

What is State-aided Emigration ?

BY  
AN IRISHMAN WHO KNOWS.

---

DUBLIN :  
BROWNE AND NOLAN, PRINTERS, NASSAU-STREET.

1884.

---

PRICE SIXPENCE.



# What is State-aided Emigration?

BY

AN IRISHMAN WHO KNOWS.

---

DUBLIN :

BROWNE AND NOLAN, PRINTERS, NASSAU-STREET.

1884

# Houses of the Oireachtas

## WHAT IS STATE-AIDED EMIGRATION ?

---

THE congestion which prevails in the West of Ireland is a well established fact, and the misery and suffering it entails upon thousands of poor families is known and recognized by all who are acquainted with this country. Crowded together upon small plots of barren soil, in wretched hovels that hardly afford shelter, in districts where no employment is to be obtained, a large number of our fellow-countrymen lead a dreary and hopeless existence. Destitute of the very necessaries of life, often on the actual verge of starvation, they are the constant prey to the ravages of sickness and penury, and their pitiable condition, which they themselves cannot improve, eloquently calls for the attention of the compassionate. Nor is this all, for the distress in the West affects the wealth of the whole country, and is a sore tax upon the prosperity of Ireland.

It is quite unnecessary to go back to the cause of this congestion or to dwell—as is so often done—upon the statement that it is due to former tyranny and to the cruel edicts of Cromwell. The perpetrators of this mischief have gone to their account and are beyond the reach of human justice. To recall the sad past and to stir up bitter recollections can only lead to recrimination and discord and cannot in the least improve the condition of those who require assistance. If therefore, we have hearts to feel and heads to work, our first duty clearly is to consider what should now be done, and to avoid controversies which irritate our social wounds but cannot cure them.

Two remedies, and two only, have been suggested to relieve the present congestion. The one is emigration and the other is called migration. Both tend in the same direction, namely to lift the people out of the small holdings in which they now vegetate and on which they suffer, and to transplant them to localities where they can support themselves on their industry in comfort and respectability. The difference between these two remedial schemes is, that in the second the family is transported to a district within their own native land, whereas in the first they are taken to a country beyond the ocean, and therefore away from their old homes.

Government has thought fit partially to alleviate Irish distress by a measure of State-aided emigration. This policy has been severely criticised by many, among them those whose sympathy with their countrymen entitles everything they have to urge to the greatest consideration. Into these objections I propose to inquire, but before doing so it will be necessary briefly to glance at the principles of the system which have been adopted.

Poor families in the West are permitted, if they so desire, to apply for assistance to do that which is the constant practice of the Irish peasant, viz., to go to America. The application for State aid is made by the people themselves, not to the department appointed to administer emigration, but to a local authority—either a committee which has been approved of, or the Guardians of the Union who wish to give the people the benefit of the measure. Candidates for assistance have in the first instance, to be recommended by such a body, so that if they wish to leave the country they can only do so when those who are interested in their welfare deem it advisable to endorse their petition. By this means small land

occupiers, unemployed labourers, and indigent tradesmen, whose departure will relieve the prevailing congestion, may be allowed to go away, and care is taken not to denude the neighbourhood of persons who are required to carry on the work of the country ; by this means also, preliminary selection for State aid is confined to the physically strong and healthy, and to those whose moral qualities will ensure their success in the New World. The families who are thus recommended are then carefully inspected by a responsible person and if after investigation, it is reasonably supposed that they will do well in their future homes they are assisted to go to the destinations which they themselves select. It is not permissible to send out portions of a family ; for State-aided differs from other emigration by this distinguishing feature, that it refuses to sever the domestic ties of a household. Whole families only are allowed to go off together when the earners are sufficiently numerous to support the children, and when their characters stand well for general sobriety and industry. In order to provide for the future prosperity of State-aided emigrants rules were adopted with regard to the destinations proposed for the people. If they wish to go to the United States they have to bring evidence to show that they have friends there who are willing and able to receive them, and who promise them the prospect of suitable employment. If they choose to go to Canada or to the Australian colonies, they have to be provided with approval orders from the representatives of those countries in London, and once so selected they are placed under the care of the Government Immigration Agencies through whose exertions their future means of livelihood are secured. In no case are the people sent out of Ireland to be landed hap-hazard upon the coast as has been so improperly stated ;

on the contrary every effort is made to render the present scheme entirely different from the practice which unfortunately was followed during the famine years. Assisted emigration in 1883 and in the present year, in which the State interferes, can in no way be associated with that which formerly took place, and to do so argues complete ignorance of the subject.

Such, then, is the measure adopted to relieve to a certain extent the distress which prevails in the West of Ireland; and for this purpose Parliament has voted the sum £150,000 to be expended during the years 1883 and 1884. Judging from the grants which may be made per head we cannot be far wrong in estimating that this vote will barely assist 25,000 persons to cross the ocean. Truly an experimental and tentative measure only, when relief to be effectual, should include as large a number as 200,000 or 300,000 persons out of the West of Ireland.

If there is one fact that is well established it is this, that emigration is a natural law in Ireland. It is a misfortune that it should be so, but it is a reality which none can deny and none can controvert. As long as distress exists so long will emigration continue, and an anti-emigrationist may as easily forbid the tide to flow as he can prevent people from endeavouring to better themselves in life. It is moreover a fact, that where emigration is unassisted, the young and strong leave the country, whereas as a rule, the old and weak remain behind. Individual emigration therefore, is open to the objection that it takes from us the bone and muscle of the nation and fixes upon us those who depend on the labour of others for their sustenance. If so, unassisted emigration may depreciate the sinews of strength upon which the country must rely for its wealth, and the poverty of people may augment;



but this cannot be said of family emigration, and the action of the State has done something towards counteracting the evil which as I have stated, is the natural consequence of our social misfortunes. Where families emigrate, the strong go away with the weak, the workers with those whom God has given them to nourish and bring up, and while this scheme *may perhaps* increase the general emigration from the country, it ought to diminish the mischief of that which is unassisted. We may infer this from the circumstance that as the Irish are attached to their homes, it is only necessity which drives the young and active away from their relations, but when they have a prospect of all going away together it is obvious they will avail themselves of it rather than do what is admittedly distasteful to them. If then the State-aided—or as it may more properly be called State-directed—scheme lessens in some degree the evils of individual emigration, it has at least one claim upon the gratitude of those who regret to see the departure of the able-bodied young men and women who every year leave our ports.

