tory member for Liverpool, and Joseph Hume, a Scottish doctor and Radical member of Parliament for Aberdeen Burghs, recommend that a committee be appointed to study the issue, apparently not recalling the numerous reports on the state of Ireland that took place a few years earlier. A final member, the Home Secretary Sir Robert Peel, reminded the others of the existence of previous committees examining this exact question, particularly in the Emigration Committees, while explicitly criticizing the member who had introduced the petition.

Mr. PEEL observed, that as two Committees had been already appointed by the House, to inquire into the causes of the increase of crime in London and the country, he certainly did not entertain the slightest intention to move for the appointment of a third Committee, such as the Hon. Member for Montrose had recommended. He thought that in either of the Committees to which the Hon. Member had referred, he would have full scope for entering into such an inquiry as that suggested. He was afraid that in the multiplicity and variety of his (Mr. Hume's) parliamentary labours, he had not been able to find time to read the evidence attached to the

reports on emigration. – If the Hon. Member had read them with the care which their importance deserved, he would have discovered that the Emigration Committee had entered into a full examination of the subject in question.¹

Despite having discussed the introduction of the poor laws in Ireland during many Select Committees, most of the members wanted a new committee to study the practicability of this proposal. This practice was not unusual during this period, when often committees were appointed to study proposals of new policy that had already been examined by past committees, especially regarding the state of Ireland (as previously mentioned, there were numerous committees charged with examining questions about Ireland). This excerpt of parliamentary debates that was selected by these publications to be reprinted could have been used to communicate to the public how slowly the government reacted to urgent distress being felt during different periods of time. As explained in this article, this question had been studied by committees in the years preceding this debate, though no steps were ever taken by Parliament to address poverty in Ireland. This same suggestion was made by the House of Lords two weeks after the Commons and the debate was similarly reprinted across four of the newspapers of this study,² in which Lord Darnley expressed that,

his present intention was, on that day to move for a Select Committee to inquire into the state of the population of Ireland, with a view of ascertaining what measures could be adopted for the relief of that population.³

This was also met with resistance when

The Earl of LIMERICK said that as one of the Representatives of that Country, he certainly should feel it his duty to oppose the appointing of any

¹ *DEM*, March 19, 1828, "Poor Laws in Ireland", 4. (Appendix B, 444).

² *DEM*, March 31, 1828, "State of the Population of Ireland", 3; *FJ*, March 31, 1828, 4; *DMR*, March 31, 1828, 2; *SNL*, March 31, 1828, 2.

³ *Idem*.

such Committee, because he was persuaded that nothing beneficial would result from such a step.¹

Whether this resistance was due to a reluctance to institute a system of Poor Laws in Ireland or the fact that similar committees had already studied the question was not further explained.

Another proposal to introduce Poor Laws was debated on April 1 and reprinted in all six newspapers selected for this study, in which a petition was presented from a distressed group in Dublin, similarly asking for Poor Laws to alleviate their conditions. James Grattan, who generally supported Irish issues, including Emancipation, expressed approval for a number of remedies for Ireland in this passage, such as the reclamation of bogs, growing the fishing industry, and, finally, the introduction of Poor Laws. This support, however, was met with fervent opposition from the other members who spoke on this proposal, with only one exception.

Sir J. NEWPORT spoke on the subject of the petition, [...] and declared his own opinion to be, that if the system of poor rates were introduced into Ireland, it would turn out to be only a means of immense speculation. [...]

Mr. MAURICE FITZGERALD thought the mention of the Poor Laws was meant perhaps unintentionally, to divert the mind of the House from those other measures for the amelioration of the condition of the Irish people. [...]

Mr. Secretary PEEL said he had occasion to consider this subject on different occasions, and he was fully impressed with the conviction that the introduction of a system of Poor Laws, like the Poor Laws of England, into Ireland, would greatly aggravate the evils under which the population of that country laboured. [...]

Mr. WILMOT HORTON agreed with the Right Hon. Secretary for the Home Department, that the Poor Laws would be a most unfortunate measure for Ireland. [...]

Mr. CALCRAFT said [...] he was satisfied the effect of introducing the Poor Laws into that country in its present condition, would be the transference

¹ *Idem.*

of the rental of that country into different hands from those of the land proprietors, and instead of relief to the labouring classes, would introduce a more extensive system of destitution than existed in that country at present. [...]

Mr. MONCK said he considered the Poor Laws of England the only partition in this country between what remained of English comfort and the introduction of Irish poverty. [...]

Colonel TRENCH said, that if the state of Ireland was actually such as it had been represented to be, neither the introduction of the Poor Laws, nor a system of Emigration, could in any measure at all operate as a remedy.¹

This opposition covered a spectrum of views on why these laws would be ineffective, from potential embezzlement of relief funds to worsening the situation of the poor and allowing England to remain in relative comfort compared to Ireland. Only one member expressed support of the proposal, contending that these laws would put Ireland on an equal footing with England and Scotland and potentially reduce their migration to those countries in search of employment.

Mr. CROKER said, that the manner in which England and Scotland were overrun with Irish paupers, would compel the House to turn their attention to the subject; and at present he did not see any better mode than by applying to Ireland a system of poor rates.²

John Croker was an Irish conservative member of Parliament for Dublin University at this point, and it appears that his main interest in addressing this question was to prevent Irish paupers from migrating to England and Scotland in search of employment, rather than the relief of his countrymen in that situation. Though the previous debates did not meet with criticism in the newspapers within which they were printed, this changed with a further parliamentary debate on the "Population of Ireland".

¹ *DEM*, April 4, 1828, "Poor Laws in Ireland", 2; *DEP*, April 3, 1828, 3; *FJ*, April 5, 1828, 3; *DMR*, April 4, 1828, 3; *SNL*, April 4, 1828, 2; *DWR*, April 5, 1828, 2.

² *DMR*, April 4, 1828, "House of Commons – Tuesday. Poor Laws in Ireland", 3.

On May 1, 1828, the Earl of Darnley again attempted to move a new committee to investigate the state of the peasantry of Ireland. This debate was printed by the *DEM*, *DEP*, *FJ*, and *SNL*, though criticism was leveled by only by the *DEM* and *FJ*, who took opposing sides on the matter. The *DEM*, a more conservative publication, linked the distress in Ireland to religion, as expressed by Lord Lorton, a staunch anti-Catholic politician with close links to the Orange Order. The *DEM* summarizes the debate as follows:

It will be seen that his Lordship after an exaggerated statement intended for the Corn-Exchange, and the miserable rent-payers to the Association, moved, that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the state of the peasantry of Ireland. Lord LIMERICK ably exposed the fallacy of the reasoning of the Noble Mover; and Lord LONGFORD, whilst he admitted that the suggestions in regard to Emigration might be calculated to produce beneficial consequences, contended that nothing but mischief could result from agitating the question of introducing anything like the system of the British Poor Laws in Ireland. Lord LORTON, adverting to the causes of the distresses alluded to, declared that the panacea recommended was calculated only to encrease and perpetuate the degradation of the Irish people. – What (said his Lordship) would have been the situation of England at this time if the Catholic religion had been maintained in it? What was not the situation of Italy, of Spain, of Portugal, of every country in short where the degrading influence of Popery held its sway over the minds of the people, the abject slavery of the people to their Priests, who were the determined enemies of this Protestant Constitution? The Catholic Association, that *Imperium in Imperio*, to which he had often called the attention of that House, was another great cause of the misery and degradation of Ireland. Having adverted to this remedy and refused his assent to it, it might be asked of him what remedy he would propose. To this he would say, give employment to the people, and this may be done by laying on a land and absentee tax. The Duke of WELLINGTON very ably exposed the gross exaggeration of the statements of Lord DARNLEY, and proved that the arguments adduced were such as could not possibly receive the attention of Parliament. Lord MOUNTCASHEL considered, with much reason and justice, that the Catholic Rent was one of the great evils of Ireland; the Body who collected it did not seem to care how poor their dupes were, if they could get their money into their hands. This was the conduct of the Catholic leaders, while on the other hand, the Protestants of property and influence contributed their own funds to establish hospitals and other institutions for the relief of the poor. With no less truth and

justice did Lord LORTON pronounce the Catholic Association to be one of the greatest curses to the unfortunate peasantry of Ireland; and his Lordship expressed a sincere wish, in which all good and loyal subjects must join, that so mischievous a body might speedily be put down. Lord DARNLEY *said* he was as good a Protestant as any Noble Lord opposed to his motion, which was thereupon negatived *without a division!*

This clash between Darnley and Lorton, further amplified by the *DEM*, pitted two opposing forces against each other. While Darnley often advocated in Parliament for relief for the Irish poor, he was better known as a skilled cricketer; Lorton, for his part, was an ardent anti-Catholic, who voted numerous times against relief for the Irish poor, Catholics, and Jewish emancipation.

Contrasting this position was *Freeman's*, an anti-government and pro-Catholic publication, which presented the Earl of Darnley's proposal in a more positive light, contending that he more than justified his suggested appointment of a committee with the documentary evidence he presented to the Parliament demonstrating the continued distress in Ireland.

The debate on Thursday night in the House of Lords, on the motion of Earl DARNLEY, "that a select Committee be appointed to inquire into the distressed state of Ireland," was given in our Paper of yesterday. The Noble Lord's sketch of the miseries of Ireland is affecting and faithful. He referred, in the course of his address, to the statements of various Parliamentary reports, and more particularly to those of the Emigration Committee. He also produced a work, by Dr. ELMORE, "a very intelligent gentleman, who had established a manufactory in the South of Ireland, which he was obliged to withdraw from the want of security," as a further argument in favour of his motion. The Noble Earl proceeded to refer to the evidence of Dr. DOYLE, to the work of Mr. SADLER, noticed by us a few days back, and to the evidence of Mr. JAMES CROPPER, which was to the effect, that not only English capital was not sent to Ireland, but that Irish capital was constantly transferred to England, for the same reasons as those which compelled Dr. ELMORE to fly from us. The numerous other authorities, official and otherwise, submitted by Earl DARNLEY to the House,

¹ *DEM*, May 5, 1828, "State of Ireland!!", 2. (Appendix B, 446).

established beyond question the ground of his motion, namely, the misery of Ireland.¹

In this publication's analysis of the debate, a more deferential perspective is given to Darnley, which gives details about the different documentary sources that were presented by him and were left out of the *DEM's* interpretation of this parliamentary session. *Freeman's* continued its article by refuting the intervention of the Earl of Limerick, who claimed that the evidence of distress in Ireland was based on rumors, and concluded on the discourse of Lord Lorton, who, as previously mentioned, made stark predictions about the effects of emancipating Irish Catholics and gives his own proposal on how to handle the situation.

The concluding part of the debate is perhaps more interesting to the Jurist, who models constitutions and codes, than to the general observer. To him it is interesting, inasmuch as it shows the scope of licentiousness allowed, and perhaps wisely, to the tongues of its legislators, by the British Constitution. Lord LORTON took occasion to observe, that "if the Catholic claims were conceded, the miseries of Ireland would be increased, and the chain of her slavery riveted," and that the surest way to relieve Ireland would be "without ceremony to extinguish the Papist Priests." This, we need not inform our readers, is language which would not be tolerated in the meanest tap-room in this island. The idea, however, of extinguishing the Priests, is like the *chateau en Espagne* – and we may say to Lord LORTON, as Gratiano said –

"If thou attempt it, it will cost thee dear."²

While Catholic Emancipation was a major dividing line in Parliament during this period, it quickly became a pressing reality in the year of this article, when Daniel O'Connell was elected to Parliament for County Clare on July 5, 1828. These two publications made their respective positions clear to the public on the urgency of addressing the question of distress in Ireland, with one denying the gravity of the situation, and the other insisting on the validity of the issue. The importance of this discussion is demonstrated by its

¹ *FJ*, May 6, 1828, "Dublin: Tuesday, May 6", 2.

² *Idem*.

publication across both conservative and liberal newspapers,¹ along with the respective opinions presented by the *DEM* and *Freeman's*. The parliamentary debates on Poor Laws for Ireland tapered off through the rest of 1828, as the primary focus became Catholic relief, particularly leading up to and following Daniel O'Connell's election to Parliament. Though the Hansard Archives are missing the year 1829 entirely, we can reconstruct the topics of their debates from the judicious reprinting habits of the newspapers during this period.

These parliamentary debates and opinion letters discussing the possibility of introducing Poor Laws in Ireland continued into the following year with an article published on April 14 in the *DMR*, which explains that on presenting a further petition for emigration assistance, Robert Wilmot Horton entered into a brief discussion on the extension of the Poor Laws to Ireland.

In the House of Commons, on Friday night, Mr. Wilmot Horton, in presenting a petition on the subject of Emigration, from the Paisley Emigration Society, gave notice of his intention to move as an amendment to the motion of the Right Honorable Gentleman (Sir John Newport), which stood for the 7th of May, a series of resolutions, asserting the causes, and declaring the remedies which ought to be applied to pauperism in Ireland. He was disposed to take this course, because he thought the motion of the honourable baronet had a tendency to support an opinion now very prevalent, that the poor laws of England ought to be extended to Ireland. Such an application of the poor laws he thought both premature and dangerous, and he undertook to demonstrate, when the subject came under discussion, that the extension of these laws was even dangerous to the progress of civilization, and that they could afford no remedy for the evils which Ireland was now labouring under.²

¹ *DEM*, May 5, 1828, "Population of Ireland", 3; *SNL*, May 5, 1828, 1-2; *DEP*, May 6, 1828, s5; *FJ*, May 5, 1828, 3-4.

² *DMR*, April 14, 1829, "Poor Laws in Ireland", 2.

This brief discourse was printed in the *DWR* and *FJ* as well, and the continued discussion on this subject was commented on by the *DEP*, which clearly outlined its opinion in favor of these laws being extended to Ireland in support of the poor.

There is little doubt, that Ministers have it in contemplation to introduce some system of Poor Laws into Ireland.

It is needless to say that we heartily concur in the principle. Friends, under any circumstances to a reasonable measure of the kind, we regard it, under the altered condition of the tenantry, as absolutely indispensable [*sic*].

On the abstract no one will be hardy enough, not even the most sturdy disciple of the Rev. Mr. MALTHUS, to deny that provision should be made for the sick and impotent. And scarcely will any one contend that because a population can neither obtain employment, nor the means of purchasing food, they must, therefore, be permitted to perish in the midst of plenty. [...]

We think that a system of Poor Laws will obviate many of the difficulties with which this subject is encumbered – and growing out of this system or accompanying it, that recourse must be had, after all, to Mr. WILMOT HORTON's scheme of Emigration.¹

In this analysis, the article affirms the justification for establishing a system of poor laws in Ireland due to the sustained distress of the laboring classes over decades, if not since the beginning of the Protestant takeover of Catholic lands. The Parliament having studied the question and published reports for many years on various aspects of the state of Ireland, this article presumes that the government is prepared to finally take action to assist and support the Irish poor and makes a link to the proposals of Wilmot Horton to complement the legislation with a plan for emigration to further relieve the population. Through this form of communication with the public, the *DEP* is able to inform people of the presumed forthcoming action of the Parliament, while influencing the public to expect and perhaps insist upon further action from government, in the form of petitions for assistance and members of Parliament insisting on the issue during debates.

¹ *DEP*, April 21, 1829, "Poor Laws in Ireland", 3.

Further opinion pieces were printed after a subsequent parliamentary debate on May 7, 1829, which appeared in the *DEP*, *DMR*, *DWR*, and *FJ*.¹ Henry Villiers Stuart, a pro-Catholic member for County Waterford gave a long argument for the introduction of Poor Laws in Ireland. Though Catholic Emancipation had already been granted a month before, many members rejected the possibility of the Poor Laws being an effective solution to the distress in Ireland, and Villiers Stuart, ultimately, withdrew his motion. The importance of this debate was demonstrated by the response of the press; four of the six newspapers wrote or reprinted commentaries on the exchange that took place in Parliament (except for the *DEM*, which had shut down in the previous year).

The *DEP* makes the point that the English papers, in presenting arguments for the introduction of Poor Laws in Ireland, assert that this remedy is necessary to alleviate the worsening living conditions of the English laborers due to the seasonal migration of Irish looking for employment.

Independent of the abstract justice of the measure, the Reader cannot fail to have observed that the English Writers advocate the extension of Poor Laws to Ireland, on the ground of the mischiefs which the influx of Irish Poor cause to the Poor of England.

But it is not in the columns of the Diurnal Press alone or in Pamphlets, that this practical view of the case is given. We would beg leave to call to the recollection of Mr. SPRING RICE, (for whom personally and politically, it is, we hope, unnecessary for us to say that we entertain a high respect), the evidence delivered *by himself* before the Emigration Committee. His opinion, we dare say, remains unchanged upon all the topics to which he addressed himself on that occasion. One of the most remarkable statements he made regarded the influx of the Irish Poor into England, and the deterioration in consequence of the state of the English Poor. He put this point, if we remember rightly, and we think we have a tolerably accurate recollection of his very important testimony, in a variety of forms, and he proved to our minds most conclusively, that if some remedy were not found for the manifold evils of Ireland, the Working Classes of England,

¹ *DEP*, May 12, 1829, "Poor Laws in Ireland", 1-2; *DMR*, May 11, 1829, 1-2; *DWR*, May 16, 1829, s5; *FJ*, May 11, 1829, 3-4.

would, in a short time, be reduced to the miserable level of their Irish fellow-subjects.¹

While this argument does not address the merits of remedying the distress of the Irish poor, it gives a dire warning to those more concerned with the conditions of the English peasantry, explaining how they would be affected by the continued suffering of Irish laborers. For some, this was reason enough to pass legislation to remedy the situation of the Irish peasantry.

This position was reflected in the *DMR* and identical *DWR* article in response to the parliamentary debates, though it advocated for a Poor Law system adapted to the circumstances of Ireland, without giving specific details.

Some of the English papers attribute the suffering which led to the late riots amongst the artizans in Manchester and other parts of England “to the competition of Irish workmen, who, accepting of almost any terms, compel the English to work for the same rate of wages.” In this some opponents of the introduction of poor laws into Ireland seem to think they discover a new proof of the truth and accuracy of their theories. It suggests to them two things – first that the Irish competitors for labour must be very numerous, and that the population here must be proportionally relieved; and, secondly, that if we had poor laws in Ireland, the competition above spoken of would cease, and the emigrant poor, with all their miseries, would return to their native country. [...] We are amongst the persons who are thoroughly convinced, that the proper relief is to be found in a modified system of poor rates. In support of such a remedy for the existing evils, much may be said; but we are satisfied, for the present, to point merely to its tendency to cause more money to be spent in the country, and therefore to greatly counterbalance the mischiefs of absenteeism.²

In this analysis, the author makes clear that while introducing the Poor Laws may have some effect on English laborers, if no measures were taken to address the issue of access

¹ *DEP*, May 14, 1829, “Poor Laws in Ireland”, 3. (Appendix B, 468).

² *DMR*, May 15, 1829, [No Title], 2. (Appendix B, 490).

to land in Ireland and the difficulties linked to absentee landowners, then little improvement would be made for the Irish poor in the long term.

The *DWR* article chose another aspect to refute in the parliamentary debates, the supposed lateness of the parliamentary session. In the summer months, the Parliament was generally in recess during this period and little to no parliamentary debates took place. This argument did not sit well with the author of this article, who demonstrates that the subject of distress in Ireland had been discussed, studied, and reported on for years in the Parliament with no concrete steps taken to solve the problem. The article cites evidence given by John Leslie Foster to the House of Commons Committee on the State of Ireland in 1825 explaining the level of distress in Ireland.

However men may differ on the policy or practicability of introducing Poor Laws into Ireland all must concur in reprobating the *sang froid* with which gentlemen in Parliament urge the “lateness of the Sessions” as a reason why our miserable population should be left as they are for another year. In February 1825, Mr. Leslie Foster and others gave the Legislature and the Government information concerning the state of our hapless poor of which the following is a sample: -

Does any mode occur to you of disposing of the surplus population, at the expiration of a lease? – It may be convenient, that I should first express to your Lordships, what I conceive to be the nature of events actually taking place. I conceive, that within the last two years a perfect panic on the subject of population has prevailed among all persons interest in land in Ireland; and that they are at this moment applying a corrective check, of the most violent description, to that increase of population, which there has been but too much reason to deplore. This course is proceeding, at this instant, to such a length, that I have serious doubts whether at this time the population of Ireland is on the whole continuing to increase. I should not be surprised if it should turn out on inquiry, that it is even decreasing. The principle of dispeopling estates is going on in every part of Ireland, where it can be effected; in some parts of Ireland more, and in some less. I have known of instances in the south, where, on the expiration of a lease affording an opportunity to a landlord of newly dividing the land, thirty, forty, or fifty occupying families have in fact been turned adrift, and the land which supported them has been divided into perhaps half-a-dozen respectable farms. Even where the expiration of the lease of a large district of the country does not create the opportunity, nothing is more common

than notice to quit being given, for the mere purpose of annexing the tenement to another farm. The landlords of Ireland are at length deeply convinced, that though a stock of cattle or sheep will afford profit, a stock of mere human creatures, unemployed, will afford none, and they therefore are acting upon the principle, even in the extreme. If your Lordships ask me what becomes of this surplus stock of population, it is a matter on which I have, in my late journeys through Ireland, endeavoured to form some opinion, and I conceive that in many instances they wander about the country as mere mendicants; but that more frequently they betake themselves to the nearest large towns, and there occupy as lodgers the most wretched hovels, in the most miserable outlets, in the vain hope of occasionally getting a day's work. Though this expectation too often proves ill-founded, it is the only course possible for them to take. Their resort to those towns produces such misery as it is impossible to describe.¹

Presenting this evidence given in 1825, the publication is reminding their readership and the public of this testimony and how long it has been since the Parliament has been studying this question with no remedy in sight. This argument could also have been used to persuade the Parliament to finally act on this subject, reminding them of how many committees had been appointed over the years to study some aspect of poverty in Ireland. The article goes on to argue that the tenuous access to land in Ireland would need reform before any significant change would be felt by the Irish paupers, who were being evicted and removed from their holdings without assistance or protection, especially after the passage of the Subletting Act in 1826.

Saunders's, which appears to have involved itself the least in these political debates, reprinted an article from the London *Times* on the proposal of Villiers Stuart.

Mr. Villiers Stuart has taken the first formal step towards a measure, which, if postponed for today, must, beyond all questions, be tomorrow adopted – namely, the establishment of some legal provision for the sick, the aged, the infirm, and the fatherless infant poor of Ireland. We have no sort of hesitation in predicting that the thing must ere long be done. That the population of Ireland has been doubly stimulated – first, by the mixed ambition and cupidity of the landlords, and next by the barbarous reckless

¹ *DWR*, May 16, 1829, [No Title], 3. (Appendix B, 503).

habits of the poor themselves – is notorious to all the world. [...] The consequence of this condition of the Irish poor is, that they beg and pilfer in their own neighbourhood, or, if more enterprising, and with a few shillings in their pockets, migrate to this country in search of work, where they find indeed a market already overstocked with labourers, but open to receive them at diminished wages. The consequence is that the evil of an excessive supply of labourers is aggravated on this side of the water. [...] Although Mr. Peel refused to pledge the Government upon the subject of poor laws for Ireland, he let enough be seen of his own sentiments to assure us that he is alive to the obligation of considering, with a view to its amendment, the general condition of her poor.¹

Despite its self-proclaimed neutrality, *SNL* presents a favorable view on the introduction of Poor Laws in Ireland because of the distress in Ireland, but also the influence on the state of the English peasantry due to the influx of Irish laborers. This is in conflict with the perception of this publication at the time, notably, that it was a pro-government newspaper, though reprinting this article from another newspaper gave it some protection from accusations of contradicting itself on this point.

These articles mostly suggest that the newspapers served to inform the public of the contents of the parliamentary debates and the positions of individual members of Parliament on various subjects, while simultaneously showing support for or refuting the arguments made during these sessions, rather than aimed to have a clear impact on policy-making and political debates. Again, while it is unclear if the activities of the press had any influence on the actions of the Parliament, it is clear that the parliamentary debates formed the public debate taking place in the press, as the example of the overshadowing of the debate on emigration by discussions of Poor Laws and Catholic relief demonstrates. These publications, having different political leanings, advocated for certain remedies and refuted different arguments, much like different members of

¹ *SNL*, May 13, 1829, “[From the *Times*]”, 2. (Appendix B, 554).

Parliament. Even those publications that had similar political beliefs did not agree on what the best solution for relieving the Irish poor would be.

5. Conclusion of Part Three

The common discourse on emigration followed by the shift in the years following show that these newspapers ultimately held different views on how to address the state of distress in Ireland. After beginning by criticizing the government's changing view on encouraging emigration, these publications evolved to strongly endorse encouraging emigration, on the part of both Parliament and individual members. In the early years of the decade (1820-22) many articles were published discussing previous emigrations from the United Kingdom to the British colonies, with the exception of emigration from Ireland which was notably absent. During the years of the Peter Robinson and Wilmot-Horton experiments (1823-1825), this shifted to an emphasis on the distress in Ireland and finding a solution to this poverty through the remedy of emigration, and including alternatives, such as employment and the introduction of Poor Laws. After a critical analysis of the third Emigration Report, expressions of disapproval from the press continued through the end of the decade, especially regarding the unawareness of the members of Parliament on Irish affairs.

The portrayal of the three reports of the Emigration Committees varied from one to the other, with little commentary being offered from the newspapers after the publication of the first report. This changed, however, especially after the third report was published, when many excerpts of witness testimony and the full report were reprinted by a majority of the newspapers studied for this dissertation. Much of the editorial content from the newspapers on this final report criticized some of the premises of the report itself, as well as individual testimonies given to the Committee. This led to a larger debate in Parliament and the press on the potential of emigration as a solution for the Irish poor, with the emphasis centered on the encouragement of emigration, the necessity of Passenger Vessels regulations to protect the health and wellbeing of emigrants, and the continued distress in Ireland requiring an urgent

remedy. In the concluding years of the decade (1828-1829), the introduction of Poor Laws in Ireland was debated by the Parliament on multiple occasions which the Irish press criticized extensively, remarking that those deciding the fate of Ireland lacked the knowledge to adequately address the problems in Ireland.

These newspapers were clearly involved in the public debate on these issues and responded fervently and frequently to the Parliament's and individual members' discourse on the subject of Ireland. After the Emigration Committees had concluded their activities, Robert Wilmot-Horton continued to evoke the subject of emigration in Parliament on many occasions, due to his ongoing representation of Newcastle-under-Lyme until 1830 after leaving his post as Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies in 1828. These unceasing proposals were accompanied by long speeches by Wilmot-Horton, who was still an ardent advocate for emigration, despite the shift of the Parliament and the press to other alternatives. In the end, Wilmot-Horton left Parliament in 1830 having failed to establish his vision of a government emigration plan that would alleviate the suffering of the Irish poor.

The passage of the new Passenger Vessels Act in 1828 was advocated for by both Wilmot-Horton and the Dublin newspapers, though, compared to previous regulations, was minimal and had little effect on the cost of passage. The press's specific criticism of no medical officers in the proposed legislation was left out of the final version of the Act. In this instance, it appears that the requests of the press were largely ignored.

As regards the Emigration Committees and Wilmot-Horton's emigration plan, the press did not provide much support, perhaps leading to little action on the part of the government to engage with emigration as a potential legislative solution for Ireland. Though the witnesses did not demonstrate agreement on the particulars of an emigration plan, the report of the third Emigration Committee set out a precise vision of how such a project would operate. It appears that the press may have had some

influence on the impact of this report on the public, as little support for the plan was expressed in Parliament, perhaps due to the unresolved question of financing.

Conclusion

Through this analysis of the three reports of the Emigration Committees, it is clear that despite their differing experience and political backgrounds, the witnesses overwhelmingly agreed on certain principles. According to their testimony, a redundant population existed in Ireland leading to high levels of distress among both employed and unemployed laborers, which required a government solution. While most witnesses agreed that a government plan of emigration was necessary, each had their own idea of the number of laborers that should be removed and how such a plan should operate. A certain type of person should be selected for the plan and those chosen, with their families, would be settled primarily in Canada or another British colony. A majority of the proprietors of land in Ireland who testified to the Committees asserted there was a great desire to emigrate amongst their tenants and communities, though some expressed a lack of enthusiasm for the idea and others were unaware or had never discussed the willingness to emigrate of the laboring classes. Additionally, the financial motivations of the Irish proprietors certainly played a role which is seen in their testimony on contributing to this planned emigration scheme. This led some witnesses to suggest alternatives to emigration, in particular the repeal of the Passenger Vessels Act in order to lower the cost of passage, enabling more people to emigrate without assistance, and the reclamation of bogs and wastelands, which some witnesses asserted would be less expensive than establishing an emigration system and would provide employment to poor laborers.

While no clear trend can be established between political leanings and opinions on emigration, ultimately, two aspects were of great concern to the committee members and the witnesses: the financing of a government emigration plan and the side effects that would be caused by removing a significant number of laborers from their community (the dreaded vacuum!). These aspects were never fully addressed, which is perhaps why no emigration plan was ever adopted by the Parliament, much to the dismay of Robert Wilmot-Horton. After withdrawing from his government and the

Parliament, Wilmot-Horton remained preoccupied by the situation in Ireland, which he addressed in a series of pamphlets, entitled *An Inquiry into the Causes and Remedies of Pauperism* in 1830 and 1831. These pamphlets were the publication of correspondence between Wilmot-Horton and influential members of Parliament discussing the problems in Ireland and England, in particular, and continuing to consider emigration as a potential solution to the conditions of the poor in those countries. Wilmot-Horton was clearly dedicated to this issue, even as he retired from political life.

Through a meticulous analysis of the press articles collected, we have demonstrated that emigration from Ireland in the 1820s was also a subject of significance for the public and those tasked with informing the people of how this and other subjects were being discussed by government officials and parliamentary representatives. While the influence of the press on the parliamentary debates is unclear during this period, the press was certainly an effective tool to communicate to the public the debates happening in Parliament, in addition to presenting their own criticism of individual members or ideas discussed during these sessions.

As we established previously, the press during this period was no longer in fear of prosecutions, and, therefore, was emboldened to express their criticism of the government without reprisals. This is made clear in the articles published throughout the decade, regarding their criticism of the government's policy of assisting emigration in some instances and discouraging it in others, the insistence on the subject of distress in Ireland, and, finally, the reproach of politicians' lack of knowledge and experience of Ireland in debating Irish affairs and legislation that would directly affect the future of the Irish poor.

First, the government policy on encouraging emigration was ever-changing and the press discussed this issue throughout the decade. While the articles published in the early years of the decade explained that the government had assisted distressed Scottish

laborers in the past, there was no longer a willingness to financially support the emigration of poor laborers in acutely precarious circumstances. This led to series of letters being printed addressing particular members of the political elite and members of Parliament, encouraging them to support petitions for assistance and to assist their own tenants who wished to emigrate. During the period of the Peter Robinson experiments in Ireland, Wilmot-Horton was able to obtain government financing for these projects. By that logic, the press saw that the Parliament was willing and able to give money for emigration, even if for a temporary project. This may have been a reason for the press's continued insistence on this issue, even after the Parliament had moved on from emigration as a solution to the problems of Ireland to Catholic Emancipation.

Though the state of Ireland was little discussed in the early years of the 1820s, beginning in 1823, perhaps due to the attention of Wilmot-Horton on the emigration experiments and the Parliament's committees from both houses on the "state of Ireland", the press discussed more intently the situation of poor Irish laborers. The particular circumstances of the laboring poor were laid out by the newspapers in great detail, expressing that due to the sustained poverty experienced by these communities there was an urgent need to find a solution to this societal crisis. While no action was taken as a result of these exhortations for relief and admittedly short studies from the Parliament, the press continued with its broadcasting of the state of the poor in Ireland through the remainder of the decade. Towards the end of the decade, in particular, the backgrounds of the members of Parliament debating proposed legislation concerning Ireland were called into question by the press. While it was primarily Irish representatives who were introducing petitions and proposing new legislation, such as the introduction of Poor Laws, the majority of the members had little to no experience of Ireland and its particularities. The press asserted, therefore, that these members did not have the authority to discuss these issues due to their lack of knowledge and that Ireland would be better served if those decisions were made by the Irish themselves. Though the rise of

nationalism and the movement for home rule had their roots elsewhere, these expressions of a desire for self-governance at minimum raised the idea among newspaper subscribers, and at most, perhaps added some influence to the debate on Emancipation, which gave Catholics access to Parliament, thereby allowing better representation for the majority of the population of Ireland.

The portrayal of the Emigration Committees by the press was admittedly distrustful overall. While the first and second Emigration Committees resulted in little reaction from the press, many columns across these six newspapers were dedicated to the third Committee, both copying the report and excerpts of testimony, in addition to printing pointed criticism of the premises and proposals presented therein. The press's examination was focused particularly on the viability of emigration as a solution to poverty in Ireland, the contradictory evidence of Malthus given to the third Emigration Committee, and the lack of action on the part of government in addressing the distress of the Irish poor, which it had been aware of for years due to the earlier committees appointed to investigate this subject.

While we cannot determine the extent of the influence of the press in this regard, we can establish that these newspapers were especially efficient in communicating to the public on the debates taking place in Parliament, and, furthermore, expressing their opinions, whether through original editorials or selecting articles or letters to reprint on the subject matter. In the years leading up to the 1820s, we can see that the press was an important medium for debate and criticism of government and individual members, especially from the reaction of Parliament in punishing these publications with Stamp Acts and prosecutions in particular, and rewarding "loyal" publications with sponsorships. In this way, the government certainly attributed importance to the press.

As to why there was no action on emigration following these lengthy debates during the Emigration Committees, in the sittings of Parliament, and the columns of the

press, it is clear in our analysis that there were a variety of opinions on what would be the best solution for Ireland. While of course those who testified to the Emigration Committees were generally in favor of emigration (why else would they travel, some great distances, to give evidence to that body?), the remaining members of Parliament who did not participate perhaps had other ideas or were not concerned at all with the situation in Ireland. A significant number of the witnesses were members of Parliament, but when weighed against the several hundred members in its entirety, it appears they could not persuade their peers that emigration would have been an efficient solution for the problems of Ireland. More importantly, the lack of support from the press may have discouraged the Parliament from passing any legislation on the emigration plan suggested by the third Committee.

This research, while making the connection between the press and the Emigration Committees, reveals the tensions between the British political elite, some of whom favored emigration as a solution to the situation in Ireland and clearly aimed to steer the debates of the Emigration Committees in that direction through the formulation of certain questions, and public opinion in Ireland, which was more aware of the causes of the problems there and suggested a number of other remedies as alternatives to emigration.

In addition, it appears that there was a growing desire for self-determination in Ireland, with the press's suggestion that the Irish were better aware of what solutions would have been appropriate to their social problems than politicians in Britain. This became clearer with the movement towards Catholic Emancipation taking center stage in both the press and the Parliament, with emigration being downgraded to the role of understudy.

The contributions of this dissertation to the fields of Irish emigration and of the history of the Irish press fill some significant gaps. The importance of emigration prior

to the Great Famine is well established by this research, demonstrated by the examination of the press, parliamentary debates, and the Emigration Committees. The communication by the press of the parliamentary debates and committee discussions of the 1820s was a direct line between the government and the people, who could learn about the considerations towards Ireland that were being discussed by their representatives in Parliament. Because of this link, the people were able to see how insufficient the government approach to Ireland was, as only a minority of the Irish members of Parliament were advocating for change for their country. It became clear to the newspapers and their contributors that the government in Westminster was so disconnected from Irish affairs, that it was incapable of effectively addressing the suffering of its people. Through this close analysis of the Irish press, we have identified early stirrings of nationalism in the pages of these sources.

One of the limitations of this study is simply the passage of time. Though many newspaper articles were readily available for examination, some editions are missing from the documentary record, without which we cannot know if they add further insights into our subject. Additionally, enlarging the number of newspapers for this study might have revealed other points of view that are not included here. Finally, with the advances of technology, some of our sources are easily found in online archives, though the digitization projects of newspaper archives are ongoing and many are currently incomplete. We hope that with this research, more interest will be directed towards the preservation and digitization of these troves of documents, allowing for further research to be conducted and sources to be found more easily. The Irish press is an essential measure of public opinion during this period and further study is necessary to reveal to what extent the press had influence over other debates.

On the question of Emancipation, the press was certainly a vital means of mobilizing support after the creation of the Catholic Association in 1823; it was also the

preferred medium for the detractors of Daniel O'Connell. It also documented assiduously his rise to Parliament, which led to further movements in the decades following the 1820s. Emancipation, the Tithe Wars, the Young Irelanders, the Land War, the Home Rule movement, were all moving towards the same goal: self-determination. How the Irish press portrayed these movements could be a significant subject for future study.

Appendices

Appendix A – Newspaper Catalogue – articles collected for analysis

DEM

Newspaper Title	Date	Page	Article Title	Category	Keywords	Type
Dublin Evening Mail	1824					
	Jan 14 1824	3	The Poyals Emigrant	Secondary	Song/Poem	Song/Poem
	Jan 21 1824	2	New Settlements at the Cape	Secondary	Cape of Good Hope/ Emigration	Letter
	Feb 16 1824	2	Imperial Parliament - Emigration of Artisans	Very Important	Emigration/House of Commons	House of Commons
	Feb 27 1824	3	(No Title)	Secondary	State of Ireland	Letter
	Mar 31 1824	3	The Tribe of Dan	Secondary	Fiction/Emigration from Ireland	Fictionalized account
	Apr 9 1824	4	Imperial Parliament - House of Commons - Friday April 2. Allen Bill	Secondary	Emigrant Plot	House of Commons
	Apr 21 1824	3	Protestant Clergymen in Canada	Secondary	Protestant Church	Opinion/Info
	May 17 1824	p1-3	Imperial Parliament - House of Commons - Tuesday May 11. State of Ireland	Secondary	State of Ireland	hOC + Opinion (3)
	Dec 24 1824	4	Meeting at the Exchange to take into consideration Mr. Cropper's Plan	Important	State of Ireland/Emigration Scheme	Meeting
	1826	3	Meeting at the Exchange	Secondary	Daniel O'Connell/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Apr 28 1826	3	The Catholic Question	Secondary	Catholic Petition/House of Commons	Opinion
	Apr 28 1826	3	From our Special Parliament Reporter. House of Commons - Friday Evening	Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
	May 15 1826	4	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Friday May 26. Emigration	Important	Petition for Emigration Assistance	House of Commons
	May 31 1826	2	Landlords' Arrear of Rent Fund	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Aug 16 1826	2	The Archbishop of Cashel	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Aug 16 1826	2	The Harvest - The Weather	Secondary	State of Ireland	Info/Opinion
	Aug 16 1826	3	The Priests - The Late Elections	Secondary	Irish Protestants	Info/Opinion
	Aug 21 1826	3	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Emigration Committee
	Aug 25 1826	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Sept 1 1826	3	The Munster Meeting	Secondary	Emigration Report/Land Grants	Opinion
	Sept 1 1826	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Report/Land Grants	Report Info
	Oct 6 1826	3	Emigration to Canada	Very Important	RWH/Emigration Petition	Letter
	Oct 23 1826	1	Emigration to New South Wales or Van Dieman's Land	Very Important	Protestant Emigration	Advertisement
	Oct 23 1826	4	Newfoundland School Society	Secondary	State of the Colony	Meeting
	Nov 8 1826	p2-3	Protestant Meeting	Secondary	Protestant Clergy	Meeting
	Nov 15 1826	3	Emigration	Important	Emigrant Societies	Meeting
	Nov 29 1826	2	House of Commons - Monday, November 27	Secondary	Establishment Church	House of Commons
	Dec 8 1826	p2-3	From the Special Reporters of the Evening Mail. House of Commons - Tuesday Evening, Dec. 5	Secondary	Emigration Petitions	House of Commons
	Dec 11 1826	2	Poor of Ireland.	Secondary	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Dec 11 1826	2	Emigration.	Secondary	Emigration Petitions	House of Commons
	Dec 11 1826	p2-3	Emigration.	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
	Dec 13 1826	2	Plymouth.	Secondary	Emigration Petitions	Info
	Dec 13 1826	3	Imperial Parliament. House of Lords - Friday, December 8.	Secondary	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Dec 13 1826	3	House of Commons - Friday, December 8. State of Ireland	Secondary	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	1827	4	Plan for the Improvement of Ireland.	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Feb 12 1827	4	(No Title)	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Feb 14 1827	2	Catholic Question	Secondary	Emigration Petitions	House of Commons
	Feb 19 1827	p2-3	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Thursday, February 15. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
	Feb 21 1827	4	House of Commons - Friday, February 16. Emigration.	Important	Emigration Petitions	House of Commons
	Mar 2 1827	3	Mr. O'Connell on Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Mar 14 1827	3	House of Commons - Friday, March 9. Poor in Ireland.	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Mar 30 1827	3	House of Commons - Monday, March 26. Passengers Act.	Very Important	Emigration Legislation	House of Commons
	Apr 13 1827	4	Emigration.	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info
	Apr 16 1827	4	House of Commons - Thursday, April 12. Emigration.	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
	Apr 16 1827	4	House of Commons - Wednesday, April 11. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
	Jun 4 1827	4	House of Commons - Wednesday, May 30. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons

Jun 18 1827	2	House of Commons - Friday, June 15. Practical Improvement of Ireland	State of Ireland	Secondary	House of Commons
Jun 18 1827	3	House of Commons - Thursday, June 14. The Distresses of the Country	State of England	Very Important	House of Commons
Aug 3 1827	4	Emigration	Emigration to Canada	Secondary	Opinion
Aug 10 1827	4	Immigration of Irishmen	Emigration to England	Secondary	info
Oct 1 1827	2	For Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Oct 1 1827	2	Van Dieman's Land	Encouragement of Emigration	Important	Info/Opinion
Oct 3 1827	4	Emigration from the United Kingdom	Emigration Committee Report	Very Important	Committee Report
Oct 8 1827	3	New Roman Catholic Association	State of Ireland	Secondary	Meeting
Oct 10 1827	3	Scotch Highlanders	Scottish Emigration	Important	Info/Emigration Report
Oct 15 1827	3	Emigration.	Emigration Committee	Important	Info/Emigration Report
Dec 21 1827	1	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Dec 26 1827	4	Emigration to Upper Canada	Encouragement of Emigration	Important	Info/Letter
Dec 28 1827	1	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Jan 18 1828	1	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 4 1828	4	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 8 1828	1	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 18 1828	4	Most Advantageous and Favourable Opportunity for Emigrants	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 18 1828	4	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 22 1828	4	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 29 1828	1	First Vessel For Quebec	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Feb 29 1828	1	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 7 1828	1	First Vessel For Quebec	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 7 1828	1	Notice to Persons intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 7 1828	2	The Poor Papists	State of Catholics	Important	Opinion
Mar 7 1828	3	Imperial Parliament. House of Lords - Tuesday, March 4.	Subletting Act.	Important	House of Commons
Mar 7 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, March 4. Emigration	Emigration Petitions	Very Important	House of Commons
Mar 7 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, March 4. Dublin Steam Navigation	Emigration Petitions	Important	House of Commons
Mar 10 1828	s5-6	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Tuesday, March 4. Emigration	Emigration Assistance	Very Important	House of Commons
Mar 10 1828	s6	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Tuesday, March 4. Passengers Vessels' Regulation Bill	Passenger Legislation	Very Important	House of Commons
Mar 14 1828	4	First Vessel For Quebec	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 14 1828	4	Notice to Passengers for Quebec	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 14 1828	4	Notice to Passengers intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 19 1828	4	Poor Laws in Ireland	State of Ireland	Important	House of Commons
Mar 21 1828	4	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Monday, March 17. Sub-letting Act	State of Ireland	Secondary	House of Commons
Mar 21 1828	4	First Vessel For Quebec	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 21 1828	4	Notice to Passengers intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Mar 26 1828	4	House of Commons - Thursday, March 20. Passengers Regulation Bill	Passenger Legislation	Very Important	House of Commons
Mar 31 1828	3	State of Population in Ireland	State of Ireland - emigration	Important	House of Commons
Mar 31 1828	4	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Tuesday, March 27. Emigration	Emigration Petitions	Very Important	House of Commons
Mar 31 1828	4	Emigration.	Emigration	Important	Info/Opinion
Apr 4 1828	2	House of Commons - Tuesday, April 1. Poor Laws in Ireland	State of Ireland	Important	House of Commons
Apr 11 1828	3	"Separate Meeting" of Roman Catholics. The Poor Laws	State of Ireland	Important	Info/Opinion
Apr 16 1828	1	Notice to Passengers intending to Emigrate to Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Emigration	Secondary	Advertisement
Apr 30 1828	4	House of Commons - Friday, April 25. Title Commutation	State of Ireland	Secondary	House of Commons
May 5 1828	2	State of Ireland!!	State of Ireland	Secondary	Opinion
Jun 5 1828	3	Population of Ireland	State of Ireland - emigration	Important	House of Commons
Jun 25 1828	4	House of Commons - Friday, June 20. New South Wales	State of Colonies	Important	House of Commons
Sep 17 1828	3	Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News

Newspaper Title	Date	Page	Article Title	Category	Keywords	Type
Dublin Evening Post	1820	3	Emigration	Secondary	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Mar 9 1820	1	To Emigrants	Secondary	Emigration to America	Emigrant Guide
	1821	2	(No Title)	Secondary	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Jun 9 1821	1	For Quebec, With Passengers Only	Secondary	Emigration	Shipping Ad
	Jun 16 1821	3	Emigration	Secondary	Emigration Info	Info/Anecdotal
	1822	3	Emigration	Secondary	Emigration Info	Emigrant Guide
	Oct 22 1822	4	Ireland. To the Editor of the Courier. Letter III	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Nov 12 1822	4	Ireland. To the Editor of the Courier. Letter IV	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Dec 19 1822	4	Irish Peasantry	Important	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	1823	3	The Landed Interest of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Jan 7 1823	2	The Dublin Journal	Secondary	Newspapers	Info/Anecdotal
	Jan 25 1823	4	Newspaper Permanent Employment	Secondary	Newspapers	Employment ad
	Feb 6 1823	3	Tithe Bills	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Jun 3 1823	3	Joint Tenancy Bill	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Jun 21 1823	2	House of Commons Wednesday, June 18. Employment of the Poor in Ireland	Secondary	Emigration Petition	House of Commons
	Jun 24 1823	2	Employment of the Poor in Ireland	Secondary	Committee	House of Commons
	Jun 28 1823	4	House of Commons - Monday, June 23. Supply	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
	July 12 1823	4	House of Commons - Monday, June 7. New South Wales Bill	Secondary	Emigrant Colonies	House of Commons
	Aug 2 1823	4	(No Title)	Important	Emigration to Australia	Letter
	Aug 2 1823	4	Mr. Owen's Plan	Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
	Aug 21 1823	3	To the Marquis of Lansdowne	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Sep 9 1823	3	State of the Country	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Oct 21 1823	2	To the Marquis of Lansdowne	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Oct 21 1823	3-4	Report from the Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report
	Oct 23 1823	3-4	Report from the Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report
	Oct 25 1823	3	To the Marquis of Lansdowne	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Oct 25 1823	4	Report from the Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report
	Oct 28 1823	3	To the Marquis of Lansdowne	Important	Emigration	Opinion Letter
	Nov 27 1823	3	To the Marquis of Lansdowne	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	1824	sup5-6	House of Commons - Tuesday, May 11. State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Jul 24 1824	4	Poor Laws Wanted in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Aug 14 1824	3	Emigration from the South of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Aug 17 1824	p2-3	Political Prospects of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Aug 26 1824	2	A Caution to Orangemen Going Out to the United States of America	Important	Emigrant Info	Letter
	Aug 28 1824	4	State of the Poor	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	1825	2	(No Title)	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Mar 31 1825	sup5-8	Select Committee on the State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration	Committee Report
	Apr 16 1825	sup5-6	Select Committee on the State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report
	Apr 19 1825	p2-3	House of Commons - Friday, April 15. Emigration to Canada	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	May 12 1825	3	Emigration to Canada	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	May 28 1825	3	The Landed Interest of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	May 28 1825	3	The Irish Inquiry	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	May 28 1825	3	Encouragement for Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Jun 4 1825	3	To the Marquis of Londonderry	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Jun 21 1825	3	House of Commons - Saturday, June 18. Emigration from Ireland	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Jul 5 1825	4	Ships and Tonnage	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 9 1825	2	Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 20 1825	2	For Passengers Only. Dublin and Liverpool Steam Navigation	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement

Sep 8 1825	2	Cape of Good Hope	Secondary	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Sep 10 1825	4	State of Ireland, Fourth Report from the Commons' Committee on the State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report									
Sep 13 1825	4	State of Ireland, Fourth Report from the Commons' Committee on the State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report									
Oct 8 1825	3	State of the Country	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion									
Oct 8 1825	4	State of Ireland, Fourth Report from the Commons' Committee on the State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Committee Report									
Dec 13 1825	2	Kingstown, Upper Canada, Oct. 11	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal									
Jan 7 1826	3	The 'Prentice Boys of Derry	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion									
Feb 2 1826	2	New South Wales	Important	Emigrant info	Letter									
Apr 29 1826	3	Emigration to North America	Important	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal									
May 16 1826	2	House of Commons - May 12, 1826. Navigation Laws	Important	Shipping News	House of Commons									
Jul 25 1826	3	To Mr. Goulburn	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter									
Jul 29 1826	2	To Mr. Goulburn	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter									
Aug 15 1826	1	Notice. Passage for New-York.	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement									
Aug 15 1826	2	From the Dumfries Courier. Extract of a Private Letter from Van Diemen's Land	Important	Emigrant info	Letter									
Aug 24 1826	3	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion									
Aug 24 1826	4	Emigration, Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Emigration from the UK	Very Important	Emigration	Committee Report									
Aug 31 1826	4	Emigration	Important	Land Grants	Info/Anecdotal									
Sep 12 1826	p2-3	State of the Country	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion									
Sep 30 1826	p2-3	State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion									
Nov 2 1826	2	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion									
Dec 12 1826	2	House of Lords - Dec. 8. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords									
Dec 12 1826	2	House of Commons - Dec. 8. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons									
Dec 12 1826	4	House of Commons - Dec. 7. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons									
Feb 17 1827	3	Irish Labourers in Britain	Important	Irish Emigrants	Opinion									
Feb 20 1827	1-2	House of Commons - Feb. 15. Emigration to the Colonies	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons									
Mar 3 1827	4	House of Commons - Feb. 26. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons									
Mar 31 1827	4	House of Commons - March 26. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Acts	House of Commons									
Apr 10 1827	4	House of Commons - April 5. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons									
Apr 12 1827	2	Second Report on Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Report	Opinion									
Apr 17 1827	3	Emigration Report	Very Important	Emigration Report	Info/Anecdotal									
Apr 17 1827	3	(No Title)	Secondary	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Apr 17 1827	4	House of Commons - April 12. Emigration	Important	Emigrant Petitions	House of Commons									
May 24 1827	3	House of Commons - May 21. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons									
Jun 2 1827	3	House of Commons - May 30. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons									
Jun 7 1827	2	Canada	Important	Emigrant info	Letter									
Jun 19 1827	2	House of Commons - June 14. Distress of the Country	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons									
Jun 19 1827	p2-3	House of Commons - June 15. State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons									
Jul 3 1827	2	House of Commons - June 29. Cape of Good Hope	Important	Emigration	House of Commons									
Jul 3 1827	4	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter X. State of the Poor	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter									
Jul 10 1827	4	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Jul 17 1827	3	Irish Massacres - The Courier	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion									
Jul 21 1827	3	Canada	Secondary	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Aug 2 1827	2	Portsmouth, July 28. Emigration	Secondary	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Aug 18 1827	2	Emigration, and Success to it!	Important	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Aug 21 1827	3	Emigration and Success to it.	Important	Emigrant info	Opinion									
Aug 21 1827	4	Emigrants	Important	Emigrant info	Opinion									
Sep 6 1827	1	(No Title)	Secondary	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									
Sep 6 1827	4	Improvement of Ireland. To the Editor of the D. E. Post	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter									
Sep 11 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter XXXVII. Waste Lands - Emigration	Very Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter									
Sep 13 1827	2	Emigrants to America	Secondary	Emigrant info	Info/Anecdotal									

Sep 20 1827	3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter XL. Population of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Sep 22 1827	3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter XLII. The Ejected Tenantry	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 2 1827	2	Emigration from the United Kingdom, Third Report	Very Important	Emigration	Committee Report
Oct 2 1827	3	Van Dieman's Land	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 4 1827	3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter XLVII. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 4 1827	p3-4	Emigration Report.	Very Important	Emigration Report	Committee Report
Oct 6 1827	4	Emigration Report	Very Important	Emigration Report	Committee Report
Oct 9 1827	2	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter XLIX. The Ejected Tenantry	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 9 1827	3	Scotch Highlanders	Important	Emigration from Scotland	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 9 1827	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Committee Report
Oct 11 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LI. The Ejected Tenantry	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 13 1827	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Report	Committee Report
Oct 13 1827	3	Remarks on the Third Report of the Emigration Committee	Very Important	Emigration. George Ensor	Opinion Letter
Oct 16 1827	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Report	Committee Report
Oct 20 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LVI. Mr. Malthus - Mr. Sheil	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 23 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LVII. The Ejected Tenantry	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 23 1827	3	Emigration Reports	Very Important	Emigration Report	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 27 1827	3-4	Irish Emigration	Very Important	Emigration. George Ensor	Opinion Letter
Nov 3 1827	3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXI. Effects upon the Towns from the Dislodgment of the Tenantry	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 6 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXII. Effects of the Dislodgment of the Tenantry on the Town	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 6 1827	4	Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Nov 8 1827	2	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXIII. The Pressure of the Population on the Landlords	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 10 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXIV. The Pressure of the Population on the Landlords	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 13 1827	3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXV. The Pressure of the Population on the Landlords	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 15 1827	p2-3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXVI. Pressure of the Irish Population on England	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 17 1827	2	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXVII. Pressure of the Irish Population on England	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Nov 20 1827	2	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXVIII. Pressure of the Irish Population on England	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Dec 24 1827	2	State of the Poor - Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 25 1827	2	State of the Poor - Emigration	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 27 1827	3	To Lord Lansdowne. Letter LXXVI	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Dec 27 1827	4	Emigration to Upper Canada	Important	Emigration to Canada	Personal Letter
Dec 29 1827	p3-4	Separate Meeting of Catholics. The Sub-letting Act	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
1828	1	For Passengers Only. Warranted First Vessel for Calcutta	Secondary	Emigration	Advertisement
Jan 3 1828	4	Emigration - Novel Circumstance	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jan 29 1828	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Jan 29 1828	sup5	British Catholic Association	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Feb 12 1828	2	Most advantageous and favourable opportunity for Emigrants	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Feb 14 1828	1	Most advantageous and favourable opportunity for Emigrants	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Feb 23 1828	4	First Vessel for Quebec	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Feb 23 1828	4	Most advantageous and favourable opportunity for Emigrants	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Mar 6 1828	2	House of Commons - March 4. Employment of Irish Poor	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 8 1828	2	For New-York	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Mar 8 1828	3	State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Mar 8 1828	s1-2	House of Commons - March 4. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 22 1828	s5	Louth Assizes	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Mar 22 1828	s7	House of Commons - March 18. Passengers Regulation Bill	Very Important	Emigration Legislation	House of Commons
Mar 25 1828	3	Passengers Regulation Bill	Very Important	Emigration Legislation	House of Commons
Mar 27 1828	3	House of Commons - March 25. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 29 1828	2	For New York	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Mar 29 1828	2	House of Commons - March 27. Emigration. Canada Company	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons

Date	Bill/Topic	Parliamentary Stage	Importance	Subject	Outcome
Mar 29 1828	s5 House of Commons - March 25. Passengers Vessel Regulation Bill	Emigration Legislation	Very Important	Emigration Legislation	House of Commons
Apr 3 1828	3 House of Commons - April 1. Poor Laws in Ireland	State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Apr 5 1828	4 Emigration	Emigration Petition	Very Important	Emigration Petition	House of Commons
Apr 10 1828	4 Emigration	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 17 1828	4 Society for the Improvement of Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 19 1828	1 Lands in Upper Canada	Land Grants	Secondary	Land Grants	Advertisement
Apr 19 1828	s2 Exportation of the Poor	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Personal Letter
Apr 22 1828	2 House of Commons - April 17. Emigration	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons
Apr 24 1828	4 Emigration	Shipping News	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 26 1828	2 For Quebec	Shipping News	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Apr 26 1828	2 Now in Port	Shipping News	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
Apr 26 1828	2 Lands in Upper Canada	Land Grants	Secondary	Land Grants	Advertisement
May 1 1828	4 (No Title)	Shipping News	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
May 3 1828	2 Lands in Upper Canada	Land Grants	Secondary	Land Grants	Advertisement
May 3 1828	4 Irish Poor Laws, and the English Journals	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
May 6 1828	s5 House of Lords - May 1. State of Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords
May 10 1828	2 For Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales	Shipping News	Secondary	Shipping News	Advertisement
May 10 1828	2 Lands in Upper Canada	Land Grants	Secondary	Land Grants	Advertisement
May 10 1828	4 House of Commons - May 6	Emigration/State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 15 1828	2 The Irish Emigrants to the Brazil	Emigrant Info	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
May 29 1828	4 Report of the Committee of Agriculture	Committee	Important	Committee	Committee Report
Jun 14 1828	s3 House of Commons - June 10. Emigration	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons
Jun 26 1828	2 House of Commons - June 25. Emigration	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons
Jun 26 1828	s1-2 House of Commons - June 24. Emigration	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons
Jun 28 1828	4 Irish Emigrants to the Brazil	Emigrant Info	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 28 1828	s5-6 House of Commons - June 24. Emigration	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	House of Commons
Aug 5 1828	2 Emigration in the Western Islands	Shipping News	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 5 1828	2 Irish Emigrants at Brazil	Emigrant Info	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 30 1828	4 Catholic Securities	Emigration/State of Ireland	Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 9 1828	3 Return of the Irish Emigrants	Emigrant Info	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
1829	1 House of Commons - Feb. 26. Drainage of Bogs in Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 19 1829	3 (No Title)	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Mar 24 1829	3 Emigration	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Mar 31 1829	2 Relief Bill - Emigrant Brunswickers	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 21 1829	3 Poor Laws in Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
May 12 1829	p1-2 House of Commons - May 7. Poor Laws for Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 14 1829	3 Poor Laws in Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
May 16 1829	2 Emigration	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
May 19 1829	3 Emigration	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
May 30 1829	3 Pauperism in Ireland	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Opinion
Jun 9 1829	3 Poor Laws in Ireland	Emigration/RWH	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Opinion
Jun 9 1829	4 House of Commons - June 4. Birmingham Petition	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Jul 2 1829	3 Colonies at Home	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Jul 2 1829	p3-4 Questions Addressed to Major Moody, Respecting the Dutch Pauper Colonies - and his Answers	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 4 1829	3 Poor Laws - Emigration	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Jul 14 1829	p2-3 Improvement of Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Aug 20 1829	3 To the Earl of Enniskillen	Emigration/State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Sep 12 1829	4 Ex-Officio Informations. The Irish Press	Press	Important	Press	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 29 1829	3 Emigration	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion

Newspaper Title	Date	Page	Article Title	Category	Keywords	Type
Dublin Morning Register	1824	3	Gleanings	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Nov 12 1824	p3-4	Mr. Cropper's Plan	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Dec 23 1824	p3-4	From Cobbett's Register. To the People of Ireland	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Feb 1 1825	3	Important to Emigrants	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Mar 11 1825	2	Private Correspondence	Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 9 1825	3	Private Correspondence	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Apr 12 1825	p3-4	From Cobbett's Last Register. "The Old Roman Plan"	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Apr 13 1825	4	From Cobbett's Last Register. "The Old Roman Plan"	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Apr 19 1825	2	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Friday. Emigration from Ireland	Very Important	Emigration from Ireland	House of Commons
	Apr 19 1825	2	Corn Bill	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	May 10 1825	2	Emigration to Canada	Important	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Jun 21 1825	2	Emigration from Ireland	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Jun 23 1825	3	Newspaper Taxation	Very Important	Press	Editor Opinion
	Jun 23 1825	3	House of Commons - Saturday. Irish Emigration	Very Important	Emigration from Ireland	House of Commons
	Jul 8 1825	2	Private Correspondence	Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 11 1825	3	Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 28 1825	3	Montreal - June 18	Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 6 1825	3	To the Editor of the Morning and Weekly Registers	Very Important	Emigration to New South Wales	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 20 1825	2	Party Spirit in America	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Mar 18 1826	4	House of Commons - Tuesday. Emigration to Canada	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	House of Commons
	Mar 29 1826	2	Canada. - Irish Emigration.	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	May 2 1826	2	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Letter
	May 15 1826	2	Imperial Parliament. House of Commons - Friday	Very Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Aug 4 1826	4	The Irish Elections	Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Aug 26 1826	3	Emigration. (From the Times)	Very Important	State of Quebec	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 2 1826	4	Quebec. June 24	Secondary	Government Committees	Opinion
	Sep 4 1826	2	(No Title)	Important	Press	Opinion
	Sep 26 1826	1	Appeal on Behalf of the Unemployed Letter-Press Printers of Dublin to the Public	Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Sep 26 1828	2	(No Title)	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Nov 30 1826	2	Emigration. (From a Correspondent)	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Dec 7 1826	4	Plymouth. Emigration to New South Wales	Important	Emigration to New South Wales	Info/Anecdotal
	Dec 8 1826	2	House of Commons	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Dec 11 1826	4	House of Commons - Thursday.	Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Dec 12 1826	1	House of Lords - Friday, Dec. 8. Emigration	Very Important	State of Ireland	House of Lords
	Dec 13 1826	2	Irish Landlords	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Feb 20 1827	p3-4	House of Commons, Thursday. Emigration to the Colonies	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Feb 21 1827	p1-2	Lord Stourton on Irish Absenteeism	Secondary	State of Ireland	Letter
	Feb 21 1827	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Feb 23 1827	2	House of Lords - Feb. 19. Emigration	Important	Emigration Petition	House of Lords
	Feb 23 1827	4	The New Tenantry Bill	Secondary	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Feb 28 1827	3	The Press	Important	Press	Opinion
	Mar 2 1827	2	To James Grattan, M.P.	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Mar 21 1827	2	To James Grattan, M.P.	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Mar 29 1827	3	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Apr 9 1827	1	House of Commons - Thursday, April 6. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Report	House of Commons
	Apr 17 1827	3	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 18 1827	4	United States of North America	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	May 1 1827	2	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	May 24 1827	p2-3	House of Commons - Monday. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Jun 8 1827	2	Mutiny in an Emigrant Vessel	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Jun 19 1827	4	House of Commons - Friday. Improvement of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons

Jun 29 1827	2 United States - Emigration	Important	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 3 1827	2 Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 5 1827	p2-3 (No Title)	Important	Emigration	Opinion
Jul 6 1827	4 America - Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 11 1827	2 Emigration, Halifax, Nova Scotia, June 16	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 13 1827	2 Emigration to America	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 21 1827	2 Canada	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 1 1827	4 Irish Emigration to Scotland	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 2 1827	2 Emigration to Canada	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 16 1827	2 Emigration to Canada	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 20 1827	2 Emigration to Scotland	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 7 1827	3 Improvement of Ireland	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
Sep 11 1827	2 Irish Emigrants to America	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 15 1827	p3-4 Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XV	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Sep 19 1827	2 Emigrants to Canada	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 26 1827	p2-3 The Thirty-Nine Reasons. To Mr. Stanley, M. P. for Preston	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 2 1827	2 Emigration Report - the Depopulating System	Important	Emigration Report	Opinion
Oct 2 1827	p3-4 Emigration from the United Kingdom	Very Important	Emigration Report	Emigration Committee
Oct 3 1827	p3-4 Emigration Report. England	Very Important	Emigration Report	Emigration Committee
Oct 4 1827	3 Emigration Report	Very Important	Emigration Report	Emigration Committee
Oct 8 1827	p3-4 New Catholic Association	Important	Catholic Affairs	Emigration Committee
Oct 9 1827	1 Scotch Highlanders - The Irish	Very Important	Emigration Report	Opinion
Oct 9 1827	3 Prospects for Ireland!	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 10 1827	1 Opinion in Scotland Relative to Emigration and the Irish Wastes	Very Important	Emigration Report	Opinion
Oct 16 1827	2 Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 17 1827	2 Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXIII. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 20 1827	2 Irish Emigrants to the Brazils	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 20 1827	2-3 Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXIV	Very Important	Emigration	Emigration Committee
Oct 22 1827	3 Emigration to Brazil	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 23 1827	2 Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 24 1827	p2-3 Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXV	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 29 1827	3 Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion Letter
Oct 30 1827	4 Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXVII. Evidence of J. L. Foster, Esq. M.P. Before the Emigration Committee	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Emigration Committee
Nov 6 1827	p3-4 Separate Meeting of Catholics	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 12 1827	p3-4 New Catholic Association	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 15 1827	2 The Depopulating System	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 22 1827	p3-4 Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 23 1827	2 American Steam Packets	Important	Emigration	Opinion
Nov 23 1827	2 Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Nov 30 1827	p2-4 The Dublin and Galway Ship Canal	Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Dec 7 1827	3 Emigration to the Brazils	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 12 1827	4 Emigration to America	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 13 1827	3 Emigration	Important	Emigration	Opinion Letter
Dec 24 1827	2 Emigration to the Brazils	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 24 1827	3-4 New Catholic Association	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Dec 28 1827	3 Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
1828	3 Emigration - Novel Circumstance	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jan 1 1828	3-4 Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jan 26 1828	3 Emigration to Canada	Important	Emigration Society	Meeting
Feb 23 1828	4 House of Commons - Tuesday. Sub-letting Act	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 7 1828	p1-2 House of Commons - Tuesday. Emigration.	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 8 1828	p1-2 House of Commons - Tuesday	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons

Mar 8 1828	3 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Mar 18 1828	4 County Court - Thursday, Nisi Prius		Secondary	Emigration Case	Judiciary
Mar 21 1828	3 Emigration		Very Important	Passenger Act	Info/Anecdotal
Mar 21 1828	4 Emigration		Very Important	Passenger Act	Opinion Letter
Mar 22 1828	p1-2 House of Commons - Tuesday, Passengers' Regulation Bill		Very Important	Passenger Act	House of Commons
Mar 24 1828	2 Passengers' Regulation Bill		Very Important	Passenger Act	House of Commons
Mar 28 1828	3 House of Commons - Tuesday, Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 31 1828	2 House of Commons - Thursday, Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 4 1828	3 House of Commons - Tuesday, Poor Laws in Ireland		Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Apr 5 1828	1 House of Commons - Tuesday, Emigration		Important	Emigrant Petitions	House of Commons
Apr 5 1828	2 Emigration from Scotland		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 7 1828	p3-4 New Catholic Association		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 10 1828	3 Employment of Irish Poor		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Apr 17 1828	3 Exportation of the Poor		Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Opinion Letter
Apr 21 1828	2 House of Commons - Thursday, Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 21 1828	4 The Poor Laws - Emigration		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Apr 30 1828	2 Emigration from England		Secondary	Shipping News	Opinion
May 8 1828	4 Irish Emigrants in London		Secondary	Irish Emigrants	Info/Anecdotal
May 10 1828	4 House of Commons - Tuesday, Emigration		Important	Emigrant Petitions	House of Commons
May 29 1828	2 Emigration		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 9 1828	p1-2 House of Commons - Thursday, Ireland		Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Jun 20 1828	3 Irish Emigration to Scotland		Important	Emigration	Opinion
Jun 24 1828	2 Irish Emigrants in Brazil		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 28 1828	p3-4 House of Commons - Tuesday, Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Sep 9 1828	2 Return of the Irish Emigrants from the Brazils		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 10 1828	2 The Brazilian Emigrants		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 30 1828	4 The Irish Emigrants to Brazil		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
1829	p3-4 Catholic Association		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jan 7 1829	4 House of Commons, Feb. 20, Bogs of Ireland		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 2 1829	2 (No Title)		Very Important	Press	Opinion
Mar 21 1829	2 (No Title)		Very Important	Press	Opinion
Mar 24 1829	2 Brunswick Papers		Very Important	Press	Opinion
Apr 14 1829	2 Poor Laws in Ireland		Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 23 1829	4 House of Commons Business		Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 23 1829	4 Emigration		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
May 11 1829	p1-2 House of Commons - Thursday, Poor Laws in Ireland		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 15 1829	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
May 20 1829	3 Society for the Improvement of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
May 23 1829	4 Emigration - the Weavers in the North of Ireland		Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
Jun 2 1829	3 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Opinion
Jun 5 1829	4 House of Commons - Monday, Emigration		Important	Emigration Petition	House of Commons
Jun 8 1829	2 The Currency - Emigration		Important	State of the UK	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 17 1829	p3-4 Benevolent Society in Ireland - Meeting at the Royal Exchange		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jul 14 1829	2 Settlers in Canada		Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 16 1829	4 Emigration		Very Important	Emigration Encouragement	Info/Anecdotal
Jul 22 1829	4 "Out-of-Doors" Collective		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Aug 19 1829	4 Swan River Emigration		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 19 1829	4 Emigration of the Best Kind		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 31 1829	2 Irish Emigrants		Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 14 1829	1 Benevolent Society of Ireland, For the Establishment of Poor Colonies		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Sep 25 1829	4 Reform Meeting - Hunt, Cobbett, and Ffrench		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland/Reform	Meeting
Oct 3 1829	2 News for Emigrants		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal

DMIR

Oct 19 1829	2	Plan for Employing the Poor	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 4 1829	3	Dubliniana - No. XI	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 18 1829	4	Society for the Improvement of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 30 1829	3	Improvement of Waste Lands	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 18 1829	4	New South Wales	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 24 1829	4	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 29 1829	2	Emigration of Silk Weavers from Dublin to Manchester	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 29 1829	2	Irish Labourers in England	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal

Newspaper Title	Date	Page	Article Title	Category	Keywords	Type
Dublin Weekly Register	1820	1	Emigration to South America	Important	Emigration	Letter
	Jun 24 1820	2	Emigration	Important	Emigration to Quebec	Letter
1821	Sep 23 1820	4	Settlers at the Cape of Good Hope	Important	Emigration	Letter
	Feb 3 1821	2	Lower Canada Papers of the 20th December	Important	Emigration to Canada	Info
1821	Feb 3 1821	3	The Press, & Public Feeling, in Ireland	Very Important	Press	Opinion Letter
	Feb 10 1821	s5	State of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Editor Opinion
1821	Mar 10 1821	3	The Government Press	Very Important	Press	Editor Opinion
	Apr 28 1821	2	To the Catholics of Ireland	Secondary	Catholic Affairs/O'Connell	Letter
1821	Apr 28 1821	s7	Catholic Affairs	Secondary	Catholic Affairs	Opinion
	Apr 28 1821	s7	The Reformers and Catholics	Secondary	Catholic Affairs	Opinion Letter
1821	Jun 2 1821	s5-6	From Cobbett's Register. On Lawyer Scarlett's Poor-Law Bill	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Nov 3 1821	4	Emigration to America	Very Important	Emigration to America	Opinion/MM Cobbett
1821	Nov 10 1821	1	From Cobbett's Last Register. Cobbett's Letters to Landlords, on the Agricultural Report and Evidence	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion/MM Cobbett
	Nov 17 1821	4	From Cobbett's Last Register. Cobbett's Letters to Landlords, on the Agricultural Report and Evidence	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion/MM Cobbett
1821	Dec 1 1821	1	From Cobbett's Last Register. Cobbett's Letters to Landlords, on the Agricultural Report and Evidence	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion/MM Cobbett
	Feb 2 1822	s6	From Cobbett's Last Register. The Emigrants' Complaints	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion/MM Cobbett
1827	Sep 28 1822	s5-6	Ireland. From the 75d Number of the Edinburgh Review.	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Oct 26 1822	s5	Emigration to Canada	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Opinion
1827	Oct 26 1822	s5	Ireland. To the Editor of the Courier	Important	State of Ireland	Letter/Hibernicus
	Nov 2 1822	1	Ireland. To the Editor of the Courier	Important	State of Ireland	Letter/Hibernicus
1827	Feb 24 1827	1 + 4 (5+8)	Emigration to the Colonies	Very Important	emigration committee, RWH	House of Commons
	Feb 24 1827	s6	(No Title)	Important	emigration committee, RWH	Opinion
1827	Feb 24 1827	s7	Prosecutions Against the Press	Important	Press	Info
	Mar 3 1827	4	Emigration	Very Important	RWH, committee report	House of Commons
1827	Mar 3 1827	2	To James Grattan, M.P.	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion Letter
	Mar 24 1827	s6	To James Grattan, M.P.	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion Letter
1827	Mar 31 1827	2	Emigration	Very Important	emigration	House of Commons
	Apr 14 1827	2	Another "Emigration" Report	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Opinion
1827	Apr 14 1827	s6	Relief of the Poor of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Apr 21 1827	s6	United States of North America.	Very Important	Emigration to America	Info/Opinion
1827	Apr 28 1827	3	Emigration	Very Important	emigration acts	order of suspension
	May 5 1827	s7	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Info
1827	May 19 1827	2	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping Report	Shipping Report
	May 26 1827	1	House of Commons - Monday. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
1827	Jun 9 1827	4	Ireland in 1827	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
	Jun 23 1827	s8	House of Commons - Canada Clergy Reserves	Important	Emigration to Canada	House of Commons
1827	Jun 30 1827	2	United States - Emigration	Very Important	Emigration to America	Opinion Letter
	Jul 7 1827	s7	To the Editor of the Morning and Weekly Registers. Ireland and America	Very Important	Emigration to America	Opinion Letter
1827	Jul 14 1827	2	Emigration to America	Important	Shipping News	Info
	Jul 14 1827	s6	Emigration	Important	Shipping News	info
1827	Aug 18 1827	2	Emigration to Canada	Important	Shipping News	info
	Aug 25 1827	s8	Emigration of Irish Paupers to Britain	Important	Emigration to Britain	Info/Anecdotal
1827	Sep 1 1827	s8	Emigration to the Brazils	Important	Emigration to South America	Opinion
	Sep 15 1827	3	Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XV	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
1827	Sep 15 1827	s6	Irish Emigrants to America	Important	Shipping News	Info
	Sep 15 1827	s7	Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XIV.	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
1827	Sep 22 1827	s6	Emigrants to Canada	Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Opinion
	Oct 6 1827	4	Emigration Report	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Emigration Committee
1827	Oct 6 1827	s5	Emigration from the United Kingdom	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Emigration Committee
	Oct 6 1827	s6	Emigration Report - The Depopulating System	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Opinion
1827	Oct 13 1827	4	The Depopulating System, and "The Law"	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Opinion
	Oct 13 1827	s5	Scottish Highlanders - The Irish	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Opinion

Oct 13 1827	s7	Opinion in Scotland Relative to Emigration and the Irish Wastes	Very Important	emigration, committee report	Opinion
Oct 20 1827	1	Irish Emigration to the Brazils	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 20 1827	2	Irish Emigrants to the Brazils	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 20 1827	3	Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXIV	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 20 1827	s6	Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 20 1827	s7	Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No XXIII	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 20 1827	s8	Emigration to the United States	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 27 1827	3	Lessons for Mr. Lamb	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Oct 27 1827	s5	Irish Emigrants to Brazil	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 27 1827	s7	Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXV.	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Nov 3 1827	s7	Lessons for Mr. Lamb, No. XXVII.	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Nov 24 1827	s7	The Depopulating System.	Important	State of Europe	Opinion
1828	Feb 2 1828	4 The Courier	Important	Press	Editorial
Mar 8 1828	p1-2	House of Commons - Tuesday, Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
Mar 8 1828	2	Emigration from Scotland	Important	Shipping News	Info
Mar 22 1828	2	Passengers' Regulation Bill	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 29 1828	p1-2	House of Commons - Tuesday, Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 29 1828	2	House of Commons - Tuesday, Passengers Regulation Bill	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 29 1828	6	House of Commons - Thursday, Letting of Land in Ireland	Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 5 1828	2	House of Commons - Tuesday, Poor Laws in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Apr 5 1828 Supp	2	Emigration	Very Important	emigration, RWI	House of Commons
Apr 19 1828 Supp	3 (7)	Exportation of the Poor	Very Important	emigration, RWI	Personal Letter
Apr 26 1828 Supp	4 (8)	Emigration	Very Important	emigration, RWI	House of Commons
May 3 1828	s6	Emigration from England	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
May 10 1828	2	Emigration	Important	emigration, RWI	Petition
May 31 1828 Supp	3 (7)	Emigration	Very Important	emigration	Opinion
Jun 14 1828	s5	House of Commons - Thursday, Ireland, Poor of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Jun 28 1828	1	Emigration	Very Important	emigration, RWI	Petition
Jun 28 1828	2	Emigration - Ireland	Very Important	emigration, RWI	House of Commons
Dec 6 1828	s6	Catholic Association - Tuesday, America - Address from Charleston	Important	Emigration to America	O'Connell
Dec 27 1828	s6	Catholic Association - Tuesday, America - Emancipation - Duke of Wellington	Important	Emigration to America	O'Connell
1829	Jan 10 1829	s5 Catholic Association - Thursday, Rent from America	Important	Press	O'Connell
Jan 17 1829	p2-3	Catholic Association - Thursday, Rent from America	Important	Catholic Affairs	O'Connell
Jan 31 1829	p1-2	Catholic Association - Thursday, America - Catholic Rent	Important	Catholic Affairs	O'Connell
Apr 18 1829	p1-2	House of Commons - Monday	Important	Catholic Affairs	O'Connell
Apr 18 1829	2	House of Commons - April 14, Subletting Act - Ireland	Very Important	emigration, RWI	House of Commons
May 16 1829	3	Kevin Street Market - Potatoes	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 16 1829	s5	House of Commons - Thursday, Poor Laws in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Jun 6 1829	2	House of Commons - Monday, Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Jun 6 1829	s6	Friends of Ireland in Quebec	Important	Catholic Affairs	House of Commons
Jun 6 1829	s6	(No Title)	Very Important	emigration, RWI	Opinion
Jul 18 1829	4	Emigration	Very Important	emigration	Opinion
Jul 25 1829	3	Proclamation Papers	Important	emigration	newspaper sponsorship
Sep 13 1828	s6	Return of the Irish Emigrants from the Brazils	Important	Emigration to South America	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 3 1829	2	News for Emigrants	Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
Nov 21 1829	s5	The Irish Press - Absentee Rental	Important	Press	Opinion Letter
Nov 28 1829	1	Protestant Colonies	Important	Emigration	Meeting

Newspaper Title	Date	Page	Article Title	Category	Keywords	Type
Freeman's	1820	2	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Policy	Opinion
	Mar 6 1820	3	Emigration to British America	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Mar 13 1820	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Meeting
	May 3 1820	4	House of Commons, Friday, April 28. Distress in Scotland	Important	Emigration/State of Scotland	House of Commons
	May 27 1820	3	(No Title)	Important	Emigration Scheme	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 12 1820	2	New South Wales	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 22 1820	2	Emigration	Important	Emigration Scheme	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 27 1820	3	(No Title)	Secondary	State of the Country	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 2 1820	2	Expense of the Queen's Trial	Secondary	Home Affairs	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 8 1820	4	Foreign Emigration	Very Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 20 1820	4	Agricultural Interests	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 30 1820	2	Canada	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Nov 21 1820	4	From the Weekly Freeman. Doctrine of Population (incomplete)	Very Important	Malthus/Population	Info/Anecdotal
	1821	4	Emigration	Very Important	Malthus/Population	Opinion
	Jan 6 1821	4	North America - Settlers	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Jan 10 1821	4	Emigrants	Very Important	Emigration to America	Letter
	Jan 25 1821	3	Emigration	Secondary	Emigration to Canada	Advertisement
	Jun 25 1821	3	Poor Laws. An Address to the Imperial Parliament	Important	Poor Laws	Publication Advert
	Aug 21 1821	3	(No Title)	Important	Emigration to America	Letter
	Sep 24 1821	3	(No Title)	Important	Emigration to America	Letter
	Oct 3 1821	3	Lower Canada	Important	Emigration to America	Letter
	Oct 25 1821	4	United States	Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Oct 26 1821	4	Birkbeck's Settlement	Important	Emigration to America	Letter
	Nov 24 1821	4	Literary Notice - Emigration	Secondary	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	1822	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 12 1822	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Letter
	May 1 1822	3	(No Title)	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 22 1822	2	Irish Emigrants	Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 24 1822	2	Emigration	Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Nov 19 1822	4	Emigrants to Canada	Important	Emigration to Canada	Letter
	1823	3	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Jan 27 1823	4	Mr. Owen's Statement	Important	Emigration/State of UK	Opinion
	Apr 14 1823	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	May 1 1823	3	Emigration from Ireland	Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Jul 5 1823	3	Scarcity of Labourers in the Eastern Part of Scotland	Important	Emigration/State of Scotland	Opinion
	Sep 11 1823	3	New South Wales	Important	Emigration/State of Scotland	Opinion
	Oct 1 1823	4	Emigration to Canada	Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Oct 9 1823	2	Court of Vice Admiralty, Lower Canada	Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Oct 10 1823	4	New South Wales	Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Oct 23 1823	3-4	Minutes of Evidence	Important	Employment of the Poor	Committee
	Oct 30 1823	3	Emigration of Irish to Canada	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Nov 14 1823	3	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Nov 14 1823	3	Liberty of the Press	Very Important	Press	Opinion
	1824	2	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Letter
	Jan 2 1824	4	New South Wales	Important	Emigration	Letter
	Feb 5 1824	2	Artisans - Machinery	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Feb 16 1824	3	Distressed Emigrants	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 15 1824	1	Protestant Clergy in Canada	Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Letter
	Apr 21 1824	4	(No Title)	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	May 21 1824	4	House of Lords, Thursday, June 10. Irish Poor	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Jun 15 1824	3	E. Barton	Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Jun 16 1824	2	Canada	Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal

Aug 19 1824	4	Emigration from the South of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Opinion Letter
Oct 5 1824	p3-4	Catholic Finance Committee	Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 4 1824	2	Tithes	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Letter
Nov 10 1824	3	State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 15 1824	3	The Union. Letter. V. - XII. To the Right Hon George Canning	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Mar 2 1825	3	New Plan for Improving Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Apr 1 1825	4	Extracts from the Evidence Given by Robert John Willmot Horton. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Committee
Apr 5 1825	2	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Apr 20 1825	4	Emigration from Ireland	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 20 1825	4	State of the Population of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
May 7 1825	2	The Irish Committee	Very Important	Emigration	Committee
May 10 1825	2	Emigration to Canada	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
May 13 1825	2	Emigration to Canada	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 27 1825	4	Irish Inquiry. Third Report of the Commons	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Committee
Aug 31 1825	3	To the Ministers, on the Combinations amongst the Working Classes	Very Important	Emigration/Scotland	Opinion
Sep 5 1825	1	Select Committee on the State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Committee
Sep 28 1825	1	Cobbett	Important	Emigration	Play
Oct 1 1825	1	Emigration of Artisans	Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 27 1825	3	Colonization of the Sea Coasts	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 27 1825	4	Emigration. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Emigration from the United Kingdom	Very Important	Emigration Report	Committee
Aug 23 1826	2	State of the Poor	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Aug 28 1826	1	Henry J. Boulton, Esq., Solicitor-General	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Sep 6 1826	4	Nova Scotia and New Brunswick	Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 21 1826	2	Dublin, Tuesday, October 3	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 3 1826	4	Emigration to Canada	Very Important	Emigration/RWH	Letter
Oct 7 1826	4	Scotch and Irish	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 27 1826	3	Relief Committee	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Dec 2 1826	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 2 1826	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 8 1826	2	House of Commons - Tuesday Evening.	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Dec 11 1826	2	Dublin, Monday, December 11	Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Dec 11 1826	4	House of Commons - Thursday, December 7. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Dec 12 1826	4	House of Lords - December 8. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Lords
Dec 13 1826	3	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Feb 3 1827	3	Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Feb 17 1827	2	Dublin, Saturday, February 17. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Feb 19 1827	3	House of Commons - Feb 15. Emigration to the Colonies	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Feb 20 1827	3	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Feb 20 1827	3	House of Lords, Friday, Feb. 16. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Lords
Feb 23 1827	3	Relief of the Poor	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Feb 23 1827	3	House of Lords, Monday, Feb. 19	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords
Mar 2 1827	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Mar 2 1827	4	House of Commons, Monday, Feb. 26. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
Mar 7 1827	4	Parliamentary Paper. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Mar 13 1827	3	House of Commons - Friday, March 9. Poor Laws in Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 14 1827	4	House of Commons - Friday, March 9.	Important	Emigration Petition	House of Commons
Apr 9 1827	4	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 12 1827	p1-2	Second Report on Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 13 1827	4	Emigration Committee	Very Important	Emigration	Committee
Apr 14 1827	2	Emigration Committee	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 16 1827	4	House of Commons - Wednesday, April 11. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 20 1827	2	Dr. Elmore's Lectures on Political Economy	Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 30 1827	3	(No Title)	Secondary	Emigration	Opinion
May 3 1827	p3-4	Aggregate Meeting	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
					Meeting

May 24 1827	3	House of Commons - Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
May 24 1827	4	New Plan	Important	Emigration Scheme	Opinion
May 25 1827	4	House of Commons - Monday Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Jun 4 1827	4	House of Commons - Wednesday, May 30. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Jun 7 1827	3	Ireland as Connected with Great Britain	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Jun 19 1827	3	House of Commons - Friday. State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Jun 25 1827	p2-3	Resources of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Aug 1 1827	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration to America	Letter
Aug 1 1827	4	The Press, the Law, and the Pettfoggers	Important	Press	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 4 1827	3	Emigration to the Brazils	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 10 1827	3	New South Wales - Colonization	Important	Emigration	Opinion
Aug 17 1827	2	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 18 1827	4	Canada	Important	Emigration to Canada	Letter
Aug 20 1827	4	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 23 1827	2	Poor Laws	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Aug 25 1827	2	State of the Country	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Aug 28 1827	4	Poor Irish Emigrants	Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 13 1827	4	The Waste Lands of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Sep 15 1827	2	The Waste Lands of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Sep 17 1827	2	Emigration	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Sep 18 1827	2	Waste Lands of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Sep 29 1827	4	Improvement of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Oct 2 1827	2	(No Title)	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Oct 2 1827	4	Emigration from the United Kingdom. Third Report	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Oct 3 1827	p3-4	Emigration from the United Kingdom. Third Report	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Oct 4 1827	3	Emigration from the United Kingdom	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Oct 5 1827	2	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Oct 8 1827	2	Law of Libel	Important	Press	Opinion
Oct 8 1827	p2-3	New Catholic Association	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Oct 9 1827	2	State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 9 1827	3	Scotch Highlanders	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 15 1827	2	State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 15 1827	3	State of Ireland	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 17 1827	4	To the Editor of the Freeman's Journal	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 18 1827	2	Frightful State of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 20 1827	2	Emigration Report	Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 25 1827	p3-4	Report on Emigration	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Committee
Oct 27 1827	4	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 31 1827	3	Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Oct 31 1827	4	Reclamation of Bogs	Important	State of Ireland	Committee
Nov 1 1827	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 1 1827	p3-4	Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 6 1827	3	Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 22 1827	p2-3	Separate Meeting of Catholics	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 23 1827	2	"Rooting Out the Peasantry"	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 26 1827	2	New Catholic Association	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 30 1827	p2-3	Ship Canal. Important Meeting	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Dec 20 1827	4	To the Editor of the Morning Herald	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Dec 24 1827	3	New Catholic Association	Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
Dec 27 1827	3	On the Preservation of the Useful Parts of the Potato for Human Food	Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Dec 28 1827	3	Colonies at Home	Important	Emigration	Opinion
1828	4	Monument to Mr. Emmett	Important	Emigration to America	Meeting
Jan 1 1828	3	New Lottery - Irish Waste Lands	Secondary	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal

Jan 12 1828	2	(No Title)		Very Important	Malthus/Population	Opinion
Jan 17 1828	p2-3	Dublin and Galway Ship Canal		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jan 24 1828	2	Guild of Merchants		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jan 26 1828	p3-4	British Catholic Association		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jan 29 1828	2	(No Title)		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Jan 29 1828	4	Lord Rossmore		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jan 30 1828	p2-3	Society for the Improvement of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Feb 4 1828	p3-4	House of Commons - Address to the King		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Feb 29 1828	1	House of Commons - Monday, Subletting Act		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 7 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, March 3. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 8 1828	2	Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Mar 8 1828	2	House of Commons - Tuesday		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 13 1828	3	Society for Promoting the Improvement of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Mar 14 1828	3	House of Commons - Monday, March 10. Assurance - Emigration.		Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 14 1828	3	House of Commons - Monday, March 10. Inland Navigation - Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 17 1828	2	House of Commons - Friday, March 14.		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 17 1828	3	Louth Assizes. Louth Election		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Mar 20 1828	4	Emigration		Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Mar 22 1828	p3-4	House of Commons - Tuesday, March 18. Passengers' Regulation Bill		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 28 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, March 25. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration Committee	House of Commons
Mar 31 1828	4	House of Lords - Friday, March 28. Population of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords
Apr 3 1828	2	(No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 4 1828	2	(No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 5 1828	2	To the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 5 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, April 1. Poor Laws in Ireland		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Apr 5 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, April 1. Emigration		Important	Emigration Petition	House of Commons
Apr 9 1828	3	On a Permanent System of Parochial and Compulsory Provision for Paupers		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Apr 9 1828	4	Mr. Lawless' Speech, at the Association on Saturday		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 10 1828	2	Poor Laws - State of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Apr 10 1828	p2-3	Separate Meeting of Catholics		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 16 1828	2	Society for the Improvement of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 17 1828	3	Separate Meeting of Catholics		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Apr 19 1828	3	Fete at Clonbrock		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 22 1828	2	(No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 25 1828	4	Introduction of the Poor Laws into Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
May 5 1828	p3-4	House of Lords - Thursday, May 1. State of the Irish Poor		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords
May 6 1828	2	(No Title)		Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
May 10 1828	3	House of Commons - Tuesday, May 6		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 22 1828	4	Society for the Improvement of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
May 23 1828	2	(No Title)		Important	Emigration	Opinion
Jun 3 1828	p3-4	House of Commons - Thursday, June 5. Poor of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Jun 21 1828	2	Irish Emigration to Scotland		Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 26 1828	2	Dublin: Thursday, June 26		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 27 1828	2	House of Commons. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Jun 28 1828	p3-4	House of Commons - Tuesday, June 24. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Jul 15 1828	1	To the Duke of Wellington		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Letter
Jul 16 1828	2	Society for the Improvement of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jul 25 1828	3	Projected Plan of Pacifying the Irish People		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Sep 10 1828	2	Caution to Emigrants		Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Sep 24 1828	2	State of Ireland		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 1 1828	4	Brunswick Club		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Oct 3 1828	2	Protestant Feeling - Letter from Mr. Leader of Dromagh Castle, to Mr. John O'Connell of Grenn		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Letter
Dec 3 1828	p2-3	Catholic Association		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting

Dec 6 1828	1	To the Editor	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Letter
Dec 9 1828	1	Chapter on Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Dec 19 1828	p2-3	Catholic Association - Thursday	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Dec 20 1828	2	Dublin: Saturday, Dec. 20	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 20 1828	3	Absenteeism	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 29 1828	3	Employment of the Poor	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Jan 7 1829	3	To the Duke of Wellington	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Jan 23 1829	2	To the Editor of the Freeman's Journal	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Jan 28 1829	p2-3	Catholic Association	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Feb 3 1829	2	To the Editor of the Freeman's Journal	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Feb 19 1829	2	To the Editor of the Freeman's Journal	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Mar 3 1829	p3-4	House of Commons - Thursday, Feb 26. Bogs of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Apr 17 1829	p2-3	House of Commons - Monday, April 13. Poor Laws in Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 11 1829	p3-4	House of Commons - May 7. Poor Laws in Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 23 1829	2	Population - Poor Laws	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
May 23 1829	3	Emigration	Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 8 1829	1	Emigration	Important	Emigration	Opinion
Jun 8 1829	p2-3	House of Commons - Thursday, June 4. National Distress	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
Jun 13 1829	2	Improvement of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Jun 17 1829	3	Meeting at the Royal Exchange	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jun 18 1829	3	Society for the Improvement of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jun 18 1829	4	Grand Dinner of the Patriots of Kilrush to Dr. O'Connell, Esq.	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Aug 13 1829	2	Orange Colonization	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Sep 21 1829	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Sep 25 1829	4	Reform Meeting	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 3 1829	2	Mr. Sadler and the Edinburgh Review	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 18 1829	2	Society for the Improvement of Ireland	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 27 1829	3	Protestant Colonies	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting

Newspaper Title	Date	Page	Article Title	Category	Keywords	Type
Saunders'	1820	Jan 20 1820				
		p1-2	Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Feb 14 1820	2	The North West Passage	Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Feb 25 1820	p2-3	(No Title)	Important	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Mar 13 1820	p1-2	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 29 1820	2	(No Title)	Important	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	May 2 1820	1	House of Commons - April 28. Report of the Address	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	May 5 1820	1	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	May 10 1820	1	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	May 18 1820	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Jun 19 1820	1	House of Commons - June 14. State of Ireland. Irish Paupers	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Jun 19 1820	2	House of Commons - June 16. Distress in Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Jul 13 1820	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 27 1820	2	The People of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
	Sep 30 1820	1	Canada. Montreal, August 12	Important	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Dec 6 1820	2	(No Title)	Important	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	1821	Apr 6 1821	3	(No Title)	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	1822	Sep 18 1822	2	Provincial Intelligence. Limerick, Sept. 14.	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	1823	Feb 1 1823	1	(No Title)	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
		May 13 1823	3	(No Title)	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
		Jun 3 1823	2	Emigration	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
		Jun 13 1823	2	(No Title)	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
		Jul 19 1823	p1-2	House of Commons - June 23. Committee of Supply	Emigration Scheme	House of Commons
		Jul 19 1823	2	Emigration	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	1824	Mar 11 1824	2	(No Title)	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		May 25 1824	2	(No Title)	Emigration Artisans	Meeting
		Jul 19 1824	2	(No Title)	Emigration Artisans	House of Commons
		Jul 19 1824	2	Canada	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
		Jul 21 1824	1	Irish Emigrants	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		Sep 8 1824	1	(No Title)	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		Sep 17 1824	p2-3	Emigration in Canada	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		Dec 11 1824	1	(No Title)	Population	Opinion
	1825	Apr 9 1825	1	(No Title)	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		May 11 1825	2	Emigration to Canada	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
		Jun 21 1825	2	House of Commons - June 18. Emigration from Ireland	Emigration	House of Commons
		Jul 8 1825	2	Dublin.	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		Jul 11 1825	1	Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the State of Ireland	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords
		Jul 11 1825	2	(No Title)	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	1826	Mar 18 1826	1	House of Commons - March 14. Emigration to Canada	Emigration	House of Commons
		Apr 6 1826	1	Van Dieman's Land	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		Aug 11 1826	1	London, August 9	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
		Aug 21 1826	1	(No Title)	Emigration Committee	Opinion
		Aug 22 1826	p1-2	Emigration. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Emigration from the United Kingdom	Emigration Committee	Committee Report
		Aug 22 1826	2	London, August 19	Emigration Committee	Opinion
		Aug 23 1826	p1-2	Emigration. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Emigration from the United Kingdom	Emigration Committee	Committee Report
		Aug 24 1826	1	Emigration. An Official Inquiry into the Expediency of Encouraging Emigration from the United Kingdom, &c.	Emigration Committee	Committee Report
		Aug 25 1826	1	Emigration. An Official Inquiry into the Expediency of Encouraging Emigration from the United Kingdom, &c.	Emigration Committee	Committee Report
		Aug 29 1826	1	Emigration. _____ which Land is Granted to Settlers in New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land	Emigration Committee	Committee Report
		Sep 14 1826	3	Quick Voyage	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
		Sep 22 1826	1	(From a Morning Paper)	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
		Sep 25 1826	1	(No Title)	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion

	Oct 7 1826	1	Emigration to Canada	Important	Emigration Petition	Letter
	Oct 19 1826	1 (No Title)		Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Oct 20 1826	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Nov 10 1826	1	Contra	Important	Emigration	Opinion Letter
1827	Feb 3 1827	p1-2	Society for the Promotion of Education of Poor of Ireland	Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
	Feb 17 1827	1	House of Lords - Feb. 14. Catholic Claims	Secondary	State of Ireland	House of Lords
	Feb 19 1827	1	House of Commons - Feb. 15. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Feb 19 1827	2 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Feb 23 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Feb 24 1827	3	To Emigrants (2 ads)	Secondary	Emigration	Advertisement
	Mar 8 1827	2	Chamber of Commerce	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 12 1827	1	Dublin.	Important	Emigration	Committee Report
	Apr 14 1827	2	House of Commons - April 11. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	Apr 17 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Apr 30 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	May 9 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	May 17 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	May 17 1827	1	House of Lords - May 14. The Canadas	Secondary	State of Colony	House of Lords
	May 24 1827	2	House of Commons - May 21. Emigration	Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
	May 30 1827	2	State of Trade	Secondary	Emigrant Info	House of Commons
	Jun 2 1827	2	House of Commons - May 30	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Jun 6 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Jun 8 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Jun 11 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Jun 13 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
	Jun 19 1827	1	House of Commons - June 15. State of Ireland	Secondary	Emigration to Canada	Letter
	Jun 19 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Commons
	Jun 29 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 7 1827	1	Dublin.	Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 10 1827	2	Emigration	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Jul 30 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 1 1827	p2-3	(No Title) - "London Paper"	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 2 1827	2	Emigration	Secondary	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 3 1827	1	From the Courier	Very Important	Emigration Scheme	Opinion
	Aug 16 1827	1	Dublin.	Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
	Aug 17 1827	1	Canada	Secondary	Shipping News	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 18 1827	1	Dublin.	Important	Emigration to Quebec	Letter
	Aug 24 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration to Quebec	Info/Anecdotal
	Aug 27 1827	3 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 3 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Shipping News	Letter
	Sep 10 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 11 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration	Opinion
	Sep 14 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration to Quebec	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 15 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
	Sep 17 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Oct 2 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
	Oct 2 1827	p1-2	Emigration From the United Kingdom. Third Report	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Oct 3 1827	p1-2	Emigration From the United Kingdom	Very Important	Emigration	Committee Report
	Oct 4 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Oct 5 1827	1	From the St. James's Chronicle	Very Important	Emigration	Letter
	Oct 8 1827	1	Emigration (from The Globe)	Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
	Oct 9 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Matthus Testimony	Committee Report

Oct 10 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Oct 10 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 12 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 13 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 13 1827	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Oct 15 1827	2 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 16 1827	1 (No Title)		Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Oct 16 1827	2 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 18 1827	p1-2 Emigration (from The Globe)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 18 1827	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration to Canada	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 20 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 25 1827	2 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 26 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Oct 29 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Oct 31 1827	2 Separate Roman Catholic Meeting		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Nov 2 1827	2 Mining Companies of Ireland		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Opinion
Nov 7 1827	2 A Large Family		Secondary	Emigration Committee	Info/Anecdotal
Nov 16 1827	p2-3 To Lord Cloncurry		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Letter
Nov 19 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Nov 26 1827	1 (No Title)		Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
Dec 31 1827	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration Scheme	Opinion Letter
1828	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Jan 11 1828	p2-3 On the Preservation of Useful Parts of Potato for Human Food		Secondary	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Jan 26 1828	p1-2 British Catholic Association		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Feb 4 1828	p1-2 House of Commons - Jan. 31. The Address		Important	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Feb 5 1828	1 From the Morning Chronicle		Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
Feb 5 1828	1 From the Morning Herald		Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
Feb 8 1828	3 To the Editor of Saunders's Newsletter		Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion Letter
Feb 23 1828	1 House of Commons - Feb. 19		Secondary	State of Ireland	House of Commons
Mar 7 1828	1 House of Commons - Tuesday, March 4. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 8 1828	1 House of Commons - March 4. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 8 1828	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Opinion
Mar 8 1828	1 (No Title)		Very Important	Emigration	Info/Anecdotal
Mar 24 1828	1 House of Commons - March 20. Passengers' Regulation Bill		Important	Passenger Legislation	House of Commons
Mar 28 1828	2 House of Commons - Tuesday, March 25. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Mar 29 1828	1 (No Title)		Important	Emigration	Opinion
Mar 29 1828	1 House of Commons - March 25. Passengers' Regulation Bill		Important	Passenger Legislation	House of Commons
Mar 31 1828	1 House of Commons - March 27. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 4 1828	2 (No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 5 1828	1 (No Title)		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 5 1828	1 House of Commons - April 1. Emigration		Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Apr 8 1828	1 (No Title)		Secondary	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 9 1828	1 (No Title)		Secondary	State of Ireland	Opinion
Apr 15 1828	2 Comparative Value of National Character		Secondary	Emigration to America	Info/Anecdotal
Apr 18 1828	2 Exportation of the Poor		Important	Emigration	Letter
May 5 1828	p1-2 House of Lords - May 1. Irish Poor		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	House of Lords
May 10 1828	1 House of Commons - May 6		Important	State of Ireland	House of Commons
May 17 1828	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
May 21 1828	2 Society for Improvement of Ireland		Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
May 23 1828	3 Irish Emigrants to the Brazils		Secondary	Emigration to Brazil	Info/Anecdotal
May 26 1828	2 Roman Catholic Association		Important	Emigration/State of Ireland	Meeting
Jun 2 1828	3 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigration to Brazil	Info/Anecdotal

SNL

Jun 20 1828	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Irish Emigration to Scotland	Info/Anecdotal
Jun 28 1828	1 House of Commons - June 24. Emigration		Very Important	Emigration	House of Commons
Jul 16 1828	2 Society for Improvement of Ireland		Secondary	State of Ireland	Meeting
Jul 21 1828	3 Improvement of Ireland		Secondary	State of Ireland	Meeting
Aug 23 1828	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Aug 26 1828	2 (No Title)		Secondary	Emigrant Info	Info/Anecdotal
Oct 22 1828	1 Ireland		Important	Emigration Committee	Opinion
Dec 1 1828	1 (No Title)		Secondary	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal
1829	2 (From the Times)		Important	State of Ireland	Opinion
May 13 1829	1 (No Title)		Important	Emigration	Opinion
Jun 8 1829	3 (No Title)		Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
Jun 17 1829	2 The Benevolent Society		Important	State of Ireland	Meeting
Sep 4 1829	1 (No Title)		Important	State of Ireland	Info/Anecdotal

Appendix B – Select extracts of articles analyzed

1.1 DEM – Dublin Evening Mail

August 25, 1826 page 4

EMIGRATION.

The Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on emigration from the United Kingdom states, that to be beneficial emigration must be *voluntary*, and most consist solely of permanent paupers; and that all advances from national funds should be ultimately repaid by the emigrants, excepting under certain special circumstances. The extensive emigrations of 1823 and 1825, were made from national funds, not to be reimbursed, but this was only justified upon the ground of experiment, and which experiment has completely succeeded. Parishes will find it to their advantage to remove their redundant population by a slight annual sacrifice; and local assessments might be made for the purpose in Scotland and Ireland; or specific taxes might be pledged for money advanced by Government for transporting emigrants. That it would not be desirable to employ the redundant population upon our waste lands, and if emigration should be carried to any inconvenient length, it can at any time be diminished or suspended. A war, or other general demand for labour, would of itself take away from the poor all inducement to emigrate. The poor, who are now rendered vicious and dangerous by destitution, when located in the colonies, will become independent proprietors; and thus millions of persons will create a demand for our manufactures, and augment the prosperity of the mother country. Such a system of emigration might be carried on until all the colonies were saturated, and millions added to those who speak the English language, diffusing the liberty, the laws, and sympathies of the parent state. The numbers emigrated in 1823 were 182 men, 143 women, 57 boys, between 14 and 18, and 126 children, in all 568 persons. The expenses incurred were 12,593*l.*3*s.* or 22*l.* 1*s.*6*d.* a head. The estimates had been, 80*l.* for a family of a man, the wife, and two children; or 35*l.* per man, 25*l.* per woman, and 14*l.* per child, making 88*l.*, from which was deducted about 9*l.* per cent on a supposition that a combined would be cheaper than an individual transport. This excess above the estimate was occasioned by the disproportionate number of men, and by other circumstances, but the Committee are assured that to Upper Canada, emigration may be effected at even less than 20*l.* a-head; and at a cheaper rate to Lower Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward's Island. Emigration to the Cape, or to New South Wales, on account of the increased distance, would of necessity be more expensive. The sum of 80*l.* might be raised on an annuity of 3*l.* 10*s.* 9*d.* for 60 years (interest being at 4 per cent.) – and if security were given for the first 7 years, at the expiration of that period, the emigrant head of a family would be in a condition to reimburse the remainder, by a security on his land, or, in the event of his

disappearing, the improved state of the land itself would be an effectual security. The money reimbursed might be applied to those expenses of the Colony which are now defrayed by the mother country. The poor-rates in England might be made applicable to securing the payment of the annuity for the first seven years; but it is doubtful whether the same principle could be applied to the poor-rates, modified as they are, in Scotland. No poor-rates whatever exist in Ireland, and it would be necessary to create local assessments, or to depend on the voluntary contributions from the landowners, from whose properties emigrants are selected. It will be to the advantage of all Irish landholders to consent to such contribution; and the Irish paupers, ejected from estates by landlords under legal sanction, instead of resorting to violence and spoliation, will be willing to emigrate, having been made acquainted with the advantages derived by those who were sent out in 1823 and 1825. – Colonel Talbot, the founder of the Talbot Settlement, in Upper Canada, writing to a member of the Committee, in relation to the emigrants sent out in 1823 and 1825, says –

“I accompanied Sir Peregrine Maitland last winter on a tour of inspection to the new Irish emigrant settlements, about 100 miles below York. I was anxious to see how they were getting on, and whether the scheme of transporting the poor of Ireland to this country was likely to prove beneficial or not, and was happy to find them doing admirably. These people were sent out last summer, about 2,000 souls, and did not get on their land until late in November; all of them that I saw had snug log huts, and had chopped each between three and four acres, and I have every reason to think that they will realize a comfortable independence in the course of this year, and be of no further cost to the Government; and it was satisfactory to hear them expressing their gratitude for what was done for them.”

The report then pursues its inquiry into the subject of preventing a recurrence of redundant population, after the present redundancy shall be removed; and it takes into consideration the propriety of including amongst the emigrants, the paupers of the metropolis, and particularly that excessively numerous class of persons, chiefly under age, who being thrown upon the streets in perfect destitution, soon resort to crime for their support.

December 11, 1826 page 2-3

House of Commons – Thursday, December 7.

EMIGRATION.

Mr. W. HORTON presented a petition from the Inhabitants of Glasgow, in favour of Emigration.

Mr. HUME thought it of great importance to the country, that the intention of his Majesty's Government should be declared and settled on this subject. He knew there was

no one more anxious to forward the interests of the poorer classes than the Hon. Gentleman who presented the petition.

Mr. W. HORTON said that he saw no possible good that would arise from the immediate declaration of the intention of Ministers. He expressed his intention of making a motion on the subject on the 13th of February.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE hoped that the next spring would not be suffered to pass away without the introduction of some measure of relief. He considered that but little had been done by former Committees, and he hoped that the next Committee would be more effective.

Mr. W. HORTON said that the last Committee had most usefully exerted themselves in collecting a great mass of evidence, which would now be highly available to the object in view. He did expect that some decided measure would be taken in the course of the next spring.

Mr. J. SMITH spoke in praise of the exertions of the Committee, from which he said he had always formed the most sanguine hopes.

Sir J. GRAHAM deplored the wretched state to which a population must be reduced when it was an object with them to be permitted to go into exile. The state of the country must be unhappy indeed when Ministers entertained the proposal of sending away numbers of well-skilled artisans to a distant colony, over which our future dominion was but precarious. It was indeed a measure directly contrary to the principle of our ancient law. Many causes had conspired to [increase] the distress of the lower classes, particularly the weavers. But there was one cause which perhaps was placed beyond the reach of Parliamentary interference. That cause was the universal employment of machinery. – By the mere use of the power-loom, at least one-half of the poor hand-weavers were put out of employment. He hoped before the House assembled again, Ministers would employ the recess in devising some effectual measure of relief for those unfortunate persons.

Mr. WARBURTON saw a great difficulty arising from the advancement of capital to emigrants. Their chief revenue must of course consist in corn, and he was not aware that any means had been devised for converting that into a convenient medium for repayment. It was a subject well worthy of being considered.

Mr. Secretary PEEL said, that from the great importance of the subject they were bound to keep their minds open, and not pledge themselves to measures which might hereafter fetter their judgment. They had in the first place to consider how far the measure of emigration was really available to the object it was designed to achieve. They had also to consider how far the necessary arrangements were consistent with the

interests of the Colonies, and whether it was expedient to undertake the expense of 20l., which was the lowest sum at which each individual could be sent out. In such circumstances their hopes as to the result of the contemplated measure could not be very sanguine. It might however prove in some respects an advantageous outlet for our population to go to America, and the colony would perhaps be essentially served. He was astonished that the Honorable Baronet should have described the condition of an emigrant as that of a convict sent into exile. Surely the distinction was wide and obvious. The latter went out stigmatised with the infamy of crime; not as a free settler, but with his labour appropriated to another individual. Many persons who possessed considerable capital were anxious to emigrate to Canada, and happy to receive a grant of lands there. He concluded with hoping that the House would not express any decided opinion on the subject until they were completely in possession of the facts and circumstances by which their judgment should be guided.

Sir JAMES GRAHAM explained.

Mr. MABERLY remarked, that his Majesty's Ministers had but a short time since, as it appeared to him, laid down a rule which, if just, must necessarily preclude the House from hoping that the country could receive any great benefits from pursuing the system of Emigration. He alluded to the conduct they had followed with respect to Ireland. – They had stated that little relief could be anticipated to the redundant population of that country, from any plan of Emigration which had been proposed.

Mr. BENETT begged to remark in reply to the observations made by the Hon. Baronet (Sir J. Graham) respecting the Romans having imported corn, that although it was perfectly true that people had done so, yet it appeared also clear, that to that very circumstance might, in a great measure, be attributed to the downfall of the Roman Empire. As to the question of Emigration, it had always appeared to him to be a great injury to the country that her ablest artizans should be even permitted, much less encouraged to leave it; and he must confess he felt astonished that his Majesty's Ministers had not devised some means for putting a stop to such a ruinous system. He much lamented that some measure had not been even hinted at by his Majesty's Ministers for the employment and consequent relief of the Manufacturers. With respect to Ireland he thought it must be evident to every one that quietude alone could benefit that distracted country.

Mr. W. HORTON hoped, that the Hon. Member who had just addressed the House would permit his name to be placed upon the Committee. If he did do so he would have an opportunity of stating his plan fully; although he (Mr. Horton) apprehended that it would be found most fallacious. – The only principle upon which emigration could for an instant be encouraged was this: - that upon calculation it was evident that although an emigrant cost the country 20l. still the country, in incurring

that expense, merely chose the lesser of two evils; for if the person provided with the means to emigrate had remained at home, he would have cost the country a much greater sum.

The Petition was ordered to be printed.

March 2, 1827 page 3

Mr. O'Connell on Emigration

"Freedom's the exclusive birthright of the brave; The cudgelled coward *ought* to be a slave."

It is the fashion of Mr. O'Connell to *preface* his sedition with a favourite couplet. "Fas est et ab hoste doceri" is a sound maxim; (though the Cavan Priest, who misquotes the passage, seems to think otherwise,) and we see no reason why we should not prelude our observations on the great inventor of the practice, with a favourite distich of our own. We mean to do so for the future; and think it right to apprise our Readers, that whenever they meet the "*cudgelled coward*," they may calculate on finding Mr. O'Connell in the sequence with as much certainty, as the occurrence of the "*Hereditary Bondsmen*" leads them to expect an inflammatory and seditious address to the Irish Romanists.

This premised, we come to the matter in hand.

The Government, it appears, are sedulously employed in devising means to relieve the distresses of the poor, starving, and unemployed people of the empire at large. – In England and Scotland, the misery appears to arise, not so much from the population itself having outgrown the demand for labour, as from the perfection in which machinery has been brought, and the great multiplication of engines of various descriptions, by means of which the demand for manual labour has been so much diminished as naturally to throw a vast multitude of the manufacturing classes out of employment. In Ireland, upon the other hand, the distresses of the laboring classes are attributable solely to the enormous excess of the population over and above the regular demand for labour. It is calculated that in one province alone, the supply exceeds the demand by nearly a million of hands. The demand for labour is principally agricultural; for we have no manufactures of considerable extent, that of linen excepted, and none at all in a prosperous or profitable condition. It is evident then, that unless manufactures be established which will absorb the overplus of labour now existing, the superabundant hands, if retained at home, must perish of famine. But it is equally evident that if manufactures be introduced, the use of machinery must accompany their introduction; and, if it be remembered, that in England, where the population has not naturally overgrown itself, hundreds of thousands of the most skillful artizans are now without employment, it will be readily confessed, that the introduction of engines *wrought by the*

power of steam, will afford little or no relief to our superabundant population even at the present, and would but increase the evil for the future, if the tendency which manufactures have already evinced to increase the numbers of people be taken into consideration. Under such circumstances the only feasible plan of relief for both Country seems to be an *extensive system of emigration* – and if a well devised plan for such a purpose were faithfully administered, there can be no doubt, that the parent country would feel an immediate relief, and that the emigrants themselves, having a fair and fertile field opened to their industry, would become happy and prosperous, and have abundant reason to be thankful for the paternal care of that Government which removed them from misery and famine and degradation, into independence and wealth and dignity. To the Irish poor the change would be from want to plenty; from a homeless and barren wilderness, as it were, to a paradise of comfort and security: in short, to them the removed would be (if we may be allowed the expression) a sort of *apotheosis*, in which they would ascend from being the *outcasts* of one soil, to be the *lords* of another.

A change so beneficial, so necessary to the existence of a great portion of our countrymen, who, but a [illegible], would wish to counteract? Yet possibly we shall find that demon (we speak *figuratively*) in the person of an Irish patriot. He, forsooth, has an object of his own ambition to carry, which, as it cannot be effected by clamour in the teeth of reason and argument, he seems willing to enforce by the *dernier resort*, of an appeal to arms. He would therefore multiply his numbers; and in truth, what with the powers of his Priests – whose address in the arts “*de propaganda fide*,” more will deny – what with the natural inclinations of the people themselves, unrestricted by any checks of prudence or of law, and encouraged by their demagogues and clergy, “to [increase] and multiply, and to cover the land,” his scheme, if not successful in carrying the point intended, has succeeded in producing in Ireland a greater mass of misery than can possibly be found in any other nation on the globe. Now, the Government proposes to the people an escape from this state of wretchedness – nay, more; an introduction to a condition of affluence and comfort. How does the “MAN OF THE PEOPLE,” receive the intelligence? Why, regardless of the actual misery that exists – careless of the distress and sickness and famine that result from the over crowded atmosphere, in which the victims of his delusion are pent up – unconcerned for everything but himself and his own projects, he has determined on abusing that confidence, which the ignorance alone of an infatuated and thoughtless people has reposed in him; and we learn from a reported speech of Mr. O’Connell’s, that, in his address from the Catholic Association to the people of Ireland, “he would be inclined to tell them not to go to Canada”!! This report may not be true; but if it be correct, what shall we think of the man, or rather of the monster, who would tell two millions of an idle and famishing population – “Stay at home and starve; starve at home and join the insurrectionary Captain Rock! Join Captain Rock, and be shot or hanged like rebels! – Stay at home and perish without bread, although the teeming land of Canada is crying for your culture! Stay at home and die,

though the Government will carry you free of expense to a country where ‘a man by scratching the surface of the earth with a hoe, will raise a more abundant crop, than the richest land in England, cultivated with the best machinery, can yield!’ Stay at home, and rebel, and starve, and die; and leave your children to rebel, and starve, and die, in like manner behind you, that your Priests and Demagogues may hasten on your miseries! – That your bitterest foes may prosper on your ruin! That the Catholic Question may be carried on your shoulders, though ye sink into the grave under the burden!” Such is Irish patriotism!

On the subject of emigration, we shall have a word or two to say in a few days.

April 13, 1827 page 4

EMIGRATION.

The Second Report from the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom has been printed by order of the House of Commons. This Report is on a special case which had been presented to it, viz., the condition of the hand-loom weavers, for whom it has been suggested that some relief might be afforded by emigration.

The Manufacturers’ Relief Committee have signified their readiness to contribute 25,000*l.*, out of the funds raised by the King’s letter, and the Emigration Committee recommend a grant of 50,000*l.* By this sum of 75,000*l.*, it is calculated that 1,200 families may be removed to Nova Scotia.