It is to be regretted that the opposition which State-aided emigration has drawn forth, has completely ignored all these circumstances and facts. Emigration is treated as if it always must be disastrous to the welfare of the nation and to the happiness of those who leave the country; and led by this feeling, people entirely overlook the question as to whether it should not be accepted as the best temporary measure of relief until something else shall be devised. This question is of extreme importance and it is one which cannot be neglected by those who honestly wish to improve the condition of Ireland. Emigration deals with a natural law which is carried out at present whether it is approved of or not; it affords

a ready and easy means by which the evils of Western congestion may be diminished, and it offers a good chance to the strong and healthy who are in distress in this country to better themselves in another. Those who are hostile to it have not thought it worth their while to inquire systematically into the scheme which has been adopted. They have condemned it even before they gave themselves the trouble to master its details ; and hence it is that they have failed to judge it on its merits. Driven by what may not unjustly be called prejudice, the urgent nature of the chronic distress in the West has escaped their notice, and they seem to forget that the existing congestion impedes the whole country from advancing in prosperity, and causes individual suffering which demands immediate attention. It is much to be hoped that this lamentable method of dealing with an Irish economic question may henceforth cease, and that intelligence may guide us rather than unreasoning opposition. *Plus ratio quam vis cæca valere solet.*

The objections raised against emigration may be summed up as follows :—

1. That a scheme of migration should have been first inaugurated, and if that should prove to be abortive then and then only, should emigration be resorted to.

2. That Ireland is capable of supporting a population considerably larger than it now contains ; that some forty years ago there were 8,000,000 inhabitants ; and as general wealth has increased all over the world so ought Ireland to advance in prosperity, and with it an increase, not decrease of population.

3. That emigration is a policy which depopulates our country, depletes it of its strength and industrial vigour, and injures the districts from which the emigrants are permitted to go.

4. That the policy of State-aided emigration has failed because the future prosperity of those who left the country last year has not been secured.

I propose to consider these objections seriatim.

1. All who wish well to Ireland would prefer to see a migration remedy applied to relieve Western congestion, rather than an emigration remedy. It would be most desirable—if it were possible to do so—to redistribute the people upon their own land, where they could live and thrive upon suitably large holdings. Who would grudge them their claim to live upon their own native soil? No policy would be more sound, no scheme more popular. Among a contented people every man is the guardian of law and order; conservative and loyal principles reign where the population hold property. Let none imagine that a well considered system of migration would be distasteful to what is unjustly branded as an alien public opinion, for the reverse is the case. The most thoughtless would soon become alive to the benefits of such a scheme, and hail it with satisfaction if only it were based upon sound and economic principles.

The question arises however, is such a measure feasible? Can it be carried practically into effect? Many authorities in these matters believe that it would fail, but on the other hand some are sanguine of its success. For myself, I will offer no opinion upon it. All I will say is, that the question has its difficulties.

The land must be bought. It is answered there are plenty of lands running waste. Where? I do not remember any one *exactly* stating where these waste lands are, but it is certain that at present they belong to someone, and yield, more or less, some produce. That produce may be cattle or sheep, or it may be nothing so valuable;

at all events, whatever the value of that land may be, it must be purchased for its fair and reasonable price—not perhaps what the present owner may be inclined to ask for it, but what would be got for it from a Railway Company, if it were required for the public convenience. There could be no objection to such a course being adopted if a good system of migration were found to be feasible. When purchased, the land has to be prepared for the reception of a family, a house has to be built upon it, and the settlers must be provided with some capital to start themselves. The whole money so expended, capital and interest, has to be paid off by the new occupier in so many years—possibly deducting a sum which he may receive by way of a free grant, as is the case in the system of emigration. Then comes the question of selection; how is this to be done? who is to be placed in the new farms? The scheme is obviously intended for the poor of the West; it is the small holders who have to be transplanted, and not the married sons and daughters of the richer occupiers in the less congested districts. A man accustomed to his few acres of bog-land in the West can scarcely be called an agriculturist, he would not thrive upon a large holding unless he could cultivate it; and if he did not do so, how could he pay the interest and sinking fund with which he would be burdened? What would become of the wealth of the country if land that now yields even a moderate return did not produce at least as much in the hands of its new occupant?

These difficulties are not advanced by way of contending that migration is impossible. I have said that I offer no opinion upon its practicability; all I say is, that in order to make it feasible, many experiments will have to be made and much time will have to elapse. No one can devise a

measure of this nature without making some trials, and these trials must necessarily extend over a certain number of years. It must be tested in good seasons and in bad. If any government is to commit itself to such a policy, it is but fair to urge that a practical proof of its success is first necessary, and there must be some security at least that the country is not to be committed to a chimera. To hold out delusive hopes to a population suffering from chronic starvation is not the act of a prudent statesman, and it is but reasonable to require that the system when worked out will not prove distasteful to those it seeks to benefit, nor to society at large whose welfare it will greatly influence.

Parliament has voted a small sum of money to enable those who believe in migration to initiate an experiment upon it. The Company who propose to carry out the scheme have just published their prospectus, and although perhaps tardy in their action, they have at least taken the first step towards making the trial they advocate. We may well congratulate the Company upon their appearance, and cordially wish their efforts may be attended with success; we can all join with them in the hope, that the scheme they have undertaken will offer a safe field for the investment of capital, and will effect a work of considerable national importance.

Whatever may be their eventual success, it is plain their project is in an embryo stage at present; it has scarcely yet seen the light; and whether it will reach the age of vigour and usefulness is entirely a matter of conjecture, which must be left to the future to determine. This must be so with every new and untried proposal; it will have to surmount its difficulties and to run its chances of standing or falling, so that although our sympathies are with

the plan, we must not overlook the contingencies of its failure.

But all this time the dangers of congestion increase, and the sufferings of the poor urgently cry out for some help. In this sad state of things, should nothing be done partially to ameliorate the condition of those who are in distress? Is emigration—perhaps an imperfect remedy—to be forbidden to relieve the most pressing cases of undeserved poverty until a better system has been devised? Are a people who are vegetating on their bogs to be carefully preserved in their present destitution, until those who are wedded to a migration scheme shall have time to elaborate their experiment?

Every praise is due to those who have prepared a measure whose object is to redistribute the Irish population. It is only when they accompany their efforts by an attack upon State-aided emigration that their conduct becomes indeed extraordinary. Reduce their arguments into language, and the following is what they have to say to the starving Western peasant :—“ We have been given £50,000 to make a trial of migration. After many months we have just been able to propose a scheme to the public. Whether it will succeed or not we are unable to tell you; we hope it will, but time alone can show this. Meanwhile, whatever be your distress, and however much you may require immediate help, we will endeavour to prevent your getting that little modicum of assistance which State-aided emigration affords you.”