At the conclusion of the Report, the Committee express “their deep conviction, that whatever may be the immediate and urgent demands from other quarters, it is in vain to hope for any permanent and extensive advantage from any system of emigration which does not primarily apply to *Ireland*, whose population, unless some other outlet be opened to them, must shortly fill up every vacuum created in England or in Scotland, and reduce the laboring classes to a uniform state of degradation and misery.” And they therefore pledge themselves “to devote their most anxious attention to the state of that country, and the practicability of applying emigration as a means of relieving it from its present overwhelming population.”

Though no definite plan has yet been presented by which emigration can be resorted to on so large a scale as to affect beneficially the general condition of the working people in the United Kingdom and though the difficulties in the way of any such plan are so great as to prevent us from entertaining any sanguine hopes on the subject, the appointment of the Emigration Committee has been of great importance, as a pledge given by the Government, that the improvement of the condition of the people shall be attended to – that the care for them shall not be confined to the doling out of alms, which rather suffice to prolong than to remove misery. The Committee has made one step

towards improving the condition of the people, by placing in the clearest light the immediate cause of their misery, and the circumstances which tend to perpetuate it.

An objection has been made to the application by the Relief Committee of the money at its disposal for the purposes of emigration. If six or seven thousand persons can be relieved entirely, and others be aided materially, by 25,000l of the charitable fund, the Relief Committee, by so applying the money, consults in the most judicious manner the interests of its trust, and the intention of the donors. The peculiar circumstance of the hand-loom weavers appear completely to justify this application of the money.

March 7, 1828 page 2

THE POOR PAPISTS

Really Sir Francis Burdett is much to blame. He has done worse than fling the Papists overboard. They ask for Emancipation – free, full, and unqualified Emancipation. They say that it is the panacea for all Irish ills – the great sedative for all national grievances – the measure upon which the stability of the State and the continuance of the British Constitution depends. What says Sir Francis? Transport the knaves, transport them. The following is an extract from his speech on Tuesday night, during a discussion upon the expediency of transporting certain numbers of Irish Papists to places beyond the sea, brought forward under the imposing title of “Emigration:” –

“No question which Parliament could take up was of equal importance, neither that of Free Trade, the Corn Question, or the *question of Catholic Emancipation*. Not one of them was of equal importance to this.”

There was a Separate Meeting of Papists yesterday. Mr. O’Connell is reported to have spoken as follows: -

“*Perhaps* the Catholic question had been postponed on account of the Dissenters. He did not know if such were the fact, for although the Catholics had often been treated with injury before, they never had been treated with *insult until now!* A letter had been sent to one of their friends, who had not even condescended to reply to it. Some letter, he was told, had been received this day from Mr. Blount, by Mr. McDonnell, who ought to be, *if he were permitted*, in London.”

And is it come to this – not even answer a letter?

March 19, 1828 page 4

HOUSE OF COMMONS – FRIDAY, MARCH 14. POOR LAWS IN IRELAND.

Mr. J. GRATTAN said, that he had a petition to present from certain individuals resident in Ireland, which related to a subject of great interest to that country. If the Right

Hon. Gentleman who now acted as Secretary of State for Ireland had been in his place, he would have taken the liberty of calling his attention to the allegations of this petition, which respected the propriety of making some Legislative provision to relieve the distressed and unemployed poor in Ireland. The petitioners, were, he believed, residents in the city of Dublin. He would not pretend to give any opinion at present on the subject matter of their petition. He could not, however, present their petition without stating the general want of employment which prevailed throughout Ireland. The petitioners stated, that in England and Wales the poor were enabled, by means of the laws enacted on their behalf, to obtain work, or if not work, relief from the respective parishes in which they dwelt; whereas in Ireland no such provision existed in their favour. They likewise complained of the injury inflicted upon Ireland by the absenteeism of a great English and a great Irish landholder – when an English landholder was absent from his estate in England, he paid a rate for his house and grounds, though he did not occupy them, whereas an Irish absentee landholder paid no rate on thousands and thousands of acres. The consequence was, that the Irish poor came over to England to obtain relief from their distress, and so increased the pressure of the poor-rates in this country. He should move that this petition, which he recommended to the particular notice of the Right Hon. Gentleman opposite, should be now brought up. It prayed for the introduction of a qualified system of poor laws into Ireland.

General GASCOYNE was of opinion that no question could be more important than that which the Hon. Member had just mentioned to the House. He trusted that the Hon. Member who had presented this petition would move for the appointment of a Committee to examine into all its different details. He understood that other petitions were coming from Ireland on this question, and he now gave notice, that when they were presented he would take the opportunity of stating at large to the House his opinion upon their merits.

Mr. HUME expressed a wish that the Right Honorable Secretary for the Home Department would attend to the matter contained in this position. He believed that the extension of crime was caused by the poverty which was felt throughout the country, owing to the increase of the price of provisions during the decrease of the rate of wages, and to the attempts made by the paupers of Ireland to drive the artisans out of the manufacturing market, by competing for lowness of wages. He was therefore of opinion, that the Right Hon. Secretary would do well to appoint a third committee to inquire and consider what effect would be produced on the lower orders in England by making some provision for the poor in Ireland, and by preventing them from flocking, as they now did, in crowds to this country.

Mr. PEEL observed, that as two Committees had been already appointed by the House, to inquire into the causes of the increase of crime in London and the country, he certainly did not entertain the slightest intention to move for the appointment of a third

Committee, such as the Hon. Member for Montrose had recommended. He thought that in either of the Committees to which the Hon. Member had referred, he would have full scope for entering into such an inquiry as that suggested. He was afraid that in the multiplicity and variety of his (Mr. Hume's) parliamentary labours, he had not been able to find time to read the evidence attached to the reports on emigration. - If the Hon. Member had read them with the care which their importance deserved, he would have discovered that the Emigration Committee had entered into a full examination of the subject in question.

Mr. HUME in reply, stated that all he wanted to discover by further inquiry was, the means of remedying the evil which existed at present.

The petition was then laid up on the table, and ordered to be printed.

May 5, 1828 page 2

STATE OF IRELAND!!

Lord DARNLEY, one of the most strict, griping, and liberal of the Absentee Landlords of Ireland – a Noble Proprietor of soil, who gives a return in idle and useless words, for the actual value received – exacted we might say, in pounds shillings and pence – brought forward in the House of Lords, on Thursday night, one of these periodical humbugs for which the present era is remarkable, under the denomination of “a motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the state of the peasantry of Ireland.” The report upon this ridiculous motion will be found elsewhere, and perhaps, it would be sufficient for all purposes to state, that those best acquainted with the true interests and real situation of Ireland, not only opposed the motion of the Noble Lord but exposed its absurdity; and that the proposition for an enquiry into the state and population of Ireland was finally negatived without a division; but we cannot avoid giving the following summary which must prove interesting to our readers.

It will be seen that his Lordship after an exaggerated statement intended for the Corn-Exchange, and the miserable rent-payers to the Association, moved, that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the state of the peasantry of Ireland. Lord LIMERICK ably exposed the fallacy of the reasoning of the Noble Mover; and Lord LONGFORD, whilst he admitted that the suggestions in regard to Emigration might be calculated to produce beneficial consequences, contended that nothing but mischief could result from agitating the question of introducing anything like the system of the British Poor Laws in Ireland. Lord LORTON, adverting to the causes of the distresses alluded to, declared that the panacea recommended was calculated only to [increase] and perpetuate the degradation of the Irish people. – What (said his Lordship) would have been the situation of England at this time if the Catholic religion had been maintained in it? What was not the situation of Italy, of Spain, of Portugal, of every country in short where the degrading influence of Popery held its sway over the minds

of the people, the abject slavery of the people to their Priests, who were the determined enemies of this Protestant Constitution? The Catholic Association, that *Imperium in Imperio*, to which he had often called the attention of that House, was another great cause of the misery and degradation of Ireland. Having adverted to this remedy and refused his assent to it, it might be asked of him what remedy he would propose. To this he would say, give employment to the people, and this may be done by laying on a land and absentee tax. The Duke of WELLINGTON very ably exposed the gross exaggeration of the statements of Lord DARNLEY, and proved that the arguments adduced were such as could not possibly receive the attention of Parliament. Lord MOUNTCASHEL considered, with much reason and justice, that the Catholic Rent was one of the great evils of Ireland; the Body who collected it did not seem to care how poor their dupes were, if they could get their money into their hands. This was the conduct of the Catholic leaders, while on the other hand, the Protestants of property and influence contributed their own funds to establish hospitals and other institutions for the relief of the poor. With no less truth and justice did Lord LORTON pronounce the Catholic Association to be one of the greatest curses to the unfortunate peasantry of Ireland; and his Lordship expressed a sincere wish, in which all good and loyal subjects must join, that so mischievous a body might speedily be put down. Lord DARNLEY said he was as good a Protestant as any Noble Lord opposed to his motion, which was thereupon *negatived without a division!*

January 7, 1823 page 3

THE LANDED INTEREST OF IRELAND.

The great difference between the Occupiers of Land in Ireland and in England is this, that *here* the insolvency is very general; in England, perhaps, there is not yet more than a fifth of the Farmers absolutely ruined. The difference between the Owners of Land in both Countries amounts to this, that, in England, one-third of the reduced rents are perhaps paid; in Ireland, the Landlord is completely without any income derived from the soil; and any one that knows any thing of Ireland knows this, that Irish Country Gentlemen have, generally speaking, very little money “in the Funds.”

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE. This is the constant cry; but what that something is, we have never yet heard an Irish Country Gentleman (and we know several in almost every County in the Kingdom) had the courage to *hint* in public. In private they talk of it freely enough—indeed they talk of almost nothing else; yet, bring them together at a County Meeting, as at Galway the other day, and they maintain the most “dignified silence.” In this County the Proprietors are almost all on the threshold of destruction; and one would imagine that it was of very little consequence to them, whether a County Meeting was palatable to the great Functionaries of Galway, or not. These Functionaries had nothing to give them, and they could take very little from them; yet, the appearance of a few Gentlemen in the Court of the Church interest operated as a wet blanket on the high-spirited Gentry of Galway, and they passed as gentle a set of Resolutions, and as amiable a Petition to Parliament, as the heart of a Man or a Minister could desire. Indeed, one of their Representatives (Mr. Martin) congratulates them upon their temper and moderation. This very Mr. Martin was a Colonel of Volunteers in 1782, and he knows, as well as any man, that, if the County then followed the advice which he gives them now, we should never have looked upon even “the image of the British Constitution.” He was, we believe, at that time quite of a different opinion—that opinion fortunately prevailed. If *moderate* councils were taken, Ireland would not have enjoyed, brief as the period was to the extinction of her Legislative independence, that bright epoch in her history.

Times are changed—unfortunately they are. The language of independence is now no longer the fashionable language of the Irish Gentleman; it is a dialect which, we rather imagine, is totally incomprehensible to the majority of them. Yet, what have they gained by their subserviency? What have they gained by becoming Courtiers—by echoing, *usque ad nauseam*, the verbiage of the Court? We shall tell them what they have gained: Many of them have been made Peers—more of them have been made Beggars. They are all lives-and-fortunes men—but they were distanced all to nothing in the race of subserviency and adulation by the Corporate Bodies which infest this Country. They

toiled after the latter in vain. And here they are! without rents, without authority, without influence; and almost afraid to call their lands their own. Never was any thing so degraded as the condition to which they have reduced themselves. In Tipperary, t'other day, a young man, who happened to be Sheriff, pocketed the entire County, and the thick-blooded Gentlemen had not the spirit to resent the affront. In Galway, they passed a set of Resolutions, which, for all the practical purposes, they might as well have put in their pockets—and their Representative praised them for their moderation! Oh, brave! But, after all, what does this *moderation* mean? The Gentlemen come to the Meeting with empty pockets; they see around them a revolution of property which threatens to overwhelm them in its billows. They resolve and they petition. Their object was, *we know*, to enter late some resolution about Tithes; but this was a subject which they were evidently deterred from touching on. — Why were they deterred? Could they have been worse? Did they imagine that silence upon the only *practical grievance* which the Legislature could remove, would work better for them than an honest and open avowal of the sentiments which they *all* feel? Oh! no—they did not think so; but there was an obscure and lurking hope among the majority, that the State would do something for them, or for their Sons and Brothers—there was the Constabulary Act—there were Stipendiary Magistrates to be appointed—there were twenty little things which might be obtained by subserviency, and to this individual feeling they postponed the great, the only object of their Meeting. This omission is the moderation to which the Honorable Member alluded. And yet we would ask him, who has written himself down a Friend to Commutation, *how* could this great measure be *hurt* by making it the subject of a Resolution at a County Meeting? Is he really in earnest, when he advocates it—and if he be in earnest, why should he deprecate its introduction at a Meeting of his Constituents. He knows as well as any man the effect of a County Meeting. He induced this very County, this *Catholic* County, at one time, to pass a vote of thanks to Mr. Peel, the ablest opponent of Catholic Emancipation. And Mr. Peel knew and felt the value of such a vote. It was the brightest feather in his cap. But it is one thing to bepraise a Lord Lieutenant's Secretary, and it is another, it should seem, for people to indulge in the expression of common sense upon their own misfortunes.

Moderation! We do not desire that the People of Galway, or of any other County, should be intemperate, in their expressions. The time nor the occasion does not demand it — but we cannot see, how a little reason, how a disposition to speak the whole truth, can be justly charged with intemperance. But the truth is, that the Irish Gentry, with their Station and Estates, are fast losing the Character which Mr. Martin remembers them once to have possessed, and of which, we believe he, at one time, was not a little proud —

We are not advocates for intemperance. It can do now little good. But we do think, that steadiness and resolution are necessary for the present crisis. It is quite idle

to pretend that things can continue to go on in their present course. For the last three years, the Income of the Country has been declining, and we challenge contradiction most broadly when we assert, that *no Rents at all*, due last Lady-day, has been received. Can any be received next Lady-day — can any be received next Christmas? Talk of moderation! will moderation put money in your purse?

Oh! but let us wait and see what Parliament will do. Aye, we hear that Parliament means to do something. It will lend, we are told, *Ten Million* to the Landed Interest; at Four per Cent to pay off the existing Mortgages, that is, it will induce the Banks of England and Ireland to lend the money. It is a very absurd and wild speculation, but we hope it will do so with all our hearts. They will then become the general Mortgagees of the whole Kingdom. In other words, the Landlords will become the Creditors of the State. They will be all under the thumb of the Minister. Yet before this Euthenasia arrive, before this Millenium, for which all the faithful sigh, shall ccome, Cash Payments must be suspended, and if they be, the duration of the suspension must extend to the Greek Kalends. Is Parliament, is the Country, prepared for this? Poor Webb Hall used to talk about a *crop of Currency*. Here will be a crop, but then up go the Markets, and up will go the Radicals, for if the necessaries of life are enhanced in price, the Manufacturers must cease working, and the sturdiest portion of the Community will be again thrown out of employment. This proposition, we think, capable of strict mathematical demonstration, and we rather imagine the Ministers are of the same opinion.

But, indeed, the scheme is impracticable. The Bank will not lend the money—they will not take the estates in pledge. Why should they? What is the value of the estates now? sell them all—would they all discharge the liens now upon them, even though the interest should be reduced from six to five or three per cent.

No, no; the only way by which the present proprietors of land can be saved, is to reduce the Taxes; the only way in which this can be effectually done, is to reduce the Interest of the Debt; and the effectual way of doing *that*, is to reduce the Debt itself. To be sure, there must be also a reduction of private contracts; and why should there not? In strict equity there ought. Let us all agree public and private, to give and take ten shillings in the pound, and, though we are by no means sure that this would be sufficient, yet, considering the difficulties of the times, and the value of money, the dividend would not be a bad one. There are few Merchants who would drive their debtors to a commission of bankruptcy, that could calculate securely upon half their debts. We are quite serious in this proposition. It may sound like a national bankruptcy; but, after all, is this more horrible than the ruined landed proprietary which we now witness in Ireland, and which, we hear, is approaching with such rapid and formidable strides in the Sister Country. At all events, to this complexion, or to something like it, we are satisfied, the Nation must come at last.

TO THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE.

My Lord, - With regard to the second proposition, that touching the introduction of a system of Poor Laws in Ireland, we are satisfied that the principle upon which those Laws is resisted, will be found ultimately to resolve itself into the interest which the Landowners and Landholders *think* they have in taking all that can be taken from the produce of the land and the labour. - Accustomed to receive a rack-rent, they will not yield, if they can help it, a penny to the support of those by whose toil the rent is raised. They will not be made to believe, or at least to acknowledge, that the Poor have any *right* to support, from the fruits of the earth, when sickness, or accident, or want of work, renders it impossible that they can *earn*. It is this total contempt of the Poor of Ireland - this opinion that they are, and they ought to be, a distinct race, to which their degradation is to be ascribed. Had the Landlords been compelled to provide for them, had the People their *rights* in this regard, we have little hesitation in asserting, that they would soon become more respectable in the eyes of the Gentry, as well as more independent in their own. It may be, and we doubt not it is otherwise in England. But your Lordship will be pleased to remark, that those evils did not appear until within the last fifty years. For upwards of 200 years, when the Poor Laws were framed, the Yeomanry and the Labourers of England were the most sturdy and independent race of men in Europe, the Poor Laws notwithstanding. During that period too, it is to be observed, that although there was what is called the Grand Rebellion, the warfare in England, though a Civil War, was particularly remarkable for the spirit with which it was conducted, there were, in fact, in England, none of those shocking scenes which steeped Scotland in blood, and rendered Ireland a Golgoths. Even the change of Dynasty, which took place at the Revolution, was effected in England without bloodshed, while Scotland and Ireland were deluged with slaughter. After the accession of the House of Hanover, there were two Rebellions in Scotland; and, though Historians now admit, that the majority of the English People were hostile to the pretensions of the present family, yet no Rebellion took place in England. It is true, there were other causes which operated in favour of the new family. The Debt had been created, and the Public Creditors were bound by their interest to the existing families. The Septennial Act was carried by the Whigs, and this - necessarily - we had almost said, secured the subserviency of the House of Commons to the Minister of the day. Yet, though the upper ranks might be neutralized by those measures, they could have had little effect upon the bulk of the People, if the latter were not in circumstances too comfortable to risque. Those matters occurred, your Lordship will observe, when England, though a great commercial country, was by no means a manufacturing one. At this period the Poor Laws were not felt by the Proprietors of the Land, or by the Farmers. It was only when Manufactures and Machinery began to increase and multiply - when great numbers of persons were congregated together - in short, when the habits and pursuits of Englishmen had

incurred a very considerable alteration, that the severity of these Laws began to be experienced; and above all, when the Taxes had quadrupled, that the Rates increased from one million, or one million and a-half, to seven or eight millions. It is, in short, to the Taxes and Manufactories of England that the advance of the Poor Rates are solely to be attributed. While she was an Agricultural Country – *when she exported Corn*, there were no lamentations as to the enormous amount of her burdens in this respect.

My Lord, Ireland is *not* a Manufacturing Country; she, has, comparatively, less Taxes; she has not, so to speak any commerce or credit; she would have been bankrupt long since, had not England undertaken to pay the interest of her Debt; she is almost strictly agricultural. Nay, we maintain, that, had the same policy been adopted towards Ireland as Elizabeth judged it necessary to use with respect to the Poor of England in the early part of her reign, this Country would not have exhibited the deplorable scenes which have since occurred. Their interest would have knitted the upper and the lower ranks together. – There would have been but few Rebellions. Elizabeth would not have found it necessary to send Mountjoy and Totness forth as examiners. James I. would not have found it necessary to colonise a part of the North of Ireland. we should not have had such a bloody and atrocious Rebellion as that of Phelim O'Neil's; nor would almost the entire of the Land become forfeited, as it was during the Wars of Cromwell, and at the Revolution. We do not say that other causes were not at work to produce these deplorable scenes. We are far from leaving *Religion* out of our consideration. But, had there existed a community of interest between the Rich and the Poor – had the former been bound, as they might have easily been, to the State, Ireland would have escaped most of the calamities which have rendered her the opprobrium of Europe, and the disgrace of England.

It is, we think, quite clear to your Lordship, and indeed you have repeatedly given it as your opinion, in your place in Parliament, that the present mode of managing the Irish People, however imperative circumstances may be, cannot be long continued, or, if continued, that it cannot be attended with these results which all good men would desire. It is our opinion, that same system of Poor Laws would have a tendency to unite the inferior with the superior ranks of society. For the sake of both, this is indispensable. Emigration, though very advisable for those who emigrate, can effect little or nothing for the Country. The Poor *cannot* emigrate, unless they render themselves obnoxious to the Insurrection Act, as some of them actually did with this view, but were unhappily disappointed in their object. – Still, even upon the most extensive scale in which it could be practical to carry on a system of Emigration, it could not be felt even, as a temporary expedient. South America was colonised, in a great degree, from the Province of Galicia; yet Galicia continues to this day the most populous district in Spain. In one word, though Population be an evil, we must deal with it as one that we cannot remove or

check; and, as Ireland is an Agricultural Country, it is our conviction that the application of a system of Poor Laws would tend to remedy this evil, and many others.

The aid given to the Poor would certainly keep at home much of those rents which are annually sent out of this Country to the great Absentee Proprietors. To those Noblemen this subtraction from their income would be, no doubt, a considerable disadvantage; yet we question whether, on the whole, their property would not be benefitted by the benefit which would be conferred on the Sub-Tenantry. – In a short time they would abandon the disposition to outrage, which they have manifested so long. They would no longer be driven periodically to desperation by famine, or by oppression, or by rack-rents, and *rack-tithes* – for, though their potatoe crops might fail, they would feel that a part of the corn which they contributed to raise must be applied by the Laws of the Land to their sustenance. And the very necessity which would be imposed on the Landowner and Landholder for their support, would operate decisively against the system of Rack-rents, as the Occupiers and Proprietors of Land would be compelled with one hand to give out a portion of that money which they exacted with the other. The efforts of the Poor, with regard to Tithes, would, we have no doubt, be still more important – it would unite the whole Community in favour of a Commutation. Indeed, we do admit that it would be impossible to introduce the system in Ireland, without previously effecting a complete and, (for it is useless to mince the matter) a radical alteration in the mode of paying the Clergy of the Establishment. It is known *now*, we imagine, to every one, that the *sole* object of Tithes, on their original institution, was *not* merely to support the Clergy, but also for the purpose of affording relief to the Poor. In fact, they were a sort of Poor Laws; and the Clergy, either by law or by custom, were constituted the Almoners. In the Catholic times of this Country, there is no doubt that they discharged these functions, generally with zeal and honesty. We do not, however, deny, that the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the Country demanded reformation. We imagine, indeed, that there are few Catholics of the present day, if any, who will deny this. However, the Reformation in England began in robbery and plunder – in Ireland, in blood and murder. But the dissolution of the Monasteries was followed in a short time in England by a system of Poor Laws. Before the Acts of Elizabeth, or at least in the time of her ferocious Father, the Poor were supported by the Monasteries, the Bishops, and the Secular Priests. When that odious monster seized the Church Lands, instead of leaving them open to the purchase of the People and benefitting the Nation, as the French Revolutionists did, and as the poor Spaniards were attempting to do, he bestowed the spoil upon his minions and favourites. But it was soon found that the Poor should be provided for – mendacity and outrage had arrived at a dreadful height, when it became necessary to arrest their course by a system of Poor Laws. In Ireland, no such system was adopted; and Ireland, from that day to this, has been the prey of evils more complicated than any that any other Nation in Europe has been exposed to, with the exception of Modern Greece. In no other Nation, with this exception alone, is the

religion of the State a religion hostile to that professed by the People. It is true, in Ireland both Churches are Christian, and differ less in essentials from each other than any different Christian sects do. But we need only appeal to History, in order to satisfy us as to that fact, that the greater agreement there is between People on points of religion, the more decided in their animosity on those other points on which they happen to differ. The contests between the Homoousions and the Homoiousions, (who disagreed only in an iota, and whose disagreement, in point of fact, it would be difficult to collect even from themselves,) furnish a complete illustration. But in Ireland the case is still more unhappy. The bulk of the People are obliged to support those whom they can consider in no other light than as their spiritual opponents, and whom they only know as the exactors of the last penny they can afford to pay to an Establishment with which they cannot possibly have a sympathy, and indeed, which the daily and hourly occurrences of life would suggest to them the unchristian feeling of detestation. Now, my Lord, we would turn a part of the immense revenue of the Established Church to some of the purposes for which it was originally designed. We would make the Clergy support the Poor, or contribute to their support, with the Landowners and Farmers. Many other things should be done with regard to Tithes, which the late Bills will not do, but which as we shall have another opportunity of stating to your Lordship, our object at present being to demonstrate, if possible, the necessity of doing something substantial for our superabundant Population.

August 14, 1824 page 3

EMIGRATION *from the* SOUTH of IRELAND.

To R. J. Wilmot Horton, Esq. M. P. &c.&c.

SIR, - I have the honor to report to you, for the information of the Right Hon. Earl Bathurst, that having received directions from his Majesty's Government to proceed to Ireland, for the purpose of superintending a limited Emigration to the Province of Upper Canada, I left Liverpool on the 18th, and arrived at Fermoy, in the County of Cork, on the 20th of May, 1823.

Being a stranger in Ireland, I was ordered to act under the advice of Lord Ennismore, and the Magistrates; and in order to receive the full benefit of their assistance, I made Fermoy my principal place of residence. I was happy to find that the very liberal conditions proposed by his Majesty's Government to such as were disposed to Emigrate, met the cordial approbation of all the Gentlemen to whom they were communicated. Lords Ennismore, Kingston, and Doneraile, Mr. Becher, M.P., Mr. Jephson, and the Rev. Dr. Woodward, were most friendly to the scheme, anxious for its success, and ready to give me every assistance in their power.

On the 2d of June, my final instructions arrived; and as the gentlemen I was directed to consult, were unanimously of opinion, that I should take as many persons as

possible from the disturbed baronies in the County of Cork, which were at that time in a very distracted state, I caused several hundred copies of the Memorandum, containing the terms of Emigration, to be distributed in the towns of Fermoy, and Mitchelstown.

Not satisfied with giving all the information I could to the Magistrates, and calling upon the principal inhabitants, I made myself accessible to all the people, and entered patiently into their views and feelings, answering their inquiries, and affording them as true a description of the Country as I was capable of giving. On these occasions it was, that I found the benefit of being well acquainted with Upper Canada, the place of their destination. I was able to set before them the length of the journey, the obstacles in their way, and the means of removing them. I explained the manner of clearing lands and cultivating the virgin soil. I dissipated their apprehensions concerning wild beasts, and the danger of being lost in the woods.

Many, after being satisfied in regard to the excellence of the soil and climate of Upper Canada, were anxious to know whether, in case they liked the country, there would be room for their friends, and whether they would likewise be granted lands, and enjoy the same benefits and privileges which were now offered to them. To these inquiries I made answer, that I could not give them any positive information as to the future intentions of Government, but this I knew, that there was room enough in Canada for many more than would ever come from Ireland; and that if they were industrious and sober, they would be able, in a few years, to send for their friends and relations themselves, if no public assistance should at that time be given to Emigrants.

On the 2d of June, I began to advertise for Emigrants, and to distribute copies of the terms on which Government was disposed to send them to Canada. Before the end of the month I had distributed 600 tickets for embarkation, a greater number than I could have taken; but I acted on the presumption that some would keep back from sickness, or imaginary fears, and apprehensions, or the advice of friends. The event proved that I was right, for on the first of July, four hundred and sixty only were embarked, but I was able, the next day, to select one hundred and eight more, making in all five hundred and sixty-eight, which was as many as could be accommodated. During the time that I was collecting the people, two vessels, about five hundred tons each, were engaged in the Thames to carry them from Cork to Quebec; these vessels were amply supplied with provisions, and every comfort, in case of sickness, that could be imagined. Two Medical Officers of experience, one for each ship, were employed. The vessels and stores were strictly inspected, and they were, in every respect, as well found as if they had been fitted out by a company of passengers, for their own convenience, safety, and comfort.

Thus, in rather less than a month from the time of issuing the proposals, the Emigrants were on board, and the ships ready to sail; such was the promptness of

Government in making its arrangements, and the active exertions of the Nobility and Magistrates in enabling me to select the requisite number. For their kindness in thus forwarding the object of my journey to Ireland, as well as their attentions to myself, I feel exceedingly grateful. – During the voyage, nothing happened of importance; the rations were abundant and comfortable; the men were allowed [corn?] for breakfast, and nearly half-a-pint of spirits, which was perhaps not too much. The women and children were allowed tea and sugar. The best proof of the attention paid to them on the voyage, arises from the good health which they enjoyed, as only one woman and eight children died in the passage, and these from the smallpox, which had unfortunately got into both ships, and not from any causes which could be attributed to their change of circumstances or situation.

It may be worth remarking, as it is so characteristic of the fondness of the Irish people for potatoes, that the men preferred them to cocoa, which they refused for several days to taste, till they saw the Officers of the ship repeatedly breakfasting upon it. The children, during sickness, called constantly for potatoes, refusing arrow-root or any other ailment more congenial to their situation; and nothing could prevail on man, woman, or child, to eat plumb-pudding, which, as is usual on ship-board, was part of the Sunday's dinner.

Few of them would eat the best English Cheese, and when it was served out as part of their ration, it was most commonly thrown overboard.

We arrived at Quebec in the *Hakesby*, on the 2d of Sept., after a passage of eight weeks; the *Hebe* had been in port two days, I shipped the people from the transport on board the steam-boats, without landing them, and proceeded to Montreal on the 4th, having been detained only two days. We were much facilitated in our progress by the orders which his Excellency Lord Dalhousie had given before our arrival to the Quarter-Master-General, to find provisions and transports as far as Prescott, in Upper Canada, a distance of about 320 miles.

We reached Montreal on the 6th, and finding the means of transport ready, I forwarded the Emigrants by land immediately, without stopping in Montreal, to Lachine, distant ten miles. Here we remained two days, and then set out in boats to Prescott, the crews of each consisting of Emigrants, with two Canadians to guide and steer. Notwithstanding the rapidity of the river and unskilfulness of the men, few of whom had ever been in a boat, we got to Prescott on the 15th. A Commissary had preceded us with one month's provisions; but finding no Commissariat Establishment at Prescott, and being unwilling to incur what I considered an unnecessary expense, I receipted the month's supply, and allowed the Commissary to return to Montreal.

I have much pleasure in being able to state, that although the detailed account of the expenditure cannot yet be made out, as there is a cow and some little articles still to

be supplied, it will fall within the estimate, so that this part of the experiment proves most satisfactory. The second part of the experiment, "how far the Emigration of the poorer classes to Canada, is calculated to promote their permanent comfort and happiness," will be best proved by a reference to the letters of the persons sent out, some of them so late as the 20th of Feb., stating their good health and complete satisfaction with the country and climate, and earnestly inviting their friends to join them; and to the fact, that every head of a family will have from three to four acres of land cleared and ready to plant this spring.

I therefore feel warranted in stating, that the Emigration to the Province of Upper Canada, committed to my superintendence, has completely succeeded.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servant,

P. ROBINSON.

The most correct estimate of the expense of conveying Emigrants to Canada, and settling them on their lands, is to be found in the Appendix to the Report of a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland, during the last Session of Parliament, and is as follows:

For every Man £35
 - every Woman 35
 - every boy between 14 and 18 25
 - every Child under 10 years, 14

This includes all expenses, such as superintendence, medical assistance, provisions, a cow, farming utensils, &c. as described in the Memorandum.

The Estimate applied to the actual Emigration that took place, gives the following results: -

	£	s.	d.
182 Men	£35 ...	6,370	0 0
143 Women	25 ...	3,575	0 0
57 Boys between 14 and 18 ...	25 ...	1,425	0 0
186 Children	14 ...	2,604	0 0
568	£13,974	0	0
Actual expense incurred,	11,789	10	10½
Leaves a surplus of	£ 2,184	9	1½

From which the services of the Superintendent are to be remunerated.

The result of this practical experiment shows that the Estimate was calculated on sound principles; and there is every reason to believe that future Emigrations may be carried into effect at even a less expense, although the occurrence of casualties might swell the amount of particular items, and it would not be safe to make a calculation upon other date.

[...]

August 17, 1824 page 2-3

POLITICAL PROSPECTS of IRELAND.

We have asserted, that the present period is peculiarly calculated for a temperate re-consideration of our affairs, and of our future prospects. We may, of course, and perhaps we shall, be contradicted by those, who think it a part of their duty to vilify the Country, and to exaggerate the by-gone disturbances. We would just beg to put a preliminary question, however. What object – what public object – nay, what private one, can the parties to whom we allude have, in representing the Country worse than it is? If it be for the purpose (and indeed this purpose is almost avowed), of annoying Lord WELLESLEY, or displacing Mr. PLUNKETT, it must be manifest to the parties themselves, that the system has altogether failed. Lord WELLESLEY continues, and will continue, to administer the Government, and Mr. PLUNKETT will continue to discharge the functions of Attorney-General. Where is the *good*, then, of attacking them? Experience should have taught long since the futility of that tactique, which was very feasible, unquestionably, during the first year of his administration. He has passed the Ides of March – he has survived the Kalends of December; and the last Session of Parliament has proved that the present mode of administering the affairs of Ireland has had the sanction not only of the Government, but of the Opposition. The Orangemen in the House of Commons did not even make what is called a *stand*. Mr. BROWNLOW, it is true, let off a *cracker*, but that was all. In Ireland, the only symptoms of vitality exhibited by the Party was the Deputation to Lord FARNHAM with the piece of plate, and the *joyeuse entre* of Alderman KING into Enniskillen. This only proves, what none affect to deny – that the embers of the Faction are glowing still. But Lord FARNHAM and Alderman KING would be very angry with you, notwithstanding, if you put them down as enemies, personal or political, to the Marquis WELLESLEY.

The truth is, and *we know it*, the Faction would be very well satisfied to make a drawn battle. The more reasonable among them perceive, that nothing can be had by continuing the system of annoyance with which they commenced, while *a great deal may be risked*. Many of them, no doubt, chuckle at the lampoons of the Reverend Sir HARCOURT LEES, and of other Reverend Gentlemen – but it is only for the laugh, for as to active co-operation, the season for accomplishing it has passed by, and they feel it. The Country is now comparatively tranquil. *Captain Rock* is no longer their Ally. This

Personage has, in a great measure, ceased from his midnight labours. They can no longer press into the service, as arguments, plundered houses, or barns on fire. Very bad arguments, to be sure, but even these did some service, while the Country was in a state of agitation. Distress, the source of which every one knows, can no longer be set down at the door of Lord WELLESLEY – for, happily, the Potatoe Crop is abundant.

But the grand point undoubtedly in this, that all persons perceive, that a great change has taken place in the Government of the Country – and that a far greater one is in silent progress and operation. This change they see cannot be prevented. They make a great noise – but the innovation, as the Americans would say, is steadily progressing. It is effecting without much parade – indeed, we think, there is even an affectation against display – and there is, in this regard, too great a deference to the opinions and passions of the old Oligarchy – too great a disposition to treat with respect the feelings and interests of those who showed little respect either for the King or his Government.

We shall now proceed to indicate the further alterations in the Government of the Country, which are proceeding in their silent march.

There was an assertion in one of the Orange Papers, that Government had it in contemplation to introduce a system of Poor Laws into Ireland. This assertion was flatly contradicted by one of the Castle Prints – no doubt, on authority. We rather think the latter was right to the *letter*, but we are satisfied notwithstanding, that the state of the Poor in Ireland must have occupied the most serious attention of the Government. The recurrence of such a season as that of 1822, must be calculated upon as one of those periodical visitations, to which such a Population as ours, depending upon the returns of so uncertain a crop in such a precarious climate, as the Potatoe – and *calculated upon*, there can be no doubt, that a Government, not altogether existing upon shifts and expedients, must, most anxiously, have engaged itself, in a consideration of precautionary measures. The most obvious means of averting the calamity, or rather of encountering it, when it should arrive, would be *to employ the People*. *This*, as it is one of the most important problems in political economy, is unquestionably one of the most difficult of a satisfactory solution. Our roads are already good – we have more canals than trade to employ them. Piers and harbours are more frequently made *by trade than for it*. Besides the money which must be expended by Government must be raised by taxes. Now, if there be no chance of any of this money returning into the coffers of the Exchequer, it cannot be expected, nor indeed would it be possible, that it should continue to be expended. At the same time, though we admit it, as a good general principle that the Government were not to find employment, it is a principle equally incontrovertible, that it is the *duty* of Government, that the People shall not starve in the midst of abundance. This, then constitutes the peculiar difficulty of the Irish Question. How will you prevent famine, without a recurrence to *some* system of Poor Laws? We are told that the English system has been most destructive to the morals and comforts

of the Poor. We are not blind to the terrible abuses of this system, but it is incumbent on those who exclaim against Poor Rates in Ireland to show, first, that England, *as a nation*, has been injured, by her Poor Laws, and secondly, that Ireland, as a Nation, has been served by their absence. We think they will not be able to prove either of these propositions. They will say, indeed, that England has thriven, *in spite* of her Poor Laws; and that Ireland, *with them*, would be much worse even than she is. The first of these propositions, perhaps, may be very plausibly maintained, but we defy the most ingenious and fertile sophist to make out the second. For, the Poor are not only worse off than they are in England, or any where else; but they cannot possibly be in a more deplorable condition than they are. No system of Poor Laws could make *them* worse. But after all, why, when we speak of the necessity of making some provision for the Poor – *why* are we so constantly referred to the abuses of the English system? Why will not these Gentlemen who are so dreadfully alarmed at the consequences, [___] a side-glance upon the North of England, or upon Scotland and *her* system. The North of England, be it remembered, is Agricultural, but *then* we do not hear the People complain of the operation of the Poor Laws. Nor, except in some abstract speculations of *The Edinburgh Review* do we hear many complaints from Scotland. We are not masters of the detail of the Scotch system; but it would be worth while, before we raise our hands altogether against the plan, to Inquire how our Scottish neighbours have managed the matter. At the same time, we shall deliver no opinion on the subject. It is one that cannot be treated lightly – it involves a change – a *Revolution*, we might say, greater than Ireland has ever yet witnessed, and must be approached even by the sternest Statesman with dread & trembling. But that it must be approached at last, that it must be grappled with manfully, we have as little doubt as we entertain of our existence.

It is clear that Government has been most anxiously considering the subject; and, as far as we can judge, one of the results has been judicious. We allude to the Emigration Project. A most interesting letter appeared on this subject in our last, from a Gentleman who was employed by Government to *locate* certain Emigrants from the most disturbed districts of the South of Ireland, in Upper Canada. It appears that he was enabled to bring out and to settle more than 500 individuals, at an expense of less than £12,000 in that Province. His account is not only instructive, but very amusing. The expense amounted to £35 a-head. According to this estimate, 50,000 would cost more than a million of money. Could Government – could the Country allocate so much, to Colonise at such a rate as this? Surely it could not. And, as to the plan suggested by the *Limerick Observer*, namely, that the Landlords should subscribe half, our well-informed and ingenious contemporary knows very well, that he might as well ask them to pay off the National debt, or their own. If the thing, to any reasonable extent, could be put in execution, it would be the most effectual means of superseding the necessity of introducing the Poor Laws into Ireland. But, to any extent, be it never so inconsiderable, it must prove decidedly advantageous to those who go.

TO MR. GOULBURN.

SIR – Let us now, pursuant to the course indicated in our first letter, take a view of the actual state of the population of Ireland. It is unnecessary to repeat the generalities with which you and every man must be familiar – of their great excess of numbers – not indeed with reference to food, but to employment. In regard to food, Ireland might easily maintain double her present population – but it must be at the same time admitted, that the cultivation of the Country – to a much higher degree than it is at present cultivated, might be accomplished with half the numbers engaged. It is useless, Sir, for us to inquire into the causes of this great population, and nearly as useless to fret ourselves in lamenting its consequences. *The population is there.* How to deal with it is the question.

To a certain extent, we are friendly, and we imagine the Country in general is friendly to *Emigration*. We, for our own parts, do not grudge the money which has been expended with this view. It is, we take it, the duty of Government, to provide means of bestowing, in some manner, if possible, the surplus of the population. It is the interest of Government to do so. The individuals will be benefitted – the country to which they go, will reap advantages from their labour, and the Country which they leave, will, *pro tanto*, be served by their absence. We only regret the inability of the State to accomplish more. At the very utmost, (we cannot speak in round numbers, for the papers are not now before us) but take the expatriation of the Emigrants, at 10,000 persons annually, it is manifest, that on a population of seven and a half millions – a population too, which is increasing with such frightful rapidity, such a drain could not be felt. – If it went on for a series of years – say for ten, there would be only 100,000 removed; but you know well, that the County of Cork alone, would not only easily spare that number, but even after the drain, would still have, for half the year, half the hands in the Country unemployed. It is, we are sure, besides, unnecessary to remind you, that should emigration be systematized – that should this kind of carrying trade, become as it were, a permanent law of the Country, the *losses* would be speedily and regularly filled up. Carthage was a colonizing Country – so was Greece, in the days of her glory – yet it is an historical fact, when these nations had the most colonies abroad, their population was the greatest at home. Not, however, to seek in ancient history for examples, let us take into our view the state of Spain and Portugal. While these Countries were sending forth their adventurers to South America and India, their internal population has been more abundant than at any subsequent period. The Province, or as it is called, the Kingdom of Galicia, was the great outlet for the colonies – and it is remarkable, that three-fourths of the people who crossed the Atlantic from Spain, were Galicians – yet this province continued to be the most populous in Spain. The same effect would follow in the County of Cork, even if that County refused to receive the natives of Kerry or Tipperary, if it were made the sole scene

of recruiting for the colonies. It would be found after a lapse of ten years, the same circumstances continuing, that Cork would be more populous than it is at present.

Though we approve, therefore, of Emigration – though we think, for the sake of the individuals themselves, the measures of the Government in this regard, wise and salutary and humane, because these measures have, at least the effect, of diminishing the maps of national misery, we should be imposing a fallacy upon our readers, if we pretended that the old country, could receive those advantages from the system which makes so handsome a figure in Parliamentary Reports, and in speeches made in Parliament. In a word, Sir, Emigration even to ten times its present annual amount would produce upon the mass of the Irish population, remaining, no effect whatever. Before we dismiss this subject of Emigration, there is one point to which we would beg particularly to direct your attention. You are aware, that beside what Government are doing in this case, there has been for several years a constant Emigration from the North of Ireland to the United States of America. We have learned, we know not how truly, that this system is at present in as full activity as ever – and indeed the fact is demonstrable without having access to the Custom-House Books. We have read in the American Newspapers, of the efforts made by the Civic Authorities of the City of New-York, to prevent the riots which occasionally occur in that City, between the Orangemen and the Catholics. This circumstance is sufficient to shew that emigration of *Protestants* from the North of Ireland, must be very considerable indeed. The fact is, that few *Catholics* leave Ulster at all for America. The Emigrants, therefore, are almost uniformly Protestants of the Establishment and Dissenters. – But their places are not filled up in turn by Protestants. – They are generally succeeded by Catholics. Within the memory of some now living, the Catholic population of Donegall was principally confined to the Highlands of that County – they have now spread into the plain, and from circumstances, which it would be at present superfluous to enumerate, it is a fact that they are *treading out*, if we may so express ourselves, the Protestant population. The latter are retreating to the towns and to the coast – and will, in spite of the Church Establishment, and the *Regium Donum*, soon disappear altogether. In and about Newry, in the County of Down, some thirty or forty years ago, there was, comparatively speaking, a considerable Protestant population. These have almost altogether disappeared, and their places have been supplied by Catholics. In the County of Armagh, by far the most Protestant County in Ireland, it is needless to remind you; after the circumstances of the recent Election, that a moiety of the Freeholders are Catholics, and that their amount is in a constant state of progression.

The truth is, Sir, that the Protestant population of the North, many of them certainly, consider themselves, even at this day, more in the light of colonies, than as natives of the [still?]. Among the under sort, families which have been dominated more than a century, talk of the “Irish,” as a distinct nation, as a people, hostile to them, and

among whom they are *sojourning*. No doubt, ancient predilections – the prejudices they carried with them from Scotland and England – the principles they found in the century in which they had settled – the historical circumstances however, imperfectly remembered, that attended their settlement in the reign of Elizabeth and James – the struggle they made to retain the gripe which they then fastened upon the country, but above all the difference of religion, and the state of superiority, in which they were placed by unjust laws – those things have contributed to prolong and to strengthen the disunion between the colonists and the aboriginal inhabitants – to make the former imagine that colonists they still continue – that Ireland is not their home and that in Britain they must seek for the *antiqua mater* of their race. It may be supposed too that they have more of the enterprising spirit of their progenitors, than the old Irish. *They* came from Scotland and England to better themselves, and now that the forceable divisions of the land have ceased – that their descendants cannot reap the same advantages – the latter, with the character of colonists still manifest a disposition to change their homes, somewhat similar to that which prevails in the United States, where a family will remove a thousand miles, with more indifference than a Catholic mechanic in Ireland will change from one country town to another in the same province. Perhaps, also, the circumstance of religion should be taken into account. The principles of the Presbytery – the ideas of religious freedom – the tone and the temper these considerations give to the mind, render their professors active and [...]. Whatever be the causes, the consequences have been as we have stated. The chief emigrants from the North are Protestants of one kind or other. Even there, notwithstanding the excitements of the times, Protestantism of every hue and grade is on the decrease. We do not know to what extent proselytes from Protestantism have been made. We rather think it bears no proportion to what has occurred in the West and South of Ireland, from which the Protestant colonies that existed fifty years ago, have nearly disappeared. But certain it is, that in the most Protestant parts of Ulster, Catholics are rapidly gaining the ascendancy. The town of Belfast furnishes a frequent proof. About forty years ago, there was scarcely a small congregation of Catholics; nearly a moiety of the population is Catholic at this moment.

So much for Emigration, and its consequences upon the population of Ireland.

February 17, 1827 page 3

IRISH LABOURERS IN BRITAIN.

We scarcely take up a London Paper, that does not contain Jeremiads on the subject of the terrible, intolerable, the tremendous, the frightful influx of the Irish Labourers into England and Scotland. Blessings on you FULTON, or WATT, or whoever you were, last applied the powers of Steam in Navigation! Others may laud your memory on account of the felicitous application of a great mechanical principle, and erect monuments of marble or brass to perpetuate your name. Some there are, who praise you

for establishing a safe and rapid Commercial communication between kingdoms and states. The *Quid Nunce* applaud you for bringing the Journals quickly and almost regularly to their tingling fingers – but we shall for ever bless your memory, because you have brought the sister islands – the dear and affectionate ladies, almost into actual contact. It is true, that only a little channel flowed between them – a herring brook, which a man might stride across in his seven-leagued boots if he had them. But slighter obstacles have kept as near relations at a great distance. It is therefore a most comfortable consideration – it is “most refreshing to all the finer feelings of the human heart,” that the sisters may now hold commune with each other from their own Drawing-Room windows – and that she, who though the youngest, is far the most prolific, can send her children, not by tens and twenties, as formerly, but by hundreds and thousands, to the rich and teeming domains of her eldest sister. Are we not to sink or swim together? Have we not pledged our last guinea, and last drop of blood to the Connection? Do not the two islands, is a word, form one United Kingdom? And why should not both reap all the *advantages*, such as they are, upon which each is disposed to lay so emphatic a stress? For our own parts, we are exceedingly rejoiced that Pat is *locating* himself in the County Palatine of Lancaster, that he is moving into Worcestershire – that he has penetrated into Hampshire, and that he may be found in some twenty or thirty Counties of England. Nothing can be more unnatural or hard hearted than the Scotch and English writers. Where can a destitute poor fellow go but to his rich relations? If they will not support him, who will? We send most of our Corn and Cattle to England and Scotland, and we are, thank God! sending our People rapidly after them. What would the English and the Scotchmen have? Do they think that our People will lie down and die, while the steam boat can carry them across to a land flowing with milk and honey in a few hours, and for a few pence? No, by the blessing of God starve they will not, while England opens her harbour and Scotland presents such facilities of intercourse. – We remember about sixteen or eighteen years ago, that the Ministers of the day, and the Legislature made an immense fuss about the incalculable advantages derivable from an interchange of Militias. It was to bring the two countries better acquainted with each other – it was to remove national prejudices, - in fact it was to make us in reality one, as well as in law. It may be said indeed, that the pretence was abundantly absurd – that the marching regiment is not likely to come into an agreeable contact with the People amongst whom it might take up its quarters – and the truth was, that the Irish Militia were very troublesome in England. But what an interchange of the Militias could not effect – what [...]ting fellows in red jackets could not accomplish, very modest and unobtrusive poor man in grey or blue freize will effectuate. Let them go over, therefore, and learn English manners and customs. They may teach the English peasantry morality and religion – (qualities which by their own accounts they appear woefully to want) – in return for the polish which they will doubtless derive from the intercourse. As to the building a brass wall round Great Britain which is recommended most unnaturally in some of the London Journals, we must venture, with all due deference, to question its practicability.

It is indeed, the opinion of many experienced men, that even the omnipotence of Parliament would fail in the attempt. Without going to this length, - for what is it that Parliament cannot do? - we would suggest that the expense of raising such a wall would be very considerable, and we doubt, whether in the present financial situation of the Country, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would lend a favorable ear to the plan. But if you do not build the wall, you will not keep the Irishman out. As to a *cordon sanataire*, a line of troops along the coast to drive the Irish into the sea, or a Waterguard to seize them, as they do contraband brandy - the humanity of the age - the march of "Antallac," as Mr. COBBETT, and the Scotch have it, would prevent the operation of such a design. - Go they will, and every year, every month, will be adding to the numbers. The Irish are 200,000 strong in the City of London - nay, we are satisfied that London contains as many Irishmen as Dublin does. The population of Glasgow is about 123,000, among whom are 50,000 Irish. The Mob, *par excellence*, in Manchester is Irish. In short, you will [fi]nd them every where, and having made a lodgment here they will remain, adding in despite of Malthus and Maculloch, to the productive powers of the English People. But it seems they are weighing down the *national* population? What do you mean by *National*, JOHNNY BULL? What's National in England is National in Ireland. *Tros Tyrinsve* - as PITT used to say - which being interpreted into the vulgar tongue, implies, that what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. What's the difference between us - is not Wexford as dear as Warwickshire, and Cork as precious in the eyes of our English Statesmen as Kent? To be sure they are. We have a monument to NELSON, who was an Englishman, and when the Angel of Death shall visit the great Captain of the age, you will doubtless erect a monument to WELLINGTON, who is an Irishman. Our Laws, our Customs, our Language, our Constitution, on the same, and why should not be our destinies? If you are rich, why should not *we*, who are as well circumstanced in point of climate, soil, and situation, be rich also, and if we are poor, why should you not participate in our poverty? It is nonsense, JOHNNY, to be drawing lines of demarcation between the Countries in this enlightened age. And JOHNNY, JOHNNY, remember this - that as you have brewed, so you must bake.

August 18, 1827 page 2

EMIGRATION, AND SUCCESS TO IT!

The Irish are still landing at the Broomielaw at the rate of above a thousand per week, and are spreading like locusts, over the whole surface of the country. The first thing they do on landing is to find out the habitation of a resident countryman, whom they despatch in search of employment; if he is successful, they enter at half the wages people are usually in the habit of paying, and if he fails in his mission, they know the worst, for it generally follows, that, their funds being exhausted, they must either beg, steal, or starve. Some have got it into their heads that it is incumbent on the police to relieve them in their destitute state with clothes and food, and one of them appeared at

the Calton police office a few days ago, claiming those essentials, when he was committed as a vagrant. The officers at the Broomielaw have received orders to number them as they arrive, but for what reason we as yet have not learnt. – *Scotsman*.

The emigration of the poor destitute and miserable inhabitants of Ireland into this quarter of the country still continues without statement. On Sunday morning two steam [boats] brought over about 150 each; and it is ascertained, that during the last week about 1800 persons of this description were added to the population of this city and neighbourhood. When informed that there will be no harvest work in this quarter for several weeks, and that there are already more than a sufficiency of hands for this sort of employment, many of them expressed a determination to find their way to the northern counties of England, in expectation of the harvest being earlier begun there. They say that they have no fear of getting work from the farmers, as they will work for whatever wages are offered them, and that such is the state of misery that they were in at home, they cannot be worse go where they will. *It is pretty well ascertained that, during the last six weeks, the number of labourers who have arrived from Ireland is about twelve thousand.* – *Glasgow Chronicle*.

August 21, 1827 page 3

EMIGRATION AND SUCCESS TO IT.

It is conjectured that upwards of 3,000 Irish labourers have passed through Newark this season, seeking harvest work, and many of them seem quite destitute. One ironmonger alone (in the Market-place) has sold to them nearly 1,400 pickles, and as there are three more ironmongers in the town, the calculation is quite moderation. – *Doncaster Gazette*.

There is a vast influx of Irish labourers, at this season, in to West Riding of Yorkshire. At Huddersfield, the number is so great that it is with difficulty they can find shelter during the night. The farmers all the way from the western to the eastern coast are quite pestered with applications for employment from these half-famished people. – *Sheffield Mercury*.

[We are not sorry for this fact. We have made Ireland, by misgovernment, the wretched country it is; and its despairing inhabitants now sw[i]m to our shores, and undersell, in the market for labour, even our own overworked and half fed peasantry.] – *Examiner*.

DESTITUTE IRISH. – The *Scotsman* says, according to the *Glasgow Chronicle*, upwards of 12,000 of these creatures had landed on Sunday night, and on Monday evening a fresh migratory band of 350 was landed by the Fingal steam-packet. Only eighteen-pence a head was charged for their passage. – When told that it would be some

time ere the harvest commenced, and that it was needless for them to expect employment, they coolly answered that they would labour for any thing, no matter how little, and declared that they could not possibly be worse off than they were in their own country.

September 8, 1827 page 4

IMPROVEMENT of IRELAND.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE D. E. POST.

SIR – I send you a copy of a Plan for the benefit of the Poor, which I received from a friend high in office and much respected. I am very anxious that the subject should be discussed prior to the meeting of Parliament, and fully considered by the Proprietors and Friends of Ireland. It is always observed, that the consideration of our necessities, or of any proposition for our advantage, is brought forward so late in the Session as to render its consideration or adoption impracticable.

I would, therefore, most anxiously wish that a meeting of those Noblemen and Gentlemen, most interested for Ireland, should take place in October or November, when some plan should be agreed upon to be submitted to Parliament. The plan I now send you, however well intended, would, I fear, fall from want of funds, if no other reason, for it would be difficult to obtain the voluntary subscription of one per cent. In the course of my life I have observed the rise and the fall of very many schemes for the relief of our People and for their Education; I have subscribed to them all, and have only escaped frequent disappointment by the extreme moderation of my hopes. Without money nothing effectual can be done, and the money can only be obtained by a tax, or by a project of such probable advantage as would induce capitalists to embark in the speculation. The Joint Stock Company for reclaiming the bogs and waste lands, would probably have been very useful and prosperous, if it had been incorporated by Act of Parliament. Of the plan of Mr. Owen, many parts were not only practicable, but most applicable to this country; they were, however, borne down by being associated with what was visionary, or contrary to received opinions. Mr. Cropper's projects would probably have continued or increased the misery they were intended to relieve. I shall say nothing of the Farming Society, the Dublin Society, the Education Society, or the many Associations for Promoting Industry; they have almost always ended in miscarriage or in job.

The country is now in the midst of one of the most plentiful harvests I ever remember; the poor, generally speaking, have potatoes that will carry them to March; the country, almost every where, is peaceable and quiet; it is the very best moment to discuss plans for our improvement, and the prevention of renewed misery. Emigration for the benefit of the country it, I believe, impracticable. Propositions for poor laws, absentee tax, interference with the Church, or repeal of the Union, will not be listened

to by the rich, nor the doctrines of Malthus or McCulloch by the more rational, because less sophisticated poor. It would be most desirable to devise, if possible, such employment for a large body of people as would hold out a security of repayment, with interest of the money advanced for the undertaking. – With this object in view, I know nothing so likely to be a great national benefit as the formation of a ship Canal from Galway to Dublin; it would give a new and Great stimulous to the trade of England; it would shorten by one-third the duration of an American or West India voyage; it would put an end to the dangers of the channel, whether arising from storms or from steam privateers; in conjunction with the projected Canals from Portsmouth to London, and from the Bristol to the British Channel, it would make the finest system of internal Navigation in the world, if made on a permanent, uniform and grand scale. Ireland affords peculiar and very remarkable facilities for such an undertaking; though mountainous to the North and to the South, the centre is an extensive plain, no where more than 270 feet above tide-water, the soil of easy excavation, the land of small value in its present state, though the very cutting of the Canal would drain and improve near half a million of acres, growing food, and giving employment to as many persons, and securing the repayment of the capital expended. I have known similar land in Ireland to have advanced from one penny to 5 pounds in less than 10 years by the formation of a Canal. I have no doubt the undertaking would create a fund of wealth and prosperity, exceeding the most sanguine expectations of our friends, and laying the foundation of permanent improvement, hitherto wished for in vain.

I have to apologize for taking up so much of your valuable time; the cause will be sufficient excuse to you. I am not personally interested or influenced by any other feeling than love of Ireland, and I do not urge the adoption of any plan without full discussion and inquiry by more competent judges than your very humble servant,

CLONCURRY.

NOTE. – Distance from Galway to Dublin 133 miles, of which a Boat Canal is already made to Ballinasloe, 90 miles.

May 14, 1829 page 3

POOR LAWS IN IRELAND

We refer to some recent accounts from Manchester, and we do so, after the *Morning Chronicle*, with a view to the state of the Irish Poor.

Independent of the abstract justice of the measure, the Reader cannot fail to have observed that the English Writers advocate the extension of Poor Laws to Ireland, on the ground of the mischiefs which the influx of Irish Poor cause to the Poor of England.

But it is not in the columns of the Diurnal Press alone or in Pamphlets, that this practical view of the case is given. We would beg leave to call to the recollection of Mr. SPRING RICE, (for whom personally and politically, it is, we hope, unnecessary for us to say that we entertain a high respect), the evidence delivered by himself before the Emigration Committee. His opinion, we dare say, remains unchanged upon all the topics to which he addressed himself on that occasion. One of the most remarkable statements he made regarded the influx of the Irish Poor into England, and the deterioration in consequence of the state of the English Poor. He put this point, if we remember rightly, and we think we have a tolerably accurate recollection of his very important testimony, in a variety of forms, and he proved to our minds most conclusively, that if some remedy were not found for the manifold evils of Ireland, the Working Classes of England, would, in a short time, be reduced to the miserable level of their Irish fellow-subjects.

It is needless to add, that events have fully corroborated the arguments of the Honorable Member, and it is only necessary to refer again to a statement of the occurrences at Manchester and Roshdale, in order to prove, first – that the distresses in Lancashire have been very [...] increased by the accumulation of Irish Weavers in that County; and secondly – to show that the excesses committed were principally alleged to be the work of the starving Irish, who had no claims for parochial relief.

The object of the Emigration Committee was manifestly to demonstrate that Emigration afforded a remedy, though perhaps not an adequate one, to the evils arising from the excess of a labouring population. Of this opinion was Mr. SPRING RICE himself, and of this opinion, notwithstanding all we have heard to the contrary since, we continue to be the steadfast advocates.

But from the tone of public men, from the indifference of Ministers, and the conduct of Parliament, it is impossible not to observe, that it is a remedy which there appears no present disposition to adopt.

Mr. SPRING RICE is also an advocate of the Subletting Act. We quarrel with him not for his opinion on this subject. The state of the sub-tenant was miserable indeed – he was liable to double and treble distress, and the lands were out up into such minute portions as rendered the hope of productive farming almost chimerical in many parts of the country – while the Freehold System had a tendency, we do not deny it, to cover the land with a pauper population. It is now quite clear, however, that the operation of the Subletting Act has been, and will continue to be, to throw the tenantry out of their holdings, while the Disfranchisement Bill removes the only chance the Poor possessed, of obtaining some consideration from their Landlords.

Now, the Flying Bridges, as Mr. SPRING RICE very aptly termed the steam-boats will convey thousands and tens of thousands of these poor houseless creatures to the shores of England. For our own parts we are delighted at the change which Steam

Navigation has made in the intercourse between the sister islands. Pat has a ready and cheap opportunity of visiting his rich relations, and though he cannot, perhaps, better his condition by the change, he will force his dear friends, for their own sakes, to devise some means to keep him at home. We owe much to this noble invention, but Ireland ought to be particularly grateful to the inventor.

The Irish landlords, we speak in the aggregate, of course, for we do not forget the Earl of DARNLEY and CHARLES BROWNLOW, are adverse, it cannot unfortunately be disputed, to the introduction of any system of Poor Laws into Ireland. Some of them [...] the measure on the ground of humanity! This is excellent. We suppose that it is on the same ground of humanity that all “notices to quit” have been recently agreed on the tenantry. What are to become of those who are ejected? Is the City of Limerick, for instance, to become the asylum of the poor who vegetated on one of the estates of the Earl of DERRY, so well described in the testimony of Mr. STANLEY? Some hundred of those creatures were turned off. They hid themselves in the hovels in the vicinity of Limerick, and received such support as the people of that City could afford, or perished in the most fruitful part of Ireland, of absolute starvation. Was this right? Should the people of Limerick be taxed to support Lord DERRY’s poor? The Poor of Kildare periodically add to the wretchedness of Dublin, and the benevolence of the citizens is [assessed] for their sustenance. Should this be so? Why should not the Duke of LEINSTER support his own poor? We know there is not a more excellent man than his Grace. We have heard and we believe that he is making great improvements in his vast possessions; that a better class of houses are succeeding those filthy hovels, which used to hurt ones eyes so much along the road, and that to really improving tenants, he is a most liberal landlord. We admit all this – we are satisfied that if he can go on, his estates will ultimately yield him double his present income. But if he have the right to make the most of his land – if he have the right, as he clearly has, to augment his rental, we submit whether he is not bound by corresponding duties. Now if his Grace do not feel himself so bound (and we select his instance, because the Duke of LEINSTER is really a kind man,) we would ask are the citizens of Dublin bound to maintain them? But he is bound, and so is every landlord in Ireland respectively; and it will be the fault of the Legislature, if Law be wanted to teach them their duties.

Oh! but the people have accumulated so enormously that they would devour the whole rental of the land. Now if population be an evil according to the modern doctrine, who brought this evil on the country? Did it not arise altogether from the gross negligence, or the absurd cupidity of the landlords themselves? And the creatures who have been called into existence by their system to be starved, because they have found out, in the eleventh hour, that population is an evil, and large farms a good? And now as to the rental, though we deny them it would be [...] injured as they calculate, we would beg leave to ask, is it more desirable that Famine and Pestilence should cling to an entire

people, than the Lords of the Soil should only receive a portion of their ordinary income? Do they really suppose that the People of the land were only made *for them* – or that Government was instituted only with a view to their profits alone? That all other considerations should be thrown into the shade when their interests happen to come into competition? If the Irish Landlords think so, we hope, and trust, and *believe*, they will find themselves egregiously mistaken. And after all, what peculiar claim have they upon the British Government? They have cost that Government enough. John Bull had paid dearly for them and their Church. He has been obliged to support, on an average of years, about 30,000 soldiers annually in Ireland, for preserving the peace. To him, they have been not only useless but a burthen. It is unnecessary to say that we are speaking generally – for we know there are many admirable exceptions, but it is a fact, that cannot be denied, that for the last twenty years Ireland has not been enabled to support her own establishments – though the Landlords of Ireland, if they had only common prudence, have during all that time been receiving an income infinitely less embarrassed than the rental of England is – and the Church of Ireland is notoriously the most shamefully opulent in the world.

1.3 *DMR – Dublin Morning Register*

May 2, 1826 page 2

EMIGRATION.

The following letter has been received by Mr. Graham, of Limerick, in reply to a communication forwarded by him to the Lords of Treasury, respecting a section of the Act for regulating vessels bound with passengers for the British Settlements in North America, which required for each person a certain quantity of Rice, Barley, &c., articles not used by the people of this country, and which consequently must have been felt by all passengers as a heavy and unnecessary expense: -

Treasury Chambers, 11th April, 1826.

SIR – Having laid before the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury your Petition, praying relief in regard to the restrictions imposed by the Act 6th, Geo. 4, cap. 146, upon Vessels sailing from Ireland with Passengers to the British Settlements in North America, I am commanded by their Lordships to acquaint you that they have authorized the Commissioners of Customs to permit the shipment of Butter, Potatoes and Herrings on board vessels of the above description, instead of the articles required by the 7th section of the Act, 6th Geo. 4th, cap. 116, upon condition that the quantity be sufficient and wholesome, and the Passengers fully apprized of the articles which are to be shipped for them, and are satisfied therewith.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

W. HILL.

To Mr. John Graham, General

Ship Agent, Limerick.

August 26, 1826 page 3

EMIGRATION.

(From the Times.)

The report lately printed by the Emigration Committee will be read with considerable interest, even by those who reluctantly and partially coincide in the views which it discloses. It is a good surgeon who knows how to amputate a limb, but he has more ability who effects the cure without so severe an operation. At first sight it appears very plausible to recommend the transporting, to other countries, of large bodies of the King's subjects, who possess no means of decent subsistence at home. When, however, we proceed a little further into the subject, the immediate application of such an

experiment to practice presents us with two points for consideration: - 1st, The injustice of the proposal, without striving, by some inquiry into the causes of the redundant population, to ascertain whether a remedy less heart-breaking than the final abandonment of their native country might not be found effectual for a portion at least of the paupers of England, and for a certain time. – 2d, Whether the real difficulties, in the way of an experiment, on a scale corresponding to the acknowledged nature of the exigency, have been fully taken into account by the Committee. It may be stated that England, Ireland, and Scotland, with the aptitude of each to profit by the measures recommended, are embraced by the views of the Committee, and referred to in its report. The fact of a redundant population is given, and serves as the basis of all the remarks and propositions detailed in the report. The causes of it are but incidentally touched upon by the Committee, although they are explained in the evidence more at length, and they ought, we think, to be maturely weighed before any new plan of dispeopling the country shall be adopted. It is obvious, that in looking at the manufacturing parts of England, and at Ireland as a whole, the same passion has acted upon two classes of men in very opposite circumstances, and has, through different modes of operation, tended, in both islands, to a similar result. The cupidity of the manufacturer here has occasioned an eager demand for manufacturing labourers, which, though exhibited in irregular and unequal paroxysms, has been, upon the whole, progressive throughout a period of 30 years; and calling into activity immense numbers of hands previously employed in agriculture, while it encouraged marriages which brought millions more into life, the fruits have been an increase to the inhabitants of Great Britain far beyond that amount to which the power that engendered them could furnish a continued and competent subsistence. This stimulus, displayed by the manufacturing interest, has been all along reinforced and sharpened by the excess of paper money, or, in other words, by the universal system of running in debt, and further, by the unwise administration of the poor laws. In Ireland the improvident rapacity of the landlord has produced the same effect as that of the English manufacturers, and the Irish gentleman did not require for this purpose the help of poor laws or of paper money. He multiplied *ad infinitum* the tenants on his land, as the manufacturers of England did the occupants of their workshops; and his grand auxiliary was the barbarism of a people who had no taste for the comforts of life, but offered their weight in silver for potatoes. In England, so far as the manufacturers now thrown out of bread are concerned, such a reduction in the price of bread ought to be effected, as would enable them to live on the wages which their employers could afford. A repeal of the corn laws, therefore, ought to be tried, before recourse was had to the caustic or knife of emigration. With regard to Ireland and to the agricultural paupers of England, we do not see how any measure of domestic policy can supply the employment of which large multitudes stand in need; but we are bound to add, that neither the report nor the evidence suggests to us a satisfactory or sufficient plan for carrying into effect the required alternative of emigration. It is stated, and we believe the statement, that tracts of land, of undefined

extent, and of unequalled quality, may be found in the British Colonies of North America, Southern Africa, and New Holland, with its dependencies, quite equal to the location of as many millions of emigrants as it can be conjectured that this country will furnish throughout a long futurity. How to transport our poor countrymen to these 'hills of refuge,' is the sole knot to be untied. The Committee informs us, that an average of 20l. each will suffice for the conveyance of emigrants to Canada or New Brunswick, and for their first settlement there. It is proposed that the sum so required shall be raised by annuities for a given number of years, of 3l. 10s. 9d. for each sum of 80l., assumed as the cost of a family of four persons. Now only imagine the expence of such a measure, if executed on any scale of such magnitude as would make itself felt as a relief. One hundred thousand emigrants to Canada would cost two millions of money. But it would take half a million of people, at least, to accomplish any sensible relief to the United Kingdom, and a prime cost of no less than ten millions sterling. Could this be attempted with any prospect of success? Could the estimate be regarded as fully equal to the expenditure? Then, again, how could a great and sudden increase of inhabitants find food in any of our colonies? And if not a great and sudden efflux from England, what relief should we experience? Emigrants from the Weald of Kent to New York cost but 13l. a piece. Why is this Government so much less expert as an economist? Of the expence of transporting to New Holland we have experience enough on that subject – enough to deter us from an extension of that scheme to any magnitude capable of assisting our mass of paupers. As to Irish landlords subscribing sums of money, or incurring rent-charges to a liberal amount, it is a pure vision. They are themselves but an order of more gentlemanly paupers; and many of them might be fitter subjects for emigration in their own persons, than promoters of its advantages in behalf of others. With respect to English parishes, the case is different. We are of opinion, that the poor's-rate might be mortgaged beneficially for the removal of their poor. But in this country the first obligation upon Parliament is to try a repeal of the Corn Laws, which might keep our working classes at home, instead of first taxing the nation, that the land-owners may sell dear bread; and then taxing it a second time, to feed elsewhere those whom, for the sake of these same land-owners, we have rendered unable to purchase it.

September 4, 1826 page 2

Are not there "Bog Commissioners?" We think we have heard of such functionaries – but really one loses the traces of individual inquisitors, in the mob of those who are appointed, Sessions after Sessions, to ascertain our miseries, and suggest modes of relief – and whose voluminous narratives, and, we may call them, expostulations, are regularly "stuffed into the improvement baskets, and forgotten."

We will not, in order to find some fragments of the lucubrations of the Bog Commissioners, turn up the mountain of documents which had been printed, within the last half score years, "by order of the House of Commons," but we can easily refer to the

files of the Weekly Register, for some memoranda relative to the topic of the enquiry, put upon record by certain brother Commissioners who sat and reported to Parliament in 1819.

Ireland is always wretched, but in latter times it would seem that in every fourth year the entire country is threatened with desolation from famine or pestilence, or both. We had the “typhus” in 1818. – We had the starvation in 1822. We have the typhus and the starvation in 1826. When two or three provinces are in typhus or starvation – when death journeys along the fields with the breeze from the mountains – when districts are receiving the extreme unction, and preparing, in all the hopelessness of tranquil despair, for the grave – then a [stir arises] in Collective Wisdom, and a “Select Committee” is appointed. We witnessed a movement of this description in the Session following the season of “typhus.” The Select Committee proceeded with celerity enough to enable the public to know their sentiments, and see the extent of their investigation, about the middle of September, 1819 – more than seven longyears “from the present writing.” They began their report by stating that the “contagious fever” (or typhus) was only a “calamitous indication of the general distress of Ireland.” They proceeded to touch upon expedients to remove, or mitigate, this “general distress,” and they glanced at the Bogs. With regard to these they stated, they ascertained that there were no fewer than 100 millions of acres (about the one-sixth of the whole island) which were unreclaimed, but which were perfectly reclaimable. They stated, that besides there were fifteen hundred thousand acres of mountain, also unreclaimed, and perfectly reclaimable. They stated that the bogs and mountains might be placed in a condition to render England, in reference to corn, entirely independent of the Continent, and besides to provide for an additional Irish population of two millions. All this was alleged more than seven years ago, by one of the Collective Wisdom’s “Select Committees.” To lead the Committee to its conclusions, there were all sorts of depositions. The Government Engineers, and the Lords and Gentlemen, of all shades of politics, who are usually consulted when enquiries are on foot, contributed their portion of testimony. Alexander Nimmo went even into a history of the Dutch and Westphalian drainages. He told all about what was effected at Nieuwenkoop, and Zovenheven, and Mydrecht, and twenty other places. Not contented with this, the Committee had from him all that was to be learned from the law books and other records, about the fens of England – touching which, by the way, there is this interesting and curious fact, that they have been objects of Acts of the Legislature in all reigns from Elizabeth’s downwards, though we believe there is not as yet as much as one statute in the countless volumes that encumber our shelves relative to drainage in Ireland. All that this luminary and the host of witnesses could communicate was submitted to Collective Wisdom more than seven years ago; and there were, besides, the sage recommendations of the “Select Committee” themselves. Still, to this hour, nothing has been done with regard either to bogs or mountains; but a new mania has seized

official folk, which manifests itself in plans for transporting people to the Canadas and still more remote quarters of the globe.

What is to be done in the Canadas? Why, there are unproductive districts which may be rendered available to the production of human food by the ordinary process of reclamation. Forests are to be cut down, morasses to be drained, and wastes to be fenced and sub-divided. To turn all these into profitable land, people are to be shipped off at 20l. a head, and they are to be provided, it seems, in some instances, with sums of 80l. each, "to be raised (if that be practicable) on annuity of 3l. 10s. 9d. for sixty years, interest being taken at four per cent." Well, all this is called a wise and salutary contrivance to get rid of forty or fifty thousand people, (for that is the largest number that seems to be embraced in the calculations of our worthy experimentalists,) and means of providing AT HOME for an additional population of two millions are neglected, notwithstanding all that was said seven years ago by the Committee appointed at that season to humbug the nation. What an age! – and what a Government!!! To talk of sending people to cut down the forests of Canada, and draw riches from wastes at the Cape of Good Hope, New South Wales, and even Van Diemen's Land, while there are immeasurable tracts in our own country that only want the cultivator's hand to be sources of wealth and comfort to millions unborn. But perhaps we over-value these tracts. Let us have the very words of the 1819 Committee themselves: -

"Upon the extent (they say) to which internal improvement and agricultural speculation may be pursued, with a confident expectation of adequate and permanent benefit in Ireland, your Committee refer with satisfaction to the able and scientific evidence contained in the Appendix. It proves the immense amount of land in Ireland EASILY reclaimable, and convertible to the production of grain, ALMOST WITHOUT LIMITATION FOR EXPLOIT."

Again –

"It appears in evidence that there are of reclaimable bog in Ireland two millions of Irish acres, of a soil suited to the production of grain. The mountain districts of Ireland, at present comparatively unproductive, are capable of high improvement; they consist of about one and a half millions of Irish acres, of which it appears that about one half is suitable for agriculture, the remainder for much improved pasturage, for rearing or dairy purposes; and the entire eminently suitable for planting, much of the worst of it having been old forest land. A reference to the reports alluded to will evince the great source of employment which the improvement of the bogs of Ireland would offer to the population, and the facility of transport by canals through such level lines, would insure to England supplies of grain at moderate prices, which might render it WHOLLY INDEPENDENT OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR THE FOOD OF ITS AGRICULTURAL POPULATION."

These are the words of the Committee-men. They speak of the millions of acres, and their witness, Alexander Nimmo, speaks of the millions of men whom the acres may be rendered capable of supporting. Now these Committee-men and their witnesses were fools and pretenders to knowledge, or they were not. If they came under the former designation, what a pretty thing is Collective Wisdom, and what admirable fellows are the Ministers by whom its deliberations were directed, for the witnesses are the highly salaried officers of the Government, or the local authorities whom they generally consult, and the Committee were even the “select,” or elect, (for that is a more favourite phrase,) of Collective. If, on the other hand, the examiners and deponents were not Ideots or ignoramuses – if they were the wisest heads and best depositaries of information that could be found at the time, what rational excuse is now to be offered to a people that were suffering in 1819, and that have been suffering since for the cushioning of the project of that year, and the recommendation to send people to the extremities of the earth to turn forests and morasses into corn fields. We call on the public to take the earliest opportunity of putting this question to his Majesty’s Councillors, through the medium of some description of petitions or remonstrances to the new Parliament – and we most strenuously recommend to adventurers of all descriptions, to take no heed of the representations of the “Emigration” gentry, until the question is satisfactorily answered. If the public money is to be given as a bounty to men to hew wood and draw water, in the name of common fair play and common reason let it not be spent in the country of rattle snakes or of tigers, while there is an acre of the three millions and a half to be reclaimed at home.

September 26, 1826 page 2

It is generally surmised that some measures will be proposed as soon as Parliament meets, to be founded on the Emigration Report. We do not think it likely to succeed. If tried at all, it should have been tried when the finances of the country were in a more prosperous state, for the poor rates now consume so much money that few parishes can command the necessary means for promoting emigration. The money could be better employed at home. We still think that the proposed emigrants might be more advantageously occupied in the cultivation of waste lands here. We should like to see a Committee of Inquiry into the feasibility of this suggestion appointed. – *Sunday Times*.

December 13, 1826 page 2

IRISH LANDLORDS.

A correspondent informs us that the following circular is about, immediately, to be put into the hands of every Irish Member of Parliament who manifests the least disposition to serve this unfortunate country: -

SIR – I take the liberty to call your attention to a grievance which appears to me well worthy your consideration. You must be aware that leases are generally made without any clause to enable the tenant to surrender the premises to the landlord, although from a change in the price of agricultural produce, or from any other causes – the lands so let may be reduced in value to such an extent as to render it impossible for the tenant, even with the utmost attention and industry, to make near the amount of the rent to which he is subject. – This case not unfrequently occurs; where a large fine has been paid, and where valuable improvements have been made. The fine and the improvements the tenant is willing to sacrifice, and yet the landlord refuses to exonerate him from the obligations of his lease. This is, surely, a great hardship, and must be admitted to be in many instances oppressive and unjust. In the country where large tracts of ground have been let, and by the tenant again sub-divided and re-let, the injury is most serious and extensive. The immediate tenant, finding that he must pay the rent in full, and that a surrender of his lease will not be accepted, is, in his own defence, compelled to distrain and oppress his under tenants, who are thereby goaded into violent proceedings, and induced to resist the regular course of the law. They enter into secret combinations – they destroy or rescue the property under seizure – they serve threatening notices – and the peace of the entire country is thus disturbed.

I think it is right to call your attention to this plain statement of facts; and I would respectfully suggest, that the landlord should be compelled to accept of a surrender of lands or houses, after due notice in all cases in which a fine has been paid, or valuable improvements have been made. – In such cases the landlord cannot complain of buying the intrinsic and real value of the property restored to him, being actually greater than it was when first taken by the tenant. – An act to this effect would, I am convinced, do much towards tranquillizing some of the most disturbed districts in Ireland, and would also prevent that dilapidation which so frequently occurs.

A LANDLORD.

March 29, 1827 page 3

EMIGRATION.

After all the talk about the tens of millions, which it was gravely contended that Parliament would do and to endeavour to raise, in order to encourage Emigration on a *grand* scale, we find that the sum to be actually applied to this magnificent undertaking, in 1827, is only £20,480, very nearly *one-half* of which is to be expended in “surveys and enquiries,” now in progress in Canada and Nova Scotia!!

This is the *Parturiunt montes*, with a vengeance!

THE THIRTY-NINE REASONS.
TO MR. STANLEY, M. P. FOR PRESTON.

SIR – The mantle of Mr. Wilmot Horton has fallen upon your shoulders, and you are now Under Secretary for the Colonial Department. “Emigration” is most likely the endorsement on the first bundle of papers that attracted your attention on entering the closet of your very enlightened and well-meaning predecessor. Many bundles there are which have no higher destiny than these, belonging to your own department, which related to a mode of affording a market for the redundant corn of New South Wales, and also of providing magazines for the people of that country of droughts and inundations in times of famine. Their object was, most unquestionably, to effect in the instance of this people “an encrease of human comforts,” and as they had merely that end in view, they were, of course, said a writer in the Edinburgh Review “stuffed into the improvement baskets, and forgotten.” It is evident that this will not be the fate of the Emigration bundles – for some time at least. They afford still considerable employment to the Parliamentary printers, and the Government, notwithstanding the condition of the potato fields, must redeem its pledge of bringing them again under consideration in the ensuing Session of Parliament. On you, Sir, most probably will devolve the task of explaining what they suggest to his Majesty’s Ministers – and, indeed, of considering what they ought to suggest. You are yet, we dare say, considerably undecided, and even unread, on the subject; and as we are bound to republish the THIRTY-NINE REASONS for a bold demand of English succour in a season of Irish misery, with which we lately furnished your friend Mr. Lamb, we shall seize the opportunity of giving you a short view of what is afloat in the public mind of this country, on a question to which so much of its attention has been given, and which is certainly so very vital and momentous.

The people here are persuaded that the Emigration scheme is idle and impracticable, and that it will end in mere talk. They know that to be effective, it would involve an expenditure of fifteen or twenty millions, and that he might almost as well attempt to wipe off the national debt itself, as to raise and appropriate that sum under present circumstances.

The Emigration Committee speak of expending 75,000*l.* by way of experiment, in “locating” 1,200 families in the North American Colonies. There are hundreds of parishes in Ireland that would not be effectually relieved without the removal of this number of families; and against mere experiments, we all, in the existing state of things, enter our solemn protest. An experiment on 1,200 families in the North American Colonies could not be fairly tried in fewer than four or five years, and within that space of time our population, at the present rate of progression, would receive an increase of one million or twelve hundred thousand souls.

There is, Sir, a domestic system of “location” which we could consider preferable to all schemes of foreign colonization, if even the latter could be effected without any pecuniary sacrifice, - we mean that which has for its object the turning of our own wastes into profitable land, and the data upon which our opinions on this subject are grounded, are as follows: -

Eighteen years ago, a Commission, which cost upwards of 21,000l., was appointed to inquire into the nature and extent of the wastes in Ireland. This Commission pursued its inquiries for four or five years, and as a general result of its labours, it has been ascertained –

That more than a fourth of the island, or three millions and a half of Irish acres, are waste and unprofitable.

That nearly the whole of these acres are capable of being rendered sources of food and occupation.

That there is no bog land in the world that presents such facilities to the reclaimer’s process, as that of Ireland, the best manures being at hand, and six-sevenths of it being one continuous tract of country, communicating with the capital, and placed under circumstances most favourable for draining in the first instance, and the disposal of its produce afterwards.

That good land can be obtained at seven years’ purchase in Ireland, by reclaiming bogs.

And, finally, “that bogs (Nimmo) may be converted into arable land at an expence which need hardly ever exceed the gross value of one year’s crop produced from them.”

To these conclusions, Sir, did the five years’ labours of the Royal Commissioners lead. They were known to the public in 1814, when the last of four reports was printed and circulated. There is not a proposition advanced in these reports which had not subsequently received the sanction of a Parliamentary Committee. In 1818, one of these seasons of famine which philanthropists sought to guard against in New South Wales, visited Ireland. Besides famine, there was the usual concomitant of pestilence; and, indeed, the Parliamentary Committee to which we have just alluded, and which was appointed to inquire into the state of our laboring poor, declared it was their opinion, that the pestilence was only “a calamitous indication of the general distress” then prevalent in Ireland. The Committee were called upon to recommend measures “remedial and preventive;” and they pointed first of all to the bogs and waste lands. With regard to these they furnished new evidence corroborating all that was submitted to the Legislature and the Government by the Royal Commissioners. They [...] published the principal portion of the reports of these Commissioners; and they wound up all they had

to submit on this grand head of inquiry, by stating it on their solemn and deliberate opinion, after all they read and heard, that the reclaiming of the waste lands of Ireland would, in itself, provide “for an additional agricultural population of two millions,” that is, for as many human beings, as it would take twenty millions of pounds sterling at the lowest possible calculation to “locate” in the North American colonies.

Now, Sir, it is not at all strange, under these circumstances, that there is in Ireland a strong predilection for the domestic scheme of “location.” – We pray you to give it your best attention before you join in recommending the preposterous experiment of shipping off 1,200 families at an expense of 75,000l. Look at the four Reports of the Bog Commissioners, beginning in 1809, and ending in 1814; look at the Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Irish famine and pestilence in 1819; examine the statements of the Government Engineers, the practical agriculturists, and man of science, contained in these Reports; and if you be not of opinion with us that we should look exclusively to the cultivation of our domestic means of relieving the wants of our people, and leave the Canadian swamps and wildernesses as a dernier resort, you want the statesman-like qualities of understanding, and the range of intelligence, for which we are now disposed to believe that public rumour gives you very just credit.

We assume, Sir, that no money at all should be spent upon a Canadian experiment. We assume that there should be a very liberal expenditure on Irish bogs – though we are aware that if our wise rulers gave us an Act of Parliament, such as they were advised to do by the Royal Commissioners sixteen years ago, much good might have been done from private enterprise alone. Public aid is certainly now indispensable. It should, we say, be granted liberally by the English Parliament and English people, and we think we satisfactorily shew why, in our THIRTY-NINE REASONS, for which, Sir, without further detaining you, we beg leave to make reference to the fourth page of our present publication.

October 2, 1827 page 2

EMIGRATION REPORT – THE DEPOPULATING SYSTEM.

It will be seen that there is another Emigration Report out. It gives a representation of the “depopulating system” which is truly frightful. But when was this “depopulating system” commenced, which now threatens anarchy and desolation to the entire Island? Leslie Foster gave testimony before the House of Lords on the 23d of February, 1825, and he then said it was, at least, TWO years old. He entered into descriptions which we shall presently have occasion to resort to, and he concluded one narrative thus: -

“The Landlords of Ireland are at length deeply convinced, that though a stock of cattle or sheep will afford profit, a stock of mere human creatures, unemployed, will

afford none: and they, therefore, are acting upon that principle even in the extreme. If your Lordships ask me what becomes of this surplus stock of population, it is a matter on which I have, in my late journey through Ireland, endeavoured to form some opinion, and I conceive that in many instances they wander about the country as mere mendicants, but that more frequently they betake themselves to the nearest large towns, and there occupy, as lodgers, the most wretched hovels, in the most miserable outlets, in the vain hope of occasionally getting a day's work. Though this expectation too often proves ill-founded, it is the only course possible for them to take. Their resort to those towns produces such misery as it is impossible to describe."

All this was stated, on oath, to the Legislature, and, we may say, to his Majesty's Government, nearly three years ago, and the witness then spoke of evils of two years' standing. Yet there has not been one offer at a remedial or precautionary measure!!! – Even the Emigration Committee are unable to say how soon something dreadful may break out; - and we can well conceive, if the vile Tories were in power, how much they would affect to be astonished and horrified if Captain Rock, driven to frenzy by mere hunger and despair, had interrupted the peace of one townland out of all the parishes of Ireland.

October 9, 1827 page 3

PROSPECTS FOR IRELAND!

Sir H. Parnell says the distress of the lower classes is so great that there is a growing indisposition in the higher to reside in the country, "I have received letters of late which induce me to believe, not only that it contributes to produce an indisposition among absentees to return to Ireland to reside there, but that it contributes very much to induce those gentlemen who are now resident to become absentees. . . . I have received a letter from a nobleman who has always been residing on his estate, in which he says, 'What can we do? Landlords will not surrender their rents, and of course a contest will ensue between them and the people. . . . Government must take their choice between insurrection and emigration; one cannot look forward without dismay; a residence in Ireland is becoming a burthen too great to be borne; it is bad enough living in the midst of distress; any attempt to relieve the people only brings shoals of wretched beings from other places; what must it be in districts (and this will soon be the case everywhere,) in which, in addition to this, the gentry are living in daily apprehension of their houses being attacked, and their families destroyed? We must leave Ireland to Police Magistrates, and perhaps return in some years, when famine and disease and (if trade improves) a great emigration into England have improved the condition of the country."

Thus, then, we see a servile war, and famine and disease are looked forward to, as the means of purifying the atmosphere of Ireland. But the rebellion of 1798, and all the burning of cottages and outrages in its train, did not materially diminish the population,

or sensibly affect the regular rate of increase. Before any material effect could be produced [...] thinning the population by thousands [...] be filled with horror at our proceedings.

Thus then we see the most [...] announced as inevitable; we see Ireland proceeding in a career which famine and contagion can alone impede, and England gradually approaching to the state of Ireland, which it must ultimately reach.

The Emigration Committee have proposed no remedy to meet the evil. They have, however, done great good in exhibiting the evil to the country in all its hideous magnitude. Whether this awful prospect before us will stimulate the country to any corresponding exertions remains to be seen. – *Morning Chronicle*.

October 10, 1827 page 1

OPINION IN SCOTLAND RELATIVE TO EMIGRATION AND THE IRISH
WASTES.

(From the Glasgow Free Press.)

The Committee have published their Third and final Report on the subject of emigration. The document is much too long for quotation in a newspaper; but we have given to-day the substance or gist of the whole – namely, the summing up of the evidence received upon the subject, and the measures which the Committee feel justified in recommending to Government upon the strength of that evidence.

And never, it may safely be affirmed, did measures of a more visionary kind enter into the heads of Statesmen. The Committee recommend a pecuniary advance by Government, in the form of a loss, of 1,140,000l., to be spread over a surface of four years; a specified part of which sum is, during each of those four years, to be appropriated to the transportation to and location in Canada of a certain number of families from this country, until the whole sum shall be expended, and the entire complement of emigrants removed. The number of families that would thus, within the time specified, be transported to Canada, would, assuming the Committee's estimate of 60l., to each family, amount to 197,030; or – allowing, as the Committee do, five individuals to each family – 985,130 individuals.

It is on all hands allowed, that, in Ireland alone, to make emigration be at all felt as a relief, it would be necessary at once to subtract one million of individuals from its present population; while it is evident, from the rate at which population increases in that country, that, were no means adopted to prevent it, the vacuum thus caused would be again more than filled up in the given space of four years. The same principle applies equally to England and Scotland, as population, like water, from its tendency to maintain a level, always acts towards the last point of subtraction; and what then are we to think

of a remedy, which, instead of permanently removing this evil, only mitigates it for a moment, to render its recurrence more severe?

We affirm, without fear of contradiction, First – that the removal of so small a number of emigrants as is above condescended upon, would not, were they all shipped off to-morrow, be felt by the nation as a general relief; Second – that the allowance of four years for their removal, renders the measure entirely nugatory, since, during that time, their places would be again filled up; And, third – that the money expended upon their transportation and location, would never be repaid by the emigrants, as the Canadas must ere long become independent of this country, to which result nothing more powerfully tends than the gratuitous accessions of strength we would thus afford them; or, did this not occur, the emigrants would find easy means of evading our claims, by crossing the colonial frontier into the United States. This is not merely our own view of the matter it has been stated to Government by men of the highest talents and respectability, who are personally acquainted with Canada, and familiar with all the systems upon which emigration to that country has hitherto been conducted. Among these it is necessary only to specify Lieutenant-Colonel Cockburn, whose evidence before the Emigration Committee is worthy of the most serious attention.

In the face of all these facts, it were absurd to suppose that Government will, for a moment, listen to the proposed scheme of Emigration to Canada.

It is admitted by every one, and even by the Emigration Committee, that it is alone owing to the rapid increase of population in Ireland, that emigration from the United Kingdom has become at all necessary. From this it of course follows, that, could some plan be adopted to remedy the evil of superabundant population in Ireland, there would cease to be any cause for such unnatural parturitions of our “body politic” in future.

The plan here desiderated, was suggested by the Irish Bog Commissioners upwards of twelve years ago; and the idea of it has of late been revived and ably enforced in a series of excellent papers, entitled “Lessons for Mr. Lamb,” which appeared and are still continued, in the columns of the Dublin Weekly Register. Those papers, which take for the ground-work of their arguments the Reports of the above-mentioned Bog Commissioners, state, upon indisputable evidence, that there are in Ireland, in a state of utter unproductiveness, 3½ millions acres of bog and other waste lands, all of which might be brought under cultivation at an expense of only 20l. per acre, and, at the very lowest rate, yield a return of from 10 to 15 per cent the first year; while, in the majority of cases, the first crop would more than repay the whole outlay. These lands, on the lowest estimate, would sustain an additional agricultural population of two millions; the money expended in their improvement would be certainly and almost immediately repaid; and the two millions of individuals they would thus draw from the over-crowded parts of the

already cultivated districts in the kingdom, would much more than relieve us from the whole pressure of our surplus population.

Why is a plan so efficacious, and at the same time so easy of accomplishment, not instantly preferred to the visionary and impracticable scheme of foreign emigration? Schemes, as well as prophets, have no honour in their own country; else, in providing for the wants of an overgrown community, our eyes would not, under these circumstances, have both turned to any other spot than Ireland.

Let Government commence the improvement of those Irish wastes, by appropriating a certain sum, under proper conditions, to that purpose. The Irish landlords will speedily follow the example; and by this means will the small tenantry, that at present are daily rendered destitute by the progress of the "large farm consolidation" system, find new homes and employment within their own country, instead of being forced to wander into England and Scotland, and there, by their competition, render the native peasantry not less miserable than themselves. The waste lands of Ireland are capable of maintaining the whole superabundant population and ejected tenantry of that Island, until the small farm and subletting system shall have wrought itself entirely out; and from that period, as emigration from thence to this country would have altogether ceased, such an equalization of numbers among the labouring classes of the two Islands, could not fail to take place, as, under a proper order of things, would render the wish for colonial emigration not less remote than its necessity.

October 29, 1827 page 3

EMIGRATION.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE REGISTER.

SIR – I really am at a loss to understand your objection of Mr. W. Horton's emigration scheme, or your obstinacy in recommending the draining of bogs. Have they not, from the time of McMurrough, been busied, as Lord Norbury said in draining the country; and is not the country, to the great surprise of all loyal Tories, not a whit the better for the process? However, that I may not embarrass myself with two subjects, I will consent to let the draining plan remain untouched, and stick to the Emigration. I don't see why we may not have both. As for emigration, it has advantages without end; and first, it has the great recommendation with all practical men of being no innovation. It has been tried over and over again, for a long series of years in England; only they call it transportation in that country. By the assistance of Game Laws, Gaol indiscipline, and County Just-asses, they have contrived to keep down the population of England by an annual export of men highly beneficial to the general community. Upon theoretic principles, I confess Dean Swift's plan of eating the children is preferable; because it not only thins the population, but it fattens it at the same time; two great blessings, it must

be owned. But, unfortunately, on approaching the experiment, it has been found that the children of this nation have been so villainously starved, that they are not worth the expense of cookery; and moreover, there is good reason to fear that the eating of Catholic children might have a bad effect on the religious purity of the true-blue Protestants. My voice is, therefore, still for emigration. I remember a Scotchman saying that Scotland was a very fine country to come from; and the same is the case with Ireland. I fancy the emigrants would at least be as glad to get rid of us, as we should to get rid of them. The great difficulty, however, still remains untouched, namely, the class of persons who are to be entitled to the preference. This is a point on which I have thought much; I have determined to give you the benefit of my reflexions. On first approaching the subject, it struck me that the most desirable class to export would be the fire shovels. There is no class that makes a greater outcry about their poverty. They are always craving for more of the eatables and drinkables; and judging from the small sums they contribute to the First Fruits, they must be very poor indeed. Then, again, Parsons are a profitable export, because they proverbially work least and consume most of any variety of the genus homo. In the third place, they are greatly overstocked. Four Bishops, we are told, might do all the episcopal duties of Ireland; indeed half the number might suffice – one at home to convert the peasantry, and one in Parliament to vote against the Catholics. Nor is there any good reason why these offices might not be filled by two old women.

Another class of persons who might well be spared are the trading Magistrates and Grand Jury-men. They would do admirably to rough it in an infant colony; having no objection to put their hands to any sort of dirty work. I had some thoughts also of exporting the Saints, in order that they might convert the bears and the foxes of Canada, which with very little trouble they might easily make at least as good Christians as themselves. I then thought of the Corporation of Dublin and the Guild of Merchants, who would prove very serviceable abroad, by teaching the Colonials to speak good English. As to exporting the peasantry, I wondered, at first, no one ever thought of the cruelty and impolicy of spreading the contagion of Popery, by exporting a race who might starve at home and be d – d, without further trouble. But on second thoughts, I remembered that that is no affair of ours. Every one for himself, and God for all, is our motto. But then the peasantry are so numerous, and multiply so fast, and ships hold so few, and cost so much! accordingly we find the whole objection of the opponents of emigration lie in its inefficiency. To meet this evil I have hit on a plan which will vanquish all difficulties. By removing the superfluous men, we are practising at the symptom, and not at the disease; we are attacking effects, and not causes; whereas if we went to the fountain head and shipped off 100,000 plump young breeders every year, we should strike at the very root of the evil, and at a comparatively small expense, soon bring the population to a wholesome level. My scheme, therefore, consists in leaving the males to shift for themselves, and exporting only the women. Fortunately all things conspire to render this desirable. There is a great demand for womankind in New South Wales, and

the exiles would be sure of a good husband, which is not always the case at home. In exporting the women, you export all the children they would have had in this country, and their children's children also to the end of time: a benefit which increases in a geometrical ratio; and preference might be given to pregnant ladies, to render the scheme still more beneficial. By exporting the women, you would, besides, lay a powerful temptation in Paddy's way to induce him to export himself, in order to follow his sweetheart, which would be killing two birds with one stone. It has been urged against emigration that the best workmen alone would go – by my scheme we keep them at home, and send only the most injurious labourers away – namely, those whose works are constantly adding to the overstocked population. By getting rid of the women, we get rid of early marriages, and the habit of improvidence: in short, there is no end of the good to be thus effected. As to the manner of obtaining recruits, there would be little difficulty on that head; many men would be glad to part with their wives, and many wives would be glad to get rid of their husbands. The great difficulty would be to prevent the old and the ugly from volunteering, who may as well stay at home, as their vanity would be so much flattered by their being considered dangerous enough, to be selected. If the worst come to the worst, we might have recourse to press-gangs, and the ladies have, proverbially, no objection to a little pressing; or a law might pass compelling every parish to furnish a quota. The poor Curates, who are usually overburdened with children, would be glad to contribute half a dozen superfluous daughters a piece, which would amount to a large sum total. – Female children might also be kidnapped by the agents of the Hibernian Society, and educated abroad for the establishment, by which two good works would be carried on simultaneously. As to the men, who would be thrown out of employment in the marriage line, they must do the best they can for themselves. Irishmen are notorious for their success with the ladies; and there are few men now a-days who do not like neighbours' wives to the full as well as their own. If this will not do, what do you think of making those who are unprovided, Fellows of Trinity College, upon due certificate of their orthodox belief, which, of course, might be secured by the valuable consideration offered in the fellowship. If you approve of my ideas, pray take an early opportunity of hitching them into one of your Lessons for Mr. Lamb, and believe me your very hungry friend and well wisher. M.

March 8, 1828 page 3

There is something very sublime before the collective wisdom, on the subject of emigration, but not a word yet about any scheme for cultivating the natural resources of Ireland! Even the emigration project seems to be a thing to tingle upon the ear, but leave a certain other part of the body to the comforts of "hope deferred," for there is no talk of the voting away of sixteen or twenty millions to defray transport charges, and without such talk, it is worse than idle to breathe a syllable about emigration. – There is a whisper that there will be some attempt, in reference to paupers, to obstruct intercourse with

England. A pretty codicil this to the grand act of Union!! That something will be experimented on the subject we have not the least doubt – but may the plagues of Egypt seize the Irish people if they do not endeavor, by every legal and constitutional means, to render the effort memorable in British history!!

March 21, 1828 page 4

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING REGISTER.

Sir, - Influenced by feelings of commiseration for my fellow-men, I venture to solicit a portion of your columns in order through them to attract the public notice to a subject of the most appalling interest.

The season of emigration is just now commencing, and the harbor of Dublin already is crowded with shipping, waiting the first favourable wind, to transport from their native country hundreds of her most active and speculating children. With the abstract merits of the question, or with the ultimate fate of the Emigrants, in a communication of this nature, I have nothing to do, but, Sir, if so they must, it at least becomes a duty, that the utmost attention be given to their accommodation on their route, that the asperities of the path leading from all they love should be softened, at any rate that independent of the dangers of the sea, some little security should be given for their lives.

Before I advance the question, whether or no this security is afforded, permit me to lay before you a plain statement of the calamities contingent on these vessels. I speak from experience, from authentic information, having once been extensively engaged in the superintendance of passenger ships to the Colonies and United States. Imagine, Sir, a multitude of men, women, and children, stowed under the hatches, and ventilate as they will, the air is still stagnated and foul – provide against it as they may, sickness necessarily supervenes in even the first hours of the voyage. The foundation thus laid, every circumstance around encourages the susceptibility of disease – heat and filth, constantly accumulating, generate contagion, and without dwelling on the probabilities of pregnancy, accidental wounds, and the diseases of children, typhus fever at length commences its work of desolation.

Unexposed to the hardships of the sea, or unconfined in the hold of a ship, this takes place in our lanes and alleys, and even here its virulence defies professional skill and hospital accommodation. Far from assistance, what then must be the situation of those miserable beings, no remedies to be had, or else administered with destructive ignorance by the captain or his mate, and lying in the same atmosphere of pestilence which gave birth to the distemper. The horrible result is obvious. I cannot be accused with overcharging the colour of the picture, the truth itself is too melancholy to be sufficiently described. But one fact, Sir, confirmed by a name, speaks more than volumes.

In a newspaper we find the following statement, addressed to the Colonial Office, by Sir J. Kempt, the British Governor at Halifax: -

“The ship James, left Ireland for Halifax, with 160 passengers, five of whom died on the voyage, - thirty-five men left at Newfoundland, unable from illness to proceed further; the remaining 120, as well as the whole of the crew, arrived at Halifax, laboring under typhus fever.”

It now, alone remains for me to state the almost incredible truth, which principally calls forth this communication, namely, that the law requiring it being repealed, the passenger-ships are sailing without medical officers. – Good God, Sir, is this to facilitate emigration by relieving the brokers’ of expense, or are we justified in believing it a link in some conspiracy to annihilate the growing population. Your space, Sir, is too valuable, to be longer encroached on; - a word to my emigrating countrymen, and I have done. If they care not to bury themselves in these floating pest-houses, let them at least reflect on their offspring and their wives – their health, their lives should be dearer to them than their own; they should, at least for them, require the assistance of medical superintendance, and only embark in such vessels as in this respect are adequately supplied.

March, 1828.

I am Sir, your obedient servant,

NAUTICUS.

April 17, 1828 page 3

EXPORTATION OF THE POOR.

The following is the reply of Mr. W. Horton to a letter from a person in Ireland, who was preparing to take out emigrants to Canada, and requesting information on the subject from the Right Honourable Gentleman: -

“Richmond-terrace, April 3.

“SIR – I have received a letter from you, stating that you are fitting up vessels for the ‘emigration trade,’ as you call it, and requesting me to afford you information of various sorts upon the subject; among others, ‘the nature of the domicile of the emigrants in Canada,’ and ‘the sum allowed to each.’ I am extremely surprised that any person in your situation should be so totally ignorant of what the Newspapers clearly explain, with respect to what is passing in Parliament. The Bill in question, when passed into a law, will transpire as other Bills do; but that Bill has no reference whatever to any assistance of emigrants; it is merely a Bill for the regulation of passage vessels, as to certain proportions of space and certain quantities of food. At present no public money has been voted for the assistance of emigrants in any shape; and it is of the utmost importance that this fact should be distinctly understood throughout Ireland, so that

parties may not be deceived as to their real situation, and not be induced to embark under an impression that assistance of any sort awaits them in the colonies.

“As I am no longer connected with the Colonial Department, and do not hold any official situation under the Government, any applications of this sort should be directed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. – I remain, your obedient servant,

“R. W. HORTON.”

April 21, 1828 page 4

THE POOR LAWS – EMIGRATION.

In the House of Commons, on Thursday night, two important Bills connected with the Poor Law system were introduced – one by Mr. Slaney, to prevent the abuses in the mode of relieving the poor; the other by Mr. Wilmot Horton, to permit parishes to mortgage their rates, under certain restrictions, in order to remove willing paupers to the Colonies. Mr. Slaney, who adduced certainly many instances of the abusive application of the parish funds, proposed to take away the right of all able-bodied persons to parochial relief. He deprecated all criticism on his measure till it should be introduced and more fully explained; but, we fear, under no modifications or precautions can it be possible to carry the principle of Mr. Slaney’s bill into immediate effect. There is, however, a great presumption to be found that something may be done (not only without injury, but with benefit to the poor) to repress the abuses of the poor laws, in the very different effect which the system has produced in the northern and southern countries. – *Globe*.

May 15, 1829 page 2

Some of the English papers attribute the suffering which led to the late riots amongst the artizans in Manchester and other parts of England “to the competition of Irish workmen, who, accepting of almost any terms, compel the English to work for the same rate of wages.” In this some opponents of the introduction of poor laws into Ireland seem to think they discover a new proof of the truth and accuracy of their theories. It suggests to them two things – first that the Irish competitors for labour must be very numerous, and that the population here must be proportionally relieved; and, secondly, that if we had poor laws in Ireland, the competition above spoken of would cease, and the emigrant poor, with all their miseries, would return to their native country.

As to the Irish competitors for English employment there is no doubt that their number must be very large, but though they may cause great embarrassment in a manufacturing town in England, can their removal hence make any perceptible impression on the state of the country generally? And what does their emigration, and

their “accepting of almost any terms” prove? Nothing more than that they would be unspeakably miserable at home, and that they are scarcely better off abroad!

To see any thing in this competition but a picture of utter and unmitigated wretchedness, demanding a remedy in some quarter or other, however desperate; to see that it establishes any thing more than that the competitors yield to a hard, rigorous, and overwhelming necessity, which should be relieved at any cost or hazard – is to share in that odd faculty of perception, which discovers in Paddy an instinctive liking for the potato. Cobbett denies that nature had established any indissoluble tie or relationship between Paddy and “the rascally root of slavery.” He says he has seen Paddies in many parts of the world, and that he has never seen any people who are in general better supplied with *grinders* than they are. He maintains that these grinders are as fitted for any purposes to which such implements could be applied, as the best masticators of a London Alderman, and that they infinitely prefer to try their power upon the crust of a quartern loaf, than the pulp of what is supposed to be their favourite esculent. Sheer necessity, then, according to this authority, gave Ireland the distinction of being “the land of potatoes,” and the same thing produces the scenes which are now witnessed in England. The public may rely upon it, that Paddy will not “accept of any terms” until he cannot help himself, or, in other words, until his choice is merely “between living and starving.” When he is at home, he has as handsome a taste for high wages, as any other son of industry. We believe there is not a trade in this country that has not run up its wages in any instances in which the thing was practicable, even higher than the English standard. When Paddy, therefore, accepts “almost any terms” in his competition with the English artizan, he only shews that he is miserable at home and abroad, and that something ought to be done for his permanent relief. As to keeping a market open for the hapless beings who are competitors for rags and garbage in another country, we would ask what good does it do to the myriads of wretched creatures whom they leave after them? Ireland can derive no advantage from such a market, and if the market had twice more facilities, or incitements to emigration, something should be done to mitigate the sufferings of those who *must* remain at home.

We are amongst the persons who are thoroughly convinced, that the proper relief is to be found in a modified system of poor rates. In support of such a remedy for the existing evils, much may be said; but we are satisfied, for the present, to point merely to its tendency to cause more money to be spent in the country, and therefore to greatly counterbalance the mischiefs of absenteeism. Three pence a day is supposed to be the average cost of the lowest state of subsistence in Ireland at present. Poor rates would undoubtedly raise this to 5d. or 6d. – and *so much the better*, say we. The more that is spent on the subsistence of the lower orders, the better for the general weal, for the more will money be prevented from accumulating in huge masses in the upper ranks and the more equably will it be scattered amongst the middling orders. – Deplorable is it for the

small shopkeeper and artizan of every class, that a human being can vegetate at present in Ireland for 3d. a day. But from what source will the additional 3d. be derived? Chiefly, no doubt, from the land – four-fifths of it from the land. Then, say the opponents of poor laws, the occupying tenant, who is already racked and reracked, will be the sufferer. Not at all, gentlemen, say we. The operation will be this: The heartless and tyrannical absentee landlord will endeavour in the beginning to throw all the burthen on the tenant, from whom he already exacts the highest penny, without having supplied the implements of husbandry, offices or fences; without giving one day's employment in a whole year to one being living on the soil that feeds him; and without contributing to the payment even of the Peelers who aid in bearing down all resistance to his rapacity. The tenant will be inconvenienced for a time, but it will be soon found that, to use a vulgar adage, "the cat can give no more than his skin." Eviction will take place; but who will bid for the land? "The old competitors," it will be said "who pay eight, ten, and twelve guineas for the con acres of Connaught?" Not at all, gentlemen, say we. The competition for land *will be at an end!* The possession of a scrap of it will not be necessary for the subsistence of the poor man, and he will leave it to be taken by a person, capable of cultivating it, at a fair value. If this hypothesis be right, we see at once how the lord of the soil will be the real sufferer at length. And what has the lord of the soil to do in order to avert the total swallowing up of his rent? Lord Carnarvon let him into the secret in the last Sessions of Parliament. – He said he found his rents nearly absorbed in a parish even of opulent, highly-favoured, England. He found, besides, that robbing had rendered the district nearly uninhabitable. He tried the experiment of fixing his residence there, and inventing employment for the people. In some time, he found that crime ceased, that contentment was diffused around, and that rent came in with the regularity, and in the abundance, of times of more general prosperity.

June 2, 1829 page 3

We are as willing to give Mr. Wilmot Horton the credit of perseverance, in reference to his labours on the Emigration question, as a contemporary, and we most freely acquit him of the evil intention with which the puritanism of Mr. Sadler so unsparingly charges him, but we cannot help being of opinion that his assiduity on this subject can claim no greater merit on the ground of utility than his unremitted endeavours to enamour the government of his newly-invented Catholic "Securities," and make them palatable to the nation. The fault we find with the Emigration scheme is, that it is a fanciful project – never likely to be carried into effect, incapable of rendering the benefit sought for if it were practicable, but having at the same time enough of plausibility to divert men's minds from an infinitely better mode of providing for the wants of the poor, and to afford the timid and the worthless an excuse for postponing the adoption of one or other of the really efficacious remedies for the appalling evils by which we are surrounded. We had a similar fault to find with the security project. It was

most mischievously ingenious and insinuating; and if the government had not been inspired with the resolution of putting an end to intolerance at once, and doing it as far at least as conscience was concerned, on the broadest and most manly basis, we should have a bye-play, for God knows how many years, grounded upon the feasibility of Mr. Wilmot Horton's new scheme for settling the Catholic question!!

November 30, 1829 page 3

IMPROVEMENT OF WASTE LANDS.

In the last number of the Quarterly Review there is an excellent article entitled "Home Colonies," or the Anti-Pauper System, in which an attempt is made to prove that the poor-rate might be greatly diminished, and the able-bodied poor very profitably employed either in farming poor soils, or bringing into cultivation waste lands. The author of the article has brought much knowledge of his subject to bear upon the question, and reasoned upon it in a manner which appears to us equally ingenious and accurate. Assuming as the basis of his argument, what is indeed the fact, - that the effect of British machinery, aided by the growing rivalry of continental nations, since the peace, has been to produce more goods of all kinds than a profitable market could well be found for - and that great numbers of the working classes have, in consequence, been thrown out of employment, he proceeds to state his -

"Conviction, which no argument that readily presents itself to our minds can shake, that no measure can afford our labouring classes substantial relief which falls short of producing an entire change in the character of their industry - which does not transfer their labour from the manufactories in which they starve, to the soil of the country, on which we entertain no doubt, they might be made to subsist in comfort, at least, if not in affluence. This proposition may appear paradoxical, as we have already admitted that even our agricultural population is superabundant; it may sound somewhat strangely that we should propose pouring more water into a vessel which, upon our own showing, already overflows.

"With regard, however, to the idle hands which now press upon the resources of country parishes, it may be observed, that their want of employment arises from the faulty organization of the district, and from the defective cultivation which the occupiers bestow upon the soil. Every intelligent person, conversant with the state of agriculture in this country, will acknowledge that scarcely one farm can be met with on which a vast addition of manual labour might not be employed, to the great benefit not only of the labourer, but also of the occupier. But laying for the present out of our consideration the number of unemployed hands which a better system of tillage undoubtedly would absorb, we venture to reiterate what we have already more than once stated, that we possess in our numerous waste and uncultivated districts a source of employment which cannot be speedily exhausted."

We never have befriended schemes of emigration at the expense of the country. They have always appeared to us very excellent contrivances for enriching a few individuals, benefitting those emigrating, and saddling the country not only with a great additional burthen for the present, but also with the prospect of increased pressure in future. If more hands have been trained to manufacturing employments than can now find a vent for their industry, the natural remedy – especially if the country does not produce a sufficient supply of agricultural articles – would seem to be, to turn the overplus of population upon the land, which, although it might not afford much remuneration for the labour and capital bestowed upon it, would, at all events, under due regulation, be made to supply abundance of the first necessaries of life to the labouring man and his family, whose principal support is now derived from the parish funds. The experiment has indeed been most successfully tried on the Continent upon the poorest soils, and in the most unfavourable situations; and if on the Continent, why should it not also succeed here? – *London Morning Advertiser*.

1.4 *DWR – Dublin Weekly Register*

November 3, 1821 page 4

EMIGRATION TO AMERICA.

How often must I say, that this is a country for only two descriptions of persons to go to: those who mean to work with their own hands; and those who wish to work no more, and who, upon the interest of two or three hundred pounds cannot live comfortably here. For farmers, who think of gaining by the labours of others, America is no country. Neither is it a country for men with great parcels of money, who feel impatience here under the neglect of an Aristocracy; for, here such men have somebody to pull a hat off to them, and there they find not a soul to do it! They may swell and puff and give themselves airs as long as they please; but, they will find no white man to look upon, or to treat them, in any way but the way become an equal. Nobody could live a happier life than I lived in America; but, then, I never attempted to stick myself up above any thing that had a white skin. I used to talk with them all that came within the hearing of my tongue; and, as I went along the roads, if I was too far off for talking, I used to nod or bow. I used to treat them in their own way; and they liked me the better. The faults they find in the English are their stiff[ening] and commanding tone. "Free and easy," is the motto of the Americans; and they found me just their mark. I liked them, I like them, I always shall like them, and, all that I can say is, that those who do not like such a people have no business to be amongst them. – Those who cannot live without having somebody to hector over would do well to stay here; for here, any man with money in his pocket will always get some poor devil to crawl upon the belly before him.

There is, I hear, a Mr. Croft of Manchester, lately come back. This gentleman landed at New York just before I came away. He will now remember, probably, an opinion that he heard me give, at Mrs. Waldron's, about the emigration of rich men. He himself was reported to have a very large fortune; not less, to think it was said, than a hundred or two of thousands of pounds. Mr. Croft is a clever man, but he was not calculated for America. He expected to find the practice of republicanism accord with his pre-conceived abstract notions; and yet he did not appear to me to have wholly divested his mind of that set of ideas which generally accompany the consciousness of the possession of wealth: and a man must do this completely; he must feel no rebel-blood stir within him when the man that hoes his corn calls him Tommy or Johnny, or, his best way is to "come back" at once. I dare say, that Messrs. Birkbeck and Flower have, by this time, been called Morrice and Richard till they have almost forgotten their family names.

This is a horrid thing for a man who goes to America because he cannot endure the neglect and slight of the aristocracy, and who goes off in a dudgeon because, with all his money, he can get no place among the great. The truth is, such a man is, at bottom,

unjust; for, he may be amongst the great, if he will pay for it; but, he wants to rise and keep his money too; which is unreasonable, not to say almost dishonest. It depends upon circumstances how a man ought to proceed in such a case. If young, or, if unmarried (for money smooths away wrinkles,) he may easily get "a connection." Any Norman that is poor will discover his merits, and will let him make his bow to a daughter or a sister, especially if he will lend, that is to say give the Norman some of his money. If married, make the sons parsons, which can be done by buying livings for them; and the calling of parson, like that of play-actress, puts the parties upon a level with the highest; these may be called nobles ex-officio. But to succeed in the latter case, demands beauty, and that is not always the lot of the daughters of rich tradesmen. To get the daughter up, therefore, there is nothing sure but the cash. Then, as to the papa himself, how many baronets have we seen spring from God Almighty knows what! A couple of seats may be had, if "retrenchment" go on, and had in perpetuity too, for, perhaps twenty thousand pounds. This is the real way. Then there is Sir Spindle and My Lady and the young 'Squires and young Ladies all coming out, at once, like a litter of pigs.

[...]

If the reader ask, what all this had to do with "Emigration to America," I say, it has every thing to do with it. And I hope, that I have here proved to the satisfaction of every rational mind, that for a man to go to America with a great parcel of money, because he is impatient under the neglect of the Aristocracy here, is the greatest of follies; seeing that, as I have, I think, clearly shown, he may get amongst the Aristocracy himself for less money than he can purchase the pulling off of one single hat to him in the United States.

WM. COBBETT.

October 26, 1822 sup page 5

EMIGRATION TO CANADA.
(From the last Edinburgh Review.)