2. The assertion that Ireland is capable of supporting a larger population than it contains at present is one which by itself cannot directly attack the policy of emigration; because if more inhabitants are now possible, why should so many be

found to go away year by year at their own expense? Unassisted emigration takes place freely, and this it may be argued, shows our social constitution is unhealthy; but it also shows that there can be no immediate connection between the statement that the country is insufficiently peopled and the scheme of relief by State-aided emigration. The measure may be considered injudicious; but there are no grounds for assailing it on the score that Ireland can maintain a larger population than exists at present, when the exodus continues whether it is helped or not. I regard therefore, the plea relating to the increase of the inhabitants of Ireland as a corollary only to the third objection already mentioned—viz., that emigration reduces the strength of the country; but as it is so often brought forward as an argument of some importance, I propose to devote a few words to its consideration.

It is I believe, a well-known law that the population of a country is in proportion to the amount of food which it can command—at least, when the necessaries of life cannot be obtained, the poorer portion of the population must go away to where they can get them. Take the example of England, for instance; the soil under good cultivation is capable of supporting only from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 mouths, but everyone knows that the inhabitants of the Sister Island are much more numerous. And why? Because by the industries and manufactures which have been established, a large amount of food-producing power is in the possession of the people, and thereby a large number of inhabitants can obtain subsistence. The growth of the British population from 8,000,000 in the last century, to over 30,000,000 at the present time, is due, first, to increased science of agriculture whereby the

soil is made to yield more produce ; and secondly, to a rapidly progressing system of manufactures and industries, all of which are the result of energy, enterprise and thrift. The wealth yielded by the British manufactures is converted into food for the people by the nation's trade, or the power of transporting their goods to the best market, whence, when exchange is effected, the articles that are most required are brought back to the country. If now, through some catastrophe this trade were annihilated, what would be the consequence ? It needs little reflection to perceive that the facilities for converting manufactured goods into food would be destroyed, that there would be millions of hands thrown out of work, and that the mouths of those millions would be without subsistence. Annihilate that upon which a nation depends for food, and you destroy its power of supporting its population. If ever so terrible a calamity were to occur in England, a famine would arise, the like to which nothing has yet been seen in the world's history ; and after a period of terrible distress and awful human suffering, the country would gradually lose its numbers, and take up its position at last as a nation whose inhabitants do not exceed the amount which its soil could support.

Now something of the same sort did happen to Ireland. Before the famine this country contained a population of about 8,000,000 souls ; they were mainly dependent for their sustenance upon the luxurious crop of potatoes which the soil produced. A terrible catastrophe destroyed that crop, and never since has it grown in its former profusion. Food which was at hand to support 8,000,000 souls, by this failure reduced itself gradually to food for 5,000,000, and the difference of 3,000,000 persons had not wherewithal to exist.



The argument therefore, that because we had in Ireland a larger population than at the present moment, we ought to have it still, falls to the ground when we come to examine it. It can only be used by one who has not taken the trouble to inquire into facts, nor into their bearing upon human affairs. Suppose that a catastrophe, either by war or other causes, were to fall upon England, and that by a series of misfortunes she were to lose for ever all her trade, her population would, as I have tried to show, sink to 15,000,000 at least, and the remainder would be destroyed or would have to leave their country. What would be thought of the intelligence of any man who represented himself to be a statesman, if forty years after that event he taunted the then Government with the argument that because there were 30,000,000 inhabitants in the country, say in 1884, there should be that number at the time he speaks? Judged by the light of the facts that I have advanced, that politician would not be considered a sound economist; and yet many who profess to speak for Ireland, mislead the people by using the same puerile argument.

It is a question whether—as things then were—the large number of inhabitants which Ireland contained some forty years ago was a gain to the country. I do not intend to examine this proposition, but I will only point out that famines occurred before 1846, and that no people can be prosperous who rely upon a precarious crop as their only means of subsistence. Be that as it may, it is undoubted that under existing circumstances the population of the country is not increasing, and that a social malady affects the national constitution. The cause of this evil has to be eradicated before any improvement

can be made; and if this cause is congestion, the rulers of the country have done no harm by endeavouring to apply a remedy which ought to make it disappear. Their remedy has been emigration which, it is urged, reduces the strength of the country. Let us therefore see how far that charge is based upon a reasonable foundation.

3. The allegation that by emigration, Government is destroying the industrial vigour of the country, is very frequently made by those who are opposed to the policy which has been inaugurated for the purpose of relieving distress in the West. I have already stated that this charge may perhaps be framed against emigration which is unassisted and which cannot be checked, but it does not apply to that which is State-aided, and conducted by family groups. Society may be in such a state—and unfortunately this is the condition of parts of Ireland—that many persons composing it cannot find work, and are therefore not a strength, but a weakness to the community. Where employment fails, where commercial enterprise languishes, where the soil is unproductive, where the inhabitants are crowded together, and where the holdings on which the people depend for subsistence are too small for their requirements, then the families in those districts are ground down by poverty and cannot produce wealth. Far therefore from increasing the national prosperity, they become by their circumstances a burden upon it. If, as I have endeavoured to show, they cannot be taken at once to districts within their own land, then it is better for themselves, and no loss to the State, that they should go elsewhere. As long as we retain the dead weight of congestion as a drag upon our progress, so long must our country remain backward and needy; but directly the load is removed—and I care not whether it is

done by emigration or by migration—the first step towards the social regeneration of Ireland will be secured. If blood-letting will restore the patient more quickly and more effectually than the slow and uncertain process of internal remedies, a skilful physician will not hesitate to employ the lancet. If emigration will remove the evil of over crowding, and give wealth its free circulation sooner than the hitherto untried method of migration, the rulers of the country should not hesitate to apply the measure. The loss of a few thousand of the inhabitants now, if judiciously taken from where distress is chronic, is not to be compared with the future growth of the population when the causes of recurring famine are removed. Everything is to be gained by prompt and speedy action, nothing by delays and the application of quack remedies.