Some years ago, when the condition of the working classes was in the highest degree miserable, Government afforded many facilities, and gave liberal encouragement to such as were disposed to settle in Canada. Besides granting each person a certain portion of land, they gave them a free passage across the Atlantic, and provided them with provisions and agricultural implements for one year after their arrival. But, with the exception of the free grant of 50 acres of land, these encouragements are all now withheld, owing as it is said, to the conduct of worthless individuals, who abusing this bounty, frequently sold whatever they received, and went to the United States. We agree that Mr. Hewison (author of a late work on Canada) in thinking, that though the former plan offered too much temptation to pursue this line of conduct, yet if the assistance of government were extended only so far, as to lessen the expense of the voyage and

journey to the interior of the country, it would operate as a great relief to the honest poor, and remove a serious obstacle to the prosperity of the settlement, without any danger of such abuse. If vessels were occasionally despatched for Quebec for this purpose, Mr. H. calculates that the passage money, including provisions, might be made so low as 2*l.*, while Government would incur no other expense than the hire of the vessel. This arrangement, together with the establishment of an agent at Quebec, to whom the emigrant might immediately, on his arrival, apply for advice and information, would, we are convinced, greatly relieve the difficulties of the poor, who, from the want of such assistance, frequently linger in the Lower province, wasting uselessly those funds which would have enabled them to reach comfortably their ultimate destination. The evils arising from this ignorance and want of information are well known, [both in] Montreal and Quebec, where benevolent individuals have united in establishing Emigrant Societies; but their influence is of course extremely limited; and nothing short of the interference of the supreme power of Government can effectually remedy the evil. If this were done, and a regular, direct, and cheap conveyance established between Quebec and York, it would greatly diminish the disasters which are now so common.

As things now are, the most prudent course the emigrant can pursue, is to take his passage either to Quebec or Montreal, which can generally be obtained for about 7*l.* or 8*l.*, provisions included. – If he take the way of New-York, which many do, he will find that route considerably more expensive; for, besides paying 30 per cent. on the value of the articles he brings with him, the transport of them by land will prove exceedingly troublesome and costly. On his arrival, his first object should be to reach York as expeditiously as possible, and not waste his time and funds by lingering in the Lower province. From Montreal, he should proceed up the St. Lawrence in a batteau, which, in about a week, will bring him to Kingdon, at the mouth of Lake Ontario, from whence there are regular steam packets for York, the seat of Government of Upper Canada, and the centre of all transactions connected with land business. He ought immediately to apply to the land-officer there, where he will obtain all the requisite instruction concerning the steps to be taken to entitle him to a grant. Fifty acres are given gratis to every British subject; and he can procure an additional quantity on the payment of certain fees proportioned to the extent required. For about 5*l.* he can procure 100 acres, and 500 for 40*l.* The quantity being agreed on, he obtains what is called a location ticket; for as all lands are bestowed under certain restrictions and regulations, he does not receive a deed of the lot till the duties required of him are performed; but these are by no means severe, and indeed essential for his own comfort and subsistence. He must clear five acres of each 100 granted to him, open a road in front of his lot, and build a log-house of certain dimensions. If these operations are performed within eighteen months after the date of his location ticket, he is entitled to a regular deed from Government, which makes the property his own for ever. The emigrant should loose [sic] no time in proceeding to the district where he is inclined to make his settlement. If he has a wife

and family, he ought, if possible, to leave them at York, while he explores the country; for when he has finally chosen his station, he must return there to get it confirmed.

It is of the highest importance that the settler should arrive in the country early in the summer, that he may have time to travel through the settlements, and survey the vacant lands while the roads are in a good state. If he should reach York in July, he may not only do this, but select his lot, build his house, clear several acres of ground, and sow it with wheat or Indian corn, before the commencement of winter – objects of the greatest moment to a new settler. There are many Emigrants who, after having obtained possession of their land, are unable to commence operations for want of means to purchase the agricultural implements, stock and provisions, absolutely necessary even for the humblest beginnings. The only resource for this class of persons, is to hire themselves out as labourers to such of the settlers as are in a more prosperous condition, till they have acquired sufficient means to enable them to begin to work their own lands. Labourers being very scarce in all the new settlements, the demand is great and constant, and wages high. A man's wages are usually about 3*l.* per month, besides board; and female house-servants get about 1*l.* per month; so that such persons, if industrious or economical, may soon be in a condition to work on their own account, and raise themselves to comfortable independence. In a couple of years, an individual who arrives without funds of any kind, may be able, by these means, to purchase all that is necessary for his establishment. He should if possible, before he begins, have a pair of oxen, a cow, a few pigs, and some farming utensils. The cost of the whole will not exceed 30*l.*; and while he has been labouring to purchase these necessaries, he will at the same time have acquired much useful knowledge for his future guidance, with regard to the mode of clearing the land, rearing of cattle, and method of farming adapted to the peculiar nature of the climate and country. For the first two or three years, he must reckon on encountering many hardships, and leading a severe and laborious life; but every season will lessen his difficulties, and he may look forward with certainty at the end of that period to obtain a secure independence for the rest of his life. He will then be able to raise from his own ground, not only abundance of every kind of produce for his own consumption, but sufficient to purchase all the necessaries of life. When he has reached this point, his future prospects are all cheering and inviting; he may confidently anticipate that every succeeding year will add to his possessions and his comforts; and when he looks on the rising family that surround him, he has the satisfaction to feel, that his labours have secured to them comforts superior to those he himself enjoys. The contrast of his present situation with that he quitted in Europe, cannot fail to strike him; - there, even in the vigour of his youth, often obliged to submit to the degradation of receiving aid from the parish to eke out his scanty subsistence; his children an equal burthen on himself and the state, and with probably no better prospect than that of ending his career within the dreary walls of an almshouse.

Mr. Howison describes at large the various methods employed by the Canadians for clearing their wild lands, and all the process of their farming operations. We have no intention in following him in any of these details. The emigrant cannot fail in a very short time, to acquire on the spot all the necessary information. It is sufficient for him to know before hand, that the soil of Upper Canada is in general of excellent quality, and easy of cultivation, producing all kinds of grain, and very favourable to the growth of fruit; the climate not unhealthy, and improving with the progress of cultivation; taxes extremely light, a penny an acre being all that is levied on improved land.

April 14, 1827, pg 2

ANOTHER "EMIGRATION" REPORT.

The Emigration Committee have given the public another Report. It does not profess to be "a general or final report," – a curiosity, we suppose, which we have no chance of seeing until 1830 – but a report growing out of "a special case," of a serious and most pressing nature, which has been submitted to them. This case is that of the hand-loom weavers of certain districts, especially Lancashire, Cheshire, Yorkshire, Cumberland, and one or two counties of Scotland. In these districts, it appears that something like an Irish famine prevails, though hundreds of thousands are voted for the building of useless palaces, and though Great Britain has been long since voted by every Pitt Club in England to be "the envy of surrounding nations and admiration of the world."

In these districts, (says the Report) and more especially in Lancashire, there appear to be among the hand-loom weavers, two classes almost wholly distinct from each other: the one, who though they take in work in their own houses or cellars, are congregated in the large manufacturing towns; and the other, scattered in small hamlets or single houses. Upon the latter class it is, that the distresses of the times have fallen with peculiar hardship. While the decline of their manufacturing business has utterly disabled them from supplying those rents which were due from them as agriculturists, they have found themselves called upon to give support, as liable to the rates, to those of their fellow weavers who were engaged in manufacture alone; and a remnant of honest pride and shame has prevented many of those in the extremest distress from applying for parish relief; while others, being from their remote situation less immediately under the eyes of the regular authorities, have lingered on, till found accidentally, as has been proved in evidence, in the last stages of misery and disease.

Here is England for you! – the once boastful and imperious England!! The Bible and the new Reformation will rectify the evils of Ireland, but what will cure this? What will restore to the condition of the people of any other country but "envy of surrounding nations," those miserable creatures who are reported to have the feelings of "honest

pride and shame” about them – but who are, at the same time, in “*the last stages of misery and disease!*”

April 14, 1827 sup page 6

RELIEF OF THE POOR OF IRELAND.

It appears from the Parliamentary debates, that Lord Cloncurry has presented a petition claiming succor for the starving poor of Ireland. This is a duty demanded by humanity itself, which it becomes imperative on individuals to perform, in proportion as it is neglected by public bodies enjoying rights and franchises originally conferred for popular benefit. We are reminded by the Noble Lord's petition of another appeal from an individual, made in the present Sessions. It was from Sir Thomas Waller, Baronet, and was couched in the words [inserted] below. The Hon. Baronet has in his view some emigrating project. Into the consideration of this, we do not think it necessary to enter at present. But when we assert that even one-eighth of the sum he proposes to raise, applied to purposes of domestic industry and improvement, would make a great and essential change in the condition of the people, we only echo the words of concurring Committees of the House of Commons. The great evil amongst us is represented to be redundancy of population. How can people have the face to say that this is not an evil susceptible at least of temporary alleviation, when the bogs alone may, according to the Report of a Parliamentary Committee, be rendered capable of providing for an additional agricultural population of two millions. A time may come when there may be a real redundancy, speaking in reference even to the productive power of the land, but that time can never arrive, while one-fourth of the island is under no cultivation at all, and the remainder under very indifferent cultivation.

A Petition of Sir Charles Waller, Baronet, was presented, and read: setting forth, that his feelings, in common with many of his countrymen, are heavily oppressed by the frequent representations he hears and reads of the miserable state of the lower class of the Irish people, representations but too well attested and known to render it necessary that he should take up the time of the House in stating them; the Petitioner therefore humbly prays that the House will take into their consideration, as soon as they possibly can, the poverty and misery of that most wretched people, and that the House will, as their wisdom may dictate, adopt some measure which may relieve those people, and cause them to live as the subject of so good and excellent a Monarch, ruling over so great, so wise, and so humane a nation, ought in [illegible] the Petitioner humbly presumes to observe, that some wide extended national plan ought to be adopted to offset this great and glorious good, and to that end the Petitioner humbly presumes to suggest to the House a plan, whereby he thinks this great, human, and really glorious object, may be attained with little expense to the Irish nation; the Petitioner has already proved, in a late publication, which has been in the hands of many Members of the House, that the

Government might, by collecting only one-eighth of the poor rates throughout England, provide for 500,000 souls; that this one-eighth might yield 1,000,000l.; that this 1,000,000l. might raise 25,000,000l.; that this 25,000,000l. might, according to his plan, provide for, and comfortably, usefully and wisely settle 500,000 people; that those people, thus relieved, might, at the expiration of three or four years, pay the full interest of the said 25,000,000l.; that this might be effected without putting the nation to one shilling expense, but, on the contrary, as his plan further proves, that there would be a saving to the nation in poor rates, in the course of four years, of full 12,000,000l. sterling; the Petitioner most humbly prays that the House may adopt some such measure with regard to the Irish people, and as there are no Poor Laws or Rates in Ireland, he presumes that the Irish Noblemen, Clergy, and Gentlemen, would most willingly pay any tax which the House may in their wisdom think necessary to impose upon them to effect an object so wise, so humane, so glorious, and, he must add, so absolutely necessary; particularly, too, when they may be assured that it would not be necessary to levy such tax for a longer period than three years, seeing that the poor who might be thus relieved would, at the expiration of that time, pay the full interest of the sum borrowed; supposing the tax to amount to 1,000,000l., the sum borrowed to 25,000,000l., and the number of poor relieved 600,000; and, finally, the Petitioner begs leave humbly to suggest that a small per centage on all property, whether it be church or lay property, that is, on all rents and Church livings would be a tax just, equitable, and most effectual.

October 6, 1827 sup page 6

EMIGRATION REPORT – THE DEPOPULATING SYSTEM.

It will be seen that there is another Emigration Report out. It gives a representation of the “depopulating system” which is truly frightful. But when was this “depopulating system” commenced, which now threatens anarchy and desolation to the entire Island? Leslie Foster gave testimony before the House of Lords on the 23d of February, 1825, and he then said it was, at least TWO years old. He entered into descriptions which we shall presently have occasion to resort to, and he concluded one narrative thus: -

“The Landlords of Ireland are at length deeply convinced, that though a stock of cattle or sheep will afford profit, a stock of more human creatures, unemployed, will afford none: and they, therefore, are acting upon that principle even in the extreme, if your Lordships ask me what becomes of this surplus stock of population, it is a matter on which I have, in my late journey through Ireland, endeavoured to form some opinion, and I conceive that in many instances they wander about the country as more mendicants, but that more frequently they betake themselves to the nearest large towns, and there occupy, as lodgers, the most wretched hovels, in the most miserable outlets, in the vain hope of occasionally getting a day’s work. Though this expectation too often

proves ill-founded, it is the only course possible for them to take. Their resort to those towns produces such misery as it is *impossible to describe*.”

All this was stated, on oath, to the Legislature, and, we may say, to his Majesty's Government, nearly three years ago, and the witness then spoke of evils of two years' standing. Yet there has not been one *offer* at a remedial or precautionary measure!!! – Even the Emigration Committee are unable to say how soon something dreadful may break out; - and we can well conceive, if the vile Tories were in power, how much they would affect to be astonished and horrified if Captain Rock, driven to frenzy by mere hunger and despair, had interrupted the peace of one townland out of all the parishes of Ireland.

October 13, 1827 page 4

THE DEPOPULATING SYSTEM, AND “THE LAW.”

John Scott Vandeleur, Esq., of the County Clare, after being interrogated by the Emigration Committee, as to the advantages likely to arise to the country from the thinning of the tenantry, which advantages he is disposed to rate very highly indeed, is asked (question 3, [123 OR 128], p. 300) “Speaking generally, do you think it would be the interest of the landlords of Ireland to contribute towards the removal of that class of under-tenants, who may be on their property on the determination of a lease?” What is the reply of Mr. John Scott Vandeleur? “I think (he said) it would be their interest to induce those persons to emigrate; *but I doubt very much whether it would be their interest to contribute any thing towards it.*” Why? Oh, do pray attend to Mr. John Scott Vandeleur – “BECAUSE THEY CAN GET RID OF THEM NOW BY LAW!!”

October 13, 1827 sup page 7

OPINION IN SCOTLAND RELATIVE TO EMIGRATION AND THE IRISH WASTES.

(From the Glasgow Free Press.)

It is admitted by every one, and even by the Emigration Committee, that it is alone owing to the rapid increase of population in Ireland, that emigration from the United Kingdom has become at all necessary. From this it of course follows, that, could some plan be adopted to remedy the evil of superabundant population in Ireland, there would cease to be any cause for such unnatural parturitions of our “body politic” in future.

The plan here desiderated, was suggested by the Irish Bog Commissioners upwards of twelve years ago; and the idea of it has of late been revived and ably enforced in a series of excellent papers, entitled “Lessons for Mr. Lamb,” which appeared and are still continued, in the columns of the *Dublin Weekly Register*. Those papers, which take

for the ground-work of their arguments the Reports of the abovementioned Bog Commissioners, state, upon indisputable evidence, that there are in Ireland, in a state of utter unproductiveness, 3½ millions acres of bog and other waste lands, all of which might be brought under cultivation at an expense of only 20l. per acre, and, at the very lowest rate, yield a return of from 10 to 15 per cent. the first year; while, in the majority of cases, the first crop would more than repay the whole outlay. These lands, on the lowest estimate, would sustain an additional agricultural population of two millions; the money expended in their improvement would be certainly and almost immediately repaid; and the two millions of individuals they would thus draw from the over-crowded parts of the already cultivated districts in the kingdom, would much more than relieve us from the whole pressure of our surplus population.

Let Government commence the improvement of those Irish wastes, by appropriating a certain sum, under proper conditions, to that purpose. The Irish landlords will speedily follow the example; and by this means will the small tenantry, that at present are daily rendered destitute by the progress of the “large farm consolidation” system, find new homes and employment within their own country, instead of being forced to wander into England and Scotland, and there, by their competition, render the native peasantry not less miserable than themselves. The waste lands of Ireland are capable of maintaining the whole superabundant population and ejected tenantry of that Island, until the small farm and subletting system shall have wrought itself entirely out; and from that period, as emigration from thence to this country would have altogether ceased, such an equalization of numbers among the labouring classes of the two Islands, could not fall to take place, as, under a proper order of things, would render the wish for colonial emigration not less remote than its necessity.

May 31, 1828, sup page 7

EMIGRATION.

We are concerned to state that numbers of families have just quitted the north for America, and several others are making preparations for a similar journey, particularly from Westmorland, Alston Moor, and the West of Cumberland. It is apparent that want of trade, increase of poor rates, excessive taxation, and the innumerable sinecurists living upon the industry of the people, present a prospect to the country the most dreary imaginable; and from which there is but little chance of escape while the present evils are allowed to exist. – *Carlisle Journal*.

May 16, 1829, page 3

However men may differ on the policy or practicability of introducing Poor Laws into Ireland all must concur in reprobating the *sang froid* with which gentlemen in

Parliament urge the “lateness of the Sessions” as a reason why our miserable population should be left as they are for another year. In February 1825, Mr. Leslie Foster and others gave the Legislature and the Government information concerning the state of our hapless poor of which the following is a sample: -

Does any mode occur to you of disposing of the surplus population, at the expiration of a lease? – It may be convenient, that I should first express to your Lordships, what I conceive to be the nature of events actually taking place. I conceive, that within the last two years a perfect panic on the subject of population has prevailed among all persons interest in land in Ireland; and that they are at this moment applying a corrective check, of the most violent description, to that increase of population, which there has been but too much reason to deplore. This course is proceeding, at this instant, to such a length, that I have serious doubts whether at this time the population of Ireland is on the whole continuing to increase. I should not be surprised if it should turn out on inquiry, that it is even decreasing. The principle of dispeopling estates is going on in every part of Ireland, where it can be effected; in some parts of Ireland more, and in some less. I have known of instances in the south, where, on the expiration of a lease affording an opportunity to a landlord of newly dividing the land, thirty, forty, or fifty occupying families have in fact been turned adrift, and the land which supported them has been divided into perhaps half-a-dozen respectable farms. Even where the expiration of the lease of a large district of the country does not create the opportunity, nothing is more common than notice to quit being given, for the mere purpose of annexing the tenement to another farm. The landlords of Ireland are at length deeply convinced, that though a stock of cattle or sheep will afford profit, a stock of mere human creatures, unemployed, will afford none, and they therefore are acting upon the principle, even in the extreme. If your Lordships ask me what becomes of this surplus stock of population, it is a matter on which I have, in my late journeys through Ireland, endeavoured to form some opinion, and I conceive that in many instances they wander about the country as mere mendicants; but that more frequently they betake themselves to the nearest large towns, and there occupy as lodgers the most wretched hovels, in the most miserable outlets, in the vain hope of occasionally getting a day’s work. Though this expectation too often proves ill-founded, it is the only course possible for them to take. Their resort to those towns produces such misery as it is impossible to describe.

This was delivered on oath before the Lords’ Committee nearly four years and a half ago, and be it specially borne in mind that it treated of a state of things which had existed for *two years previous* to that time. In February 1825, the Sessions was not “too far advanced” for Legislative interference. In 1826, 27, or 28, one would think that [leisure] might have been found to make at least a commencement in the merciful work of applying some sort of legal remedy to the terrific evils which are here described. Those years, however, had been suffered to pass over; and even in May 1829, we hear nothing

spoken of but the “lateness of the Sessions,” though the suffering of six or seven years ago has been most enormously aggravated by the operation of the Sub-letting Act, and though it is still further sharpened and embittered by the effects of the disfranchisement law passed in the present year.

A defender of the English system of Poor Laws who published an article on the subject two or three years ago in the Quarterly Review, described the effects of the depopulating system which came more actively into operation towards the middle of Elizabeth’s reign. “The leases,” he says, “under which the tenants of the Monasteries held their land, expired, and the storm of depopulation which had hitherto raged exclusively against the tenantry who held under lay landlords, began now to wreak its fury on their defenceless heads also. Hence, about the close of this reign the crowd of ejected peasantry who were forced to beg from house to house received a further augmentation.” The writer then proceeds to shew that the legislative remedy suggested by this state of things, and which was adopted, was not defensible on grounds of humanity merely, but on these likewise of absolute, positive and [uncontrollable] necessity: -

“Whatever difference of opinion (he says) may exist among economists respecting the present influence of the poor laws upon the population of this country, we scarcely conceive it possible that the most bigoted theorist will contend that it would not have been GROSSLY INHUMAN, if not absolutely impracticable, to carry into effect the change which we have above described in the management of landed property, without the intervention of some legal provision for the peasantry, *who became its innocent victims*. If the public good required that they should be dispossessed of their scanty holdings, *which to them was just the difference between subsisting and starving*, HONESTY as well as HUMANITY, required that the public should alleviate as much as possible the blow which it inflicted. But had the legislature of that day been – what, thank God, it was not – insensible as any thorough-bred economist to all feelings of sympathy for the sufferers, still a REGARD FOR THE SAFETY AND TRANQUILLITY OF THE PUBLIC WOULD HAVE REQUIRED ITS INTERFERENCE. It might, perhaps, have been profitable for the landowners to turn away their surplus tenantry, destitute and hungry, to perish and rot on the highways and hedges of the country – but WOULD IT HAVE BEEN SAFE? WOULD THERE HAVE BEEN NO DANGER THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TURNED UPON FROM THEIR OPPRESSORS? Human endurance may, under certain circumstances, be carried to a point where it excites no sympathy, and therefore elicits no praise.”

Now the “change in landed property” above described, or a worse change, has taken place in Ireland, and though surely it may be regarded in the abstract as “grossly inhuman, if not absolutely impracticable,” to endeavour to hold society together, “without the intervention of some legal provision for the peasantry, who are its innocent victims,” yet gentlemen are with the greatest coolness and composure preparing the

public for a six or seventh prorogation of the parliament, without even an attempt to give us the benefit of such “intervention.” Dispossessing our poor people of their “scanty holdings,” is just the difference to them “between subsisting and starving,” as it was in Elizabeth’s time, and yet though “honesty as well as humanity” require that the public should “alleviate as much as possible the blow,” or rather the three or four blows, which have been inflicted, the suffering is still unrelieved and unmitigated. The legislators of Elizabeth’s time sympathised with the victims of the system that has been described. It is hinted by the writer that if they had been as unfeeling as our modern economists, still “a regard for the safety and tranquillity of the public would have required their interference.” The writer admits, that it might be profitable for the landowners to turn away their surplus tenantry, destitute and hungry, to perish and rot on the hedges and highways of the country; but he asks, “would it have been safe, would there have been no danger that they would have turned upon their oppressors,” if they had done so. Surely the provident man, wholly dead to feelings of humanity, might have asked this question in reference to the condition of the Irish poor, six or seven years ago, and yet we are told in May, 1829, that no “intervention” is practicable, or to be expected, in this year, because a Sessions that might go into July, or into December, if the exigencies of the state required it, is “too far advanced.” It is really shocking, to thus trifle with the miseries of the people, and if the country did its duty, it would address itself to the Parliamentary gentlemen energetically, if not indignantly, on the subject, through the voices of five hundred public meetings.

July 18, 1829, page 4

EMIGRATION.

(From the Wexford Evening Post.)

The large extensive tract, known by the name of Conamara, in the county of Galway, offers, perhaps, the strongest inducements to the emigrant; and we would most seriously recommend such of our county Wexford friends, who have a small capital and intending to emigrate to America, to change their intention and try Conamara. Within two miles of the sea shore, land in any quantity may be procured easily. We have seen an estimate drawn up by an able and intelligent person who resides on the spot, and we lay it before our readers for their information: -

FIRST YEAR.

Rent of one acre of land or mountain, at two miles distance from the sea shore....	£0 1 0
Ten boat loads of sea weed, at 5s. per	2 10 0
Carriage of same from shore to farm	1 10 0
Planting, spreading manure and seed	3 0 0

Moulding	150
210 stone of potatoes, for seed, at 1d. per st.,	100
Digging, picking and pitting	1100
	<hr/>
Total amount,	£1594

SECOND YEAR.

Rent	010
Ten boats load of shelly sand, or decomposed coralline, at 2s. per boat load.....	100
Carriage from sea-shore to farm	1100
Planting, &c.	300
Moulding	150
Seed	100
Digging, picking and pitting	1100
	<hr/>
Total amount,	£960

THIRD YEAR.

Same expenses as second year	960
First year	1594
	<hr/>
	£3414

On general calculation, it is found that about twelve fold is a fair average return; but suppose only ten fold, making 4800 stones of potatoes, at the small price of 2d. per stone, would be

	£2000
Second year	2000
Third year	2000
	<hr/>

Deduct rent, and expenses of three years' cultivation, amounting to 34 1 4

The profit of the three years would be £25 18 8

The land, after three years' cultivation as above, is then fit to produce oats of the very best quality, indeed so superior, as experience has shown on that place and other reclaimed mountain districts, that the weight of equal bulk is one-sixth more than of the produce of other lands. Sea-weed and coraline (of which there is constantly the greatest abundance on the shore) is by far the most profitable kind of manure which can be any where used.

Should any of this county small farmers, or persons possessing a little capital, be disposed to emigrate, we would recommend them to seek first a settlement in their native land. They will be then at least in the vicinity of their friends, no wide watery waste separates them, and their particular home will be still in some measure the home of their fathers. We are happy to inform then that by applying at our office any further necessary information can be given, and letters of introduction to responsible resident gentlemen will also be furnished.

1.5 *FJ – Freeman’s Journal*

January 14, 1820 page 2

EMIGRATION.

The policy of our old laws was to discourage Emigration – that of our new is of the opposite kind. We do not know if the Radicals are availing themselves of it. Cobbett will not stay away and Hunt’s enemies say he cannot go. The following extract from the fourth volume of Robertson’s History of America shews the unfortunate predicament in which Charles I. became involved by stopping a radical emigration: -

“The number of the emigrants to America drew the attention of Government, and appeared so formidable, that a proclamation was issued, prohibiting masters of ships from carrying passengers to New England, without special permission. On many occasions this injunction was eluded or disregarded. Fatally for the King, it operated with full effect in one instance. Sir Arthur Haslerig, John Hampden, Oliver Cromwell, and some other persons, whose principles and views coincided with their, impatient to enjoy those civil and religious liberties which they struggled in vain to obtain in Great Britain, hired some ships to carry them and their attendants to New England. By order of Council, an embargo was laid on these when on the point of sailing; and Charles, far from suspecting that the future revolutions of his kingdoms were to be excited and directed by persons in such an humble sphere of life, forcibly detained the men destined to overturn his throne, and to terminate his days by a violent death.”

January 6, 1821 page 4

EMIGRATION.

(From Godwin’s New Work in Answer to Malthus.)

“Long has the Coast of North America been looked to by the discontented, the unhappy, and the destitute of every Kingdom of Europe, as the land of promise, the last retreat of independence, the happy soil, on which they might dwell and be at peace. How could it be otherwise? Here every man, without let or molestation, may worship God according to his conscience. Here there is no legal infliction of torture, no Bastiles and Dungeons, no sanguinary laws. This is the sacred asylum of liberty. Here lands, by hundreds and thousands of acres, may be had for almost nothing. Here the wages of labour are high.

“There are but two or three reasons, that prevent the whole lower and worst provided cast of the inhabitants of Europe, from passing over to the United States almost in a body.

“First, the strange and nameless love which a great majority of mankind feel for the spot of earth on which they were born. To see it no more, to meet no more the old familiar faces, never to behold again the trees and the hedge-rows, the church, the hamlet, the chimney corner and the oaken board, which have been our daily acquaintance through life, is a divorce hardly less severe than that of soul and body. In this respect man is for the most part a vegetable, with a slight shade of difference, and clings to his native soil with almost equal pertinacity.

“A second reason why our poor do not generally remove to America, is that those to whom removal would be in a manner the necessary of existence, do not possess the means of accomplishing it. Without the possession of a little sum of money, they may look a thousand times with eager aspirations upon the waves of the Atlantic, but they can never ascend the bark that should waft them over.”

July 5, 1823 page 3

EMIGRATION FROM IRELAND

The grant of 15,000l. to facilitate the conveyance of emigrants from the South of Ireland to the Canadas and the Cape of Good Hope, excited some discussion on Monday night in the House of Commons. Mr. C. Hutchinson suggested that it should be enlarged, for the farther purpose of affording employment to the peasantry at home, and this led to some observations upon the excessive population of the country as a principal cause of its distress. In this case the disease and the remedy require more consideration than has been bestowed upon them. The population of a country is not to be measured by its number of acres, but also by its means and capabilities, and if these be taken into account, Ireland is able to sustain a much greater population in proportion to its size than England or Scotland. While there are mountains and bogs in Ireland now in an unproductive state to be reclaimed, and mines in the bowels of the earth to be explored, it appears preposterous to complain of distress arising from excessive population. In some of the Northern parts of the country the population is as dense as in the South, and yet they enjoy comfort and tranquillity. The reason is obvious: the inhabitants have employment – the linen manufacture is a source of industry to the male and female population. When, indeed, every means of employment that human ingenuity can devise are exhausted, and there still remains an excess of population unemployed; then, indeed, the exportation of the superabundance of the human species, appears to be the direct and proper remedy. But to resort to it in the present state of the country, has no character of a comprehensive, liberal, and enlightened policy. Under any circumstances, this mode of cure, which does not come at the root of the disease, is at best merely a palliative; but applied as now proposed, in a grant of 15,000l. it is trifling with the complaint. We can easily conceive the great benefit a country might derive from the weeding of its population, from the culling its bad and noxious members, and expending

15,000l. upon their exportation. This operation would improve its peace and tranquillity. It would be eminently beneficial in a moral point of view; but to transport a parcel of poor people, who are only poor and distressed, because they want employment, can have little effect upon the morals of the country; and as to any material reduction of a population of seven millions to be produced by number which the present grant would dispose of, it can have no sensible effect at all. It requires no proof to demonstrate that the statesman, who should clothe a waste with hay and corn, would display more wisdom than he who should transport its poor inhabitants to a foreign clime. To seek a remedy for distress in additional means for the employment of the poor, has, on the contrary, all the recommendation of a liberal and humane policy, and of that paternal feeling which is due by the Government to the subject. It has also the sanction of experience; for, wherever it has been tried, its efficacy has been felt and acknowledged. This is fully established in the Report of the Committee of the Society for Improving the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Irish Peasantry. While, however, absenteeism prevails to its present extent, and capital is deterred from settling in the country, by the insecurity of property and civil dissension; we fear that no remedy or combination of remedies can prove adequate to the removal of the evil, and place the people in a state of comfort, even approaching in a remote degree, the state of the population of England. – The Union has served to increase the former of these evils. The grant of the Catholic Claims would be in the opinion of the ablest Statesman of the last 25 years, a remedy for the latter. There can be no tranquillity in a country where religion, which should be a bond of peace, is made a sword to sever the people from each other. Any temporary calm which it may enjoy will be only a state of smothered discontent. – *New Globe*.

November 10, 1824 page 3

STATE OF IRELAND.
(FROM THE ATTIC MISCELLANY.)

“And as to England, I cannot too often inculcate upon you, that she knows nothing of our situation.” – CURRAN’S *Speeches*.

IRELAND may note the progress of her amelioration from that time when her evils, and the causes of those evils; may arrest the attention of the British people. We mean their serious and fixed attention; for a superficial and occasional observation can never detect the source of those ills which strike their roots so deep, and which so many are interested in concealing from view.

Whether the Parliament of the United Kingdom represents the opinion of the public inadequately or otherwise, it is certain that in every strong case of an extensive grievance, or an extensive interest, if the public mind be well informed upon it, and if the public press echo that impression, the public and the press become too strong for

the Parliament; and the latter, yielding to or confessing the influence of general opinion, or general interests, feels it no derogation from its wisdom or authority to give at least an occasional victory to improved ideas and common sense. Therefore much benefit may be hoped for Ireland, by informing Great Britain respecting her condition.

We reject the vanity, and would smile at the boast of the public writer, who would presume to think, or would have the still greater presumption to avow, that he could confer such information *exclusively*. The daily press may boast, and justly, of useful information respecting facts, the occurrence of which they considerately foresaw, the value of which they prudently anticipated, and the knowledge of which they expensively procured. But the periodic press has a different duty to perform, not to be effected by horses or express-boats. They have to war with prejudices sanctioned by custom, sanctioned too often even by law; and aspire to the dignity, in common with the diurnal press, of assisting the legislature, *through* the public opinion, on subjects vital to the public interests.

Neither do we presume that this miscellany proposes to instruct the public mind of Great Britain exclusively on the causes of Ireland's misfortunes. But we are anxious to shew ourselves an useful ally to all that portion of the press, which concurs with us in the opinion, that the affairs of Ireland have attained a crisis which should command the attention of the British people; and that her evils have now attained an aggravation and importance, which rendered the farther postponement of a remedy inconsistent with the wisdom and interests of this Empire.

The general and true eulogy on the natural advantages of Ireland, has been so often and awkwardly served up, and indeed is so worn out by its eternal repetition, that nationality alone can now endure it; and to offer it again as any matter of information, would only imply, that the person using it had lived for the last twenty years either in Ireland or out of Europe. One reference, however, may still be permitted, because it carries its apology in its brevity, and is an authority not only of the positive value of Ireland, but the benefits she is capable of conferring on England. That enlightened statesman, Sir Wm. Temple, declared that Ireland was qualified to become "one of the richest countries in Europe, and a mighty accession of strength and revenue to the Crown of England." It is true, indeed, that one senator in the country has lately avowed a different opinion; the honourable member for Corfe – castle, as Mr. Plunkett speaks of him with a lingering emphasis on *Corfe* – castle, which would draw a frown from a borough-owner, and a smile from a reformer. It is true that the representative for Corfe-castle, considered Ireland as of *no value whatever*. We certainly dare not *on our own* question an authority so eminent, respecting a position so peculiar, especially when propounded *in his place* in Parliament by the representative for Corfe-castle: but we may refer to opposing authorities. Sir William Temple thought otherwise, 150 years since; and in the debate on the question of the Irish Union, the present Lord Oriel, then speaker of

the Irish House of Commons, declared in his speech on that occasion, that Ireland “during the twenty years preceding, had risen in civilization, wealth, and manufactures, in a greater proportion, and in more rapid progress, than any other country in Europe.” We extract but these two from a crowd of authorities corresponding to the same result; but we may be permitted to say, that this position of the member for Corfe-castle, if it do stand, must stand “piled in its own strength;” it must depend on its internal evidence, and can expect for its support no aid from any external adjunct, no sanction from any name save his own; that in fact all authority is against him on this point, to which we might add all observation and experience.

One position for which we contend is this: - That it befits not only the characteristic benevolence, but the protecting dignity of the British people, and makes *a part of their own interests*, - to turn a steady and scrutinizing attention on the unexampled misery of the sister island.

Even on the principle of the member for Corfe-castle, that Ireland were incapable of conferring any advantage on England; yet her proximity may render her capable of being, if neglected and misgoverned, of important disadvantage to Great Britain; creating by her misery a sort of supplement to the over-heavy burden of the English poor-laws, becoming a continual drain on British generosity; producing no other results than new wants; and exhibiting the extraordinary political anomaly of a great part of one nation depending for an existence on the charity of another.

National charity, to be useful, can only be *occasional*. It may then ward off or mitigate the evil of some temporary calamity – as a famine in Ireland, or the consequences of an earthquake at Lisbon. But should national charity once become habitual, it loses its essence, and ceases to be remedial. On the contrary, it aggravates the evil which it proposes to alleviate; and it not only an abuse of the fund of benevolence, but a misapplication of money, which works at the same time loss to the bountiful, and mischief to their objects.

Charity may meet the temporary evil of an occasional famine: but what is to meet the *continual* deficiency of human sustenance which exists generally and at all times in Ireland? a sort of lingering famine is habitual to that country. There is not any hour in the day in which there are not *millions in Ireland suffering* the pain of positive hunger.

Newenham says that “Ireland is the greatest food exporting country, its area and population jointly [...(bottom cut off)] of Egypt.” Certain it is, that there never was a nation which exports so much food and suffers so much hunger. We repeat the startling but undeniable statistical fact – so revolting to humanity, so unexampled in history, so inconsistent with right government, and wholesome institutions, and so discreditable to a civilized age, - that the majority of the Irish peasantry is always in a state of absolute starvation. Any observer in Ireland may soon convince himself of the truth of this

melancholy fact. Any Englishman may be satisfied of it without ever having left his native country. The hordes of unfortunate Irish peasantry who periodically cross the Channel in search of employment during the harvest time of England, bring with them to this country full evidence of this truth. It may be said, that these unfortunate poor men are an unfair sample of the Irish nation, and afford no example from which any just inference can be drawn unfavourable to their countrymen. We yield to the objection; but retain the opinion, that although this horde of periodic emigration affords no fair sample of the Irish people, yet it represents with too much fidelity the greater part of the Irish peasantry; and whether the Englishman would contemplate their wretched situation in *his* country or *their own*, he may readily perceive, in their attenuated figures and haggard aspect, the habit of want, and the suffering of hunger. It may be said of them, in the language of Shak[e]speare, that, "like moss they grew withered." Let a traveller through Ireland observe the peasantry that frequent a fair in the interior of that country, he will scarcely find a fat man amongst them *nemo hercule vel duo vel nemo*; and should one or two of that description appear amongst them, for a ducat he will find that they are *Protestants* or *Policemen*: "Protestantism," in other countries a mode of faith and form of worship, is, to a great extent, an office in Ireland.

In fact, there never was a country wherein the peasantry got so little for their labour, and paid so much for their land; or raised so much food, and suffered so much hunger; a country whose chief import is her *fuel*, and whose principal exports are her food and inhabitants. Add to this the rapid increase of her population, which has doubled during the present generation; and gives more gloom to the prospects of this nation, as well as more motive to their powerful and generous neighbours to commiserate such wretchedness, and if possible alleviate it. But where, it may be asked, is the remedy to this evil? To which we answer, that much of the remedy will be effected when the press shall have succeeded in fixing the attention of the British public on the extent and nature of the evil, and its close relation to British interests. This close relation must alike appear, whether Ireland be regarded as a national *evil*, or a national *benefit* to Great Britain; if the former, the evil is at our doors; if the latter, the benefit is within our grasp.

(To be concluded to-morrow.)

March 2, 1825 page 3

NEW PLAN FOR IMPROVING IRELAND.
(FROM THE MORNING HERALD.)

The most effectual thing the Ministers could do in favour of Ireland would be to materially reduce the taxes on tea, coffee, wine, spirits, and other luxuries, which would have the effect of inducing English people, with incomes of from 200l. to 500l. a year, to live in Ireland; instead of emigrating to the Continent. This in time would secure for

Ireland a greater proportion of Protestant population. And on the other hand, with regard to the poor people of that country, if, instead of sending them back again, we were to alter our Poor Laws, so that they might easily become English parishioners, we should very soon have swarms find their way from their own country to this. If such a measure could be brought about, Ireland would gradually draw from England Protestant settlers of medium properties, instead of the latter going to France and elsewhere; and we should have an increase of hard-working people from Ireland. – England, therefore, religiously speaking, would become more Catholic, and Ireland would become more Protestant. The Ministers have already effected highly beneficial things for Ireland by removing the absurd barrier of duties between the two countries; and if on those luxuries of life we have enumerated, they lessened the taxation, Ireland would flourish in a much more rapid progression than England. Great numbers of people of medium fortunes will always flock to the cheaper country, and, on the contrary, the poor will flock to the dearer, in the hope of being employed; but it is a dreadful thing for an Irishman when he comes to England, and is overtaken by poverty or illness, that he should be sent back again to his own country, from whence he came, because probably he could find no employment. This is a defect in our Poor Laws, which, so far as our policy towards Ireland and Scotland is concerned, England would be wise in altering. We are spending immense sums every year in sending missionaries to all parts of the world; in instructing the poor of Ireland and Scotland – in giving them bibles and tracts, and yet we are so hard hearted, that if an Irishman is famishing in our streets, we give him a little temporary relief, and get rid of him as fast as we can, sending him to his own country, from which famine may have driven him. – Why we do not use the Africans worse than this.

April 5, 1825 page 2

EMIGRATION.

The perusal of Mr. Wilmot Horton's evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, upon the subject of emigration from Ireland to the Canadas, which we yesterday published, has naturally turned our attention to one of those numerous Companies which have lately started forth, and which seems peculiarly calculated to cooperate with the views of Government in draining off the surplus population of Ireland. it is admitted on all hands that there is a surplus population in that country, with reference to the existing demand for labour; and it is equally admitted, we believe, that emigration, upon a comprehensive plan, would supply the speediest and most permanent mode of relief, by more nearly equalising the supply of labourers with the demand for labour. Our readers are probably, aware, that, in 1823, his Majesty's Government was induced to make an experiment, upon a very small scale, of conveying emigrants from Ireland to our North American colonies; and it appears, from the evidence of Mr. Wilmot Horton, and of Mr. Peter Robinson, who was employed as superintendent, that the experiment was attended with every success that could be fairly

anticipated. The average expense for carrying out the emigrant, locating him, and his maintenance for a year, was about 22l. per head. It is obvious, however, that it would require a very large sum (though the largest sum would, in our opinion, be wisely expended) to promote emigration at this rate, to such an extent as would produce any sensible effect upon the existing superabundant population of Ireland; and hence it is, that we are led to consider the Colombian Agricultural Association as a Company whose professed objects might become most beneficial auxiliaries in the prosecution of the proposed plan. – This Association has obtained the grant of upwards of a million of English acres, for the express purpose of being colonized; thus advancing, on the one hand, the internal prosperity of the States of Colombia, and, on the other, benefiting England by planting in the most favourable position, a body of consumers, spreading English habits, taste, and intelligence, wherever they go. The numerous advantages which the Colombian Government, with a wise liberality, has held out to those who may emigrate thither, under the direction of this Company, will, necessarily, attract that industry and capital which may be expected, in a few years, to effect most important changes. But it is chiefly in connexion with Ireland, and with the desirable opportunity thus afforded, of facilitating the execution of any general plan of emigration which Government may sanction, that we feel disposed to direct public attention to this Association. Relief would thus be obtained for Ireland; England would have her share of the general benefit; while the rising Republic of Colombia would have its prosperity advanced, by the infusion of a new spirit of industry, enterprise, and ingenuity. – *Courier*.

April 20, 1825 page 4

STATE OF THE POPULATION OF IRELAND.

On Friday night, Mr. Wilmot Horton proposed in the Committee of Supply, a vote to facilitate emigration from Ireland to Canada, which was agreed to.

The misery under which a large part of the population of Ireland suffers is so acute, that the House of Commons is justified in the attempt to alleviate it by expedients, even if they promise no lasting benefit. The picture given of the poor of the neighbourhood of Carlow, by Dr. Doyle, exceeds in wretchedness any representation we have seen of the ordinary or continually recurring condition of any people in an European country. In the parish of Killishean, where the Doctor resides, and which contains between 3000 and 4000 people, the poor whom he enumerated last year as actually in a state of starvation, were upwards of 700. In addition to those paupers, the distress among the bulk of the people was so great, that men having cabins and a few acres of land, were obliged to sell the furniture of their houses, and to pledge their beds in order to procure subsistence; and this subsistence, says the Doctor, that is the subsistence of this *better class* “consisted of a few potatoes supplied to the family once in each day, for about six or eight weeks or perhaps longer.” The last year, he states, was

a year of more than ordinary, but not very extraordinary distress. The greater or less extent of this period of starvation, which recurs every summer, depends upon the scarcity or abundance of the potato crop.

“The poor people in general,” says Dr. DOYLE, “collect a little dung (they have no land); this dung they put upon a piece of land given them by a farmer, and it produces a little stock of potatoes. This, with their earnings, supports them until, suppose, March or April, then their entire stock is exhausted; and when the summer advances, particularly the latter part of it, before the harvest comes in, they have no means at all of support; they have no employment; they have no food, and are actually dying of hunger.”

The Doctor explains the manner in which these wretched creatures live: -

“The people who have some property are in general very charitable, and they see that broths are made in their families, and cabbages and roots, which are very abundant, boiled and distributed out to the poor. The male part of the family lie, very frequently, in bed during the day; the wife, or daughter perhaps, goes abroad and begs about the neighbourhood for some few potatoes, which she brings home. On these they vegetate; and even an Honourable Member of this Committee, who is well acquainted with our poor, can scarcely imagine upon what a small pittance one of those wretches endeavours to subsist. In fact, he is almost like a savage of the American deserts. He lies down on a little straw upon the floor, and remaining there motionless nearly all the day, gets up in the evening, eats a few potatoes, and then throws himself upon the earth, where he remains till morning. Thus he drags out an existence, which it were better were terminated any way than to continue in the manner it is.”

This condition, the same Divine observes, not only shortens the lives of the people, but enervates their minds, paralyzes their energies, and leaves them incapable of almost any useful exertion. This misery, too, contains in itself the seeds of its own increase.

“The population,” says Dr. D., “is immediately increased, as every one must perceive, by improvident marriages; but those marriages themselves, in my opinion, *result in great measure from the extreme poverty of the people*. For, that poverty has paralyzed their energies – it has prevented their taking such an interest in creating a respectable situation for themselves in life, as men possessed of some property always feel; for those wretched people say their state cannot be worse when married than before. [...] If those people had some property that would give them education, and a feeling of self-respect, and would put them, as it were, upon their energies to seek a livelihood, they would look before them before they married. But now their very depression and their extreme poverty throws them together like so many savages in a wood. It is a frightful state of society, and when it is considered, it fills one with so much pain and horror, that I have frequently prayed to God, if it were his will, rather to take

me out of life than leave me to witness such evils if they were to continue.” – Minutes of Evidence, 2d Report, Commons, p. 208.

This truth, which it is very important to attend to, viz. that the misery of the people tends to keep up the excess of the population, and that to prevent *future* evil the *present* generation must be made less wretched, is also pointed out by Dr. Kelly, the Titular Archbishop of Tuam. The Doctor expresses his opinion that every measure which has a tendency to augment the comfort of the peasant, and to raise his condition in society, has also a tendency to check improvident marriages.

“About the year 1806,” he observes, “I was appointed to a parish in the county of Mayo, along the sea-coast, between the towns of Westport and Newport, and I found that the people who inhabited that district were extremely comfortable; they were more industrious than the generality of the people in other parts of the country; they were weavers; they had taken spots of ground along the sea-coast, and they employed themselves occasionally at the linen business, at other times in tilling their little farms, and where an opportunity offered, in fishing; by those means they became much more comfortable than the peasantry in other parts of the country, and the increase of population *was not so rapid*. In those prosperous districts the marriages were not so frequent as I found them in the more impoverished districts. There was an indisposition (on the part of the comparatively prosperous peasantry) to contract improvident marriages.”

This is a most important lesson: - The most biting misery contains in itself no cure for the evils resulting from an excess of people – it only tends to extend and perpetuate them. It is happily through good that good is to be attained. Prudence can never be found in people absolutely desperate – it is only among those who have something that the fear of degradation and misery is to be expected. Every act of beneficence that raises the present state of the peasantry of Ireland tends, by giving them an idea of some mode of existence above the lowest, and by thus creating provident habits, to improve their future condition.

October 1, 1825 page 1

EMIGRATION OF ARTISANS.
(FROM THE MACCLESFIELD HERALD.)

Although we are not amongst the number of those who take up a public question upon prejudice, we do not hesitate to avow that we were forcibly struck with the information given to the House of Commons on the subject of the emigration of artisans and manufacturers to France and other parts of the Continent, and with the statements which subsequently appeared in the London Journals. Surrounded as we are by a population more or less interested on this subject, we have thought it our duty to avail

ourselves of the sources which were open to us to procure authentic information, and we rejoice that the result is by no means such as to justify the alarm which has been manifested. If we recollect rightly, it has been publicly stated that at least 1900 mechanics and manufacturers have emigrated to France, where they are said to have completely fixed themselves; and the steam engine manufactory in Paris, has been mentioned as an establishment filled with Englishmen, who were thus laying the foundation of the ruin of their own country in one of its most important branches of industry. We now find that in this establishment there is not a single English workman, and the same incorrectness in the statements which have been published in the London papers as to other establishments abroad, has been clearly pointed out to us. That [...] have been many attempts to establish manufactories in France with English workmen, we do not deny; but they have nearly all failed, from the unwillingness of the workmen to remain, except at wages at least double in amount of those which they received in England; an advantage which appeared to them scarcely sufficient to counterbalance the inconvenience of their situation – shut out from their friends and connexions, and cut off, as it were, from society; and the inability of the masters to pay such wages – the period of credit for goods, &c., being so long, that only a colossal fortune could support the expenditure. So feeble is the spirit of enterprise in France, that there appears to be no prospect of our manufacturers being injured to any extent by the competition, although we know very well that it has become quite the fashion to talk of danger from the increasing resources of that country; from the same [...] also it is impossible that any considerable number of our artisans can attain profitable employment there. The public shall judge of the real danger, when we inform them upon the authority of the parties themselves, that in the very steam engine manufactory in Paris, of which we have heard so much, few [...] can be obtained at a credit of less than nine years, or three payments at intervals of three years; and yet we are to be terrified at the idea of petition with manufacturers who prefer continuing the old principle, unless they can have nine years credit with the means of improvement.

October 27, 1825 page 3

COLONIZATION of the SEA COASTS.

We have been requested to resume the subject of the formation of towns and villages on the winding shores of Ireland, on which we slightly touched in last Saturday's paper. After the declaration of the independence of the North American States, there were numerous complaints made to government and the legislature of extensive emigrations from the highlands and isles of Scotland to America. This led the late Duke of ARGYLL, the Earl of BREADALBANE and other Noblemen and Gentlemen in North Britain, to form an association for erecting harbours, towns, villages and fishing stations on the north western coasts and isles, in which they were joined by some English public spirited individuals, members of the House of Commons; particularly Mr.

WILBERFORCE, Mr. ISAAC HAWKINS BROWNE, the late Mr. BEAUFOY, and Mr. WILLIAM SMITH, M.P. for Norwich. In 1786 they obtained an Act of Parliament constituting the subscribers into an incorporation as a Joint Stock Company, styled the BRITISH SOCIETY, for extending the fisheries and improving the sea-coasts of the kingdom. Captain ROBERT FRASER, whom we mentioned as endeavouring to form a similar association in this country, was selected by his Grace the Duke of ARGYLL and other directors, as a fit person to examine those distant coasts, and point out the situations best adapted for the intended establishments. Mr. FRASER reported a great variety of situations, amongst which three were chosen; he having stated that it was first necessary in order to the success of the measure, to form, in the first place, a navigable communication from those islands and coasts with the flourishing towns on the Clyde, by cutting a canal through the peninsula of Cantire which was accordingly set on foot, and of which Mr. AIRD, now engaged in the works at Kingstown Harbour, was the resident engineer. This navigable communication, called the Crinan Canal, was tedious in being completed. The new establishments languished; but since its completion, and the introduction of steam-packets, these towns have become flourishing in an extraordinary degree. Tobermory, in the Island of Mull, the most southerly, is crowded with settlers. The value of the land has risen enormously, and the people complain of want of room. – Several of the great proprietors, particularly Lord MACDONALD, have erected new villages and harbours, which are all thriving rapidly. If the Noblemen and Gentlemen who lately met this spring, at the Marquess of BUCKINGHAM'S, were to take a lead in forming a similar society, in order to raise a fund, by subscription, for building towns, villages, and fishing stations on the coasts of Ireland, the best results might be expected to arise in the improvement of the agriculture, fisheries, trade, and commerce of the kingdom. New towns and villages might be formed at Killiney-bay, (as judiciously stated by a Correspondent in our Journal of Saturday), at the Greystones, at Wicklow, Arklow, and other beautiful situations on the eastern and southern coasts; but the western shores are most important. The whole of these might be thickly studded with such establishments. Even at the small harbours and little piers recently erected by the commissioners of the fisheries, numbers of families are beginning to settle. Mr. FRASER, we understand, is in hopes to persuade two spirited young Noblemen to show an example for this purpose, to other proprietors, and perhaps to take an active part in forming an association of proprietors.* The Marquess of SLIGO has already begun to improve the town of Westport. The enterprising fishermen at that place have long been accustomed to pursue the sun-fish, which are to be seen at some distance from the west coast in great shoals, in the months of May and June. But the herring fishery on the west coast claims the principal attention. It may be made a source of immense wealth. The herrings which approach this coast in winter, are of a very large size, and peculiarly fitted for being cured as red-herrings – more so than any on the British coasts. They would find an inexhaustible demand in the West Indies, and North and South America. The noble proprietor of Westport is a grandson of that great and accomplished Naval Officer, the

late Admiral Earl HOWE. He is said to inherit that generous spirit, intelligence, and decision, for which his noble and gallant relative was so highly distinguished; and with these qualifications he also possesses a predilection for the sea. Westport, under such patronage, may soon become the depot of the west of Ireland, as Great Yarmouth is on the east of England. To encourage his Lordship, we may remark, that in the year 1765, when the Isle of Man was annexed to the Crown, and the trade of smuggling was annihilated, the inhabitants of the town of Douglas betook themselves to the curing of red-herrings, obtained people from Yarmouth to instruct them, and in three or four years fully equaled the people of Yarmouth in the excellence of this, by far the most productive branch of the herring fishery. The Marquess of CLANRICKARD possesses the islands of Boffin, which may be made admirable situations for extending the fisheries, and particularly for the pursuit of the sun-fish, and for the cod fishery. A few leagues west of those islands, an immense bank extends along the whole of (it is believed) the west of Ireland, on which cod, of the finest quality, are found in immense quantities, at about forty fathoms, the same depth of water as at Newfoundland. The sun-fish, it is believed, might be taken in great numbers, by means of Congreve rockets throwing harpoons. The liver of this fish produces five, seven, and sometimes twelve barrels of oil. The liver is the only part used; but Dr. ANDERSON says, that the entrails may be made into a kind of parchment, which surely might be easily tried.

If the two Noble MARQUESES, as they seem inclined to reside a good deal on their estates, take a lead in the improvement of the sea coast, many sources of productive labour will speedily present themselves, when the inhabitants, being collected together, can employ their joint exertions in various branches of useful industry. The great engine on which the prosperity of the new colonies and towns, already enumerated, is considered to be grounded, is that of the extensive power of circulating navigation by steam-vessels. The western coasts of Ireland, and those of the Highlands, and Isles of North Britain, possess advantages of a maritime nature beyond all the countries of Europe. The soil near the coast is capable of being rendered very productive and THE FISHERIES in all their branches present an indefinite source of productive labour. The turf with which these coasts every where abound, can be compressed, we understand, and freed from its moisture, by the operation of the steam-engines which navigate the vessels, so as to afford a constant supply of fuel for the boilers, without having recourse to coals. Vast numbers of people may be usefully employed, and those districts on the Atlantic, hitherto neglected and waste, may be rendered flourishing parts of the empire; many new towns and villages may be erected, to which the steam vessels can speedily supply all materials for carrying on the fisheries and various branches of manufacture. The cotton manufacture, for which the demand in South America is greater than can be at present supplied, may be carried on with great facility. The linen trade may be also greatly [i]ncreased. The complaints of a redundant population will soon vanish. We shall

be happy to see these views realized, and we confess that they do not seem to us to be visionary, but founded in true views of political economy.

August 28, 1826 page 2

STATE OF THE POOR.

We beg to direct public attention to an advertisement in a preceding column, calling a meeting of the parishioners of St. AUDEON'S, this day, to consider the very alarming state of the poor. The requisition is signed by some of the most respectable men in the city. We know not what opinions these gentlemen, or any of them, entertain respecting a permanent provision for the poor; but it cannot be doubted that some more effectual relief than has been yet afforded, is quite necessary. The introduction of regular Poor Rates, however, is a question of the utmost importance, and certainly should not be resorted to, if at all, without the fullest deliberation. The Morning Chronicle asserts, that "they would take the whole produce of the country, and leave the landlord nothing." The same Paper proceeds –

"A very small number of labourers in a district beyond the demand, involves the whole body in a state of poverty and destitution. On this point the Emigration Committee observe, that if a district be admitted to require only nine hundred labourers for its adequate cultivation, and if a thousand are found to exist there, who are all more or less employed, it is evident whether the case he supposed to happen in England or Ireland, hat the fund for the remuneration of labour is divided among a thousand instead of nine hundred persons; the consequence may, and probably will be, that the whole one thousand will receive less than would be adequate to support them, and that they may all present an appearance of want and destitution; but if one hundred labourers be removed from this district, and by that operation, the supply of labour be proportioned to the real demand, the wages of labour will necessarily rise, and the condition of the remaining nine hundred may be materially improved; and, what is of more importance, the actual work executed by those nine hundred labourers in their improved condition, may, and will, be equal, if not superior, to that which was executed by the whole 1,000, in their state of comparatively unremunerated service."

October 3, 1826 page 2

DUBLIN, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3.

The unhappy picture of the present condition and future prospects of a large portion of the manufacturing population of England, which we extracted yesterday from The Times, is already equalled by an account of the state of an extensive district in Scotland, as we find it described in the last number of The Morning Chronicle. It appears that a meeting of the county of Lanark was held at Hamilton, on Saturday se'nnight, for

the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of transmitting to Government a representation of the distress existing in that part of the country. The Chronicle gives a report of the proceedings at that meeting, and also the report of a committee, appointed by a former meeting, which was then taken into consideration, and afterwards proceeds as follows: --

“The condition of the hand-loom weavers of the West of Scotland seems wretched beyond description. In the County of Lanark alone, it is stated, in the Report, there are 30,000 of them, who, with their families, are mostly in a state of utter and hopeless destitution. A circumstance, stated in *The Scotsman* of Wednesday, will serve to give some idea of their wretched condition. Petitions were presented to the Meeting from thirteen Societies (almost all weavers), in the Lower Ward of Lanarkshire, consisting of from 100 to 250 families, each praying for pecuniary assistance, to enable them to emigrate.

“The hand-loom weavers, both in England and Scotland, are fully proscribed. The struggle between them and the power-looms can only be carried on at an expense of privation and suffering, at which humanity revolts. Every improvement in the power-loom machinery must add to the misery of these unfortunate beings. The number of hand-loom weavers throughout this island and Ireland is so great, that the difficulty of disposing of them becomes quite appalling.

“But in Scotland, those who, from humanity, or even a regard to the peace of the country, would make exertions to remove these unhappy sacrifices to mechanical improvement, to some of our Colonies, are arrested by the consideration, that their places would immediately be supplied by a worse description of people.