There can be no doubt that the small amount of State-aided emigration that was promoted last year has in no way injured the districts in which it was carried out ; on the contrary, it has effected a partial improvement. In some places wages have increased, employment has become more constant, and agricultural holdings have been consolidated. These indeed, are the principal effects emigration can produce ; they may well be accepted as a slight indication of social progress, and as such they should be welcomed. It is known that remuneration for labour in the West of Ireland is small and uncertain, and that the Connaught peasant has been in the habit of taking anything he could get to ward off starvation. He is more or less the serf of his employer, and often he ekes out a miserable existence by going for months to England and Scotland, away from his home, where he has to shelter himself in dens and barns hardly fit for human habitation. Is it a small matter to

make his life more tolerable, and to raise the labour market by emigration? Is it injurious to the country to increase his means of support, and to relieve him of the cruel necessity which impels him to go where his self-respect must be lowered? The statement so often repeated, that "Emigration is depopulation" *when the price of labour is at its lowest*, can only mean that this price must not be allowed to rise; and those who are hostile to this measure of relief on this score, lay themselves open to the suspicion that they fear the introduction of a more generous rate of wages, and that they wish them to remain for ever at famine point.

4. It is said that those who went away last year by means of the Government grant, have not succeeded in their new homes, and that consequently the policy adopted for the relief of Irish distress by emigration has failed. Before entering upon this matter, I must warn my readers that the only families into whose condition it will be necessary for me to inquire, are those who actually were State-aided. It is to be feared that to some extent they have been confounded in America with persons who went out under different auspices; but with the latter I have nothing whatever to do. If any of these should have become destitute, no charge can lie against the State-aided scheme, for the precautions necessary to ensure their prosperity may not have been observed.

Now, upon what foundation is the very sweeping proposition made, that those who emigrated with Government assistance have not been benefited by their change in life? It is not to be imagined that it is possible to ensure with mathematical certainty the future success of every single State-aided emigrant; the most determined foe to the measure could not require so extreme a test without render-

ing himself ridiculous. If during 1883, 16,000 to 18,000 persons were assisted to leave the country, it is only reasonable to suppose that some few at least should—however carefully they may have been selected—prove to be worthless characters who would not do well in any position of life, even under the best and most favourable conditions. This will be easily admitted. The number of persons of whose non-success we have heard amount to some 200 or 300 souls in all, *i.e.*, to between 80 or 100 who were sent back to Ireland by the Immigration Commissioners in the United States, the remainder those who have been reported in distress in Canada. As much as possible has been made of these cases of failure. If a State-aided emigrant was rejected at New York, the public here heard a great deal about it; if a family fell into bad circumstances in Toronto, the fact was loudly proclaimed to the whole world. It is too true that those who relished the task of obstructing State-aided emigration, availed themselves eagerly of every opportunity of spreading accounts of these failures, while we heard nothing of those who have prospered. I have not the slightest objection to the circulation of these reports; it is very desirable that the facts should be fully known, but the public must accept them for what they are worth, and avoid drawing from them unjustifiable conclusions. A trifling proportion of those who were assisted to go to America fell into poverty, and of these a great deal has been said; the condition of the rest—the large majority—has been ignored, and we are asked upon this imperfect foundation to affirm the statement that emigration has not succeeded!

The cases of failure on which this proposition is based are exceptional, as I shall proceed to show; I propose to

deal with them separately, *i.e.*, those rejected by the United States Authorities, and those who are reported in distresses in Canada.

It has already been mentioned that only those families were allowed to go to the United States, who produced letters showing they had friends there who invited them out. It was probably argued that the Irish poor do not as a rule, impose upon each other, and it was in the highest degree improbable that an Irishman in the States would encourage his friends to go to him unless he was satisfied they would succeed in their new home. This reasoning was fair, and grounded upon practical principles ; and if it failed at all, it did so only in exceptional cases which could not be foreseen. The cause that led to a few persons being sent back is not far to search : it was mainly due to the fact that the letters of encouragement were not genuine ; that is, either there was some presumption they were manufactured, or else the persons who wrote them did not mean what they said. It is to be sincerely regretted that these failures occurred ; but it must also be admitted that amongst large numbers of persons, some such occurrences are sure to arise.

With regard to the few in Canada who have been reported to be in distress, it is well to know who these persons are. I have taken some trouble to ascertain this, and find they belonged to a very unfortunate class, alas too numerous in Ireland. Some were men who will not work when they get it to do—the hangers-on and odd-job men in the purlieus of the Irish western towns—persons who have never taken to regular occupation, and who when they pick up a shilling spend it in drink ; others were men whose habits of life unfitted them for the sort of labour

which is remunerative in a flourishing colony, and who found that exertions awaited them of a very different character to what they were accustomed. These persons left the employment provided for them, and congregated in Toronto, and there they very naturally fell into destitution.

If any blame were deserved for having selected unsuitable persons of this class as emigrants, it would fall to a great extent, upon the local bodies who in the first instance recommended the candidates for assistance. They have local knowledge, and every means of judging of the character of the persons whose applications they entertain. It is obvious that the Government Inspectors, who go as strangers to see the people desiring to emigrate, must rely upon the reports they receive from responsible persons in the neighbourhood. Boards of Guardians who undertake State-aided emigration have to be careful in their recommendations. Much depends upon their judgment in rejecting those whose intemperate or indolent habits debar them from the hope of succeeding in another country. The exercise of this judgment is clearly a duty ; and if they are not disposed to perform it, they are deceiving the poor themselves by asking to be allowed to undertake emigration, and it would be far better they should have nothing to say to the scheme. The consequences of the charge, that by State-aided emigration large numbers of worthless characters have been sent off, would be disastrous to the reputation of our local authorities, and it is unjust to make so baseless an accusation. It is certainly very much to be deprecated that those who conducted State-aided emigration did even in a very few instances, fall into the error of selecting unsuitable emigrants in one or two Unions ; but on the other hand, where

the rush was to "get going," there was considerable difficulty in refusing to help some dubious cases; especially when there was a hope that under new and better conditions of life the earners of the families would turn over a new leaf, and become more respectable members of society. If error there was anywhere, it was of judgment only, which cannot invalidate a great scheme; it is only to be hoped that what has occurred will serve to quicken all who have anything to say to emigration to a keener sense of the responsibilities they incur. Nor are these responsibilities onerous; for let us remember, that the gentlemen who compose Mr. Tuke's Committee were instrumental in sending nearly 2,000 persons to Canada from the very poorest parts of Ireland; they had not the same means of knowing the districts where they conducted emigration, as the Guardians who live continually on the spot; and yet by their very careful selections, not one single man of those they assisted has fallen into distress.

I have dwelt upon these cases of failure at some length, not because it was necessary to make any elaborate apology for them, but because the cry got up against emigration on their account is one that is most injurious to Irishmen. It is not flattering to us as a people, to hear so much said about the want of success of these few families. It is not patriotic to publish to the whole world—even if it were true, which is not the case—that in Canada the cry is "No Irish need apply." Self-styled patriots maintain that this cry is unjustifiable in England; what are we to think of their consistency, nay of their good faith, when we find them willingly perverting every circumstance to prove that the unprejudiced Canadian thinks an Irishman an undesirable settler?



In the New World there is plenty of employment, wages are high, and the conditions of life are favourable to success. Poor immigrants, even those without any money, can attain at least to comfortable circumstances, and some have opportunities of reaching a high degree of prosperity and eminence, which at present is absolutely denied them here. Strong limbs, healthy constitution, industrious habits and steady conduct form the capital on which they must begin the struggle of life, and when joined to energy, self-reliance, perseverance and ability, a prize worth having will not fail even the Connaught peasant. But if there really has been a general failure among the emigrants who left us last year, our people must be destitute of these good qualities, and the persons who have gloated over the few cases of non-success and magnified them into a universal law, have strained every nerve to shew that the Irishman of the West lacks energy and activity and has none of the vigorous powers of manhood. Are they patriotic who cast so undeserved an imputation upon the character of our countrymen? Is it right or even generous to injure the prospects of struggling families just landed among strangers? Is it worth while to attack a measure of relief with weapons so improper, and purchased at such a price?

The accounts of failures relate to a very few, who never ought to have been sent out; to an insignificant quantity when compared with the large number of those who left our shores last year. The reports referring to the vast majority, on the contrary, are very favourable. It was to be expected that the first winter in Canada should bring its trials with it, for acclimatization and experience are necessary to contend against a temperature different to that to which a man is accustomed. In every change of life

difficulties have to be met, but it would be an insult to the Irish colonist to say that he alone has no spirit to encounter them. Any one who will get authentic accounts will be convinced of the very general success which has attended the emigration assisted by Government. Considerable sums of money have been sent home, and the opinion in the districts where State-aided emigration was conducted last year is, that those who went away have largely benefited by the change.

The best test is to be found in the letters of the emigrants themselves. It would however, be difficult to get such authentic evidence from *all* those who were assisted to leave the country last year, and if got, it would be impossible to reproduce it in a paper like this. I will take a few typical cases and these will shew in their own words, that where men were willing to work, they had every prospect of doing well.

Most of the State-aided emigrants who left Cahirciveen Union proceeded to the States of Connecticut and of Rhode Island. One of these, Thomas S—, writes home in a letter, dated Westerly, 23rd February, 1884:—"All here that came  
 "out last summer in the free emigration got work right  
 "away—all those that were able to work I mean. This is a  
 "good country for you to come, because you have got good  
 "help; if nothing but to take your boys from the hungry farmers  
 "of V—. You were foolish that did not come out last summer.  
 "I see P. D—and P. R— and Mrs. R— are all doing very  
 "well; everyone of their children are to work, so you can  
 "judge that they all would not work at home like that; so  
 "you can see the difference yourself." Another, Mary D—  
 who left the same district, writing from Rhode Island, says:  
 "This is a fine country; we are all working in the mill;

“we have nice work there. Thanks be to God now we  
 “left V—.” Pat C—, from the remote west of Galway  
 (sent out by Mr. Tuke’s Committee), writes from Portland :  
 “I am sending £3 for the tea. I am glad I came out here ;  
 “I am not sorry ; I got steady work since the day I landed ;  
 “I have a steady job for the winter—£1 a week after my  
 “board. This is like home to me ; I am working in the  
 “paper mills.” Michael C— from the same district,  
 (also sent out by Mr. Tuke’s Committee) writes from  
 Lynn :—“Mary is sending £2, Pat and me £1 each,  
 “£4 in all. Mary and Anne look well, and Pat also ;  
 “we are very happy together ; we will send plenty of  
 “money soon ; I am working since I was two days in the  
 “place.” John N—, who left Sligo, writes from Hastings,  
 Minnesota : “James and me are working at two dollars and  
 “a-half a day each of us (10s. 5d.). John is driving a lady at  
 “15 dollars a month (£3 2s. 6d.) and his board.” Michael  
 C—, also from Co. Sligo, writing from Scranton, says :  
 “It is a pity to have ye working there (*i.e.* at home) for  
 “nine shillings a week, when ye would get that a day  
 “here.” Mary L— from Co. Sligo, writes from Hoboken :  
 “We like this place well ; it is a good place for anyone that  
 “will work ; it is not for a shilling you would work, and  
 “they say at home that in America it is very hard to work,  
 “but don’t believe it.” Mary G— (Donegal), from Beaver  
 Meadow, says :—“I wrote you a letter three weeks ago,  
 “and I sent £3 in it ; I am very glad I came out here ;  
 “you need not worry about us, for we are getting along  
 “very nice. There is a good country here for anyone that  
 “stays from liquor.” James McG— (Donegal), from  
 Eckley :—“Father, mother and the family are well, and  
 “doing first rate ; I must say that we are going to do well.”

Thomas M— (Mayo), from East Douglas : “ We left —  
 “ last week, and paid 150 dollars (nearly £30) to bring us  
 “ here, and only for we paid all that money we would be  
 “ well off to-day, and we won't be very long until we bring  
 “ in the loss of it again.” John M— (Mayo), from  
 Scranton :—“ The clothes, flour, beef, bacon, and everything  
 “ is much the same price they are at home, but not near so  
 “ good ; between myself and the little boys we earn 60  
 “ dollars a month (£7 18s. 4d.). It is a good country for  
 “ anyone that likes to work ; I never lost a day since  
 “ I came here.” Kate C— (Co. Galway), from Alleghany,  
 writes :—“ I am as happy as ever I can wish to be ; I  
 “ always told ye that God would do what would be good for  
 “ me ; we intend to get a house for ourselves.”