“An emigration,” said the Duke of Hamilton, “was effected from Lesmahago, but they were replaced by Irish, who lived worse.” – “During more prosperous times,” says the Report of the Committee, “hand-loom cotton weaving, attracted into this country from all parts of Scotland, and particularly from Ireland, an entirely new and extraneous population, the parity of whose morals can bear no comparison with the sober and steady habits of the former natives of the District; and, what is worse, the bad example set by these incomers in daily tending to demoralize those with whom they come into immediate contact. At this very time, the most respectable part of the weavers already alarmed at the change, are forming themselves into Societies for the purpose of emigrating to America; a circumstance greatly to be lamented, and from past experience, there is every reason to conclude that the whole weaving shops and houses vacated by their removal, will be filled by people direct from Ireland, who, for a few shillings, can import themselves and their families into this country by means of the steam boats; and as they can maintain themselves on little more than potatoes and water alone, and reside three or four families together in one apartment, or accommodate themselves together

in a miserable hovel, they must necessarily drive the whole of the weaving population out of the country, or reduce them to the same mis[e]rable level as themselves; ultimately having a more numerous, and degraded set of paupers to be maintained by the parishes.”

“We have here a fresh confirmation of what we have so often inculcated, that the population of Ireland must necessarily pull down the working classes of this country to their own level. The West of Scotland may now almost be considered an extension of Ireland. The Scotchman, yet unable to live on potatoes and water, and to pig three or four families in one room, quits the field to the Irishman, and seeks for a new country beyond the Atlantic.

“But will any thing be done to stop the progress of the calamity which is reducing the labouring population to the level of Irish wretchedness? We believe not. The Parliament of the United Kingdom is a Parliament of Landholders; its sympathies with the wretched labouring classes will not lend them to enter on any searching measures by which the Landholders of Ireland might be affected. But with a free intercourse between the two Islands, and the possibility of obtaining a passage for a shilling, or even less, it is useless to attempt any remedy here, till Ireland has been grappled with. The source of the evil the overflows the empire is in Ireland. The moment you remove a necessitous family from hence, its place is supplied by an Irish family. It has been recommended in Scotland to adopt measures to check building, but they would be attended with difficulty. The Duke of Hamilton said “he would be ready to break his loaf with the countrymen of his own soil, but he would have nothing to do with the foreign population – let those who brought them to this country, and were advantaged by them support them.’ But his Grace cannot, in the present state of the law, prevent persons from bringing strangers into the country, and availing themselves of them to beat down the wages of the natives, and indeed it requires not the gift of prophecy to predict, that as long as the stranger can be obtained at a cheaper rate than the native, he will be preferred. The employer is forced, in his own defence, to purchase the cheapest labour he can find. His Grace may be ready to break his loaf with his own country-man, though unwilling to do so with the stranger, but the cause of the distress will still remain untouched.

“Ireland might add greatly to the wealth and prosperity of the Empire; but then the people must not be sacrificed for the sake of the church and the landowners. Parliament ought not to hesitate, but to inquire in good earnest whether it is practicable to remove the Irish peasantry in sufficient numbers to allow of the attempts to introduce agricultural improvements. The thing must either be tried on a great scale or it is useless. But if it is practicable, then we say, a Parliament with any regard for the people, would at once pass a law, making it compulsory on the landlords to contribute to the expense of clearing of their estates of this vicious population, which their rack rent system has

called into being. Money could be easily obtained on the security of the land. But will any thing be attempted? We fear any thing beyond palliatives is not to be expected.”

October 27, 1826 page 4

SCOTCH AND IRISH.

It is a very old practice among our Scottish neighbours, to trace almost every crime committed in their country to the Irish, who have migrated into it. – Their anxiety to trace the origin of heinous criminals to the sister island was never more remarkably displayed than in the case of the McKeands, who perpetrated the recent murder at Winton. However much the inclination of the Scots to throw such imputations off themselves may have tended in their eyes to depreciate beyond its due level the character of their Irish fellow-citizens, the opinion which they seem in this respect to entertain of the Irish is apparently very much corroborated by the recent history of the West of Scotland. For several years, almost every Judge who has been in that quarter has taken care in his charges to animadvert in strong terms upon the increase of crime in the West of Scotland; and it is a very singular fact that emigration of Irish labourers in the west of Scotland has been exactly contemporaneous with these complaints. The number of these emigrants has become a subject of general discontent in that quarter, and the Duke of Hamilton has expressed himself concerning them in a manner which can scarcely be tolerated even in the Premier Nobleman of Scotland. If the lower classes of the Irish are degraded in their manner of living, and debased in their morals, as they have but too truly in many cases been represented, that degradation and debasement is not attributable to them as Irishmen, but to the unfortunate circumstances in which they are placed; and instead of considering what means may be used to prevent their emigration to more favoured countries, it would be much more advisable to consider what means may be used to render them comfortable at home, and thus to remove all temptation to emigrate. In this way, and only in this way, can we prevent their emigration to Scotland. The state of Ireland, is in every respect unfortunate, and the only difficulty lies in devising the means of remedying it. The cause of the superiority of Scotland in point of morality is clearly to be attributed to its superior means of education, and to this there exists at present in Ireland an almost insurmountable obstacle. It is of no use to talk vaguely of causes. No political dissertation can be of the slightest consequence which does not lead to a palpable result. Since the Duke of Hamilton has traced the miseries of the West of Scotland to the influx of Irish, let the Duke of Hamilton show us the means of preventing that influx. – It is a most serious, a most momentous question, it involves the interests of seven millions of Irishmen; and the discussions in the West of Scotland have shown that it equally involves the interest of every portion of the empire to which the distress of these seven millions of Irishmen may induce their surplus population to bend its course. – If things go on as they are doing at present, we may soon see our poor rates equal our rentals; for, as the Irish habituate

themselves to live on what we consider almost nothing, there can be no bounds to their increase, and no end to the swarms which may be poured over every habitable spot of the British dominions. – *British Press*.

December 13, 1826 page 3

EMIGRATION.

The subject of Emigration was agitated in the House of Lords on Friday night, on the presentation of a petition by the Marquis of Lansdowne, from the Emigration Societies of Cambusland and Corkfield-bank, in the west of Scotland. In that part of the country, and in Lancashire, there are hundreds of thousands of human beings in a state of misery which baffles all description. Indeed, such is the distress in Scotland in particular, that we do not think it safe to repeat what we have heard from sources of the most undoubted credit, with respect not merely to the sufferings of the weavers, but also the apprehensions of the other classes.

That these poor people should be desirous of leaving a country, in which life to them in unceasing misery, without even the alleviation of hope of relief, is natural enough. As they can always find a grace every where – the only relief which their own country holds out to them from their sufferings – they who are removed to another part of the world may esteem themselves happy. But, unfortunately, man is not so easily removed from one hemisphere to another in reality, as in the works of imagination; and the number to whom the happiness is in store, of being transported from the land of their birth, must indeed be small. It would be cruelty to the poor sufferers, to feed them with the hope, that any relief worth talking of is in store for them from this source.

We heartily concur with Mr. Peel in opinion, that the evidence of Colonel Cockburn before the emigration Committee was worth that of all the other witnesses taken together. In the first place, Colonel Cockburn had had a great deal of experience in locating settlers in Canada (though, it must be owned, that soldiers are not the best description of settlers). In the next place, his evidence was free from all suspicion of bias from interested motives. Of the other witnesses, some talk very loosely of the capabilities of the different Colonies, and of the possibility of obtaining repayment of the sums advanced to Colonies; while some again display so great anxiety respecting the object, that a suspicion is excited they had private ends to serve.

Lord Lansdown observed: --

“That the question divided itself into parts – whether Government ought, and by what means, to interfere with it, and to what extent it should carry the operation in to effect; whether it should be extended to the country at large, or limited to particular districts; whether it should be adopted on so large a scale as to send off a million of

people, or whether emigration should be a measure of a much more limited nature, in which case it might be restricted to carrying out those persons who, possessing a small quantity of capital, might be able to provide for themselves, or, at least, contribute to their own support.”

As to the carrying out a million, or even a hundred thousand persons in one or two years, the thing is quite impossible. The influx of even a few thousands in one year into Canada would cause great distress in that colony. The emigrants must be subsisted till a return can be obtained from the soil, and houses of some kind must be erected for their reception. – Even if Government were to consent to subsist twenty or thirty thousand persons, the food for them would at present be obtained with much difficulty. As the population of Canada increases, and the communications improve, the number of emigrants who can be received without inconvenience, will be, of course, greater. But we are speaking of the present capabilities of Canada, which of all our colonies, is the one most available for the poorer class of emigrants. – *Morning Chronicle*.

February 17, 1827 page 2

DUBLIN, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17.

The following article relates to a subject of great importance to Ireland especially, and one which has not engaged as large a share of public attention in this country as it most certainly deserves: --

EMIGRATION

A motion stands in the Order Book of the House of Commons, for to-morrow, (Thursday) to which we are desirous of directing public attention. It is that of Mr. Wilmot Horton, for re-appointing the Emigration Committee, whose Report of their inquiries and proceedings last Session, conducted under the personal superintendence of Mr. Horton himself, contained such a mass of valuable information. This Report, which consisted of nearly four hundred folio pages, besides not being accessible to every one who might feel deeply interested in the subject, was of too voluminous a character to be generally read. We are glad, therefore, to find, that the Report itself has been published, without abridgment, accompanied by a brief analysis of the evidence and appendix, in a compact octavo volume of about two hundred pages; thus placing within the reach of the public, generally, all the more essential parts of this most important document.

We observe, also, that Dr. Strachan, Archbishop of York, Upper Canada, has just given to the world a pamphlet addressed to Mr. Wilmot Horton, entitled Remarks on Emigration from the United Kingdom. In this pamphlet, Dr. Strachan, adverting to the Report of the Committee, observes, that “it contains so much important and various information, that every means should be adopted for promoting its circulation; but,”

continues the writer, "as the copies printed are limited in number, and its appearance not of the most attractive form, it is within the reach of very few readers – and still fewer are disposed to wade through the mass of evidence which it contains. A summary, therefore, of the Report, condensing the more important parts of the evidence, and showing the principal facts which it clearly proves, may not be a barren service, and may win the public attention to a subject which involves the most momentous interests, and on which the peace and happiness of society particularly depend. The following facts appear completely established: --

1. That there is a redundant population in the United Kingdom.
2. That the Colonies to which this redundant population may be sent, are well adapted to their reception, offering good neighbourhood, health, independence, and even opulence.
3. That the experiments made, both by Government and individuals, have been eminently successful.
4. That pauper emigrants will, after seven years, be able to repay, with care, the expense of their emigration and settlement.

Dr. Strachan then proceeds to prove, and, we think, successfully, that all these propositions are well founded, both by the evidence produced before the Committee, and by facts coming within the range of his own observation. We have not room, to day, to extract his reasonings, and the circumstances on which they are founded; but we very strongly recommend the perusal of this pamphlet to every one who feels any interest, however remote, in the question which it discusses. One of the concluding paragraphs we must lay before our readers, because, though brief, it enforces an important truth. "If it be asked," says Dr. Strachan, "why there is such a clamour against emigration as a national measure? I answer, that it is a question which has never yet been carefully examined: its philosophy has not even been touched upon, nor its consequences, as a State measure, unfolded. It, nevertheless, offers an untrodden field for the political economists who will take common sense along with him, well deserving his most serious attention."

We look forward, with confidence, to the discussion of to-morrow night, as one of the occasions on which the individual who has taken up this subject with so much honourable zeal and unquestioned ability, will develop some of those philosophical views of it, to which Dr. Strachan refers. – *Wednesday's Courier*.

EMIGRATION.

The following exhibits only one side of this important subject. Coming from an organ of the Cabinet, however, it is worth attention: --

“We hasten to call public attention to the able and interesting Speech of Mr. Wilmot Horton, in the House of Commons, last night, on the subject of Emigration, to which we adverted on Wednesday. The honorable gentleman moved for the revival of the Committee which sat last year; and, in doing so, he took occasion to state what were the results of the experiments already made, by his Majesty[‘s] Ministers, in Canada. We are happy to hear that these are most satisfactory, and, indeed, of a strikingly gratifying character. From the superabundant population of Ireland – from a set of wretched paupers, without property, without regular subsistence, wandering about the country, partly with a view to obtain charitable relief, sometimes for the purpose of robbery and depredation – from this helpless class the emigrants were chiefly selected. These unfortunate creatures having been placed under the care of Mr. Robinson, were removed to Upper Canada. One hundred and sixty families were located on fertile lands, never before occupied. Of these, forty heads of families went, in the summer, to North America, to look for work, while 120 families took root on their settlements, cultivated their lands, and had acquired property in the year 1826, to the amount of 7,000l.

“Thus,’ said Mr. Horton, ‘these poor people were, in a short time, raised from wretchedness and degradation in their own country, to prosperity and independence, in lands on which human beings had never before set their foot.’ He further stated, that the old settlers were benefitted by the arrival of these emigrants, and that, in fact, the good effected in their behalf, was perfectly without alloy.

“The Hon. Gentleman proceeded to show the practicability of sending out, annually, a considerable number of persons without expense to the State. The relief from poor’s rates, which might, in particular cases, be obtained through encouraging emigration, he demonstrated, would make it the interest of the parochial authorities to remove, under certain conditions, a portion of their paupers to North America. In this way, those who are at present a burthen to the country, may be brought to contribute to its prosperity, while their own condition is, at the same time, immensely improved.

“In answer to the general objection to emigration, that it cannot be conducted on a scale of sufficient magnitude to make it the source of very important relief to the country, it was forcibly argued by Mr. Baring, that the abstraction of comparatively small numbers, might prove highly beneficial to a state. It is not their proportion to the gross amount of our population, that is to be considered, nor even the proportion they bear to the distressed part of it, that we are to look at, but we ought to recollect, that the removal

of a few may render it unnecessary for the many to think of removing at all. It is not the object of Ministers to transfer to another land all who now complain of distress, but to find the means of enabling so many to emigrate as may suffice to make employment, and, consequently, the means of subsistence more abundant at home.

“We agree with those who think there may be a difficulty in making the settlers in Canada repay the expense which must in some cases be incurred for sending them out, and locating them there, by direct advances of money, or even of produce; but we can imagine no possible objection to the admirable plan suggested by Mr. Secretary Peel, for making them indirectly reimburse the country for any charge which they may bring upon it in the first instance.

“What,’ the Rt. Hon. Gentleman inquired, ‘could be more fair, than allotting to the Government a portion of land, between the lands granted to the emigrants? It was worthy of consideration, whether or not the Government would, by a sale of those lands, in the course of ten or twelve years – when the lands on all sides of it should have been brought into a good state of cultivation, and when those lands allotted to the Government would acquire a value, which they never would have acquired, if the surrounding lands were not in a state of cultivation – be repaid the capital advanced to the emigrants, for the purpose of cultivating their grants. He mentioned this merely to show that if the plan of repayment by the emigrants was encumbered with difficulties, that the Government might not be induced to give up the general policy of the measure, but that other plans might be devised, which would hold out, not an immediate, but a distant and certain prospect of payment.”

February 23, 1827 page 3

RELIEF OF THE POOR.

CORK, FEB. 20. – In our report under this head on Saturday, we stated that his Worship the Mayor had a communication of considerable moment to impart to the Committee, regarding the relief of the existing and extensive distress among the poor of this City; but that we would defer its communication until Monday, when a better attendance of the Committee may be reckoned on. Accordingly, at a full meeting which took place yesterday at the Commercial Buildings, the Mayor presiding, he disclosed this proposition in very pathetic and eloquent language, to the effect, that a highly respectable individual, who would not suffer his name to be divulged, and whose benevolence and good feeling could only be equalled by the munificence of his offer, had tendered a donation of 500l., for the purpose of enabling a number of the cotton weavers of Cork, at present out of employment, to emigrate to the City of Philadelphia, in the United States, where that manufacture was carried on in a state of great progression, and where a tradesman, by moderate labour, may earn 2l. to 3l. a week; or, the gentleman would give 3l. each to any number of these weavers, belonging to the city of Cork, who,

under the superintendence of the Committee, may desire to take advantage of so favourable an opportunity of bettering their condition. The Mayor further stated, that this offer flowed from a spirit the most disinterested, the benevolent gentleman being quite independent and possessed of considerable property in the north of Ireland. In adverting to the appalling degree of distress which now prevails throughout the city, his Worship mentioned the case of forty men, chiefly cotton weavers, of the most wretched plight and appearance, who waited upon him on Saturday evening, imploring some relief for themselves and their families, being at that instant without any food, and in danger of starvation. A vessel was now in the river from Messrs. Harvey and Deaves, and Messrs. Carroll and Co., for New York, who would take any number of passengers, at about 6l. each. The Mayor concluded with the following resolutions; and with the other determinations of this interesting meeting we must finish, being obliged by the press of important matter brought by the packet of Saturday, to withhold a detailed report we had prepared of the observations and sentiments of the several Gentlemen who took part in the proceedings, viz., Rev. Archdeacon Thompson, Rev. Dr. Quarry, Rev. Mr. England, Rev. Mr. Swete, Messrs. John Callaghan (Lota), Wm. Crawford, John Murphy, Daniel Murphy, Michael J. Barry, &c. &c.

The following are the resolutions: --

“That the grateful thanks of this Committee be given to the Humane Individual above alluded to, and the Mayor be requested to state to him that his munificent donation will be applied by the Committee according to his wishes – and that they will send as many of the distressed Cotton-weavers of the City of Cork to the United States of America as it will enable them – and that the Committee will use their best exertions to give effect to and promote his benevolent object.

“That a Letter be written by the Secretary to Mr. Wilmot Horton, Secretary to the Colonial Department, acquainting him with the offer made to this Committee, and soliciting from Government such aid as may enable them to give full effect to the object proposed.

“That thirty pair of blankets be purchased and presented to the Governors of the House of Industry, for the purpose of affording relief to sixty paupers.”

“Resolved – That the City be divided into fourteen Collections and Districts, and that two or more Collectors be appointed to each, for the purpose of collecting and receiving contributions to their respective districts, and that the money received be accounted for and paid weekly to the Treasurer of the General Relief Fund.”

The following sums were then voted to the parishes to afford present aid, and for upholding the soup-shops: --

St. Ann's Shandon ... £60

St. Mary's Shandon ... 40

St. Nicholas's ... 45

St. Finn Berry's ... 20

St. Peter's ... 15

Some other routine business being disposed of, the Committee adjourned their sitting to Friday next, at two o'clock, when it is expected the usual attendance will be given.

October 5, 1827 page 2

EMIGRATION.

The Third Report of the Emigration Committee has just been published, and some idea may be formed of the zeal and labour which were exercised on the part of those who framed it, from the fact of this final report, with the evidence and appendix, constituting a folio volume of between 600 and 700 pages.

Sufficient is known of the general proceedings of the Committee, and of the opinions of its most effective members, to let the public already understand that there exists in the minds of those gentlemen a strong persuasion of the necessity of removing gradually, by systematic means, a portion of the pauper inhabitants of the United Kingdom to some of our Colonial possessions.

To recommend such a project, certain facts must be assumed as demonstrable: -

1st, That there does actually exist in Great Britain and Ireland, a large class of able bodied men, with their families, for whom, generally speaking, no profitable employment can be found.

2d, That there cannot be procured at home an unoccupied land, on the produce of which these idle paupers could be subsisted by their own industry, more amply than by transporting them across the sea.

3d, That the expense of transporting and of settling them would not be equal to that of supporting them at home, whether by poor-rates or from private charity.

And, 4th, That the paupers themselves, wretched as is their present condition, would not be exposed to the chances of a life still more precarious and miserable, by the change which is now suggested.

We have often expressed a conscientious distrust of the soundness of the emigration project, as applied to the relief of the British and Irish poor; or, speaking more correctly, as resorted to for a remedy to the evils afflicting the community at large, from their presence, their wretchedness, and their apparently progressive increase. But it is in the very calmest and most dispassionate temper, that a subject of such infinite importance ought to be approached; and we are far from insisting that the Committee have made no case in relation to the four requisites above enumerated, or that no evidence and no reasonings are contained in their voluminous work now published, of a nature to demand the deepest consideration from all humane and reflecting minds. – *Times*.

October 9, 1827 page 2

STATE OF IRELAND.

We have now gone attentively through the whole of the evidence taken by the Emigration Committee, and are more and more convinced of the impossibility of improving Ireland with her present redundant population – of the impossibility of consolidating farms, and preventing the still further increase of the population. The experimental emigration proposed by the Committee will only serve to give a stimulus to population; it will be beneficial to the individuals removed, but will not be felt in the way of diminishing the redundancy. Sir Henry Parnell, on whose opinion we place the utmost reliance, when asked what was his opinion of the probability of the existing evil of a surplus population increasing in Ireland, answered, “I think there is every probability of the actual distress greatly increasing, and all the consequences belonging to it; I see no reason for supposing that the population is not increasing now as rapidly as it has increased during the last thirty years: I believe it has doubled in that period.

. . . And when I have recourse to my own observation of facts, I have no doubt that the population is now increasing at the rate of doubling in thirty years; for this reason I think the misery of the people must become everyday greater, that the temptation and disposition to violate the laws will become more general, and that the difficulty of preserving tranquillity in the country will be greatly increased; I also think that the emigration to England will be so much greater than it has ever yet been, that it must produce a general deterioration to the comforts, habits, and character of the labouring classes in this country.” Sir Henry Parnell thinks “the progress of clearing estates will be slow, from the general resistance of the occupying tenants to that practice, and the means they possess of deterring landlords from carrying their intentions into effect.” Mr. Spring Rice observes, that “those proprietors who, in the first instance, perceived the necessity of acting upon the principle of clearing their estates, were enabled to act upon it without much inconvenience; for so long as there was but one person, or a few persons, who wished to consolidate many small farms into one, and to

reduce the number of the surplus population upon their estates, adjacent estates, which were not directed by the same principles, afforded to the population quitting their former residences a facility of settlement; but now, when almost all the proprietors are disposed to act upon the same principle, and even if they have not the means of removing the excess of population from their own property, of taking the best care to prevent the settling of strangers among them, there is scarcely any means by which a poor man, who loses his former habitation and farm, can acquire a settlement elsewhere." We cannot conceive the possibility of a general dislodgment. It is easy, as Mr. Spring Rice observes, to clear one or two properties in the outset, when the persons removed can find shelter elsewhere; but it is otherwise when the inevitable consequences are famine and death. The towns have been gorged with vagrants, and disease has been making sad havoc; for, last year, out of a population of 200,000 in Dublin, 60,000 passed through the Hospitals in contagious fever. But long before any great increase can be made to the mortality, the country must be in a state distressing in the extreme to all classes. You cannot KILL OFF the lower orders by famine and contagious disease without carrying disease into the other classes. Sir Henry Parnell says the distress of the lower classes is so great that there is a growing indisposition in the higher to reside in the country. "I have received letters of late which induce me to believe, not only that it contributes to produce an indisposition among absentees to return to Ireland to reside there, but that it contributes very much to induce those gentlemen who are now resident to become absentees ... I have received a letter from a Nobleman who has always been residing on his estate, in which he says, 'What can we do? Landlords will not surrender their rents, and of course, a contest will ensu[e] between them and the people.

. . . Government must take their choice between insurrection and emigration; one cannot look forward without dismay; a residence in Ireland is becoming a burthen too great to be borne; it is bad enough living in the midst of distress; any attempt to relieve the people only brings shoals of wretched beings from other places; what must it be in districts (and this will soon be the case every where), in which, in addition to this, the gentry are living in daily apprehension of their houses being attacked, and their families destroyed? We must leave Ireland to Police Magistrates, and perhaps return in some years, when famine and disease and (if trade improves) a great emigration into England have improved the condition of the country." Thus, then, we see a servile war, and famine and disease are looked forward to AS THE MEANS OF PURIFYING THE ATMOSPHERE OF IRELAND. But the rebellion of 1798, and all the burning of cottages, and outrages in its train, did not materially diminish the population, or sensibly affect the regular rate of increase. Before any material effect could be produced in the way of thinning the population by the sword, all Europe would be filled with horror at our proceedings. Thus, then, we see the most portentous results announced as inevitable; we see Ireland proceeding in a career which famine and contagion can alone impede, and England gradually approaching to

the state of Ireland, which it must ultimately reach. The Emigration Committee have proposed no remedy to meet the evil. They have, however, done great good in exhibiting the evil to the country in all its hideous magnitude. Whether this awful prospect before us will stimulate the country to any corresponding exertions remains to be seen. England could easily be set right herself, were it not for the Sister Island. – *Morning Chron.*

October 15, 1827 page 2

STATE OF IRELAND.

Although we are ardent admirers of the *Morning Chronicle*, we are persuaded that, if we acquiesced in its censure of certain statements in a late speech of Mr. SHEIL, our admiration would be as absurd as that of the Roman, who said that he would rather err with PLATO than think accurately with the rest of mankind. The article in the *Chronicle* to which we allude, and from which we unhesitatingly dissent, is that where Mr. SHEIL'S remarks upon the favourite, although anti-human, theories of MALTHUS are described as "only discreditable to Mr. SHEIL himself, or rather to the system which has called forth a Mr. SHEIL." If the doctrines of MALTHUS be popular and rational, it is not harshness to tax a man with speaking "discreditably to himself" who impugns them, as Mr. SHEIL has done. On the other hand, if they be not only universally rejected, but universally abhorred, as warring with GOD and nature, then Mr. SHEIL merits our sympathy and respect, inasmuch as he vindicates the ways of a creating and conservative Providence, by his denunciations of their professor. The *Morning Chronicle* may speak with sarcasm of the individual; but it is not original in the idea when it observes, that "men like Mr. SHEIL will always be found in countries torn by civil dissensions." The same has been said by the author of the Dialogue upon Eloquence, which the learned Editor of the *Chronicle* may have consulted with advantage, even since his school-boy toil has terminated. Mr. SHEIL is exactly the sort of creation, which a system of government like that fashionable in Ireland must always beget, and which, while it owes its humiliation, is also indebted for its consequence, to that system. By his own caste Mr. SHEIL is regarded as an acquisition and an ornament, and if he appear mischievous to others, the evil is traceable to those who, by continuing the misrule of the country, open a field for men, whose genius might have been otherwise content with the sphere professedly marked out for them. Were emancipation granted, Mr. SHEIL would have his chance of something beyond popular applause but each alarm and prejudice which protracts that concession, stimulates him the more, because it confirms his claims upon the admiration of the future as well as the present.

But, in a subsequent number, the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle* enters upon a review of that part of Mr. SHEIL'S speech to which our own attention was directed, when we pronounced it, what it undoubtedly is – philosophical. Here no brotherly predilection, nor blind idolatry of the craft, (for into this political economy now

degenerates), is visible. A letter, signed "A Practical Observer," appeared in the *Chronicle* of the preceding day. In this, the writer denies that those districts in Ireland in which the Catholic population prevails, are justly chargeable with a greater portion of depravity than those in which the Protestant population is most extended, and grounds his denial by contrasting the proportion of commitments to the population in ten Catholic with ten Protestant counties, which are found to be greater in the latter than in the former. This statement, the *Morning Chronicle* holds to be perfectly compatible with Mr. SHEIL'S description of the country. It being a matter so obvious we shall not dwell upon it. The evidence of Mr. O'DRISCOL, of Sir HENRY PARNELL, and even of MALTHUS himself, as given in the Emigration Report just published, develops the cause of our peasantry being so vitiated in morals as late events have proved them. We might crowd our Journal with facts to the same effect as those contained in the letter which we copy from the *Chronicle*; but, as a proof that, not only in Ireland, but even in England, the Protestants are not one jot more virtuous than their Catholic fellow-subjects, let us attend to the following extract from an article in the last Edinburgh Review, upon the Cotton Manufacture: -- "There is, to say the least," says the writer, "as much moral restraint evinced in the intercourse between the sexes in Lancashire, as in most agricultural districts of England. The latter, indeed, would be but an indifferent standard of comparison, if we suppose that the morality of other districts bears any considerable resemblance to that of a purely agricultural district in Norfolk, where, we are told by the Rev. Mr. BRERETON, there were seventy-seven births in a given period, of which twenty-three only were legitimate." When was such profligacy heard of in Ireland? If religion could operate against crime-creating laws, no religion, to use the candid words of the *Morning Chronicle*, would be equally effectual with the Romish religion in checking the crimes to which the Catholic peasantry is prone.

October 20, 1827 page 2

EMIGRATION REPORT.

Circumstanced as Ireland is, any remedy prescribed with a view to relieve her, cannot be unworthy of notice. Several have been suggested from time to time; but Emigration, from all we have read of the Report just published, appears to "the collective wisdom," or at least to some of them, a cure "collected from all simples that have virtue under the moon." Our readers have been already made acquainted with the opinions of the Committee. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves at present, to an inquiry into their wisdom.

The first thing which strikes us, and that too very forcibly, is the glaring inconsistency of which the Report convicts Mr. MALTHUS. Speaking of Emigration as a remedy in case of a "redundance" of the human species, that political economist observes, in his Essay on the Principle of Population, "As these parts (the uncultivated

portions of the earth) are of great extent and very thinly peopled, this resource (emigration) might appear on a first view of the subject an adequate remedy, or at least of a nature to remove the evil to a distant period; but, when we advert to experience, and to the actual state of the uncivilised parts of the globe, instead of any thing like an adequate remedy, it will appear but a slight palliative." So much for MALTHUS' writing – let us hear him speaking: "What is your opinion as to the capability of Ireland becoming a very rich and flourishing country?" "My opinion is, that it has very great capabilities – that it might be a very rich, and a very prosperous country, and that it might be richer in proportion than England, from its greater natural capabilities." "Do you think that any one circumstance would more tend to cultivate that state of things, than a judicious system of Emigration put into force in that country? "I think that a judicious system of Emigration is one of the most powerful means to accomplish that object." Here is consistency with a vengeance!

Ireland is, indeed, the land of anomaly and of misfortune. Axioms which may be predicated of the world beside, become absurdities, when used with reference to her. "If every thing else be equal," says Mr. HUME, "it seems reasonable to expect, that where there are the wisest institutions and the most happiness, there will also be the most people." The fields of Erin, it is well known, have been replenished by her children having eaten plentifully of the bread of misery. ADAM SMITH tells us, that if the demand for labour be continually increasing, the reward of labour must necessarily encourage in such a manner the marriage and multiplication of labourers, as may enable them to supply that continually increasing demand by a continually increasing population. In Ireland, however, where every thing goes the wrong way, thanks to British misrule, the absence of all demand on labour has the same effect upon the increase of mankind, which the ancient Romans ascribed to the lash of the Luperici, and that was rigidly anti-Malthusian. "The want of trade in Ireland," said Sir WILLIAM TEMPLE, in 1673, "proceeds from the want of people." A population amounting to seven millions and a-half in Ireland, swears the Rev. Mr. MALTHUS, in 1827, ought not to be overlooked by the Legislature, inasmuch as it is "the greatest possible degree of misery." Sir WILLIAM, in a letter to the Earl of ESSEX, the Irish Lord Lieutenant of his day, recommended the discouragement of the woollen trade here, from an apprehension, that "it would give a great damp to the trade of England." MALTHUS, in the very front of our ruined manufactures, solemnly pledges himself, that if millions of us do not be located in the Canadas, our numbers will be in a geometrical ratio of increase, when compared with the means of subsistence. "Fewness of people," says Sir WILLIAM PETTY, "is real poverty; and a nation wherein are eight millions of people is more than twice as rich as the same scope of land wherein are but four." Mr. SPRING RICE hands in to the Chairman of the Committee of Emigration, a solution to a question, in which solution the roof which shelters him "who is made unto the image and likeness of God," is called a "most grievous nuisance." "The bodies of men," observes Dr. DAVENANT, in his political and

commercial works, “are without doubt the most valuable treasure of a country.” Away with them to the banks of the Ottawa, exclaims Mr. WILMO THORTON. A Ship Canal is recommended by Lord CLONCURRENCY as a means of employment for our labourers and of wealth to the nation. Five hundred thousand pounds are about to be thrown away by our Government upon the formation of the Rideau Canal in Upper Canada, which, notwithstanding this expenditure, is represented by the editor of an American paper as totally unfit for any purpose of utility or enterprise. The Commissioners of Waste Lands, Bogs, and Irish Fisheries, gave a demonstration, almost mathematical, of the practicability with which those inert resources of the country could be turned into active profit. The wilds of a colony which we hold by a spider’s thread, open to us a less precarious field of speculation. It is observed by Mr. MALTHUS himself, in his work on population, that the late Empress CATHERINE of Russia found it necessary to protect, by regular fortresses, the colonies which she had located on the banks of the Wolga. The [Crim Tartms] were, no doubt, unpleasant neighbours; but does Mr. MALTHUS seriously imagine, that in case of an attack from the republican frontiers of the United States, the expatriated Irish will gain as easy a triumph, even though they should struggle for it, over the Congress, as CATHERINE did over the Crimea. But thus it is with our enthusiast Committees, and thus it is, alas, with our wretched country.

We are fully aware, that the political economists of the London Press will say, “all this is cant.” If they are persuaded that a colonization of Canada with one million of Irish will secure that settlement to the mother country, (their apprehensions on this head are not disguised) and import a sensible relief to the residue, then, indeed, have they reason to speak wrathfully of those who will not obey their dicta. But this the Report does not establish; although we would be uncandid were we not to state our belief, that it abounds with matter which cannot fail to be useful to every public writer who makes Ireland his theme. The Morning Chronicle seems to think that opponents of the Emigration Committee ground their opposition upon texts from the Book of Genesis. We are not among the number of those; because, we are persuaded, with the Chronicle, that “increase and multiply” is no more a positive injunction, as regards us, than the bigamies of the Old Testament are a positive precedent for the regulation of our moral code. We stand upon a stronger foundation, and that foundation derives additional solidity from the countless irrationalities which we have met with in the Emigration Report.

January 12, 1828 page 2

Although the name of Mr. MALTHUS has become unpopular in Ireland, there is, nevertheless, in his evidence upon the condition of our peasantry, matter that we may approve of, however associated it be with matter that we must censure. When he was asked what the circumstances were which introduced bad habits amongst the people? he vindicated the true principles of political economy by replying, “Their degraded condition, oppression, and ignorance.” The querist, anxious for a more positive

elucidation of Mr. MALTHUS'S views, questioned him as to the "way" in which he imagined "there was oppression in Ireland?" Our approval centres in that portion of his testimony which was a reply to this question: -- "I think," answered Mr. MALTHUS, "that the Government of Ireland has, upon the whole, been very unfavourable to habits of that kind; it has tended to degrade the general mass of the people, and, consequently, to prevent them from looking forward and acquiring habits of prudence." (3d Emigrat. Report, p. 119.) If the witness has committed himself upon other subjects, candour must certainly reward him for having thus convicted of the guilt of degrading a whole people, its real authors.

Mr. MALTHUS has written some ingenious books, and, perhaps, the man who would explode the theories contained in them, may need the gift of more ingenuity than is generally apprehended to be needful. But, when he says that the character of the English labourers will be deteriorated "in every respect, moral and physical," by contact with those whom hunger, enterprise, and industry drive from this country into England, he evinces an ignorance which the veriest simpleton breathing may expose. A visit in 1817 to the County of Westmeath, and in the same year to the Killarney Lakes – which Mr. MALTHUS admits to have been the full period and compass of his peregrination in Ireland, is too limited "in every respect, moral and physical," to entitle Mr. MALTHUS to confidence on this head. Mrs. FRY, a benevolent, well-meaning, but extremely presumptuous, Quaker Lady, has committed the sin of throwing away three calendar months upon the examination of our commitments, calendars, prisons, and (to use the felicitous phraseology of her own Report) other public charitable institutions – for the Reader must bear in mind that our gaols are so many asylums of charity; but, grateful as we feel towards the fair visitant for good intentions, we apprehend, that a description from her pen, of an evening at the Phoenix Park (her "Report" is dedicated to the Marquis WELLESLEY), would transcend in point of graphic excellence, that with which she professes to illuminate the empire; as a "Guide" to Killarney, and a sketch of Mullingar by Professor MALTHUS, must, if given to the world, have transcended the fruits of his tour of observation through Ireland, exhibited as they are in the Emigration Report. We have been induced to notice Mrs. FRY, by an article in the Monthly Review, for January, which we consider a fair criticism of her book, the motives supposed to have led to its publication, and the state of society in Ireland, upon which it would persuade us that it is almost oracularly instructive. That portion of the article which bears upon our remarks upon Mr. MALTHUS'S evidence, with respect to the morality of the English and Irish labourers, will be found particularly interesting, because it is from the pen (at least there is prima facie testimony of the fact) of a writer acquainted with the real state of Ireland, its complication of anomalies, and numberless misfortunes.

January 29, 1828 page 2

Our readers are aware from our publication of the Report prepared by the Ship Canal Committee, that amongst the expedients recommended for the improvement of the condition of Ireland, that of a modified system of Poor Laws holds a prominent place. Although we should be disposed to hesitate before acquiescing in the adoption of a measure of very questionable benefit to society, we willingly subscribe to the suggestion, that the absentees ought to be compelled to bear a portion of that burden to which we have reason to know they will never be voluntarily reconciled. "If it be admitted as a general principle," says the Rev. Mr. KEATING, in a letter addressed to Mr. GOULBURN, "that every country should establish some provision for its poor; the obligation to do so holds good with greater force in Ireland, which suffers under all the evils of absenteeism. Can a reasonable doubt (continues the writer) be entertained with regard to the benefit that would arise from a charge on the lands for the relief of the poor, which must ultimately fall on the landed proprietors? It is both just and natural for those that are resident, and who at present support, by voluntary contributions, the whole expenditure, to desire an equality of parochial burdens among all the proprietors." The question of Emigration may be now considered as disposed of. Internal employment, the true source of national wealth, has, in the opinion of the Committee, become paramount to the chimeras of Mr. WILMOT HORTON. Upon this subject we extract from the article in the first number of the Foreign Review upon KASTHOFER'S work upon the rural economy of Switzerland, the following appropriate passage, mutatis mutandis: -- "The check to excessive population in Switzerland, and all other countries must be sought in the people themselves. Extend and improve agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, and thus create a greater demand for labour. ... Emigration cannot be an effectual remedy for the misery of an excessive population; the source must be cut off in the manner we have indicated, otherwise, as fast as the overflowing and injurious population is drawn off, its place will be supplied and the evil continued. But, independent of this consideration, Emigration to foreign countries ought not to be encouraged, so long as the native country contains uncultivated land." As The Society for the Improvement of Ireland hold their first meeting this day, these observations may not be devoid of utility.

March 8, 1828 page 2

EMIGRATION.

The question of Emigration was again brought before the House of Commons on Tuesday night, in a very clear and able speech by Mr. Wilmot Horton. It is a painful subject for reflection, that the population of a country should exceed the means of employing it, and that it should be necessary for Government to promote the emigration of its subjects. The love of one's native soil, the dulce natale solum, is so inherent in our

natures, that no legislature would have recourse to such a measure without a perfect conviction, as in the present instance, of its necessity. Every encouragement, every facility, will, of course, be afforded the emigrants – every care taken to insure health during their passage – and every means be adopted, upon their arrival, to encourage and promote their industry. A remark made by Mr. Huskisson seems to be so important, that we shall repeat it: --

One of the greatest of these evils – an evil not impossible in any country, and improbable in this – was, that there might exist a great emigration from amongst the population, without a corresponding emigration of capital, and thus they would only be transposing a portion of the mischief existing here to other quarters of the world. If individuals were encouraged to emigrate, they should be enabled to employ themselves profitably in the new countries to which they were sent, and the capital at present lying idle in this country, might be advantageously put in requisition for that purpose. – Courier.

We copy the following excellent observations upon the subject from the Sun: --

It would be better not to throw on Emigration the whole burden of the existing evils. The construction of public works, to furnish occupation for a period of years, might be brought to its aid, and ere a generation had passed away, moral and prudential restraints, enforced for a time by legislative enactments, might prevent the recurrence of those evils which now perplex.

It is, however, impossible to approach the subject without feeling the paralyzing influence of that unhappy dismemberment of our country into religious sects – where the dominant persuasion exercise an intolerant and irritating supremacy, which has for centuries succeeded in making unhappy Ireland a curse to that empire, the brightest gem in the crown of which, might and would otherwise be, the Emerald of our sister Isle.

June 8, 1829 page 1

EMIGRATION.

(From the Northern Whig.)

We question much whether Ireland would be much benefited by the removal of the most enterprising and industrious of the working classes, who unquestionably would be the first to take advantage of any regulated emigration, conducted under the auspices of government. It may be prejudice; but we confess that when bewildered, though not convinced by the arguments of political economists of the Malthusian School, we can confirm ourselves in our original opinion, by calling to mind the lines of Southey: --

“Train up thy children, England,
In the ways of righteousness – and feed them

With the bread of wholesome doctrine,
Where hast thou thy mines – but in their industry?
Thy bulwarks where, but in their breasts? – thy might,
 But in their arms.
Shall not their *numbers*, therefore, be thy *wealth*,
Thy *strength*, thy *power*, thy *safety*, and thy *pride*?
 O, grief, then – grief and shame,
If in this flourishing land there should be dwellings
Where the new-born babe doth bring unto its parents, at
 The birth,
No joy! – where squalid poverty receives it,
And, on her withered knees,
Gives it the scanty bread of discontent.”

1.6 SNL – Saunders' News-Letter

August 21, 1826 page 1

The report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Emigration has been printed, with minutes of evidence. The report contains a statement of the evils which emigration is calculated to remove, but contains no definite plan, and the Committee apparently look forward to a resumption of their enquiries in the next Session. The Committee remark that –

“It appears that there are extensive districts in Ireland, and districts in England and Scotland, where the population is at the present moment redundant – in other words, where there exists a very considerable proportion of able-bodied and active labourers beyond that number to which any existing demand for labour can afford employment. That the effect of this redundancy is not only to reduce a part of this population to a great degree of destitution and misery, but also to deteriorate the general condition of the labouring classes. That by its producing a supply of labour in excess as compared with the demand, the wages of labour are necessarily reduced to a minimum, which is utterly insufficient to supply that population with those means of support and subsistence which are necessary to secure a healthy and satisfactory condition of the community. That in England, this redundant population has been in part supported by a parochial rate, which according to former evidence, threatens in its extreme tendency to absorb the whole rental of the country; and that in Ireland, where no such parochial rate exists by law, and where the redundancy is found in a still greater degree, a considerable part of the population is dependent for the means of support on the precarious source of charity, or is compelled to resort to habits of plunder and spoliation for the actual means of subsistence.”

They observe, also, that while this redundant population represses industry at home, and even endangers the peace of the country, the reception of the same population in our colonies increases their wealth and promotes their security.

The fact is certain that the removal to the colonies of some of our pauperised population would be a great benefit, both to those who go and to those who remain behind, - to the colonies and to the mother country; but there is great difficulty in knowing how public money can be applied to this object so as to produce an effect at all adequate to the expenditure. The redundancy of population is caused by the continual increase of population – an increase not so rapid, however, but that it may be accelerated. To make any general improvements in the condition of the labourers, the diminution of their numbers must be considerable; and even then, unless some

alteration took place in the habits of the people, the improvement would be of short duration.

August 22, 1826 page 2

LONDON, AUGUST 19.

The Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, of which Mr. Wilmot Horton was the Chairman, has just been printed, and we lay it before our readers in our preceding columns. It will be found a document of great importance, embodying much information, and many interesting calculations, derived from a laborious inquiry, conducted with that zeal, judicious attention, and searching knowledge, which we have a right to look for wherever the exertions of that Honourable Gentleman can be traced.

In the outset, the report assumes that for which we lately contended, that, at present, there are many able labourers in this country, for whose productive industry there is no immediate demand, and who, in consequence, become, in some way or other, chargeable to the country.

It then proceeds to set forth the results of the experiments made to induce labourers to emigrate in 1823 and 1825, and the expense attendant on them.

The average expense of emigration appears to have been 22l. 1s. 6d. per head; but it is supposed that lengthened contracts, and other arrangements now practicable, may effect some reduction for the future.

Proceeding on this assumption, it is then calculated that a family of four persons, a man, a woman, and two children, may be conveyed to Canada for 80l.

It next inquires whether those interested in reducing the superabundant labouring population, can advantageously avail themselves of the facilities afforded for emigration, and the affirmative is assumed. The Committee suppose that 80l. could be raised on an annuity of 3l. 10s. 9d. for sixty years. Security being given for the payment of the annuity for the first seven years, it appears from evidence, that it may be fairly calculated, that, at the expiration of that term, the head of an emigrant family will be in a state to pay it for the remainder of the sixty years, or to effect its redemption within a shorter period.

The mode in which this may be done, is pointed out; and it is shewn that parishes in England, and proprietors of land in Scotland and Ireland, are interested in contributing to the removal of unemployed labourers from a part of the empire where they endure distress and constitute weakness, to other parts, where they may maintain themselves, and add to the strength and security of our foreign possessions. – *Courier*.

(FROM THE COURIER.)

Our attention has been called to a letter addressed to Mr. Wilmot Horton, by the Reverend M. J. Keating, Rector of Ventry, on the subject of emigration from Ireland; in discussing which, he takes a view of the present situation of that country, and of the causes of those evils, which it is but too well known really exist.

In opposition to the wretched rant in which the pretended patriots of Ireland for ever indulge, he proves that the distress arises not from political causes, but from circumstances and impressions which might be witnessed under any government, as they have no connection with the general policy of the State, or with the predominant creed.

To the practice which has obtained in the letting of land, he ascribes much of the misery which prevails. He remarks: --

“The subdivision of land has been carried to a greater extent in Ireland than any other Country in Europe, and with the same effects that have, invariably, attended so injudicious a system. Small patches of land are granted out for the sake of the exorbitant rent offered. The landlord acquires new tenants and new freeholders. This design is seconded by the natural inclination of the people, the state of the country leaving the father little other means of providing for the sons but by dividing his farm. Hence, many Districts are occupied by as many families as its produce can maintain.”

In order to correct the evil, he suggests the more general establishment of large farms, and encouragement to emigrate. He says –

“It is, evidently, the interest of the Proprietors to clear their estates of the superfluous population, and to set their lands, in large farms, to individuals of capital and skill, without a power of re-letting in sub-divisions. During the operation of this change, and the temporary derangement it occasions, the population must be gradually cast into a new form. – The race of cotters, after filling up the demand for labour, which will be required under the new arrangements, and falling into the various fixed employments that are necessary for the business of an extensive farm, must be drained off by Emigration. A few of the small tenants, who, with some amount of capital, combine industry and good management, will take a part in the new system, and grow up into farmers on a greater scale, but the remainder must, in one way or other, seek for means of livelihood different from those on which they have hitherto depended; and, as the country affords little other means of living beyond that arising out of a possession of land, they must look for subsistence where there is a prospect of employment, and bring their minds to the resolution of removing from their native place. Two prospects present themselves – employment in public works and manufacturers, or emigration. It is easy

to foresee which alternative will best suit the inclination of the Irish Farmer, when, by the easy acquisition of land in the Colonies, he may speedily attain a situation and mode of life similar to that in which his habits have been formed. – Thus it appears, that in the subversion of the present mode of setting land, emigration forms a necessary part in the general change.”

The beneficial effects which result from well regulated emigration, we have had opportunities of describing, on former occasions, when noticing the meritorious labours of Mr. Wilmot Horton, in connection with this important subject. We then distinctly shewed, that at a small risk (the magnitude of the object considered) those who were at present a burthen to the State, might be made to contribute to the advancement of its prosperity. On this we shall not dwell at present, but we consider some of the hints thrown out by Mr. Keating well deserving the serious consideration of those Irishmen whose object it is, not to embroil, but to serve, their country. His concluding paragraph we subjoin, as it makes an affecting appeal to the absentee Landlords. The Rev. Gentleman thus sums up his case: --

“The absence of Irish Landlords is the subject of continual complaint. Compulsory laws are impracticable! To induce Gentlemen to remain on their estates, their residence must become attractive, and the people around them improved. No one will reside from choice in a land of misery – continually liable to outrage and disturbance, and overflowing with a degraded, unemployed population. Should, however, the proposed means of amelioration be adopted, I am convinced, that Ireland would cease to be a blot in the British Empire, and its whole internal economy altered in a period of short duration. Capital would be invested in agricultural pursuits – the lands planted, fenced, drained and properly laid out – the miserable cabins, which now disfigure the aspect of the country, will be removed, and be replaced by comfortable and neat villages. And how gratifying would it be, that the traveller, as he passes, should view, both on the face of nature and the face of man, that it is by wisdom and prudence the country he surveys is governed, and, while he sighs at the sterility which improvidence causes, and the miseries which a vicious system produce, he will leave a blessing on that land which the wisdom of its proprietors has made fertile, and on the people whom their benevolence has made happy.”

October 2, 1827 page 1

The third Report from the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom, has made its appearance. Mr. W. Horton presided over this Committee, and, among the witnesses examined, we find the names of the Lord Bishop of Chester, Lieutenant General Robert Browne, Doctor William Murphy, Dr. John Strachan, Mr. Spring Rice, Sir H. Parnell, the Hon. E. G. Stanley, Mr. S. McGillivray, Mr. Powles, and the Rev. T. R. Malthus.

The evidence elicited from these intelligent persons furnishes important information on almost every subject that can demand the care of civilised man. The appendix comprehends much interesting correspondence, valuable abstracts, and important documents. The whole extends to nearly 700 folio pages.

On one point we must offer a word of two. – The letters transmitted by Sir Peregrine Maitland, Lieutenant-General of Canada, prove that the experiment made in 1825 has been attended with very considerable success. It appears that, in the short space of one year, many of these settlers had been lifted from beggary to a state of comparative affluence, and all were most grateful for the unremitting care and bounty which they had experienced from the Government. The Irish emigrants, from whom some of the letters come, testify the highest satisfaction, and it would seem they had with great facility adapted their habits to their new situation, and they particularly invite attention to their orderly and peaceable conduct since their location in America. – *Courier*.

October 4, 1827 page 1

We have given in another column an extract from the Third Report of the Committee on Emigration, and shall tomorrow present our readers with this important document. In the mean time we wish to notice an observation of a morning contemporary, to the effect that it would be more beneficial to advance money to enable our unemployed population to cultivate the waste lands in England and Ireland, than to provide them with the means of settling in the Colonies. If it can be shown that the waste lands in the United Kingdom are of the same fertility as those which remain unoccupied in Canada and New South Wales, we shall immediately assent to our contemporary's opinion. But if the waste lands in England and Ireland are of such an inferior quality that they cannot replace the expense of reclaiming them, while the new lands in the Colonies are of such a degree of fertility as to be capable of replacing this expense with an ample surplus, then it must be obvious that colonization, as a means of giving permanent employment to a surplus population, is, beyond comparison, more beneficial than the cultivation of the waste lands at home. The question is one of fact, not of theory. If England, like America, contained unappropriated lands of first-rate fertility, to which the increasing population might resort, the idea of colonization, as a means of employment and relief, would be absurd. But England does not contain such lands, and she cannot raise from her own soil additional supplies of subsistence, without increased difficulty and expense. In this state of things, colonization is the most efficacious – we may say the only efficacious means of relieving the distress arising from superfluous numbers. – *Globe*.

EMIGRATION.
(FROM THE GLOBE.)

We shall from time to time insert extracts from the evidence given before the committee upon emigration, of which we have already given the report. Our readers may meanwhile be desirous of having placed before them, in one view, the origin and progress of the plan which the committee recommends. In 1823, the attention of Government was directed to the subject of Emigration from Ireland to the Colonies, Mr. Wilmot Horton, with whom we believe the plan originated, stated to the Select Committee on the employment of the poor in Ireland, the measures then under the consideration of Government, for locating in Upper Canada a limited number of the unemployed population of Ireland. The Committee entered into an examination of the particulars of the experiment then about to be tried, and in their report expressed their approbation of the principles upon which it was undertaken, and their expectation of its success. This expectation was realized to the fullest extent. In 1825, one hundred and twenty destitute families, amounting to 568 individuals, were conveyed from the North of Ireland, and settled in Upper Canada, under the superintendance [sic] of Mr. P. Robinson. The whole of the expense of this emigration, including one year's provision after location and all other charges, amounted to 12,500l.; in two years the property created by these 120 families amounted in value to 7,600l.; and, at this rate of increase, their capital in seven years (from the time of their location) may be expected to amount to 30,000l. In 1825 a more extended experiment was made – Four hundred heads of families, amounting to 2,000 individuals, were taken from a part of Ireland where no demand existed for their labour; and located in Upper Canada. The expense of this emigration was 43,000l.; and upon a rigid estimate, the value of the produce of their first year's labour amounted to 11,000l.

In 1825, a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the important subject of Emigration – an elaborate report, in which it recorded the existence of a redundant population, explained the degradation and misery thence resulting to the labouring classes, and recommended as the appropriate remedy for these great and growing evils, a regulated system of Emigration on an extended scale. The Committee of 1826, however, closed their labour without proposing any specific measure for adoption; but recommended that the question should be resumed by a future Committee, with a view to practical results. This the Committee of 1827, whose report we have laid before our readers have effected. The Committee, after “a most careful revision of the evidence, and after having passed and repassed through their minds the complex considerations which are involved in an inquiry into so extensive and unexamined a subject, are decidedly of opinion, that the evils of a superabundant agricultural pauper population, for whose labour no adequate demand exists, may be, if

not removed, materially palliated, by a system of Emigration on an extended scale. They are also of opinion, that it is not for the separate interests of Ireland, where redundancy is proved to exist in a greater degree, but for the interests of Great Britain, and for the general advantage of the whole empire, that such an experiment should be made. They earnestly beg to impress upon the attention of the House, that unless an early diversion be provided by Emigration to check the increasing irruption of the pauper population of Ireland, which now pours itself into Scotland and England with alarming rapidity, no other result can be contemplated than the permanent deterioration of the condition of the English and Scotch labourer.”

After this full investigation of the subject, and with the successful results of the experiments of 1823 and 1825 before them, the Committee recommended, as a practical measure, that a Board of Emigration shall be formed in London, with agents in Scotland, Ireland, and the Colonies, for the purpose of carrying into effect a regulated system of emigration upon an extended scale. The emigration is to be strictly voluntary, and the emigrants are gradually to repay the expense of their location.

The report is drawn up with great ability. While it deals with facts and practical results, it unfolds general principles of great importance in influencing the comfort and independence of the labouring classes. This elaborate and valuable document is the production of the Chairman, Mr. Wilmot Horton, with the assistance of the other members of the Committee; and it does them great credit individually and collectively. As we have already stated, the proposed plan of emigration on an extended scale originated with Mr. Wilmot Horton, and to that Right Hon. Gentleman will be due, either the merit or demerit, as the event may hereafter prove, of this important national measure, which he has brought forward with singular industry, perseverance, and talent.

October 10, 1827 page 1

We have now gone attentively through the whole of the evidence taken by the emigration committee, and are more and more convinced of the impossibility of improving Ireland with her present redundant population – of the impossibility of consolidating farms, and preventing the still further increase of the population. The experimental emigration proposed by the committee will only serve to give a stimulus to population; it will be beneficial to the individuals removed, but will not be felt in the way of diminishing the redundancy. Sir Henry Parnell, on whose opinion we place the utmost reliance, when asked what was his opinion of the probability of the existing evil of a surplus population increasing in Ireland, answered, “I think there is every probability of the actual distress greatly increasing, and all the consequences belonging to it. I see no reason for supposing that the population is not increasing now as rapidly as it has increased during the last thirty years, I believe it has doubled in that period. . . And when I have recourse to my own observation of facts, I have no doubt that the population is

now interesting at the rate of doubling in 30 years; for this reason I think the misery of the people must become every day greater, that the temptation and disposition to violate the laws will become more general, and that the difficulty of preserving tranquillity in the country will be greatly increased; I also think that the emigration to England will be so much greater than it has ever yet been, that it must produce a general deterioration to the comforts, habits, and character of the labouring classes in this country." Sir Henry thinks "the progress of clearing estates will be slow, from the general resistance of the occupying tenants to that practice, and the means they possess of deterring landlords from carrying their intentions into effect." Mr. Spring Rice observes that "those proprietors who, in the first instance, perceived the necessity of acting upon the principle of clearing their estates, were enabled to act upon it without much inconvenience; for so long as there was but one person, or a few persons, who wished to consolidate many small farms into one, and to reduce the number of the surplus population upon their estates, adjacent estates, which were not directed by the same principles, afforded to the population quitting their former residences a facility of settlement; but now, when almost all the proprietors are disposed to act upon the same principle, and even if they have not the means of removing the excess of population from their own property, of taking the best care to prevent the settling of strangers among them, there is scarcely any means by which a poor man, who loses his former habitation and farm, can acquire a settlement elsewhere." We cannot conceive the possibility of a general dislodgement. It is easy, as Mr. Spring Rice observes, to clear one or two properties in the outset, when the persons removed can find shelter elsewhere; but it is otherwise when the inevitable consequences are famine and death. The towns have been gorged with vagrants, and diseases has been making sad havoc; for, last year, out of a population of 200,000 in Dublin, 60,000 passed through the hospitals in contagious fever. But long before any great increase can be made to the morality, the country must be in a state distressing in the extreme to all classes. You cannot kill off the lower orders by famine and contagious disease without carrying disease into the other classes. Sir H. Parnell says, the distress of the lower classes is so great that there is a growing indisposition in the higher to reside in the country. "I have received letters of late which induce me to believe, not only that it contributes to produce an indisposition among absentees to return to Ireland to reside there, but that it contributes very much to induce those gentlemen who are now resident to become absentees. . . I have received a letter from a nobleman who has always been residing on his estate, in which he says, "What can we do? Landlords will not surrender their rents, and, of course, a contest will ensue between them and the people. . . Government must take their choice between insurrection and emigration; one cannot look forward without dismay; a residence in Ireland is becoming a burthen too great to be borne; it is bad enough living in the midst of distress; any attempt to relieve the people only brings shoals of wretched beings from other places; what must it be in districts (and this will soon be the case everywhere), in which, in addition to this, the gentry are living in daily apprehension of their houses

being attacked, and their families destroyed? We must leave Ireland to police magistrates, and perhaps return in some years, when famine and disease and (if trade improves) a great emigration into England have improved the condition of the country. Thus, then, we see a servile war, and famine, and disease are looked forward to, as the means of purifying the atmosphere of Ireland. But the rebellion of 1798, and all the burnings of cottages, and outrages in its train, did not materially diminish the population, or sensibly affect the regular rate of increase. Before any material effect could be produced in the way of thinning the population by the sword, all Europe would be filled with horror at our proceedings, Thus then, we see the most portentous results announced as inevitable; we see Ireland proceeding in a career which famine and contagion can alone impede, and England gradually approaching to the state of Ireland, which it must ultimately reach. The emigration committee have proposed no remedy to meet the evil. They have, however, done great good in exhibiting the evil to the country in all its hideous magnitude. Whether this awful prospect before us will stimulate the country to any corresponding exertions remains to be seen, England could easily be set right herself, were it not for the sister island. – *Morning Chronicle*.