The following are from State-aided emigrants who have  
 settled in Canada. Martin M— (from Co. Galway), writes  
 from Mattawa, December 12th :—“ I have not written for so  
 “ long ; I have been waiting to see a little of the winter of the  
 “ country. . .” After describing Montreal and Ottawa, and  
 Mattawa, he continues—“ The weather is very severe and  
 “ cold, and we cannot touch anything without gloves. I do  
 “ not think you (his brother) would be able to bear the severe  
 “ weather, but I like it myself, as it is very healthy, and it  
 “ is laughable to see us wrapped up. . . The wages are  
 “ 2½ dollars (10s. 5d.) per day, and you know people say  
 “ we have to work very hard here, but I can assure you  
 “ I do not work half so hard as I did at home ; it is only  
 “ the cold is so severe. My board and lodging cost me  
 “ 3 dollars (12s. 6d.) per week ; as for food it is good ; for  
 “ breakfast we have beefsteak, or pork, or porridge, with  
 “ potatoes, bread and butter, &c. ; for dinner, roast beef,  
 “ boiled beef, mutton, pork, or beefsteak pie, then all sorts

"of pudding. We have them all and every day; on  
 "Friday and obligation or fast days we have two or three  
 "kinds of fish, which I did not expect to find in Canada.  
 "For tea there are three kinds of meat and pies, cakes,  
 "jam, bread, and butter, &c.; and mind you there is not  
 "the least stint of anything. Beef is 4*d.* per lb., mutton  
 "and pork in proportion; geese at 2*s.*; turkeys, 2*s.* 4*d.*;  
 "ducks, 1*s.*; so you see things are very cheap. . . My  
 "wife is getting £4 a month and her board; Mary £3 and  
 "her board; John is charged nothing for his board; he goes  
 "to the Catholic school every day, and learns both English  
 "and French. We have a nice Catholic Church here. Tell  
 "Michael F— this would be a good country for him and to  
 "all inquiring friends." Charles F— (from Leitrim), from  
 Ontario, 11th November, says:—"Let no one make you  
 "believe this is a bad country; it is the best country in the  
 "world for good treatment; no second table here; meat  
 "of all sorts very cheap." John M— (Leitrim), from  
 Thornhill, writes:—"There is plenty of work and good  
 "wages here for any man that has a mind to work, and  
 "support is cheaper than at D—" (his old home). James  
 R— (County Roscommon), writes 16th June, from Cam-  
 berville: "Dear Sir—I shall never forget your kindness to  
 "me as long as I live. I have a very good place here at 6*s.*  
 "per day of British money, but the work is very hard, but  
 "I don't mind it. There is very warm weather at present—  
 "it is a grand country and splendid land, a man could buy  
 "a good farm for about £10, and a pair of oxen for  
 "£4 10*s.* I would recommend any man with a little  
 "capital to come out here. I did not stop near any city.  
 "I am 35 miles from Toronto and 4 miles from any  
 "village. The provisions are very cheap here. I can get

"1 cwt. of potatoes for 2s. and 7 stone of the best flour for  
 "4s. 6d., and as for beef, I might say it is for nothing—  
 "4½d. per lb., and that the very best of it. It is as fine a  
 "country as any one could ask for. I have a free house  
 "and plenty of wood to burn all the year round, and 6s.  
 "a day, and a free school for the children. I consider  
 "myself a very lucky man in this country, and my heart-  
 "felt thanks to you for all your kindness to me. Send all  
 "you can out here, there is plenty of work and no men."  
 Henry M'M— (Leitrim) from Brantford, says: "I am  
 "with a farmer. The boarding is excellent here. The poor  
 "have as good to eat as the rich in Ireland. I am getting  
 "13 dollars (£2 14s. 2d.) per month. I expect to be  
 "working in a mill next month. I will get 20 dollars per  
 "month with my board in the mill. I would advise every  
 "one that can to come out here. We like the country well."  
 Thomas C— (Sligo) from Camden, says: "We are quite  
 "happy. We may bless the day we left Ireland, and God  
 "bless you that got us away. This is a fine country for  
 "men and girls. Let none be afraid to come to Canada. If  
 "there were two hundred boys to land here three masters  
 "again every boy waiting on them." Jane B—(Donegal)  
 writes from Credit Works, 14th January:—"If you can  
 "come here as soon as you can, there will be plenty of  
 "work early in the Spring; you can get 5s. a day, and no  
 "matter how high you would board you would have it for  
 "12s. per week." Jane G— (Co. Galway) from Canada,  
 says:—"I am in good health; I have a very nice place,  
 "and can go also to Mass every day if I like; I will send  
 "you some money at Easter." John D— (Kerry) from  
 Stamford says:—"I was most fortunate in being sent out  
 "here in this grand country by your kindness, which I

"will never forget. People speak bad of this country in K—" (his old home) "but if they had only my chance out here  
 "they would not long do so ; there is any amount of work  
 "here for all classes of people. The girls gets great  
 "wages, and also labouring men." Samuel H— (Kerry)  
 from Godrich, says :—" If I had come out here when I was  
 "twenty years younger I would be a rich man to-day. I  
 "write these few lines to thank you for sending me out  
 "to a good country." P. J. F—, from County Galway,  
 (sent out by Mr. Tuke's Committee), from Ontario :—" I  
 "am going on well, and say I have the life of a gentleman.  
 "I am getting 15 dollars (£3 2s. 6d.) a month ; you  
 "would do a good thing to let all O— (his old home)  
 "know how well they could get on here." Mary K— (Co.  
 Sligo), from Montreal :—" I write these few lines to return  
 "you thanks for what you did for me, the children got work  
 "two days after coming ; myself has 13 dollars (£2 14s. 2d.)  
 "a month ; Maryanne has 6 dollars (25s.) a month ; and  
 "Edward is learning a trade. I am very happy that I  
 "came here, I have such good wages." James D—  
 (Roscommon), from Linsay :—" John and James are with  
 "one master, settled at good wages and board ; — and  
 "Maria are the same. I will get plenty of work myself.  
 "My blessing to Mr. M. F— in particular for sending  
 "me to a good country." Peter L— (Roscommon), from  
 Ontario :—" We have as fine a house as we could wish for,  
 "with half acre of land ; we are as happy as the day is  
 "long. The country is the finest you ever seen. Thank God  
 "we left B—" (his old home) ; then 30th November, he adds :  
 "We are very well satisfied for coming to the country ;  
 "we find it no colder than the old country." Edmund S—  
 (County Galway), from Toronto :—" We are happier here

“than I ever thought we would be, and it is a nicer country  
 “than ever I thought it was. . . . Higher wages in  
 “the United States than in Canada, but provisions are  
 “cheaper, best beef and mutton  $4\frac{1}{2}d.$  a lb. ; house rent and  
 “fixings are very dear.” He talks of the people being in  
 good health, and the children improving and getting fat,  
 and adds :—“Religion is well kept up here.” Thomas S—  
 (Co. Galway), from Toronto, 4th December :—“I think  
 “the name this country has of heat and cold is ten times  
 “worse than it is.” Bridget D— (Co. Galway), from  
 Toronto, 5th December :—“Me and my husband are well  
 “and the children. This is a very fine place, indeed,  
 “wages from 1 to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  dollars ( $4s. 3d.$  to  $10s. 5d.$ ) a day,  
 “provisions cheap, and we have beef three times a day.  
 “All H— (her old home) is a credit to Mr. B—, and they  
 “shall never forget his kindness in the way he worked to  
 “send them out here.”

These letters, given in the simple language of the emigrants themselves when writing to their friends at home, repudiate strongly the accusation that the Irish peasant is an undesirable settler. They speak for themselves, and further comment is unnecessary.

The objections to State-aided emigration which we have had under consideration, rest upon no solid foundation ; and yet there ought to be some show of reason to account for the vehement opposition it has encountered. What then, is the cause of this opposition which forbids the poor to improve their lot in the New World, where their hopes are bright ? Why should the imputation be cast upon them that they cannot make a comfortable living in a country where there is no lack of employment, and that in the midst of plenty they of all others must become destitute ? What



are the grounds of this hostility to emigration which openly hesitates not to lower the dignity of our race? The public are entitled to know why the temporary measure of relief which emigration affords should be obstructed, and why all means, however damaging to the reputation of the country, may be used to effect this object. Nor is it too much to ask that those who try to force public opinion should give an assurance at all events on the following points :—

1. That Irish suffering shall not be preserved intact as a field for experimentalists upon which to try their remedies; and that other measures which honestly endeavour to give immediate relief may be permitted to act irrespective of any experiments.

2. That a scheme shall not be obstructed only because it produces an increase in the price of labour in localities where employment is uncertain, and the rate of wages at starvation point; and

3. That emigration shall not be rejected irrespective of any merits it may possess, solely because it is a measure which has received the approval of the Government of the country.

It is sometimes said that by emigration the people may find themselves in conditions of life where they are liable to lose their faith and good qualities, and therefore it is to be regretted that under any circumstances they should be encouraged to leave their own country. If this contention is seriously urged, it would mean that the Irish peasant is generally liable to moral degradation when he leaves his own neighbourhood and goes into the world to seek his fortune. If this were to be generally true, I can imagine nothing more humiliating and nothing more hopeless. What

would be the inference ? Simply this, that the Irish poor cannot with impunity do that which is not injurious to other races ; that our own people are not grounded upon principles of public morality like them, and cannot stand the test of improvement. These conclusions would be sad in the extreme and very damaging to us, and I find it hard to accept them.

My idea rather is that increased chances of demoralisation follow in the wake of all material progress, and whether the improvement is produced among emigrants by placing them in better circumstances, or whether in the country by the introduction of internal reforms, the results will be the same. If a number of men who now suffer from perennial starvation are suddenly put into a position where they can command more of the comforts of life than they are accustomed to, those that are weak in character are liable to sink under the weight of prosperity, while the strong become more industrious and civilised. But because when the people advance in wealth, and a few fall under the trials it produces, is the whole growth of society to be stunted ? I think not ; and if we are to judge by the laudable efforts which the clergy in Ireland are making as a body to raise the material welfare of their people, we may believe that they cannot be hostile to any measure that has for its object the elevation of the social status of their countrymen.

In a letter written by the Archbishop of Toronto, to the *Freeman's Journal*, on the 5th June, 1882, (it appeared on the 7th), His Grace gives some account of the state of things in Canada. After refusing to advise anyone to leave Ireland who could live in it in tolerable comfort, he says :—“ The Catholic Church in Canada, is in a very “ prosperous condition. Priests and Churches are to be

“found everywhere throughout the country, and Catholic  
 “education is on a better footing than in the United States,  
 “where Catholics are obliged to support by their taxes the  
 “common or irreligious schools, as also to keep up their  
 “own at great expense. In Canada this is not the case,  
 “Catholic taxes go to Catholic schools . . . In our  
 “mind Canada is the freest and best governed country in  
 “the world and the people are happy.” His Grace then  
 proceeds to shew what are the material advantages of  
 Canada : how the climate of Ontario is temperate, how the  
 everlasting snow is a myth, and the winter in Toronto, with  
 the exception of few days occasionally, not colder than in  
 Ireland ; how the soil is fertile, the wages for farm hands  
 as good as in the United States, but that living is cheaper,  
 and how the older settlers are selling out their improve-  
 ments to new comers at a fair price. These conditions, it  
 may be incidentally observed, do not offer a bad field for  
 healthy and poor families in which to find a home.

What the Archbishop wrote in 1882 must still be true,  
 and it corresponds with what we know is the state of things  
 in the New World. Everywhere in North America and in  
 Australia the Catholic Church is well organised, and exists  
 in flourishing circumstances. The extension of the Faith  
 wherever the English language is spoken is due to the Irish  
 race, and the glory of having effected this great work  
 belongs to our own countrymen. Throughout the settled  
 portions of these vast regions the Catholic poor have the  
 necessary opportunities of practising their religion. It can  
 never be said now, what might have been justly urged forty  
 years ago, that emigration deprives our people of the  
 spiritual support which is necessary to their welfare ; for  
 owing to their zeal a regular Hierarchy has been established,

and Priests and Churches abound in those places where their worldly prosperity can be secured.

But it is still said that the moral character of the Irish peasant often deteriorates when he goes to the large cities of the United States, and it is to be feared that the allegation is not wholly without some truth; that is to say, that some of the people who persist in remaining there do not maintain their primitive virtue. I will not deny that I regret when I hear of families going to large cities, and on the contrary, I believe that if constrained to emigrate, they make a wise choice when they select their future homes in a district where they can settle on the land, viz. : in Canada, in the western portions of the United States, or in the Australian colonies. The reason why any encouragement was given to persons who wished to proceed to the American cities seems to be simple. If applicants for State-aid desired to go to their friends and relations; if they produced letters from them inviting them out and persuading them to join them, is it the duty of the Government indiscriminately to deny them assistance to reach those localities where they have every prospect of good employment and where they most wish to be sent? It is impossible for a public department to inquire into the morals of individuals and to judge who is and who is not capable of resisting the temptations that are liable to assail them. The duty of warning the people of their spiritual responsibilities and of counselling them to avoid dangerous destinations must fall upon their pastors alone; and if the cities of the United States have their temptations, it is to be supposed that the clergy will advise the weaker members of their flocks not to go there. Everyone

interested in emigration would rejoice at so important a co-operation on the part of the spiritual leaders of the people, and every effort would be made to carry out any reasonable proposition formulated for the purpose of maintaining the moral excellence of the Irish poor. However much men may still unfortunately differ upon their religious principles, the tone of society is in favour of respecting conscientious convictions—if not on every point, at least in a question of this sort, where no man in his senses desires to see an increase of Irish-American rowdyism, or even worse.