October 26, 1827 page 1

The newest panacea for the evils of Ireland – namely, emigration, is one of those quack medicines which only the most superficial pretenders to Statesmanship would think of prescribing as a remedy for the distresses of a country where population has by no means yet attained the point which exceeds its natural resources. When the population of Ireland was not more than half what it is at present, the wretchedness of the lower classes was quite as great as now. The increase of population has not created that misery, it has only spread it over a wider surface. Emigration, as long as the system of society is defective, can produce no good. It is but attempting to deal with the effect without removing the cause. It is, to use the emphatic language of Scripture, “a washing of the outside of the cup and platter while the inside is full of uncleanness.” It has been ascertained that there is enough of waste land in Ireland to subsist comfortably if reclaimed, at least three millions more of people than the highest census, that can be relied on, of her present population amounts to. Ireland contains about eighteen millions of acres in all – only about twelve millions, for the statements of the Roman Catholic declaimers on this head are grossly exaggerated, with the intention of making the physical force, which they always allude to for the purpose of intimidation, appear more formidable than it really is. In fact, the number of Roman Catholics now in the country is near five millions, and there are about two millions of Protestants of all classes, making altogether, as we have said, seven millions of inhabitants. Now supposing the waste land, which is one-third of the whole of the land in Ireland, to be nearly as fertile in quality as the other two-thirds already under cultivation, it is clear that such land, if reclaimed, would subsist three millions more of people than are at present in the island.

But it is well known, that a great portion of the soil which is not cultivated, is of a richer and more productive nature than that which is – namely, the bog-land, invariably the best land in Ireland when reclaimed. – Therefore, we are safe in estimating the additional number that could be fed, in the event of such land being reduced under the dominion of the plough, at three millions. Does it not, therefore, show the greatest ignorance on the part of the Parliamentary Committee of the real state of Ireland, to represent her population as redundant, compared with her natural capabilities, and to recommend emigration as a cure for the evils of the country? But what else than error and absurdity could be expected of a Committee, who, instead of proceeding, like men of intelligence and business, to ascertain facts, called in the whimsical theorist, Mr. Malthus, as their oracle, and mistook pedantic speculations for the dictates of wisdom? No wonder that their “book” is more ponderous than instructive! – *Morning Herald*.

October 29, 1827 page 1

At the bottom of the Irish emigration plan are a number of Irish landlords, who, having been instrumental in aggravating the wretchedness of their native country, by rack renting their tenantry to support their extravagance abroad, are alarmed lest the misery which their system has produced should drive the unfortunate peasantry on their estates to acts of desperation. They are desirous to thin their numbers, that they may diminish the physical force which they have alienated from their interests by cupidity and oppression. Most of these landlords, however, pretend to liberality in politics, and are advocates for giving to the Roman Catholics political power; but they well know that the suffering population, whose resentment they dread, care not a straw about what is absurdly called “Catholic emancipation.” The peasantry are shrewd enough to know, that the placing a few Catholic aristocrats in Parliament, and bestowing silk gowns on a few Catholic Barristers, will not have the effect of adding a penny to their wages, or giving an additional meal of potatoes and salt to themselves and their children. It is of far more interest to them that rent should be lowered, than that the whole of the Catholic Bar should be made placemen and pensioners. It is of far more interest to them that their landlords should spend the money a[t] home which they derive from their Irish acres, than that Mr. O’Connell or Mr. Blake should make five hundred speeches yearly from the Treasury Bench of St. Stephen’s Chapel, Westminster. In fact, the great mass of the Irish peasantry care little who are the statesmen or the judges, or the legislators over them, provided they can get cheap land for their potatoes, and good wages for their work. But the landlord’s agent, who in general has two objects to serve, one to ingratiate himself with his employer by servility and exaction, and the other to make his own fortune, cannot, consistently with those objects, allow the peasantry the means of a comfortable subsistence. By rack renting the land to the large farmers, the latter in their turns are compelled to demand extravagant rents from the smaller farmers, to whom they sublet portions of their own taking. These again in their turn are obliged to obtain labour at a

price which may be considered a famine price to the labourer; and while starvation and disease are going their destructive round among the poor, the absentee landlord is squandering on foreign luxuries and vices the rental which, if expended judiciously at home, might make thousands of those who contribute to produce it comparatively happy. It suits his taste and inclination better, it appears, to gratify his own passions at the expense of his country, and then impute all the evils which he has produced to the excess of population. – *Morning Herald*.

March 8, 1828 page 1

The important subject of emigration was introduced again, in the Commons' House, on the motion of Mr. Wilmot Horton, last night. A country is not always enriched by the encrease of its population. This doctrine, has however, been so strongly illustrated of late by various writers, that it has at length obtained the assent of the majority of well informed and reflecting men – among the ignorant, and the prejudiced, it has not yet made way. Mr. O'Connell chos'es to declaim against emigration – he thinks it preferable that thousands should vegetate in misery, rags, and despair, on the eaten-up soil of Ireland, to those destitute beings exchanging this wretchedness, for allocation in Canada, or New South Wales, where hope and provision lie before them. The Irish Orator urges the starving multitudes, who listen to his harangues, to rot on the dunghills on which they were born, rather than exchange filth, for cleanliness – famine, for plenty – and rags, for comfortable raiment. – In the same temper, and with equal wisdom, Mr. O'Connell abuse: the subletting Act, because the two thirds of the woe, and misery that floods Ireland, have arisen from the minute subdivisions of land. It has encouraged early and unprovided marriages – introduced the worst system of husbandry – made the peasant the prey of the middle man and tithe proctor – and annihilated every thing like an independent yeomanry in Ireland. But the opponents of emigration exclaim – How can an excess of population exist where whole districts of bog, and moor remain uncultivated. Such is the state of Ireland? Let its starving thousand be employed in reclaiming these wastes, in place of being transported abroad. The simple answer to this, is – that by an excess of population – in this country is meant, not an excess relative to land, but an excess as regards the means of productive employment – a number greater than the expenditure of any subsisting capital can maintain. It may be true, that there is much land within this empire, unreclaimed, and uncultivated; but it is notorious, that the population of Ireland, especially, is excessive – that hundreds of thousands of able-bodied men, with their families, are unable to procure a full of certain subsistence. Can such a state of things continue? Can any possible hope be entertained of any improvement in Ireland, while a large portion of its population are unemployed and destitute! Will any man in this country transfer his capital – agricultural or manufacturing – where paupers and discontent abound? For evils so vast and terrific as these – evils, too, every day increasing, - extended emigration is the only remedy that

suggests itself. England and Scotland are flooded with Irish paupers. Every steam vessel imports a fresh cargo. These wretched beings are vomited on these shores in swarms, and tramp the country with their families, sleeping under hedges, or in outhouses, and tearing from the English labourer the means of honest subsistence; drugging the market with hands, and throwing our peasantry on the parish and poor rates, for a mendicant subsistence. – *British Traveller*.

The application of the plan of emigration to the poor of Ireland was objected to by Mr. James Grattan, because the landlords of that country cannot be induced to advance the sums necessary for the measure. If this be the case, the people of England will be exposed to have all their efforts frustrated by the irruption of Irish paupers. It will then probably be necessary, as a part of any system of improvement in England, that some restraint should be imposed on the influx of people of Ireland. this, however, is no objection to the plan of emigration; it is a measure which will probably be forced upon us whether emigration be tried or no – unless, instead of improving either of the two countries, we are determined to allow both of them to be reduced to a common level of wretchedness. – *Globe*.

Ireland is the sore place in the political system, for England cannot be freed from redundancy till the population of Ireland fall to the level of the population of this country. Here the people of England are deeply interested, and they ought to force public men to propose that for their relief which they at present dare not propose. – Ireland ought to be placed on a level with England with respect to her poor; and that would give the people of this country some security against the blind avarice of the Irish landholders. We protest against a shilling being laid out till either land in Ireland be charged with the poor, or some measure equally efficacious be resorted to. – *Morning Chronicle*.

May 13, 1829, page 2

[From the *Times*]

Mr. Villiers Stuart has taken the first formal step towards a measure, which, if postponed for today, must, beyond all questions, be tomorrow adopted – namely, the establishment of some legal provision for the sick, the aged, the infirm, and the fatherless infant poor of Ireland. We have no sort of hesitation in predicting that the thing must ere long be done. That the population of Ireland has been doubly stimulated – first, by the mixed ambition and cupidity of the landlords, and next by the barbarous reckless habits of the poor themselves – is notorious to all the world. The landlords for the sake of multiplied freeholds and of enormous con-acre rents, were anxious to encourage the formation of new families; and the erection of new cabins upon their estates, while the peasant youth of both sexes, having no experience under the parental roof of such comforts as require an outlay of money, and therefore no feeling about the necessity of

a timely provision for the wants of a future family, are ready enough to unite themselves in marriage, and to accept from the landlord on any terms, however exorbitant, a spot of ground, be it ever so limited or so barren, whereon to raise that miserable sty which elsewhere would be deemed a dreary refuge for cattle, but is held in Ireland an habitation meet for man. Thus the growth of numbers, which in England has been called forth by the increase of capital and the demand for manufacturing labour, and which, when capital fluctuates, and labour is suspended, finds relief, though scanty, still enough for bare subsistence, in the poor laws, has in Ireland an origin independent of capital or labour; and when suffering under excessive privation, caused by a failure of the ordinary food of Ireland, has no hope from the revival of the manufacturing market, or from any fund appropriated to his succour by the providence and humanity of the Legislature. The consequence of this condition of the Irish poor is, that they beg and pilfer in their own neighbourhood, or, if more enterprising, and with a few shillings in their pockets, migrate to this country in search of work, where they find indeed a market already overstocked with labourers, but open to receive them at diminished wages. The consequence is that the evil of an excessive supply of labourers is aggravated on this side of the water. The English peasant is outbid at his former employer's door – the distress of the British peasantry increased – the British poor-rates unnaturally swollen by this unceasing inroad of alien adventurers, and the vacancy resulting in Ireland itself from their emigration, filled by fresh tribes of beggars occupying their deserted tenements, and perpetuating those swarms of marauders upon the English market, which have forced down the native peasant of this country to the endurance of worse diet, worse clothing, and of a state mor nearly approaching to destitution than has been known at any period of the last two centuries amongst us, because his Irish competitor is satisfied with such a condition, which, if he cannot tolerate, he is turned over to the parish workhouse, and is lost, with his children, as respectable or useful citizens. Now let the English gentlemen look to it: a member for an Irish county, a man of large property and high connexion, proposes freely to the House of Commons a remedy for the above train of evils, the enormous increase of the poor rates, and the palpable degeneracy of the English agricultural popularity. This remedy is the institution of poor laws in Ireland – not poor laws with all their actual appendages and abuses, so much deplored in most parts of England, and unhappily so difficult to cure, but poor laws which shall take the burden of supporting those who are the proper, and were the original objects of that branch of legislation, from off the shoulders of the poor, and lay it upon the backs of the wealthy. That Irish landlords should, under various pretences, fight hard against the success of so humane a measure, will surprise nobody who is acquainted with the class out of which these landlords are constituted. But we trust that the English noblemen and gentlemen will not be slow to apprise their brethren from the sister country, of the expediency, both moral and political, that each parish throughout the United Kingdom should subsist its own poor; and that even if Irishmen, like Mr. Dawson, should find their incomes lowered by this necessary deduction from the gross rental, it is more fitting –

1st, that rents should fall than the people should perish, 2d, that the soil of Ireland should be taxed for the maintenance of Irish paupers, than that the soil of England should be overrun by them, and the peasantry of England degraded; 3d, that the gentlemen of Ireland, who were employed for years in raising this mendicant army, should be furnished with cogent reasons for reducing it, and for examining more closely, and more effectually consulting, the domestic interests and social progress of that multitude of which they ought to be protectors. Although Mr. Peel refused to pledge the Government upon the subject of poor laws for Ireland, he let enough be seen of his own sentiments to assure us that he is alive to the obligation of considering, with a view to its amendment, the general condition of her poor.

Appendix C – Biographical background on witnesses

1. Emigration Report 1

	Participant Name	Position	Member of Parliament	Geography	Other background	Pages in Report
27	Becher, William Wrixon	Esq., M.P.	M.P. for Mallow 1818-1826	Ireland	Major landowner County Cork Whig	191-194
15	Bliss, Henry	Agent for the Province of New Brunswick		Canada	Author and lawyer	112-114
34	Bodkin, William Henry	Esq., Secretary to the Mendicity Society	House of Commons 1840s	Ireland; England	Conservative	214-217
1	Boulton, Henry John	Esq., Solicitor-General of Upper Canada		Canada		13-22, 32-34, 48, 48-50, 51-52, 64, 81-83, 203
25	Buchanan, Alexander Carlisle * §	Esq.; built saw mills, grist + flour mills; has brought out emigrants; brother of Consul of NY		Canada	Landowner, Lower Canada	168-176, 184
30	Campbell, Archibald *	Esq., M.P.	M.P. for Glasgow, 1820-1831; Lord Lieutenant Renfrewshire 1826-38	Scotland	Landowner Tory	201
8	Campbell, Walter Frederick	Esq., M.P.	M.P. for Argyllshire 1822-1832	Scotland	Whig	73-78
13	Carlisle, Frederick * §	Resident at Cape of Good Hope		South Africa		87-91, 156-157

11	Chambers, Robert James	Esq., police magistrate		London		83-87
24	Cockburn, Lieutenant-Colonel James Pattison	Superintendent of the Military Settlements in Upper Canada		Canada		147-155, 217-225
19	Curteis, Edward Jeremiah	Esq., Assistant Chairman @ Sessions of Sussex, Magistrate for 40 years; MP	MP Sussex, 1820-1830	England	Independent	114-123
14	Eager, Edward {Eagar}	Author of pamphlet "Letters" to Robert Peel		Australia	Lawyer; convict; Irish	91-101, 108-112, 142, 155-156
29	Ennismore, Lord Viscount	M.P.	M.P. Co. Cork 1812-1827	Ireland (Irish peerage; no place in House of Lords until 1869)	Whig	197-201
2	Felton, William Bowman * §	Esq. Legislative Councillor, Lower Canada from 1822 (Tory) Agent for Crown lands from 1822		Canada	Landowner; 1815 moved to BNA; granted 2,000 acres by Bathurst	23-31, 47-48, 48-50, 52-63, 176-182, 228-231
21	Gabbett, William	Esq.		Limerick	Landowner	125-133
3	Hayes, Charles	Esq.		Canada		31-32
22	Hodges, Thomas Law	Esq.	M.P. 1830-1852	Hemsted, Kent	Liberal party	133-142, 182-184, 184-187

9	Innes, Sir Hugh	Baronet, M.P.	M.P. for Ross-shire 1809-1830	Scotland		78-80
23	Lord Bishop of Limerick	Bishop, church of Ireland (John Jebb)		Limerick		142-146
5	Markland, George	Esq., Executive Counsellor of Upper Canada		Canada		34-35
10	MacPherson-Grant, George	Esq., M.P., Member of Committee	M.P. Sutherland, 1809-12, 1816-26	Scotland	Voted for Catholic Relief/ anti-Government	80-81
26	Nimmo, Alexander §	Esq., Scottish engineer and architect, active in Ireland		Ireland		187-191, 194-195
32	Odell, Thomas	Esq.		Limerick		205-210
28	O'Driscoll, Redmond	Esq.		Ireland		195-196
6	Ready, Colonel John	Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward's Island		Canada		35-37
33	Rice, Thomas Spring §	Esq., M.P.	M.P. for Limerick City 1820-1832	Ireland	Anglo-Irish family; large estates in Munster; moderate unionist reformer; Whig	210-214
31	Rolph, John	Esq., member of legislature in Upper Canada		Canada	Physician, lawyer	204-205, 226

20	Sebright, Sir John	M.P., Baronet	M.P. for Hertfordshire 1807-1832	England	Unaffiliated, generally leaned with Whigs	124-125
35	Shepherd, William			South Africa		226-228
18	Sorrell, Lieutenant-Colonel William	Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land		Australia		104-108
4	Strachan, John Reverend Doctor * §	Born Scotland, emigrated to Kingston (Upper Canada) in 1799; Reverend of Church of England;	member of Executive Council 1815-36; Legislative Council 1820-41 (Upper Canada), Archdeacon of York	Canada	honorary Doctor of Divinity Univ. Aberdeen; 1803 ordained Church of England;	157-168, 201-203
17	Stuart, Charles	Secretary to the Colombian Agricultural Association		Colombia		104
7	Uniacke, Richard John	Esq., His Majesty's Counsel, Attorney-General of Nova Scotia		Canada		37-47, 63, 64-73
12	Wilks, John	Esq., vestry clerk @ St. Luke's		London	Whig/Liberal Protestant	85-86
16	Wilson, Sir Robert	M.P., member of Company incorporated for occupation of Colombia	M.P. of Southwark 1818-1830	Colombia	"Radical"	101-104

2. Emigration Report 2

	Participant Name	Position	Member of Parliament	Geography	Other background	Pages
38	Adams, Thomas			Mildenhall, Suffolk, England		200
19	Bradbury, Thomas	Overseer of the Parish		Great Horwood, Buckinghamshire		106-108
12	Buchanan, Alexander Carlisle * §	Esq.; built saw mills, grist + flour mills; has brought out emigrants; brother of Consul of NY		Canada	Landowner, Lower Canada	70-77, 167-168
18	Burrell, Walter,	Esq. Member of the Committee	MP Sussex 1812-1831	West Grinstead, England	Tory	100-106
31	Campbell, Alexander	Sheriff substitute Renfrewshire		Scotland	Resident of Paisley	148-166
3	Campbell, Archibald *	Esq., M.P.	M.P. for Glasgow, 1820-31; Lord Lieutenant Renfrewshire 1826-38	Scotland	Landowner Tory	18-23
22	Carlisle, Frederick *	Resident at Cape of Good Hope		South Africa		119-121
5	Drummond, Henry Home	MP, Renfrew, Stirling	Stirlingshire Renfrewshire 1821-31	Scotland		26-29
34	Eaton, Richard Webber	Resident Cape of Good Hope		South Africa Born England		171-175
24	Ellis, Henry	Esq.	1824-25 Commissioner of Customs Clerk of the pells 1825-34	South Africa (spent 2 years)		123-128

13	Felton, William Bowman *§	Esq. Legislative Councillor, Lower Canada from 1822 (Tory) Agent for Crown lands from 1822		Canada	Landowner; 1815 moved to BNA; granted 2,000 acres by Bathurst	78-88, 131-133
35	Fielden, William (Feilden)	Esq. Cotton Manufacturer	MP Blackburn 1832-47	Blackburn, Lancaster	Liberal, later conservative	175-182
37	Fitzhugh, William Sudlow	Appointed to the American Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool		Liverpool	Attends to steerage Passengers	189- 200
1	Foster, Joseph & James Little	President, Glasgow Emigration Society, Weaver		Glasgow	Working hand- loom weavers	9-18
20	Francis, David Polley	Esq. Good farmer		Cape of Good Hope, S. Africa Born England		108-114, 135-137
28	Homewood, James			Headcorn, Maidstone, Kent, England		144-146
36	Hulton, William	1824 – chairman of Bolton and Leigh Railway Co. Delivers his own coal from estate		Bolton, West of Manchester, England		182-188
40	Hyett, William Henly	Friendly Loan Society – Manager and <u>Auditor</u> Secretary – Committee for Relief of Distressed Manufacturers		Scotland, England		210-218

4	Kennedy, Thomas Francis	Esq., MP	Ayrshire 1818-1834	Scotland	Whig	23-26
26	Lacoste, Thomas	Esq.		Chertsey, Surrey, England		137-139
39	Lord Bishop of Chester (Charles James Blomfield)	1824-28 House of Lords <hr/> London Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Districts		Ireland London, England		201- 209
29	Maine, Samuel	Overseer of the parish		Hanworth, Middlesex, England		146-147
18	Marshall, Capt. William	In charge of Lanark settlement		Lanark, Canada		100
8	Maxwell, John, Esq.	Committee Member	MP, Renfrewshir e	Scotland	Whig	50-51
6	Moody, Major Thomas	Appointment to Colonial Office and Parliamentary Commission on Slavery 1821-28		Manchester, Sussex, England	Tory	29-37, 47-50
9	Northhouse, Mr. William Spencer	London Free Press Newspaper		Glasgow, London Scotland, England	Representing Scottish Emigration societies	51-68, 128-131
15	O'Driscoll, John	Esq. Resident South of Ireland		Ireland		90-93
32	Parnell, Sir Henry §	MP, Baronet Member of the Committee	Queen's Co. 1806-32	Ireland	Landowner Queen's Co. Whig	166-167
21	Pringle, Thomas	Esq., writer, poet, abolitionist		South Africa, Scotland	Emigrated 1820	114-119

41	Scott, Capt. Henry William, R.N.	Royal Navy Officer		Previously resided in Nova Scotia		218-222
16	Smith, John, Esq.	Banker		Oundle, Northamptonshi re, Midhurst, England		93-94
17	Strachan, Dr. John *§	Born Scotland, emigrated to Kingston (Upper Canada) in 1799; Reverend of Church of England;	member of Executive Council 1815- 36; Legislative Council 1820-41 (Upper Canada), Archdeacon of York	Canada Scotland	honorary Doctor of Divinity Univ. Aberdeen; 1803 ordained Church of England;	94-100
10	Tait, John & James Wilson	Weaver		Scotland (Glasgow?)		68-70
27	Taylor, James	Overseer of Feltham		Feltham, Middlesex, England		140-144
33	Thompson, George	Merchant		South Africa		168-171
7	Turner, Rev. John Matthias	Rector of Wilmslowe, Cheshire		Cheshire, England	12 miles from Manchester; 4,000 inhabitants	37-47
14	Weatherley, Capt. James Dent	Army		Canada – resided 8 years Plymouth, Devon		88-90
23	White, Lieut. Thomas Charles	Army		South Africa Nottinghamshire	1820 settlement	121-123, 168

3. Emigration Report 3

	Participant's Name	Position	Member of Parliament	Geography	Other background	Pages
12	Beauvais	Louis				305-307
34	Beecher [Becher], Rev. John Thomas	Church of England clergyman, poor law reformer; Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the Newark Division and County of Nottingham for 18 years; magistrate for 25 years		Born in Cork, Ireland; Oxford; active in England	Visited workhouses 1823; opposed abolition of poor laws	400-405
10	Blackburn (Colonel)					301-303
48	Blake, Anthony Richard	Commissioner on education in Ireland		Ireland	Catholic	456-460
4	Bodkin, John	Landowner, Co. Galway		Ireland		271-277
3	Browne, Lieut. General Robert	Absentee landlord Co. Wexford		Ireland		270-271
40, 46, 51	Buchanan, Alexander Carlisle	Esq.; built saw mills, grist + flour mills; has brought out emigrants; brother of Consul of NY		Canada	Landowner, Lower Canada	433-439, 455, 463-464
11, 45	Carlisle, Frederick	Resident at Cape of Good Hope		South Africa		303-305, 453-455
32	Clement[s], Lieut. Hanbury	Royal Navy		Australia		394-398

24	Cosway, William Richard	Resides in London, occasionally in Kent		England	Landowner in Romney Marsh and Weald of Kent	378-383
21	Couling, William	Civil engineer and land surveyor; director of general association for the purposes of bettering the condition of the manufacturing and agricultural labourers		Ireland, Scotland, England, UK		358-368
1	Dixon, Hugh	Land agent Westmeath; employed by Sir Thomas Chapman		Ireland		256-265
52	Elmore, John Richard	Manufacturing of linens and cottons, Clonakilty, SW Cork; has resided in Ireland for previous 20 years ('largest linen factory in Munster')		Ireland, Scotland, native Englishman		464-466
39	Felton, William Bowman	Esq., Legislative Councillor - Lower Canada from 1822 (Tory) Agent for Crown lands from 1822		Canada	Landowner; 1815 moved to BNA; granted 2,000 acres by Bathurst	432-433
13, 17	Foster, John Leslie	Customs & Excise; Drogheda Steam Packet Co. Mayor Drogheda Royal Commission Education Ireland	Dublin U 1807-12; Yarmouth 1816-18; Armagh 1818-20; Louth 1824-30	Ireland	Tory, anti-emancipation	307-311, 337-343

33	Howe, John	Deputy Postmaster General Nova Scotia; His Majesty's Agent for Packets at the port of Halifax		Canada		399-400
6	Hunter, Alexander	Writer of the Signet; superintended emigration from island of Rum in 1826		Scotland		287-292
5	Hunton, Thomas	Master manufacturer Carlisle (NW England); experience of cotton trade		England		280-287
31	Inglis, James	Director of Van Diemen's Land Company		Australia		394
19	Lieut. Governor of Upper Canada, Sir Peregrine Maitland	Father in law governor-in-chief of BNA; Personal friend of Lord Bathurst		Born England, emigrated to Canada in 1818	Army officer and colonial administrator	355-357
14	Malthus, Thomas Robert	Political economist; educator East India College		Born England Ireland, Scotland,		311-327
38	Marshall, Capt. William	In charge of Lanark settlement		Lanark, Canada		432
36	Marshall, John Markham	Esq., Resides in co. Kerry (on his property "for some years")		Ireland		407-411

30, 50	McGillivray, Simon	Chairman of Committee of Management of the Canada Company, emigrated to Canada in 1821		Born Scotland; Canada		393- 394, 461-463
35, 41	Mount, Roswell	Land surveyor; resides in Talbot Settlement		Canada		405- 407, 439-440
25	Murphy, Dr. William	Physician residing at Cork		Ireland		383-388
15	Nimmo, Alexander	Esq., Scottish engineer and architect, active in Ireland		Ireland		328-331
47	O'Hara, Lieut. Col.			Lower Canada		456
44	Parnell, Sir Henry*	MP, Baronet Member of the Committee	Queen's Co. 1806-32	Ireland	Landowner Queen's Co. Whig	451-453
53	Powles, John Diston	Company promoter and speculator		Colombia		467-475
43	Rice, Thomas Spring *	Esq., M.P.	M.P. for Limerick City 1820-1832	Ireland	Anglo-Irish family; large estates in Munster; moderate unionist reformer; Whig	277-279, 445-450
18, 27, 37	Robinson, Peter	Superintendent of emigration experiments 1823 + 1825		Canada	1822 – visited England and met RWH, who chose him to superintend experiment	344-355, 389- 390, 412-431

28	Sewell, Jonathan	Chief Justice of Lower Canada for 19 years; speaker of legislative council; president of executive council		Canada		390-391
49	Stanley, The Hon. Edward G.	MP Under-Secretary of State for War and the Colonies 31 August 1827-21 January 1828 (later Prime Minister); Chief Secretary for Ireland 1830-1833	MP Stockbridge 1822-1826 MP Preston 1826-1830	Slight acquaintance with Ireland; England	Whig until 1841	460-461
26	Strachan, Dr. John	Born Scotland, emigrated to Kingston (Upper Canada) in 1799; Reverend of Church of England;	member of Executive Council 1815-36; Legislative Council 1820-41 (Upper Canada), Archdeacon of York	Canada	honorary Doctor of Divinity Univ. Aberdeen; 1803 ordained Church of England;	388-389
16	Strickland, Jerrard	Esq., possibly landowner		England		331-337
42	Tighe, Robert Stearne	Resides in co. Westmeath, has property there		Ireland		440-445
29	Tredgold, Thomas	Civil engineer; published works on engineering		England		391-393
9	Vandeleur, John Scott	Magistrate co. Clare		Ireland		300-301
20	Wagner, Benedict Paul	Justice of the peace (1834)		Canada		357-358

8	West, James	Land agent in Westmeath		Ireland		297-300
22	Wills, Benjamin	Formerly a surgeon; occupier of several hundred acres of land in counties of Kent and Surrey; Director and honorary secretary of the General Association (same as W. Couling)		England		368-374
2, 7	Wilson, David John	Resident Co. Clare		Ireland		265-269, 293-297
23	Wright, Thomas	Engaged in nail trade		England		374-378

Bibliography

Primary Sources

An Act regulating passenger ships and vessels. Session II, Chapter 47; 3 Statute. 488. Fifteenth Congress; March 2, 1819.

An Act to regulate the Vessels carrying Passengers from the United Kingdom to certain of His Majesty's Colonies in North America. 57 Geo. III. c. 10 (1817).

Assignment and Sub-Letting of Land (Ireland) Act, 7 Geo. IV. c. 29 (1826).

British and Foreign State Papers, vol. 3, 1815-1816. London: Ridgway and Sons, 1838.

"Charitable Establishments of Ireland." *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 17 February 1830. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013.
<<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1830/feb/17/charitable-establishments-of-ireland>>.

"Charles I, 1640: An Act for the speedy and effectuall reducing of the Rebels in his Majesties Kingdome of Ireland to their due obedience to his Majesty & the Crowne of England." *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80.* Ed. John Raithby. s.l: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819. 168-172. *British History Online.* Web. 30 July 2019.
<<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp168-172>>.

"Charles II, 1672: An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants." *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5, 1628-80.* Ed. John Raithby. s.l: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819. 782-785. *British History Online.* Web. 30 July 2019.
<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol5/pp782-785>.

Cropper, James. *Present State of Ireland: with a Plan for Improving the Condition of the People.* Liverpool: G. & J. Robinson, 1825.

"Distress in Ireland." *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*, 13 July 1830, Vol. 25, Second Series, Cols. 1168-1171. Irish Emigration Database. Accessed 15 September 2013.
<<http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/30588>>.

"Distresses of the Labouring Classes – Redundant Population." *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*, 4 June 1829, Vol. 21, Third Series, Cols. 1719-1741. Irish Emigration Database. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/45236>>.

"Emigration." *Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser* [Dublin] 14 January 1820: p. 2.

- “Emigration.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 14 March 1826. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1826/mar/14/emigration>>.
- “Emigration.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 7 December 1826. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1826/dec/07/emigration>>.
- “Emigration.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 4 March 1828. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1828/mar/04/emigration>>.
- “Emigration.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 24 June 1828. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1828/jun/24/emigration>>.
- “Emigration.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 23 March 1830. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1830/mar/23/emigration>>.
- “Emigration.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 22 February 1831. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1831/feb/22/emigration>>.
- “Emigration.” *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*, 15 June 1830, Vol. 25, Second Series, Cols. 366-370. Irish Emigration Database. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/46486>>.
- “Emigration Committee.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 26 February 1827. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1827/feb/26/emigration-committee>>.
- “Emigration from Ireland.” *Southern Reporter* [Cork] 7 April 1825: p. 3.
- “Emigration from Ireland to the Canadas.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 15 April 1825. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1825/apr/15/emigration-from-ireland-to-the-canadas>>.
- “Emigration from the South of Ireland to the Canadas.” *British Parliamentary Papers*, 1825 XVIII, (131), pp 359-361. Irish Emigration Database. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/21980>>.

- “Emigration from the United Kingdom.” *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 1.2 (1838): 155-167. JSTOR. Web. 9 September 2013. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2337910>>.
- “Emigration News.” *The Belfast Commercial Chronicle* 20 July 1816.
- English, John. *No Emigration: The Testimony of Experience Before a Committee of Agriculturists and Manufacturers, on the Report of the Emigration Committee of the House of Commons: Sir John English, in the Chair*. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1828.
- “Extracts from the Evidence Given by Mr. Peter Robinson. Emigration.” *Southern Reporter* [Cork] 2 April 1825; p. 1 of “Supplement” continued on p. 4 of same edition.
- First Report of the Commissioners of the Bogs of Ireland*, 1810.
- Godwin, William. *Of Population. An Enquiry concerning the Power of Increase in the Numbers of Mankind, being an Answer to Mr. Malthus’s Essay on that Subject*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1820.
- Hazlitt, William. *A Reply to the Essay on Population, by the Rev. T. R. Malthus, in a Series of Letters, to which are added, Exxtracts from the Essay; with Notes*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, 1807.
- House of Commons, “Emigration of Artisans.” *Constitution; or Cork Morning Post* 18 February 1824: p. 1.
- “Living in the United States.” *Freeman’s Journal* [Dublin] 21 January 1820, p. 4.
- Malthus, Thomas Robert. *An Essay on the Principle of Population, as it affects the future improvement of society : with remarks on the speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and other writers*. London: J. Johnson, 1798. Project Gutenberg. 1 July 2003. Web. 10 Dec. 2013. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/4239>>.
- Second edition. *An Essay on the Principle of Population; a View of its Past and Present Effects on Human Happiness*. London: J. Johnson, 1803.
- “Minutes of Evidence.” *British Parliamentary Papers*, 1825, IX (181) I, pp 58-9, 210-11. Irish Emigration Database. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/31774>>.
- Mitchell, Charles. *The Newspaper Press Directory*. London: Red Lion Court, 1847.
- Parish Apprentices Act*, 56 Geo. c. 139 (1816).

“Passage Vessels Regulation Bill.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 4 March 1828. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 15 September 2013.
<<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1828/mar/04/passage-vessels-regulation-bill>>.

“Passengers in Merchant Vessels.” *Southern Reporter* [Cork] 31 March 1835: p. 3.

Passengers in Merchant Vessels Act, 9 Geo. IV. c. 21 (1828).

“Passenger Regulations Bill.” *Hansard House of Commons Sitting*, 18 March 1828. Hansard, 1803-2005. Accessed 19 June 2013.
<<http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1828/mar/18/passengers-regulation-bill>>.

“Regulations for the Conveyance of Passengers to North America.” *The British Parliamentary Papers* 1828, Vol XXI, pp 621-631. Irish Emigration Database. Accessed 15 September 2013. <<http://ied.dippam.ac.uk/records/45475>>.

Report from the Committee on the Poor Laws 1819.

Report from the Select Committee on the Poor Laws 1817.

The Report of the Select Committee on Emigration in 1826. London: John Murray, 1827.

Second Report from the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom, 1827.

Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in Ireland 1823.

Senior, Nassau William. *Two Lectures on Population, Delivered before the University of Oxford in Easter Term*, 1828. London: John Murray, 1831.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London: Cadell and Davies, 1812.

Third Report from the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom, 1827.

“View of the Emigration Question.” *The Dublin Evening Post* 7 January 1840: p. 3.

Whitelaw, James. *An Essay on the Population of Dublin*. Dublin: Graisberry and Campbell, 1805.

Cited Newspaper Articles¹

Dublin Evening Mail (DEM)

- December 24, 1824, 4.
- August 21, 1826, 3.
- April 13, 1827, 4.
- March 7, 1828, 2.
- March 7, 1828, 3.
- March 19, 1828, 4.
- March 31, 1828, 3.
- April 4, 1828, 2.
- May 5, 1828, 2.
- May 5, 1828, 3.

Dublin Evening Press (DEP)

- October 22, 1822, 4.
- August 21, 1823, 3.
- October 21, 1823, 2. (NLI)
- October 25, 1823, 3. (NLI)
- October 28, 1823, 3. (NLI)
- July 24, 1824, 4.
- August 17, 1824, 2.
- August 17, 1824, 3.
- August 24, 1826, 3. (NLI)
- April 12, 1827, 3. (NLI)
- October 13, 1827, 3. (NLI)

- October 27, 1827, 4. (NLI)
- March 8, 1828, 3. (NLI)
- April 3, 1828, 3.
- April 5, 1828, 4. (NLI)
- April 19, 1828, s6. (NLI)
- May 6, 1828, s5.
- May 10, 1828, 4. (NLI)
- April 21, 1829, 3.
- May 12, 1829, 1-2.
- May 14, 1829, 3.

Dublin Morning Register (DMR)

- August 26, 1826, 3.
- September 26, 1826, 2.
- March 29, 1827, 3.
- October 2, 1827, 2.
- October 9, 1827, 3.
- October 10, 1827, 1.
- March 8, 1828, 1.
- March 21, 1828, 3.
- March 21, 1828, 4.
- March 31, 1828, 2.
- April 4, 1828, 3.
- April 14, 1829, 2.

¹ Articles collected from British Library Newspaper Archive, unless indicated otherwise.

- May 11, 1829, 1-2
- May 15, 1829, 2.

Dublin Weekly Register (DWR)

- June 24, 1820, 2.
- October 26, 1822, s5.
- March 3, 1827, 1. (NLI)
- April 14, 1827, 2. (NLI)
- October 13, 1827, 4.
- April 5, 1828, 2. (NLI)
- May 16, 1829, 3.
- May 16, 1829, s5.

Freeman's Journal (FJ)

- January 14, 1820, 2.
- July 22, 1820, 2. (INA)¹
- November 21, 1820, 4. (INA)
- January 6, 1821, 4.
- January 10, 1821, 4.
- October 26, 1821, 4.
- November 24, 1821, 3.
- August 22, 1822, 2. (INA)
- August 24, 1822, 2. (INA)

- November 19, 1822, 4. (INA)
- July 5, 1823, 3. (INA)
- October 30, 1823, 3. (INA)
- November 10, 1824, 3. (INA)
- April 5, 1825, 2. (INA)
- April 20, 1825, 4. (INA)
- October 27, 1825, 3. (INA)
- March 31, 1828, 4. (INA)
- April 5, 1828, 3. (INA)
- May 5, 1828, 3-4. (INA)
- May 6, 1828, 2. (INA)
- May 11, 1829, 3-4. (INA)

Saunders's News-Letter (SNL)

- January 20, 1820, 1.
- January 20, 1820, 2.
- May 2, 1820, 1.
- March 18, 1826, 1.
- August 21, 1826, 1.
- August 22, 1826, 2.
- March 31, 1828, 2.
- April 4, 1828, 2.
- May 5, 1828, 1-2.
- May 13, 1829, 2

¹ Irish Newspaper Archive.

Secondary Sources

Emigration

- Adams, William Forbes. *Ireland and Irish Emigration to the New World from 1815 to the Famine*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1932.
- Brettell, Caroline B., and James F. Hollifield, eds. *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Edward Brynn. "The Emigration Theories of Robert Wilmot Horton 1820-1841." *Canadian Journal of History* 4.2 (1969): 45-65. Proquest. Web. 1 April 2015, and "Politics and Economic Theory: Robert Wilmot Horton, 1820-1841." *The Historian* 34.2 (February 1, 1972): 260-277. Proquest. Web. 10 June 2016.
- Bumsted, J. M. *Lord Selkirk: A Life*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2008.
- Dunkley, Peter. "Emigration and the State, 1803-1842: The Nineteenth-Century Revolution in Government Reconsidered." *The Historical Journal* 23.2 (1980): 353-380. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 April 2012. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638673>>.
- Fedorowich, Kent and Andrew S. Thompson, eds. *Empire, Migration and Identity in the British World*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2017.
- Gilmartin, Mary and Allen White, eds. *Migrations: Ireland in a Global World*. Manchester, Manchester UP, 2013.
- Hatton, Timothy J. and Jeffrey G. Williamson, "After the Famine: Emigration from Ireland, 1850-1913." *The Journal of Economic History* 53.3 (1993): 575-600. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 April 2012. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2122406>>.
- Ireland, Patrick R. "Irish Protestant migration and politics in the USA, Canada, and Australia: a debated legacy." *Irish Studies Review* 20.3 (2012): 263-281. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 February 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670882.2012.695613>>.
- Jackson, Pauline. "Women in 19th Century Irish Emigration." *The International Migration Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1984, pp. 1004-1020. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2546070.
- Johnson, James. "The Context of Migration: The Example of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 15.3 (1990): 259-276. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 April 2012. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/622670>>.

- Johnston, H. J. M. *British Emigration Policy 1815-1830. 'Shovelling out Paupers'*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Kenny, Kevin. "Diaspora and Comparison: The Global Irish as a Case Study." *The Journal of American History* 90.1 (2003): 134-162. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 September 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3659794>>.
- Kraus, Michael. "Across the Western Sea (1783-1845)" *Journal of British Studies* 1.2 (1962): 91-114. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 March 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/175207>>.
- Livingston, William S. "Emigration as a Theoretical Doctrine during the American Revolution." *The Journal of Politics* 19.4 (1957): 591-615. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 April 2012. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2126953>>.
- MacRaild, Donald, Tanja Bueltmann, Jonathan Clark, eds. *British and Irish Diasporas: Societies, Cultures and Ideologies*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2019; Mary Gilmartin and Allen White, eds. *Migrations: Ireland in a Global World*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2013.
- Mageean, Deirdre M., (1988). *Comparative Study of Pre- and Post-famine Migrants from North-west Ireland to North America*. Ph.D. Thesis. Open University: U.K.
- Malchow, Howard L. "Trade Unions and Emigration in Late Victorian England: A National Lobby for State Aid." *Journal of British Studies* 15.2 (1976): 92-116. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 September 2013. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/175134>>.
- Miller, Kerby A. *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Mokyr, Joel, and Cormac Ó Gráda. "Emigration and Poverty in Prefamine Ireland." *Explorations in Economic History* 19.4 (1982): 360-384. *Proquest*. Web. 11 June 2013. <<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1305246964?accountid=15483>>.
- Moran, Gerard. *Sending Out Ireland's Poor: Assisted Emigration to North America in the Nineteenth Century*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004.
- Pisarevskaya, Asya, Nathan Levy, Peter Scholten, and Joost Jansen, "Mapping Migration Studies: An Empirical Analysis of Coming of Age of a Research Field", *Migration Studies* (Oxford Academic), 3 August 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz031>
- Popoviciu, Liviu, Chris Haywood, and Máirtín Mac An Ghaill. "Migrating Masculinities." *Irish Studies Review* 14.2 (2006): 169-87. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 Feb. 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670880600603794>>.

Ralph, David. "Home is where the heart is'? Understandings of 'home' among Irish-born return migrants from the United States." *Irish Studies Review* 17.2 (2009): 183-200. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 February 2014.

<<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670880902885396>>.

Richards, Eric. "How Did Poor People Emigrate from the British Isles to Australia in the Nineteenth Century?" *Journal of British Studies* 32.3 (1993): 250-279. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 March 2014. <www.jstor.org/stable/176082>.

- "Sir Robert John Wilmot-Horton", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed: 15 May 2011. <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13827>>.

Sherling, Rankin. *The Invisible Irish: Finding Protestants in Nineteenth-Century Migrations to America*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2015.

History

- Arrowsmith, Aidan. "Introduction, the Significance of Irishness." *Irish Studies Review* 14.2 (2006): 163-168. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 Feb 2014. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670880600603612>>.
- Beiner, Guy. "Between Trauma and Triumphalism: The Easter Rising, the Somme, and the Crux of Deep Memory in Modern Ireland." *Journal of British Studies* 46.2 (2007): 366-389. *JSTOR*. Web. 29 September 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/510892>>.
- Brennan, Paul, ed. *La sécularisation en Irlande*. Caen, France: Presses universitaires de Caen, 1998. <<https://books.openedition.org/puc/110>>
- Busteed, Mervyn. "The Irish in Nineteenth Century Manchester." *Irish Studies Review* 5.18 (1997): 8-13. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 February 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670889708455563>>.
- Colantonio, Laurent. "L'Irlande, les irlandais et l'empire britannique à l'époque de l'union (1801-1921)." *Histoire@Politique* 14 (2011): 198-200. *Cairn.info*. 17 Dec 2013. <<http://www.cairn.info/revue-histoire-politique-2011-2-page-198.htm>>.
- Colantonio, Laurent. "Mobilisation nationale, souveraineté populaire et normalisations en Irlande (années 1820-1840)." *Revue d'histoire du XIXe siècle* 42(2011): 53-69. *Revue.org*. Web. 24 March 2014. <<http://rh19.revues.org/4105>>.
- Connell, K. H. "The Colonization of Waste Land in Ireland, 1780-1845." *The Economic History Review* 3.1 (1950): 44-71. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 March 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2589942>>.
- Connolly, S. J. *Divided Kingdom: Ireland 1630-1800*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Cookson, J. E. *The British Armed Nation 1793-1815*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Daly, Gavin. "English Smugglers, the Channel, and the Napoleonic Wars, 1800-1814." *Journal of British Studies* 46.1 (2007): 30-46. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 March 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/508397>>.
- Donnelly, James S. *Landlord and Tenant in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1973.
- *Captain Rock: The Irish Agrarian Rebellion of 1821-1824*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.

- Eagleton, Terry, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said. *Nationalisme, colonialisme, et littérature*. Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2013.
- Edwards, Ruth Dudley, and Bridget Hourican. *An Atlas of Irish History*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Finlay, Andrew. "Irish Studies, Cultural Pluralism and the Peace Process." *Irish Studies Review* 15.3 (2007): 333-345. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 February 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670880701461860>>.
- Foster, Roy. *Modern Ireland 1600-1972*. London: Allen Lane, 1988.
- Graham, Colin, and Willy Maley. "Introduction: Irish Studies and Postcolonial Theory." *Irish Studies Review* 7.2 (1999): 149-152. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 Feb 2014. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670889908455629>>.
- Guinnane, Timothy W. "The Great Irish Famine and Population: The Long View" *The American Economic Review* 84.2 (1994): 303-308. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Aug 2013. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2117848>>.
- Harper, Marjory. "Review of *Topo. The story of a Scottish colony near Caracas 1825-1827*, Hans P. Rheinheimer". *Northern Scotland* 10.1 (1990): 94-95.
- Inglis, Brian. *The Story of Ireland*. London: Faber and Faber, 1956.
- Jackson, Alvin. *The Two Unions: Ireland, Scotland, and the Survival of the United Kingdom, 1707-2007*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Joyce, P. W. *A Concise History of Ireland*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903.
- Kenny, Kevin. *The American Irish: a History*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.
- McDonough, Terrence. *Was Ireland a Colony?: Economics, Politics, and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*. Dublin: Irish Academic, 2005.
- McDowell, R. B., ed. *Social Life in Ireland 1800-45 = An Saol in Eirinn*. Dublin: Three Candles, 1957.
- Mokyr, Joel, and Cormac Ó Gráda. "New Developments in Irish Population History, 1700-1850." *The Economic History Review* 37.4 (1984): 473-488. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Aug 2013. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2596554>>.
- Monacelli, Martine. "England's re-imagining of Ireland in the nineteenth century." *Etudes irlandaises* 35.1 (2010): 9-20. *Revue.org*. Web. 15 February 2014. <<http://etudesirlandaises.revue.org/1738>>.

- Murphy, James H. *Ireland: A Social, Cultural and Literary History, 1791-1891*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003.
- Murphy, Maura. "The Role of Organized Labour". PhD Thesis, University of Leicester, 1979.
- O'Brien, George. *The Economic History of Ireland from the Union to the Famine*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1921.
- O'Connor, Emmet. *A Labour History of Ireland, 1824-2000*. Dublin: UCD Press, 2011.
- Peatling, G. K. "The Whiteness of Ireland Under and After the Union." *Journal of British Studies* 44.1 (2005): 115-133. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 March 2014.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/424982>>.
- Porter, Andrew, Wm Roger Louis, and Alaine M. Low, eds. *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III: The Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Pressensé, Francis de. *L'Irlande et l'Angleterre depuis l'acte d'union jusqu'à nos jours, 1800-1888*. Paris: Plon, 1889.
- Rixson, Denis. *The Small Islands: Canna, Rum, Eigg and Muck*. Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2001.
- Sheil, Richard Lalor. *Sketches of the Irish Bar*, vol 2. New York: Redfield, 1854
- Solar, Peter M. "Shipping and Economic Development in Nineteenth-Century Ireland." *The Economic History Review* 59.4 (2006): 717-742. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 June 2013.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4121958>>.
- Vaughan, W. E., ed. *Ireland under the Union, 1801-1870*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Williams, Chris, ed. *A Companion to Nineteenth Century Britain*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Politics

- Bew, Paul. *Ireland: The Politics of Enmity 1789-2006*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Bloomfield, Paul. "A Note on Malthus." *The Eugenics Review* 53.2 (1961): 87-90. *PubMed Central, U.S. National Library of Medicine*. Web. 30 Sept 2013.
<<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2972850>>.
- De Bouvier, Anne-Catherine. "L'échec programmé de la Loi sur les Pauvres ». *Revue Française de Civilisation Britannique* XIX-2 (2014) : 17-31.
- *Les élites politiques en Irlande, 1801-1829* (PhD Thesis). Université de Caen Normandie, 1998.
- Donnelly, J.S., and Kerby Miller, eds. *Irish Popular Culture, 1650-1850*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1999.
- Dorfman, Joseph. "The Malthus Letters to Wilmot-Horton: A Note on John McVickar." *Economica* 30.120 (1963): 415. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 September 2013.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2550807>>.
- Ghosh, R. N. "Malthus on Emigration and Colonization: Letters to Wilmot-Horton." *Economica* 30.117 (1963): 45-62. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 September 2013.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2601711>>.
- Gray, Peter. *The Making of the Irish Poor Law, 1815-1843*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009.
- Kelly, James. "Eighteenth-Century Ascendancy: A Commentary." *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, vol. 5, 1990, pp. 173-187. *JSTOR*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30070893>.
- Kenny, Kevin. *Ireland and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Lecky, W. E. H. *The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co., 1861.
- Sloan, Geoffrey. "Ireland and the Geopolitics of Anglo-Irish Relations." *Irish Studies Review* 15.2 (2007): 163-179. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 February 2014.
<<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09670880701284759>>.
- Woodward, Llewellyn. *The Age of Reform, 1815-1870*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Press

- Andrews, Alexander. *The History of British Journalism, from the Foundation of the Newspaper Press in England to the Repeal of the Stamp Act in 1855*. Volumes 1 and 2. London: Richard Bentley, 1859.
- Aspinall, Arthur. *Politics and the Press, c.1780-1850*. London: Home & Van Thal Ltd, 1949.
- Breathnach, Ciara, and Catherine Lawless, eds. *Visual, Material and Print Culture in Nineteenth-Century Ireland*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010.
- Brake, Laurel and Marysa Demoor, eds. *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism in Great Britain and Ireland*. Gent, Belgium: Academia Press, 2009.
- Brown, Stephen. *The Press in Ireland: a survey and guide*. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1937.
- Bruna, Giulia, and Catherine Wilsdon. "Organised Spaces: Revival Activism and Print Culture." *Irish Studies Review* 22.1 (2014): 1-6. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 17 April 2014. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09670882.2013.871852>>.
- Dubois, Claire. "L'histoire et les Penny Journals : réécriture du passé et construction identitaire." *Etudes irlandaises* 34.1 (2009): 11-22. *Revue.org*. Web. 15 February 2014. <<http://etudesirlandaises.revues.org/2571>>.
- Foley, Michael. "Colonialism and Journalism in Ireland." *Journalism Studies* 5.3 (2004): 373-385. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 27 January 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1461670042000246115>>.
- Gliserman, Susan. "Mitchell's 'Newspaper Press Directory': 1846-1907," *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter* 2.1 (1969): 10-29. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 July 2013. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20084796>>.
- Hayley, Barbara, and Enda McKay, eds. *Three Hundred Years of Irish Periodicals*. Dublin: Lilliput Press, 1987.
- Huzel, James P. *The Popularization of Malthus in Early Nineteenth-century England: Martineau, Cobbett and the Pauper Press*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2006.
- Hyland, P. B. J. "Liberty and Libel: Government and the Press during the Succession Crisis in Britain, 1712-1716." *The English Historical Review* 101.401 (1986): 863-888. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 July 2013. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/570644>>.
- Inglis, Brian. *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841*. London: Faber and Faber, 1954. - (1950). *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841*. PhD Thesis, UCD.

- Review of Aspinall *Politics and the Press, c. 1780-1850*. *Irish Historical Studies* 6.24 (1949): 301-303. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 January 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30005070>>.
- King, Andrew, Alexis Easley, and John Morton, eds. *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Periodicals and Newspapers*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Lewis, Lawrence. *The Advertisements of the Spectator*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.
- Madden, Richard Robert. *The History of Irish Periodical Literature, from the end of the 17th to the middle of the 19th century*. London: T. C. Newby, 1867.
- Munter, Robert. *The History of the Irish Newspaper, 1685-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.
- Ó Ciosáin, Niall. *Ireland in Official Print Culture, 1800-1850: A New Reading of the Poor Inquiry*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014.
- O'Brien, Mark. *The Fourth Estate: Journalism in Twentieth-century Ireland*. UK: Manchester UP, 2017.
- "Journalism in Ireland: the evolution of a discipline", in *Irish Journalism before Independence: More a Disease than a Profession*, edited by Kevin Rafter, (UK: Manchester UP, 2011) chapter 1.
- Oram, Hugh. *The Newspaper Book*. Dublin: MO Books, 1983.
- Rafter, Kevin. *Irish Journalism Before Independence: More a Disease than a Profession*. UK: Manchester, 2011.
- Royle, Stephen A., and Caitríona Ní Laoire. "Dare the boist'rous main': The role of the *Belfast News Letter* in the process of emigration from Ulster to North America, 1760-1800." *The Canadian Geographer* 50.1 (2006): 56-73. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 14 June 2013. <<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0008-3658.2006.00126.x/abstract>>.
- Steed, Henry Wickham. *The Press*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1938.
- Thomas, Joseph M. "Swift and the Stamp Act of 1712." *PMLA* 31.2 (1916): 247-263. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 July 2013 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/456958>>.
- Tilley, Elizabeth. "Periodicals in Ireland". *The Routledge Handbook to Nineteenth-Century British Periodicals and Newspapers*, edited by in Andrew King et al., (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp.208-220.
- Tutty, Michael J. "The Dublin Evening Post 1826." *Dublin Historical Record* 24.2 (1971): 15-24. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 April 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30103965>>.

Theoretical approach

- Brivati, Brian, Julia Buxton, and Anthony Seldon, eds. *The Contemporary History Handbook*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996.
- Bulmer, Martin. *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Connolly, Claire. "Theorising Ireland." *Irish Studies Review* 9.3 (2001): 301-315. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 17 April 2014.
- Connolly, Linda. "The limits of 'Irish Studies': historicism, culturalism, paternalism." *Irish Studies Review* 12.2 (2004): 139-162. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 15 February 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0967088042000228914>>.
- Crawford, E. Margaret. *Counting the People: A Survey of the Irish Censuses, 1813-1911*. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003.
- Froggatt, P. "The Census in Ireland of 1813-15." *Irish Historical Studies* 14.55 (1965): 227-235. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 April 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30005523>>.
- Geary, Laurence M., and Margaret Kelleher. *Nineteenth-Century Ireland: A Guide to Recent Research*. Dublin: University College Dublin, 2005.
- Higgs, Edward. *Making Sense of the Census Revisited: Census Records for England and Wales 1801-1901: A Handbook for Historical Researchers*. London: University of London, Institute of Historical Research, 2005.
- Plummer, Kenneth. *Documents of Life: An Introduction to the Problems and Literature of a Humanistic Method*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1983.
- Purvis, June. "Using Primary Sources When Researching Women's History from a Feminist Perspective." *Women's History Review* 1.2 (1992): 273-306. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 19 Dec. 2013. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0961202920010205>>.
- Scott, John. *A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1990.
- Seldon, Anthony. *Contemporary History: Practice and Method*. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell, 1988.

Résumé en français

Le débat sur l'émigration dans la presse dublinoise des années 1820.

1. Introduction


La recherche académique sur les migrations s'est considérablement élargie ces dernières décennies. Elle est devenue un domaine d'étude privilégié pour beaucoup d'historiens et nombre d'experts en sciences politiques, en sociologie et en économie. Le géographe anglo-allemand Ernst Georg Ravenstein (1834-1913) fut le premier chercheur à développer des théories sur le phénomène des migrations humaines de grande envergure. Ses théories, mises en avant à la fin du XIX^{ème} siècle, suscitent encore beaucoup d'intérêt et sont toujours utilisées dans les recherches universitaires actuelles relatives aux migrations. Le nombre de revues savantes exclusivement consacrées aux phénomènes migratoires a augmenté de manière très significative depuis le début des années 1990 et les travaux qui touchent à ces questions ne se limitent plus à une approche strictement quantitative centrée sur des données statistiques et la démographie. Ils privilégient également des approches qualitatives relatives à la géographie, à l'intégration des migrants dans les sociétés d'accueil ainsi qu'aux modes de gouvernance qui s'appliquent dans les différents territoires concernés.

Ce domaine a contribué à la découverte des facteurs à l'origine des migrations et a élargi notre compréhension des mouvements des différents peuples au cours de

l'histoire. Diverses études ont été entreprises pour mieux comprendre les migrations dans les îles britanniques, en particulier en Irlande. Des études, telles que *British and Irish Diasporas* (2019), *The Invisible Irish* (2016) et *Migrations : L'Irlande dans un monde globalisé* (2013), témoignent de l'importance croissante de cette discipline. Des études ont été menées sur les différentes caractéristiques des émigrants des XVIIIe et XIXe siècles, qui étaient d'abord principalement protestants, et plus tard majoritairement catholiques. L'émigration féminine irlandaise a fait l'objet d'études, dont les résultats montrent que, contrairement aux émigrants des autres pays européens qui étaient principalement des hommes célibataires et des familles, les femmes ont émigré sur un pied d'égalité avec les hommes. Le mouvement des Irlandais vers tous les coins du monde, et pas seulement vers les anciennes colonies britanniques, continue de produire d'innombrables pistes de recherche dans le domaine des études sur les mouvements migratoires et l'émigration irlandaises.

L'émigration spécifiquement irlandaise est un sujet étudié par de nombreux spécialistes universitaires depuis de très nombreuses années. Nous savons aujourd'hui que, depuis 1800, environ dix millions d'irlandais ont quitté leur pays, ce qui a conduit à d'innombrables études sur les causes de ces mouvements de population et sur les expériences des migrants irlandais au sein des sociétés qui les ont accueillis. La période qui a surtout retenu l'attention des chercheurs est avant tout celle de la grande famine de 1845-1852, période pendant laquelle deux millions d'irlandais firent le choix de l'émigration aux Etats-Unis. Beaucoup d'habitants de l'île avaient cependant opté pour le départ et le déracinement plusieurs années avant le début de cette crise importante. Alors que l'émigration pendant la Grande Famine fut exceptionnellement élevée (les estimations vont de un à deux millions sur toute la période), le nombre d'émigrants avait considérablement augmenté dans les années précédant la famine. Comme l'ont suggéré certains chercheurs, l'accent mis sur l'émigration au milieu du XIXe siècle, en particulier pendant la période de famine, a conduit à négliger l'étude de l'émigration pendant

d'autres périodes de l'histoire irlandaise. Le graphique suivant montre l'augmentation constante de l'émigration irlandaise, et met en évidence un quasi doublement tous les dix ans de cette dernière au cours des deux décennies qui précédèrent la Famine.