I have already alluded to the fact that where Irish emigration is unassisted the young and strong leave the country; these are precisely the persons, who when they are loosed from the restraints which their homes, their priests, and the public opinion of their little world impose on them, are most prone to fall into irregular habits; on the contrary by family emigration—and more especially when selection is carefully performed—these dangers are lessened, because there is still at all events, the control of the family to preserve morality. If, as I believe, assisted emigration reduces the amount of that which is unassisted, then it has at least done the service of diminishing the evils of which complaint is made. Again, although State-aided emigration has been powerless to forbid the Irish peasant from going to his friends in the cities of the United States, it has on the other hand, given facilities for sending many far inland, to Australia, and to rural parts of Canada, which they could never have reached without the help it has afforded them. Does not this divert the stream from the great towns which by the natural law is the loadstone of the unaided emigrant, and does not this still further diminish the perils complained of?

Whatever the opinion may be about the dangers to morality which arise by emigration, it is certain that the spiritual guides of the western peasants know that this process must unfortunately continue by an economic law beyond the power of any man to arrest. Is it then quite consistent for those who have raised no warning note against it when it was carried out in its worst form, that they should only now begin to rouse themselves to an appreciation of the danger when the State by its interference has lessened the evil? God forbid that I should criticise them when they feel it to be their duty to warn their flocks against temptations which attack their morality; but it needs explanation to understand why some few have reserved themselves till now to commence their crusade against emigration.

The contention that emigration should absolutely be avoided, because some persons are liable to lose their good moral qualities, is one which cannot be sustained. All that can be said is that the spiritual guardians of the people should endeavour to fence the scheme round with precautions to ensure the continuance of religious influences upon the emigrants. In applying themselves to this task which clearly belongs to this sacred calling, they will find that those who are interested in emigration have exactly the same end in view, and that the moral welfare of the people is an object which all are anxious to secure.

The various points we have had before us may now be reviewed, and they will suggest some considerations not unworthy of our attention.

A social malady affects the country, and it is directly due to the fact that a large portion of the population are too much crowded together upon poor soil and in narrow holdings, where they cannot thrive and improve their condi-

tion. This evil not only pauperises the districts where the congestion exists, but it also checks the growth of material prosperity in the whole of Ireland itself. The chief object therefore, must be to correct this state of things; and the quicker it is done the sooner will the country shake off the weight that dooms her to poverty and periodical famine. Nor can we be content with the mere arguments of economic considerations; we have to appeal to higher sentiments—to our sympathy with unmerited poverty itself. Is there anyone amongst us who, having seen with his own eyes the misfortunes of the peasants of Donegal, Connaught and Kerry, would not make their welfare his first object? Is there anyone who would not waive his political opinions if only he could help the western Irish poor to the best of his ability? They are a gallant people, who have patiently borne a long course of suffering. Simple, affectionate, courteous, and religious there is no one who has known them who cannot think it an honour to serve them. The first consideration must be to benefit them.

Urged by all these reflections therefore, we must favour every scheme calculated to develop our industries, to encourage our enterprise and to circulate our wealth; but as many of these are only partial remedies, slow in their action and uncertain in their results, they cannot be said to strike at the root of our troubles. While then they should not be neglected we must also devise something that will eradicate the cause of poverty, and an immediate effort to relieve the over-crowded districts is consequently a necessity. The scheme of migration is not yet ready, however desirable it would be; and until it can be elaborated, emigration cannot be despised.

A measure of State-aided emigration has many advan-

tages :—*First*, it improves the districts which are overcrowded, by rendering employment more certain, by raising the wages to a fair standard, and by increasing the size of the holdings on which the people greatly depend for their support. By means of this measure the congestion *can* be relieved ; and this is done without interfering with the economic and social conditions existing in other districts in Ireland, which would be the case, at least in the beginning, if a migration scheme were introduced. *Secondly*, the circumstances of those who go away are improved, and families who are in distress and whose presence in the western bogs and mountains is a source of absolute poverty to the country, can be sent off to where their own individual happiness is increased and their prosperity secured. And *lastly*, State-aided emigration takes under its control a spontaneous process, which the people in spite of every effort will continue to carry out ; and thereby it checks in some degree the evils of individual emigration, and converts the natural flow from the country into a movement more healthy, more regular, and less expensive to the nation.

These advantages can only be reaped when the measure of relief afforded by it is properly conducted. There are two conditions necessary to effect this : one, that only the right persons be selected for State-aid, and the other that suitable arrangements are made for their reception in their new settlements. I have already shown that the second condition has been provided for, that where a family are willing to work they have every opportunity of succeeding, and that as a matter of fact, their circumstances are satisfactory. I have moreover, shown that the first condition depends upon those who are entrusted with emigration—



the local bodies already spoken of, who recommend the candidates for Government assistance and the department which controls the measure. We need a cordial co-operation between these two authorities, and in the interests of the poor we are entitled to claim that co-operation, whatever may be the individual opinion entertained upon the policy of emigration.

In all I have said about emigration in this paper, I have carefully explained that it is not, in my opinion, the only remedy for congestion in the West. I believe it is the one which must be applied until a better has been found to be practically possible. I believe that the sufferings of the poor demand the most prompt attention, and that anything that affords them relief is to be welcomed. All measures that will work and that are economically sound should be accepted with gratitude. Every effort tending to throw off the load of misery which oppresses us, and to facilitate the flow of wealth which is now stagnant, should be encouraged. Let those who introduce migration, study to effect their object; let those who wish to promote our industries and to develop our national resources apply their powers to carry out their schemes; let men of all shades of political opinion combine to raise up their country by sound religious education, and by inculcating habits of sobriety and thrift. But until these efforts can produce their full effects, let those who believe in a proper system of emigration also employ their remedy, and let the public by a rational criticism secure that it shall be a real benefit to those who go away and to those who remain behind.

The result to be arrived at is to improve the condition of our own countrymen, not to afford food for a bitter par-

tizan strife ; and this can only be attained when the various measures of relief proposed, receive generous and intelligent treatment. Thus, then, when all in their different spheres and according to their respective abilities, shall be at work for the good of Ireland, we may hope that through a zealous and honorable competition of reformers, an improvement may be effected which shall eradicate for ever our present poverty, and give our common country the blessings of affluence, contentment and happiness.

---