Ce phénomène historique très intéressant, déjà en cours dans les années 1820, s'explique en partie par la volonté politique du Parlement britannique dont certains membres influents souhaitaient alors utiliser l'émigration comme un moyen de « régler » le problème de la misère paysanne et ouvrière en Irlande. La population irlandaise était alors estimée à 6,8 millions de personnes (chiffres de 1821).

Cette étude porte sur la période des années 1820, durant laquelle le gouvernement britannique à Londres examinait la situation socio-économique en Irlande et tentait de trouver un remède au soi-disant "mal" qui sévissait sur son île sœur. Dans l'ensemble des îles britanniques, le contexte social était tendu : la population augmentait rapidement en Irlande, de nouvelles formes de paupérisme émergeaient en lien avec le développement d'une main-d'œuvre industrielle non qualifiée, et la question

de l'assistance aux pauvres était débattue en termes plus pressants qu'auparavant. D'autres solutions étaient cependant explorées pour l'Irlande, car les *Poor Laws* n'y existaient pas. Les difficultés spécifiques à l'Irlande, évidentes aux yeux de tous, ne s'expliquaient pas uniquement par les raisons souvent avancées par les politiciens et les membres du Parlement. Suite à la confiscation des terres catholiques, pratiquement achevée en 1778, l'accès à la terre pour les catholiques irlandais pauvres avait été radicalement transformé. Un petit nombre de protestants, principalement irlandais et anglais, possédaient 95 % des terres en Irlande et louaient de grandes parcelles à des agents fonciers, appelés "intermédiaires", qui à leur tour subdivisaient les terres afin de les sous-louer ou de les louer à des travailleurs irlandais. Environ 900 000 familles vivaient sur moins de deux acres de terre, payant un loyer par l'échange de travail ou de produits au lieu d'argent. Ces familles dépendaient de cet accès à la terre pour cultiver des pommes de terre de subsistance, qui étaient récoltées une fois par an et devaient durer jusqu'à la saison de récolte suivante. Ce groupe ne bénéficiait que de peu ou pas d'aide, à l'exception d'une charité privée occasionnelle, ce qui ne les protégeait pas de l'expulsion si le prix élevé du loyer ne pouvait pas être payé dans le cadre de cet arrangement. Ce système de propriété foncière, associé à une population en rapide augmentation (dont le nombre approchait les huit millions d'habitants avant la famine), à une absence totale d'aide gouvernementale pour les pauvres et les chômeurs, et aux effets dramatiques de la révolution industrielle, avait créé une classe ouvrière en état de "détresse" presque constante.

De nombreux comités furent créés pour étudier ce problème : le Comité restreint sur les lois relatives aux pauvres (1817), le Comité restreint sur l'état des maladies et la condition des travailleurs pauvres en Irlande (1819), le Comité restreint sur l'emploi des pauvres en Irlande (1823), le Comité restreint sur l'étude et l'évaluation de l'Irlande (1824), deux Comités restreints sur L'état de l'Irlande (1825), le Comité restreint sur l'émigration (1826 et 1827), le Comité restreint sur l'éducation en Irlande (1828). Le

gouvernement semblait déterminé à comprendre la situation en Irlande et voulait être perçu comme disposé à légiférer pour atténuer les difficultés, principalement financières, auxquelles le pays était confronté. Bien que les véritables motivations pour résoudre cette détresse soient inconnues, les comités semblaient plus préoccupés par les aspects financiers de ces questions ; le fait que beaucoup d'entre eux possédaient des terres en Irlande pourrait avoir influencé leurs motivations pour aborder ce sujet. L'augmentation de l'espace dans les journaux consacré à ces rapports suggère que le public était clairement intéressé par les sujets étudiés par ces comités, ou du moins que la presse estimait que le public devait être informé des travaux du gouvernement.

Cette étude se concentrera sur les trois rapports du Comité sur l'émigration de 1826 et 1827, qui tentèrent d'énumérer les problèmes qui affligeaient l'Irlande, tout en proposant simultanément un plan d'émigration pour remédier à ces problèmes. Dans le même temps, elle étudiera leur réception dans la presse dublinoise des années 1820, et l'interaction entre ces deux types de sources dans le contexte politique et social de l'époque.

Les rapports étudiés comportent plus de mille pages de discussions sur la situation des travailleurs irlandais, écossais et anglais, l'existence d'une population excédentaire, notamment en Irlande, les effets de la sous-location, les différents aspects des plans d'émigration suggérés par les individus et proposés par les comités, le financement desdits plans, la question de savoir si ces plans constitueraient le remède le plus efficace, et quelques alternatives à l'émigration. L'analyse de ces rapports dans cette étude a commencé par une recherche sur les membres des commissions et les témoins qui ont témoigné devant les trois commissions. Grâce à ces informations, il a été possible d'étudier en détail les témoignages de ces témoins et de comprendre leur contexte, ce qui a permis de comprendre un grand nombre de prises de position. En lisant ces trois rapports de commission, certains thèmes et préoccupations récurrents ont été mis en évidence chez les témoins et les membres du Comité eux-mêmes.

Des extraits choisis des rapports sur l'émigration et leurs témoignages furent réimprimés dans divers journaux de Dublin à l'époque, certains avec des commentaires ou des critiques et d'autres présentant simplement les informations. La presse de Dublin nous donne ainsi une idée de la variété des réponses apportées en Irlande aux travaux du Comité, et plus généralement des échanges dynamiques et des tensions entre la perception des questions sociales irlandaises au sein de l'élite politique britannique d'une part, et en Irlande d'autre part.

La presse en Irlande s'était développée rapidement à partir du XVII^e siècle. Il s'agissait d'une entreprise intrinsèquement politique, un point qui est développé dans la première partie de cette étude. Des centaines de journaux virent le jour et seul un petit nombre d'entre eux purent prétendre à un succès, souvent limité. C'était une entreprise coûteuse et l'intervention du gouvernement pouvait rendre difficile la poursuite d'une telle activité. Différentes méthodes étaient utilisées par le gouvernement pour encourager aussi bien que pour étouffer les activités des journaux, comme le parrainage, les poursuites pour diffamation, les lois sur les timbres, l'espionnage, et même la création de ses propres publications. Néanmoins, la presse jouait un rôle essentiel dans la communication d'informations politiques au public irlandais, notamment en réimprimant les rapports des commissions, les débats parlementaires et la correspondance soumise par les fonctionnaires du gouvernement. Dans le cas présent, elle apporte même des informations archivistiques essentielles en fournissant des comptes rendus des débats parlementaires pour une période où les archives du Hansard sont lacunaires.

En choisissant les journaux pour cette étude, quelques critères ont été retenus afin d'obtenir une vision plus représentative des tendances politiques et religieuses de la période. Tout d'abord, une liste restreinte de journaux a été établie en fonction de leur longévité, chacune des publications choisies ayant perduré au moins cinq ans au cours de la décennie. Ensuite, les tendances politiques de chaque publication ont été

recherchées dans le Waterloo Directory et le Mitchell's Directory. Enfin, la disponibilité des journaux sélectionnés a été déterminée. Dans un premier temps, dix journaux ont été sélectionnés pour cette étude sur la base de leurs tendances politiques et/ou religieuses et du nombre d'années de publication. Toutefois, en raison de l'indisponibilité de quelques-uns d'entre eux, ce nombre a été ramené à six.

Je me suis penchée en 2015 sur des articles archivés à la Bibliothèque nationale d'Irlande à Dublin. **Les 514 articles que j'ai décidé de retenir comme sources primaires dans le cadre de mes travaux sont tirés des publications d'époque qui suivent :**

- Le *Dublin Evening Mail*, un quotidien conservateur anticatholique et antinationaliste, ouvertement favorable aux unionistes. J'ai analysé quarante-deux articles de ce journal relatifs à l'émigration irlandaise.
- Le *Dublin Evening Post*, un organe de presse nationaliste engagé dans la lutte pour l'émancipation des catholiques, qui publia cent-quarante-cinq articles sur l'émigration entre 1820 et 1829.
- Le *Dublin Morning Register*, un journal de tendance libérale, pro-catholique et pro-émancipation, à l'origine de cent articles sur le sujet.
- Le *Dublin Weekly Register*, libéral et lui aussi pro-catholique, qui publia quatre-vingt-quatre articles sur l'émigration au cours de la décennie sur laquelle se concentre mon travail.
- Le *Freeman's Journal*, opposé au gouvernement britannique et nationaliste. Cent-sept articles de ce journal concernaient l'émigration sur la période étudiée.
- Le *Saunders's News-Letter* qui se présentait alors comme une publication « neutre » bien qu'il fût perçu comme un organe pro-gouvernemental dans l'opinion publique. Il publia trente-six articles sur l'émigration.

Une fois collectés, les articles ont été transcrits et catalogués, en fonction de leur contenu, de leur pertinence et de leur type. Ces documents contenaient une variété de sujets, reflétant les questions abordées par les rapports du Comité de l'émigration, concernant l'encouragement de l'émigration, les règlements sur les navires à passagers, l'État d'Irlande, la mise en valeur des tourbières et autres alternatives, et l'émigration en général.

L'objectif de cette thèse est de faire le lien entre les rapports des Comités sur l'Émigration, et la presse, ce qui permettra d'étudier la question de l'émigration sous un nouvel angle. En analysant ces sources, nous montrons comment la presse a présenté le débat sur l'émigration, y compris les travaux des Comités sur l'émigration et les débats parlementaires, et comment les opinions sur le sujet ont évolué au cours de la décennie, tant de la part du gouvernement que des journaux eux-mêmes. Nous cherchons également à comprendre si la presse de Dublin eut une quelconque influence sur les débats qui se sont tenus au Parlement, ou vice versa, ce qui a nécessité une étude plus approfondie des articles de journaux qui ont imprimé les débats parlementaires. L'hypothèse principale de cette recherche est que la manière dont la presse présenta le débat sur l'émigration et les travaux des Comités sur l'émigration influença le déroulement du débat au Parlement, que ce soit intentionnellement ou non. Ces comités, ainsi que les partisans de l'émigration, firent l'objet de nombreuses critiques dans la presse pour leurs propositions. Ces critiques, associées aux arguments en faveur d'alternatives à l'émigration, semblent finalement avoir eu pour résultat l'absence de mesure pour établir un plan d'émigration assisté par l'État. La question à laquelle nous tentons de répondre dans cette étude est de savoir dans quelle mesure cette absence d'action pour remédier à la détresse de l'Irlande est due à ce débat public dans la presse.

Cette thèse s'articule autour d'une problématique qu'il convient en fait de décliner en deux questions fondamentales. Ces questions sont les suivantes :

Comment la presse dublinoise de la période mentionnée a-t-elle présenté les comités parlementaires qui se penchaient sur le sujet de l'émigration, comités qui furent organisés en 1826 et 1827 ?

Les représentations mises en évidence dans la presse ont-elles pu avoir une influence notable sur les débats parlementaires britanniques consacrés à l'émigration au cours des années 1820 ?

Dans la première partie de cette étude, nous examinons l'histoire pertinente de l'Irlande, en commençant par la période allant des confiscations de terres à l'émancipation catholique, en passant par les lois pénales, le soulèvement de 1798 et l'Acte d'Union. Ces informations donnent le contexte historique approprié pour comprendre la situation des membres les plus pauvres de la société irlandaise et leurs conditions de vie pendant cette période. Cette étude est suivie d'un examen de l'histoire de la presse irlandaise, y compris ses origines, le contrôle du gouvernement, la distribution et la diffusion, ses sources de revenus, les divisions politiques et religieuses de la presse et le contexte des journaux sélectionnés pour cette recherche. La présentation du contexte historique se conclut par une étude de l'histoire de l'émigration de l'Irlande, englobant le développement du commerce des émigrants, les modèles d'émigration et la démographie, le passage prépayé et les envois de fonds, et les motifs de l'émigration. Cette analyse se poursuit avec la législation sur l'émigration, les programmes et les expériences d'émigration assistée, la politique de l'émigration et l'influence des théories de Malthus sur la population sur le débat de l'émigration.

La deuxième partie de cette recherche contient une analyse complète des trois comités sur l'émigration et de leurs rapports respectifs, qui débute par la création du premier comité et de son principal défenseur, Robert Wilmot-Horton, et se poursuit par un examen des témoignages apportés par les participants invités par les comités. Dans l'analyse de ces témoignages, quatre catégories ont été déterminées comme étant les

thèmes les plus récurrents : la détresse générale en Irlande, en Écosse et en Angleterre ; les plans d'émigration ; la contribution à l'émigration ; et les effets de l'établissement d'un système d'émigration, en particulier en Irlande. Ces quatre thèmes englobent de multiples sujets discutés au sein des commissions :

1. La détresse couvre les sujets suivants : les conditions de vie des pauvres en Irlande, en Écosse et en Angleterre ; la population redondante ; et la sous-location.
2. Les plans d'émigration comprennent la migration saisonnière, l'émigration volontaire, le plan gouvernemental, les anciens colons au Canada, le désir d'émigrer et les alternatives à l'émigration.
3. La contribution à l'émigration traite de la volonté de contribuer financièrement, des contributions antérieures, des avantages financiers et des méthodes de contribution à l'émigration.
4. La question du vide (*vacuum*) fait essentiellement référence aux témoignages qui évoquent un vide survenant après le départ d'un grand nombre d'émigrants dans une communauté et au témoignage de Malthus, qui a tenu une place particulièrement importante dans le débat sur ce sujet.

Ces sujets sont revenus avec des niveaux d'importance différents dans les trois comités sur l'émigration. Par exemple, la sous-location a été abordée presque exclusivement par des témoins irlandais, tandis que la question des anciens colons au Canada a été abordée principalement par des témoins canadiens. L'objectif de cette partie est d'examiner les motivations politiques des comités, d'évaluer la valeur sociologique et historique des témoignages, et d'établir les premiers liens avec la réaction de la presse à ces rapports.

La dernière partie de cette thèse est consacrée à l'analyse des articles de journaux recueillis pour cette étude. Nous commençons par un examen des positions des journaux sur l'émigration dans les premières années des années 1820, avant que le débat

sur l'émigration n'attire l'attention des comités d'émigration. Nous montrons que les journaux avaient généralement une position claire sur le sujet, critiquant souvent la politique changeante du gouvernement en matière de soutien, d'encouragement et d'aide à l'émigration. Les journaux conservateurs et libéraux sélectionnés pour cette étude étaient pour la plupart d'accord sur ce point, exprimant un discours commun sur l'émigration comme remède, même si les articles sur le sujet étaient encore peu nombreux, malgré des opinions divergentes sur la plupart des autres sujets, tels que l'émancipation catholique, les mauvaises lois, et les affaires irlandaises en général. Nous retiendrons entre autres une critique de Malthus et de ses théories sur la situation de détresse des pauvres irlandais. Ce changement de ton à l'égard de Malthus était nouveau, dans la mesure où la plupart des journaux et des politiciens irlandais le révéraient sans remettre en cause le fondement de ses théories.

Alors que le débat dans la presse se poursuivait sur divers aspects des affaires irlandaises, un changement notable dans le discours se produisit, avec un accent particulier sur la détresse persistante en Irlande et, par conséquent, sur l'urgence d'y remédier. Les publications étudiées montrent un soutien à l'émigration, ainsi qu'aux alternatives à l'émigration, par exemple, différentes formes d'emploi et l'introduction de lois sur les pauvres (*Poor Laws*). Ces aspects furent reflétés dans les comités et les rapports sur l'émigration qui suivirent et, comme mentionné précédemment, il s'agissait de sujets abordés par les témoins invités par les comités. La présentation des rapports des comités sur l'émigration commença de manière quelque peu réservée, les journaux ne fournissant que peu de commentaires sur le contenu de ces rapports. La situation changea radicalement avec la publication du troisième rapport sur l'émigration en 1827, lorsque tous les journaux se mirent à exprimer leur accord ou leur désaccord avec le contenu des témoignages ou du rapport de la commission.

La ferveur autour des comités d'émigration s'éteignit rapidement après qu'il fut clairement établi que le Parlement n'adopterait très probablement aucune de leurs

suggestions, à l'exception de l'abrogation de la loi sur le transport maritime des passagers (*Passenger Vessels Act*), qui était peut-être un moyen d'encourager l'émigration en réduisant le coût du voyage. La presse commença à affirmer son influence aussi fortement qu'elle le pouvait en critiquant directement les membres du Parlement pour leur discours sur les sujets de l'encouragement à l'émigration, des règlements sur le transport maritime de voyageurs et de la condition de l'Irlande. Le débat au Parlement s'étant déplacé de la question de l'émigration comme remède à celle de l'émancipation catholique, la presse se mit à exprimer son désarroi chaque fois que la question de l'émigration était soulevée, principalement par Robert Wilmot-Horton. Il continua à faire de nouvelles propositions au Parlement, introduisant de nouvelles pétitions pour l'aide à l'émigration, sans toutefois progresser dans son argumentation. Malgré l'apparence d'un rejet de l'émigration comme solution pour l'Irlande, la presse se servit de ses pages pour plaider en faveur d'une réglementation plus stricte des navires à passagers lorsque ce débat eut lieu au Parlement en 1828, constatant un manque de médecins militaires pour les voyages transatlantiques.

Enfin, la condition de l'Irlande se trouva de nouveau à l'ordre du jour pour de nombreux membres du Parlement après que l'étude exhaustive réalisée par les commissions de l'émigration ait été fraîchement imprimée. Les membres des deux Chambres du Parlement furent fustigés dans la presse pour avoir demandé la nomination de nouvelles commissions chargées d'étudier la situation en Irlande, bien que plusieurs commissions aient examiné en détail de nombreux aspects concernant l'Irlande, depuis la commission sur les tourbières en 1809-1814, jusqu'à la commission sur l'emploi des pauvres en Irlande en 1823, et les deux commissions, l'une des Communes et l'autre des Lords, sur l'état de l'Irlande en 1825, en plus des Comités sur l'émigration, qui étudièrent nombre de ces aspects dans leur propre enquête. Les lois sur les pauvres et l'émancipation catholique devinrent le dernier champ de bataille de cette décennie, la presse participant à ce débat aux côtés du Parlement, en reprenant et en

commentant chaque session des Lords ou des Communes qui abordait ces questions. Ces deux sujets détournèrent finalement la presse et le Parlement de la question de l'émigration comme solution à la détresse en Irlande, et la vision de Robert Wilmot-Horton d'un système d'émigration assisté par l'État ne se concrétisa jamais. Si l'influence de la presse sur les débats au Parlement est difficile à évaluer, elle joua certainement un rôle essentiel pour communiquer au public les discussions qui s'y déroulaient et pour critiquer les députés pour leurs positions et leur manque de connaissances sur certains sujets dont ils débattaient. Les problèmes qui touchaient l'Irlande étaient complexes et la presse a affirmé que les députés qui débattent de ces problèmes ne comprennent pas l'Irlande ou les pauvres Irlandais et ne peuvent donc pas faire une politique saine concernant l'avenir de ce pays. Il est possible que ces prises de position aient influencé l'opinion publique sur l'action parlementaire concernant l'Irlande et, peut-être, sur le fait que l'Irlande aurait dû prendre ces décisions elle-même. On peut de ce fait y voir une première manifestation d'un sentiment nationaliste dans la presse irlandaise, ou du moins une prise de conscience de la capacité des Irlandais à comprendre et à mieux gérer leurs affaires que leurs dirigeants britanniques.

2. History of Ireland

J'ai pris soin de rédiger la première partie, que j'ai décidé d'intituler *History of Ireland*, pour rappeler quel fut le contexte historique précis dans lequel s'inscrit mon sujet de recherche. Il est en effet inconcevable d'aborder les trois rapports parlementaires de 1826-1827 mentionnés plus haut sans que ce contexte soit serré au plus près. Cette partie s'attache dans un premier temps à décrire la situation des catholiques en Irlande à partir du moment où, au XVII^{ème} siècle, de nombreux propriétaires terriens irlandais pratiquant le Catholicisme furent dépossédés de leurs exploitations sur ordre de la couronne britannique, conformément aux exigences du clergé anglican. Cette vaste entreprise de spoliation débuta sous le règne de Jacques I^{er} (1566-1625). Elle se poursuivit lors de la « conquête cromwellienne », quand Oliver Cromwell, à la demande du gouvernement de Londres, intervint militairement sur l'île en 1649, ainsi que sous les règnes de Charles II (1660-1685) et de William III (1689-1702). Ma première grande partie explique donc quel fut le quotidien des catholiques irlandais, frappés par un certain nombre de lois liberticides, jusqu'au processus d'émancipation qui débuta à la fin du XVIII^{ème}.

Les lois ici évoquées furent mises en place à partir de 1607. Elles visaient ouvertement à restreindre les droits des catholiques irlandais, tous perçus comme des opposants potentiels au pouvoir de la couronne britannique. Dès 1607 donc, les catholiques d'Irlande ne furent plus autorisés à occuper certaines fonctions publiques. Ils furent également privés de la possibilité de servir dans l'armée. En 1613, la Chambre des Communes irlandaises fut remodelée afin que les colons de religion protestante soient sûrs d'y obtenir une majorité. Les catholiques furent encore contraints de payer une amende pour non-fréquentation d'un lieu de culte anglican. Les cérémonies religieuses catholiques furent interdites dans les faits. Elles avaient donc lieu clandestinement. Quand vint la conquête cromwellienne et *l'Act of Settlement* de 1652,

les catholiques ne furent plus autorisés à siéger au Parlement irlandais. Nombre de propriétaires terriens pratiquant le Catholicisme furent expropriés. En 1673, le premier *Test Act*, visant « à prévenir les dangers issus des papistes » signifia clairement que seuls les anglicans qui communiaient dans l'Eglise d'Angleterre pouvaient travailler dans la fonction publique. D'autres lois suivirent pour empêcher les catholiques de fréquenter certaines universités, d'exercer certaines professions, de voter, d'hériter de terres appartenant à des protestants, d'obtenir la garde d'enfants orphelins, de posséder un cheval d'une valeur supérieure à cinq livres, de se marier avec un protestant. C'est ainsi que « l'ascendance protestante », la domination politique, sociale et économique d'une minorité religieuse, s'est affirmée en Irlande. Cette *Protestant Ascendancy* s'est progressivement effacée à partir du XIX^{ème} siècle.

Pour donner un aperçu des graves inégalités qui touchèrent la population catholique d'Irlande pendant près de deux siècles, il n'est pas inutile de rappeler quelques chiffres. A la fin du XVII^{ème}, 75% des terres en Irlande appartenaient à des familles protestantes anglaises ou écossaises. Fin XVIII^{ème}, c'est 95% des terres qui appartenaient à des protestants. Début XIX^{ème}, alors que la population irlandaise était estimée à environ 5,4 millions de personnes (chiffres pour l'année 1804), l'île comptait entre huit-mille et dix-mille propriétaires terriens, presque exclusivement protestants. Un tiers de ces propriétaires étaient des « propriétaires absents », ce qui veut dire qu'ils possédaient des biens en Irlande mais n'y résidaient pas.

Le régime foncier qui s'appliquait alors en Irlande était absolument unique dans les îles britanniques. En Angleterre et en Ecosse, le régime en vigueur était bien différent. Un propriétaire y louait directement une parcelle de terre à un bailleur tandis qu'en Irlande les propriétaires fonciers avaient pour habitude de recruter un bailleur intermédiaire qui avait la responsabilité, en tant qu'agent foncier, de gérer son domaine. Les agents fonciers louaient ensuite plusieurs petites parcelles de terrain à des paysans-locataires. Ce système avec intermédiaire fut promu pendant la première moitié du

XVIII^{ème} siècle. Les grands propriétaires fonciers misaient dessus car, les petits travailleurs agricoles n'ayant pas les moyens financiers nécessaires à l'amélioration des exploitations, ils comptaient sur leurs agents fonciers pour construire de nouvelles habitations, de nouvelles fermes, des équipements de drainage et d'irrigation performants.

Entre 1750 et 1815, alors que l'Angleterre exprimait une demande croissante de produits agricoles irlandais, les agents fonciers intermédiaires étaient surtout occupés à chercher de nouveaux bailleurs, tout en renouvelant systématiquement leurs contrats de location avec ceux qui louaient déjà des terres, afin d'augmenter leurs propres bénéfices. Les quantités produites dans les exploitations agricoles et la qualité de la production n'étaient pas vraiment pour eux des priorités. Les conditions de vie et de travail des paysans-locataires non plus.

Dans les années 1780 émergea le *Irish Patriot Party* qui réclamait une réforme du Parlement afin d'obtenir l'indépendance législative de l'Irlande. Ce mouvement en faveur d'une réforme parlementaire s'effaça au profit d'une autre formation politique, l'*United Irishmen*, après 1790. Les fondateurs de cet autre parti étaient inspirés par les idéaux de la Révolution américaine et par la Révolution française. Bien que fondé par des personnalités protestantes, le mouvement obtint le soutien de plusieurs organisations catholiques et sa principale revendication était bien l'émancipation des catholiques irlandais. Il fut officiellement interdit en 1793 dans un contexte de guerre entre le Royaume-Uni et la France révolutionnaire. Les autorités politiques britanniques craignaient une alliance entre les « irlandais unis » et la France. Elles déclarèrent ensuite la loi martiale sur l'ensemble du territoire irlandais. Cette situation aboutit au soulèvement de 1798 et à la mise en place de l'acte d'Union (*Act of Union*). L'Acte d'Union de 1800 officialisa l'union du Royaume d'Irlande et du Royaume de Grande Bretagne qui comprenait l'Angleterre et l'Ecosse, qui débuta le 1^{er} janvier 1801. Le Parlement irlandais fut dissous et une représentation irlandaise fut créée au Parlement britannique (cent

membres à la Chambre des Communes et trente-deux membres à la Chambre des Lords).

L'émancipation catholique, qui supprima nombre de restrictions imposées par la loi aux catholiques d'Irlande, commença comme cela a déjà été mentionné à la fin du XVIIIème. En 1778, les catholiques irlandais furent désormais autorisés à posséder un certain nombre de biens, à hériter de terres et à rejoindre l'armée. En 1782, la création d'écoles catholiques fut autorisée par la loi. En 1791, l'accès à certaines professions devint possible pour les irlandais de confession catholique, qui purent désormais exercer le métier d'avocat et enseigner à l'Université. En 1793, les catholiques accédèrent au droit de vote.

Cette première partie de mon travail résume également l'histoire bien singulière de la presse écrite irlandaise. Cette dernière commença à se développer dans les années 1680. Dans la première moitié du XIXème siècle, elle entretenait des rapports souvent conflictuels avec les autorités politiques britanniques qui cherchaient alors à lui imposer un contrôle gouvernemental le plus strict possible. La censure était forte. Toutes les rédactions, qui ne tenaient bien évidemment pas le même discours et s'affrontaient sur des questions d'ordre politique et religieux, devaient s'acquitter de taxes dont la conséquence immédiate fut la précarisation de plusieurs journaux. Certains organes de presse écrite, bien que toujours soumis à des impôts significatifs, purent bénéficier d'un système de parrainage mis en place par le gouvernement et ainsi recevoir des subventions importantes s'ils acceptaient de revoir leur discours politique. L'Etat britannique tenta même de créer son propre organe de presse, le *Volunteer Evening Post*, et en « infiltra » un autre, le *Freeman's*, en vue de modifier ses prises de position. Entre 1818 et 1828, les manœuvres politiques visant à contrôler la presse ne portèrent pas les fruits espérés. Le nombre de publications indépendantes du pouvoir et soucieuses de la cause catholique en Irlande augmenta en effet clairement durant cette période. Les

procédures en diffamation engagées par l'Etat contre des organes de presse perdirent quant à elles de leur ampleur avant de connaître un nouveau souffle à partir de 1828.

La première partie de mon travail revient aussi sur ce que nous savons de l'histoire de l'émigration irlandaise. Le fait que l'Irlande, au XIXème siècle, fut l'une des principales terres d'émigration en Europe est aujourd'hui connu de tous. Avant la grande famine, les flux de migrants catholiques irlandais désireux de se construire ailleurs une vie meilleure étaient déjà très importants. La pauvreté dont furent victimes les paysans et les ouvriers irlandais favorisa évidemment grandement le phénomène, de même que la révolution industrielle et l'évolution progressive du transport maritime. La législation britannique ne favorisait pourtant pas vraiment l'émigration. Le *Passenger Vessels Act* de 1803, une loi visant officiellement à protéger les candidats à l'émigration vers l'Amérique du Nord de conditions de vie trop difficiles à bord des navires, cherchait bien plutôt à dissuader certaines catégories de population de quitter l'Irlande. Ma première partie aborde enfin l'évolution du regard porté par les responsables politiques britanniques sur l'émigration irlandaise ainsi que l'influence des théories malthusiennes sur les responsables en question, influence d'autant plus importante que Malthus (1766-1834) fut invité à témoigner devant le comité parlementaire consacré à l'émigration en 1827.

Le principal enseignement qui ressort de ma première grande partie est bien qu'un certain nombre de parlementaires britanniques étaient propriétaires fonciers en Irlande et louaient leurs terres à des agents intermédiaires qui eux-mêmes les partageaient en parcelles louées aux paysans les plus nécessiteux. La mise en place des comités consacrés à l'émigration s'explique alors par les intérêts économiques de ces personnalités politiques en terre irlandaise. Les parlementaires dont il est ici question se trouvaient confrontés à des problèmes récurrents de défaut de paiement, les paysans les plus pauvres étant trop souvent dans l'incapacité de payer leurs loyers. L'émigration

leur est de toute évidence apparue comme un moyen de se débarrasser de cette main d'œuvre peu rentable, ce que la presse dublinoise ne manqua pas de souligner.

3. Emigration Committees and Reports

La seconde grande partie de ma thèse, qui a pour titre *Emigration Committees and Reports*, se concentre sur les trois comités parlementaires consacrés au thème de l'émigration et sur leurs rapports rédigés en 1826 et 1827. Elle se décline en quatre sous-parties. Elle montre très bien comment le gouvernement britannique a abordé la question sensible et compliquée de l'émigration.

Les trois comités furent tous mis en place à l'initiative d'un membre du Parlement : Robert Wilmot-Horton (1784-1841), sous-secrétaire d'Etat à la guerre et aux colonies. Tous furent organisés dans l'enceinte de Westminster sous sa direction. Cet homme fut propriétaire d'un grand domaine dans le Derbyshire, en Angleterre. Il semble avoir sincèrement œuvré pour le développement de l'agriculture et le bien-être des travailleurs agricoles résidant sur ses terres. Malthusien convaincu, il devint littéralement obsédé par l'émigration qu'il percevait comme le meilleur remède aux problèmes de sa nation. Ce remède devait selon lui s'appliquer en Irlande par la mise en place d'un vaste plan gouvernemental d'émigration organisé. En 1823, il rédigea une brochure intitulée *Outline of a Plan of Emigration to Upper Canada*. Il avait une conception précise sur la manière dont un programme d'émigration assistée par l'Etat pouvait être construit. Il organisa des expériences d'émigration soutenues par le gouvernement avec le canadien Peter Robinson. En 1828, il essaya de présenter un projet de loi sur l'émigration à la Chambre des Communes, sans succès. Déçu par le Parlement britannique, il quitta alors le gouvernement.

Le nombre de témoins qui se sont exprimés lors des comités est significatif.

- Trente-cinq témoins furent en effet auditionnés lors du premier comité, qui se tint du 20 mars au 26 mai 1826.
- Trente-neuf témoins intervinrent lors du second comité, lequel eut lieu en 1827, du 20 février au 3 avril.
- Le troisième et dernier comité reçut quarante-six témoins. Il débuta le 7 avril 1827 pour se terminer le 27 juin de la même année. Malthus y participa en tant que témoin à la date du 5 mai.

Les conditions de création, la méthodologie de travail ainsi que la définition officielle de la mission de ces comités sont abordées dans ma première sous-partie.

La partie *Emigration Committees and Reports* se penche ensuite, dans une deuxième section, sur les rapports rendant compte du travail des trois comités parlementaires. Le premier rapport fut rédigé en août 1826, les deux autres en avril et octobre 1827. A la lecture de ces rapports, il apparaît évident que les parlementaires qui intervinrent lors des comités, même s'ils considéraient l'émigration comme un remède, étaient également très préoccupés des éventuels effets secondaires indésirables qu'un véritable système d'émigration organisé par le gouvernement britannique pouvait impliquer. Ces responsables politiques s'inquiétaient d'ailleurs de possibles conséquences négatives en Angleterre et en Écosse bien que la situation politique, économique et sociale irlandaise fût leur principale préoccupation.

Les témoins qui intervinrent à l'occasion des trois comités parlementaires étaient plus de cent. Leurs témoignages respectifs furent retranscrits sur plus de sept cents pages. Ces témoignages portaient sur un large éventail de sujets liés à l'émigration :

Les plans d'émigration éventuels que le gouvernement britannique était susceptible de mettre en place ;

- L'expérience vécue par d'anciens colons ayant quitté le Royaume-Uni pour s'installer au Canada ;
- La possibilité pour les colons de rembourser toute somme avancée par l'Etat pour leur émigration ;
- La réglementation s'appliquant aux passagers pendant leur transport maritime ;
- La sous-location de terres agricoles en Irlande ;
- Les contributions financières vouées à encourager l'émigration ;
- La détresse sociale des catholiques en Irlande ;
- Le désir d'émigrer ;
- Le « vide » éventuellement laissé par la population émigrée ;
- La mise en valeur des tourbières et des friches abandonnées.

La majorité des témoignages recueillis lors des trois comités concernaient l'émigration en Angleterre, en Irlande, au Canada et en Écosse. Les situations en Afrique du Sud, en Australie et en Colombie ne firent l'objet que d'un examen superficiel. Dans la troisième section de ma deuxième partie, consacrée aux informations biographiques apportées par les témoins, les preuves recueillies par les comités concernant l'Irlande, l'Angleterre, l'Écosse et les colonies de l'Empire britannique sont examinées.

La quatrième et dernière section de la deuxième partie de ma thèse explique quel fut le contenu des témoignages recueillis lors des trois comités parlementaires. Partant des dits témoignages qui, encore une fois, furent tous retranscrits à l'écrit, Wilmot-Horton et ses collaborateurs résumèrent les témoignages pour appuyer leurs propres à priori, c'est-à-dire que la surpopulation en Irlande représentait un grave problème pour la prospérité et la sécurité de ce pays, et que l'émigration était la meilleure solution. Les conditions de vie des paysans leur sont également apparues comme vraiment problématiques. Bien que le premier comité parlementaire ne suggérât pas explicitement la mise en place d'un vaste système d'émigration organisé, il est

indiscutable que le troisième apporta son soutien à la création d'un système basé sur les expérimentations dirigées par le canadien Peter Robinson (1785-1838), lieutenant-gouverneur en Ontario, en 1823 et 1825. Ses expériences avaient consisté en l'installation d'émigrants irlandais en terre canadienne, et Wilmot-Horton, qui était son ami, était devenu le promoteur enthousiaste du projet auprès de Westminster.

Robinson, durant trois années successives, s'était rendu au printemps dans la vallée du fleuve Blackwater (comté de Cork), en Irlande. Aucune tradition d'émigration n'existait alors dans cette région. Lors de son premier passage, il comprit que le principal obstacle qui entravait les candidats à l'émigration était un problème de transport. Il fallait mettre en place un système de transport efficace soigneusement organisé par l'Etat pour être sûr d'obtenir un nombre important de départs. Quand Robinson fut assuré d'être équipé en navires pour ses expériences, il fut confronté à un afflux massif de candidats. En 1823, avec cinq-cent-soixante-huit émigrants, il quitta l'Irlande pour le district de Bathurst, dans le Haut-Canada. En 1825, il avait cinquante-mille candidats pour un voyage au Canada qui ne devait concerner que deux-mille personnes. C'est finalement deux-mille-vingt-quatre irlandais qu'il amena dans le district canadien de Newcastle. Pour embarquer, il fallait avoir des revenus très faibles. Une fois en terre canadienne, les migrants concernés par l'expérience de 1825 purent s'installer sur des propriétés en plein développement économique et furent plutôt bien accueillis par les colons déjà installés. Robinson resta avec eux jusqu'en mars 1826. Les deux-mille émigrants répartis par ses soins dans neuf cantons du district s'étaient regroupés sur plusieurs lots de terre. Chaque famille exploitait une parcelle et s'occupait également de défricher. Le rapport envoyé par Robinson à Wilmot-Horton consécutivement à cette expérience faisait donc état de résultats très concluants. Lorsqu'il témoigna devant deux comités sur l'émigration en 1826 et 1827, Robinson ne manqua pas d'exprimer tout son enthousiasme ainsi que ses certitudes quant au bien-fondé des positions de Wilmot-Horton. Ce dernier, en juillet 1827, lui confia le poste de Commissaire des terres de la

Couronne dans le Haut-Canada. Il le nomma également responsable général des bois et des forêts dans la même région.

Le troisième comité parlementaire, celui de 1827, suggéra clairement le financement d'un vaste plan gouvernemental d'émigration destiné à répondre aux graves problèmes de l'Irlande. Quatorze pages du rapport rédigé suite aux réunions de ce comité visaient à en défendre l'idée. Le projet était de financer un plan massif d'émigration par un emprunt des pouvoirs publics, emprunt qui serait remboursé par les émigrants eux-mêmes. Les témoins auditionnés avaient des positions très divergentes sur les modalités de remboursement à imposer aux émigrants.

4. Dublin Press's discourse on emigration

La troisième grande partie de mon travail de recherche s'intitule *The Dublin Press's discourse on emigration*. Comme expliqué dans ma première partie, la presse irlandaise, particulièrement celle de Dublin, connut une expansion rapide au XVIIème siècle, bien que de nombreuses publications aient été de courte durée. Pendant la première moitié du XIXème, certains périodiques, dont plusieurs figurent parmi mes sources, sont devenus célèbres pour leurs critiques à l'encontre du gouvernement britannique. Dans la plupart des articles que j'ai pris soin d'analyser afin de prendre connaissance des publications de la presse sur les rapports des comités d'émigration, les résumés des rapports en question furent recopiés dans leur intégralité sans que commentaires et critiques soient mis en avant. Cela reflète peut-être un accord des rédactions avec les opinions exprimées à l'intérieur des rapports, ainsi qu'avec les éléments de preuves fournis par les témoins entendus lors des comités. Mon travail vérifie en fait cette possibilité par l'analyse minutieuse d'articles traitant du thème de l'émigration comme moyen de soulager l'Irlande de sa souffrance économique et sociale.

Cette partie examine comment les comités d'émigration ont été dépeints par la presse de Dublin entre 1820 et 1829. Elle s'attache à rendre compte des éléments de discours communs partagés par tous ces journaux, ainsi qu'à bien saisir l'évolution des prises de position mises en avant par la presse au cours de la décennie. Elle entend aussi expliquer l'influence de la presse sur les débats politiques. Les analyses qui s'y trouvent montrent quelle fut la réelle importance de la presse pendant la période. Elles témoignent aussi de l'originalité de mon sujet d'étude. Les journaux conservateurs étaient avant tout hostiles à l'émigration qu'ils se refusaient à considérer comme un remède aux problèmes de l'Irlande dans les premières années de la décennie. Les journaux de tendance libérale étaient au départ plus ouverts vis-à-vis de l'émigration et exprimaient un sentiment d'urgence face à la grande détresse irlandaise. Les rédactions libérales-progressistes modifièrent toutefois leur point de vue au cours de la période. Leur regard évolua et la plupart de ces publications finirent par estimer que l'émigration ne pouvait pas être une réponse suffisante aux problèmes complexes en Irlande.

Ma troisième partie se penche surtout sur des données hautement importantes pour apporter une réponse à ma problématique, celles qui reflètent l'influence de la presse dublinoise sur les débats parlementaires concernant le sujet de l'émigration. L'un des questionnements majeurs de ce travail est bien celui qui appelle à une évaluation du rôle joué par la presse écrite dans l'évolution du débat politique. Dans les années qui suivirent l'organisation des trois comités parlementaires, la presse fit le lien entre la question de l'émigration et d'autres sujets brûlants : l'émancipation des catholiques irlandais et l'introduction de lois visant à lutter contre la pauvreté en Irlande. La presse de Dublin a pu avoir un certain impact sur la tournure prise par les débats parlementaires, dans la mesure où ces derniers finirent par dépasser la conception simpliste qui faisait de l'émigration la solution ultime aux problèmes en Irlande. A la fin des années 1820, les priorités de la presse comme du Parlement étaient désormais les combats de Daniel O'Connell et la question de l'émancipation catholique.

Les critiques parfois acerbes de la presse écrite vis-à-vis de la classe politique portaient sur le déroulement des discussions parlementaires et sur toute la complexité de la situation irlandaise, que les élus de Westminster ne semblaient pas toujours bien saisir. Plusieurs quotidiens soulignèrent le fait que peu de députés anglais connaissaient vraiment les particularités culturelles, économiques et sociales de l'Irlande. Ces publications ont aussi bien mis en évidence que les quelques députés résidant en Irlande étaient les premiers à proposer des solutions alternatives à l'émigration pour régler les difficultés du pays. Un article du *Dublin Evening Post* paru en date du 8 mars 1828 alla même jusqu'à dire que « les affaires irlandaises ne peuvent pas connaître d'amélioration grâce à un Parlement qui tient ses séances dans un autre pays ».¹ Cet article dénonça évidemment ouvertement la méconnaissance des réalités irlandaises par les députés. L'exemple du *Dublin Evening Post* est intéressant car cette publication ne s'opposait pas absolument à l'émigration en n'y voyant aucun effet positif sur la situation sociale en Irlande, mais elle avait à cœur de mettre en avant d'autres solutions qu'elle jugeait nécessaires comme des contributions à l'impôt plus importantes pour les grands propriétaires fonciers. Les propositions faites par Wilmot-Horton en 1828, propositions visant à faire entrer en vigueur une nouvelle réglementation sur le transport maritime des émigrants irlandais, s'inscrivent clairement dans un contexte de fort intérêt pour la question de la part de la presse dublinoise. Ces propositions furent d'ailleurs à l'origine d'un débat intense chez les journalistes de Dublin. J'ai pris soin de relater quelle fut l'ampleur de ce débat afin de bien montrer quelles étaient les interactions entre la presse et les échanges parlementaires.

Ma troisième partie montre aussi que les organes de presse dublinois ont mis en avant des avis différents sur la manière de répondre à la détresse irlandaise. Ces organes de presse commencèrent par critiquer les opinions fluctuantes du gouvernement

¹ *DEP*, "State of Ireland", March 8, 1828, 3.

britannique sur l'émigration, tantôt présentée comme la solution indépassable, tantôt désignée comme une solution partielle. Ils s'exprimèrent sur l'assistance à l'émigration. Dans les premières années de la décennie sur laquelle se concentre mon travail de recherche (1820-1822), de nombreux articles furent rédigés sur les vagues d'émigration un peu plus anciennes, dirigées depuis le Royaume-Uni vers les colonies britanniques. Toutefois, ces articles ne mettaient pas du tout l'accent sur les départs ayant lieu depuis l'Irlande. Quand en 1823 et 1825, les expériences de Peter Robinson eurent lieu, certains journaux commencèrent à présenter l'émigration comme un remède approprié pour « soigner » l'Irlande de ses problèmes. Très vite, la presse écrite dublinoise a proposé des solutions alternatives, telles que des mesures gouvernementales fortes pour favoriser l'emploi et l'introduction d'une législation contre la pauvreté.

La présentation par la presse des trois rapports rédigés par les comités parlementaires consacrés à l'émigration évolua de manière significative suite à la publication du troisième de ces rapports. Le document et les témoignages qu'il contenait furent publiés par la majorité des journaux que j'ai pris soin d'étudier dans mon travail. A cause de la longueur du texte (trente-neuf pages), chacun des journaux que j'ai retenus pour ce travail de recherche dut consacrer plusieurs éditions, ainsi qu'un nombre important de pages, pour réimprimer le rapport et le porter à la connaissance du public.

Une grande partie des journaux concernés critiquèrent certaines prémisses du rapport. Les articles du *Dublin Evening Post* traitant du document furent rédigés par George Ensor (1769-1843), un avocat et écrivain politique irlandais réputé pour avoir publié plusieurs brochures très critiques vis-à-vis du gouvernement britannique au cours des années précédentes. Les articles d'Ensor dans le *Dublin Evening Post* se présentaient sous la forme de deux lettres. La première fut publiée le 13 octobre 1827, la deuxième le 27 octobre. Dans la première de ses lettres, Ensor qualifia le rapport rédigé suite au troisième comité de « document étrange ». Il attaqua également l'idéologie malthusienne de Wilmot-Horton. Enfin, il s'en prit aux propos de plusieurs témoins sur

l'inactivité supposée d'une partie de la population rurale irlandaise, inactivité à laquelle le comité se proposait de mettre fin par l'émigration de quatre-vingt-dix-mille personnes en trois ans. Il souligna également les hésitations de Malthus lors de son audition. En effet, le célèbre économiste britannique, lorsqu'il fut entendu par le dernier comité, ne semblait plus très sûr de ses propres positions. Il dit en effet de l'émigration qu'elle était un « outil puissant » pour régler les problèmes irlandais, alors que ses écrits antérieurs sur la démographie, ceux-là même qui lui avaient permis d'atteindre la notoriété, la présentaient comme un « léger palliatif ».

Cette critique à l'encontre de Malthus fut reprise par plusieurs organes de presse qui remirent profondément en question le témoignage de l'économiste. Ensor, toujours dans sa lettre du 13 octobre publiée par le *Dublin Evening Post*, dénonça la mauvaise gestion des affaires irlandaises par le gouvernement britannique. Il affirma que cette mauvaise gestion était la « première cause des grands malheurs du peuple irlandais » et exprima ses doutes quant aux déclarations du comité. Pour lui, l'émigration ne pouvait pas être le remède à appliquer en Irlande et d'autres mesures politiques devaient impérativement être mises. Il pointa aussi du doigt l'absentéisme des grands propriétaires fonciers qui possédaient des terres en Irlande, lesquels étaient d'après lui beaucoup trop souvent en train de se divertir à Londres ou en Ecosse.

La deuxième lettre d'Ensor, celle qui fut donc publiée à la date du 27 octobre 1827, attaqua le dogmatisme des parlementaires de Westminster et des témoins entendus à l'occasion du troisième comité. Selon son auteur, les personnalités qui participèrent au dit comité avaient tort de présenter l'économie politique comme la discipline qui allait permettre d'arracher l'Irlande et ses communautés les plus pauvres à leurs difficultés.

L'économie politique avait été définie par Adam Smith dans son ouvrage *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) comme « une science propre à un homme d'Etat ou à un législateur qui propose deux objectifs bien distincts : dans un premier temps fournir un

revenu ou une subsistance suffisamment abondante au peuple, ou, plus exactement, permettre à la population de produire un tel revenu ou une telle subsistance pour lui-même ; et, dans un second temps, fournir à l'État ou au Commonwealth un revenu suffisant pour le bon fonctionnement des services publics. L'économie politique propose donc d'enrichir à la fois le peuple et le souverain ». En gardant cette définition à l'esprit, dans sa deuxième lettre, George Ensor accusa les économistes politiques actifs lors du troisième comité sur l'émigration de se concentrer uniquement sur le deuxième objectif propre à cette science gouvernementale, l'enrichissement du pouvoir, cela au détriment des irlandais en souffrance.

Ensor et le *Dublin Evening Post*, toujours dans cette deuxième lettre, s'attaquèrent encore une fois à Malthus, désigné comme la personnalité publique « spécifiquement consultée à l'occasion de ce comité [...] bien qu'il soit comme mort à la racine ». Ensor trouva ici beaucoup à dire sur Malthus dont il entreprit de contester les idées les plus célèbres. Sa seconde lettre fut en conséquence beaucoup plus longue que la première. Dans le dernier paragraphe de cette lettre, il cita d'autres expériences d'émigration organisées qui n'avaient apporté aucun soulagement dans les pays d'origines des migrants. Le fait que cette lettre comme la précédente furent publiées par le *Dublin Evening Post* montre à quel point la presse ne craignait pas d'attaquer ouvertement le gouvernement et la volonté de Wilmot Horton de recourir à un système d'émigration à grande échelle en Irlande.

Des journaux dublinois ont voulu réfuter les opinions de plusieurs témoins auditionnés à l'occasion du troisième comité. Cette situation a poussé Wilmot-Horton et le Parlement britannique à se pencher plus sérieusement sur les moyens d'encourager l'émigration. Les autorités politiques firent également en sorte de revoir la réglementation appliquée sur les navires afin de mieux protéger les émigrants qui y embarquaient.

Un nouveau *Passenger Vessels Act* fut ainsi adopté en 1828. Cette loi rendit obligatoire la présence d'une certaine quantité d'eau et de nourriture à bord de chaque navire. En 1828 et 1829, l'introduction de lois visant à lutter contre la pauvreté en Irlande a été débattue plusieurs fois à Westminster. C'est d'ailleurs à ce moment précis que la presse dublinoise se mit à critiquer le manque de connaissance des parlementaires sur la complexité de la situation irlandaise.

Les journaux que j'ai retenus comme sources primaires étaient très impliqués dans le débat public et répondaient fréquemment aux discours du Parlement traitant de la question irlandaise. Malgré le scepticisme évident d'une partie non-négligeable de la presse, Wilmot-Horton ne se découragea pas. Il continua de présenter l'émigration comme la solution la plus adaptée aux nombreux problèmes de l'Irlande. Comme indiqué plus haut, il quitta le Parlement en 1830 sans avoir pu mettre en place un véritable système d'émigration organisé destiné à alléger les souffrances des irlandais.

La mise en place du *Passenger Vessels Act* de 1828 fut soutenue à la fois par Wilmot-Horton et par la plupart des titres de la presse dublinoise. Les journaux, avant la promulgation de la loi, critiquaient le fait que la présence d'un médecin à bord de chaque navire ne soit pas rendue obligatoire. Westminster ne leur a pas donné gain de cause sur ce point, ce qui indique que l'influence de la presse sur les débats politiques de l'époque ne doit pas être surestimée.

D'une manière générale, il n'est pas exagéré de dire que la presse n'a pas apporté beaucoup de soutien aux trois comités parlementaires ainsi qu'au projet de Wilmot-Horton visant à mettre sur pied un vaste système d'émigration en Irlande. Cela a pu dissuader le gouvernement britannique de légiférer sur l'émigration en tant que solution officielle à la détresse irlandaise. Bien que les témoins auditionnés lors du troisième comité, parmi lesquels Malthus lui-même, n'aient pas officiellement validé un modèle de système d'émigration organisé par le gouvernement, le rapport faisant suite aux

discussions de ce comité a bien mis en avant une ébauche de projet assez complète. La question particulièrement sensible du financement d'un système d'émigration de grande envergure est restée non-résolue.

5. Conclusion

Pour conclure cette brève présentation de ma thèse, il faut commencer par dire que lors des trois comités parlementaires étudiés et consacrés à l'Irlande, les témoins auditionnés étaient d'accord sur un certain nombre de points. Tous estimaient, à tort ou à raison, que le nombre important de personnes sans emploi en Irlande reflétait un problème de surpopulation qui appelait une solution gouvernementale. La plupart des témoins convinrent qu'un système d'émigration organisé par les autorités politiques britanniques était nécessaire, et chacun d'entre eux avait son avis quant aux nombres d'irlandais qui allaient devoir émigrer. Certaines catégories de population devaient être sélectionnées et envoyées avec leurs familles au Canada ou dans une autre colonie du grand Empire britannique. De nombreux propriétaires fonciers possédant des propriétés agricoles en Irlande affirmèrent lors des comités que le désir d'émigrer était très important chez les ruraux irlandais. D'autres témoins proposèrent des alternatives à l'émigration telles que la mise en valeur des tourbières jugée bien moins coûteuse qu'un vaste système d'émigration que le gouvernement britannique aurait la responsabilité d'organiser et de financer.

Deux préoccupations majeures inquiétaient en fait les personnalités ayant participé aux trois comités que j'ai pris soin d'étudier : le financement d'un plan gouvernemental visant à organiser l'émigration et le manque de main d'œuvre qui pouvait résulter d'un nombre de départs trop important.

Ces deux préoccupations furent sources de nombreuses inquiétudes à Westminster, ce qui explique certainement en partie pourquoi Wilmot-Horton, à son grand désarroi, ne réussit à organiser l'émigration à grande échelle comme il l'entendait. Après s'être retiré du gouvernement et du Parlement, Wilmot Horton resta néanmoins soucieux de la situation en Irlande. Il aborda le sujet dans une série de brochures ayant pour titre *An Inquiry into the Causes and Remedies of Pauperism* et publiée en 1830 et 1831. Ces brochures contenaient sa correspondance avec des membres influents du Parlement sur les problèmes sociaux-économique en Angleterre et en terre irlandaise. Elles continuaient de présenter l'émigration organisée comme une solution à prendre sérieusement en considération pour régler les problèmes liés à la misère paysanne.

Par l'analyse méticuleuse des articles de journaux que j'ai sélectionnés, j'ai pu montrer à quel point les débats politiques sur l'émigration irlandaise, dans les années 1820, était un sujet de prédilection pour la presse dublinoise. Il apparaît en fait que le niveau d'influence de la presse sur les débats parlementaires concernant l'Irlande est difficile à évaluer. Le refus des parlementaires de Westminster de répondre favorablement à la demande de la presse qui souhaitait qu'un médecin se trouve systématiquement à bord de chaque navire susceptible de transporter des migrants le prouve amplement. Les organes de presse dublinois ont bien sûr été un outil efficace pour informer le public des débats politiques alors en cours. Elle a mis en avant une critique du travail et des prises de position idéologiques des parlementaires mais il n'est pas aisé de dire dans quelle mesure cette critique a pu contraindre les autorités à revoir leurs points de vue.

La presse de l'époque n'était pas impressionnée par les poursuites judiciaires que l'Etat britannique pouvait engager à son encontre. Cela ressort nettement des articles publiés par les journaux dublinois entre 1820 et 1829. Ces articles abordèrent sans nuance des sujets aussi délicats que les malheurs de la population rurale irlandaise, la possible

mise en place d'un système d'émigration financé par le gouvernement et, surtout, la compétence des responsables politiques.

La volonté de ces derniers d'encourager l'émigration irlandaise évolua pendant la décennie et la presse rend compte de cette évolution. Alors que des articles de presse publiés pendant les premières années de la décennie expliquaient que le gouvernement britannique avait dans le passé aidé des travailleurs écossais en détresse, plusieurs journaux pointèrent du doigt les hésitations du gouvernement à soutenir financièrement l'émigration des travailleurs irlandais les plus pauvres qui vivaient pourtant dans des circonstances extrêmement précaires.

La presse mit également l'accent sur le fait que le gouvernement pouvait investir de l'argent tant dans l'émigration que dans certaines aides sociales, prenant en exemple le fait que des fonds avaient déjà été débloqués pour soutenir financièrement certains paysans irlandais très pauvres lorsqu'avaient eu lieu les expérimentations de Peter Robinson en 1823 et 1825. Elle insista donc sur la question des financements, cela même après que le gouvernement fut passé d'un point de vue qui présentait l'émigration comme l'ultime solution aux nombreux problèmes de l'Irlande à un discours bien davantage centré sur la poursuite du processus d'émancipation catholique.

Bien que la situation chaotique en Irlande ne fut pas un thème très discuté dans les premières années de la décennie 1820, à partir de 1823, peut-être à cause de toute l'attention que Wilmot-Horton, une personnalité politique de premier plan, lui portait, la presse vit dans les conditions de vie des travailleurs irlandais les plus pauvres un sujet qui allait lui tenir à cœur. Les difficultés quotidiennes de ces travailleurs ruraux furent exposées dans le détail par de nombreux articles. L'urgence de trouver une solution à cette crise sociétale fut soulignée à de nombreuses reprises.

Dans les dernières années de la décennie, on assista à une critique par plusieurs journaux des antécédents des parlementaires débattant des propositions législatives

concernant l'Irlande. Les médias mirent l'accent sur le fait que c'étaient bien des représentants irlandais à Westminster qui proposaient de nouvelles législations visant à aider les irlandais les plus fragiles, tandis que la grande majorité des parlementaires avaient de très faibles connaissances sur l'Irlande et sur ses particularités. Plusieurs titres affirmèrent ainsi ouvertement que la majorité des politiciens professionnels n'étaient tout simplement pas qualifiés pour débattre de la situation socio-économique dans l'île, et que l'Irlande s'en sortirait bien mieux si les irlandais pouvaient prendre eux-mêmes un certain nombre de décisions politiques relatives au devenir de leur société.

Il est évident que la montée du nationalisme irlandais et l'essor du mouvement pour le *Home Rule* ont historiquement leurs racines ailleurs que dans les débats parlementaires sur l'émigration. Mais l'idée d'une gouvernance autonome en Irlande a tout de même été soulevée par la presse dublinoise pendant la période que j'ai décidé d'étudier. Cela a dû jouer sur les discussions politiques des députés britanniques qui en sont venus, comme indiqué un peu plus haut, à considérer que le sujet majeur en Irlande était une juste représentation de la majorité de sa population, c'est-à-dire les catholiques.

Résumé en anglais

Emigration from Ireland has been a subject of great interest for many decades, though some periods have not been studied thoroughly. This dissertation examines the period of the 1820s, when Emigration Committees were appointed to study the possibility of emigration as a solution for the poor living conditions in Ireland. Through an in-depth analysis of these three Committees and the Dublin press's analysis of emigration, we will determine the connections between these two major sources, the role the press played, and the extent to which the former had an impact on the debates on emigration.

Keywords: Irish emigration, Emigration Committees, Robert Wilmot-Horton, Irish press history, parliamentary debates.

Résumé en français

L'émigration irlandaise est un sujet de grand intérêt depuis de nombreuses décennies, même si certaines périodes n'ont pas été étudiées de manière approfondie. Cette thèse examine la période des années 1820, lorsque des comités d'émigration ont été organisés pour étudier la possibilité de l'émigration comme solution à la pauvreté en Irlande. Grâce à une analyse approfondie de ces trois comités et de l'analyse de l'émigration par la presse de Dublin, nous déterminerons les liens entre ces deux sources majeures, le rôle joué par la presse et dans quelle mesure la première a eu un impact sur les débats publics et parlementaires sur l'émigration.

Mots-clés : émigration irlandaise, comités sur l'émigration, Robert Wilmot-Horton, histoire de la presse irlandaise, débats parlementaires.