



EVIDENCE

GIVEN BY

THE REV. THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D.

AND

THE RIGHT REV. JAMES DOYLE, D.D.

BEFORE A

SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

ON THE

State of Ireland.

EXTRACTED FROM

THE COMMITTEE'S SECOND REPORT OF EVIDENCE.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY BALDWIN AND CRADOCK, PATERNOSTER ROW,
AND S. GROOMBRIDGE, PANYER ALLEY.

1832.

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND



THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND

PREFACE.

IN presenting the following pages to the public, the editor trusts that little apology is necessary. The frequent discussions in Parliament on the policy of giving a system of poor laws to Ireland, and the probability of renewed attempts to effect that object, make it highly important that correct information should be generally diffused. The best arguments on both sides of the question are contained in the evidence of DR. CHALMERS and DR. DOYLE, but the form in which only it was hitherto to be had prevented its being generally known. In the way in which it is now offered it is accessible to all; and to all who take an interest in the condition of the poor, the following pages will, it is believed, be interesting.

Whether the reader subscribe to the creed of Dr. Chalmers, that poor laws are calculated to deteriorate the condition of any country—"of the least improved of the European countries," or agree with Dr. Doyle that the state of Ireland makes the adoption of poor laws there a matter of imperative necessity, he will doubtless give to both the credit of sincerity. He will applaud that noble zeal for general education which distinguishes both those ornaments of their different churches, and even on the great question on which they are at issue, will give to both the praise of real, though in one of them ill-directed, christian philanthropy.

It is proper to observe that the following pages do not contain the whole of the evidence in the Report of the Committee. In an examination on one subject, protracted through several days, and the questions put by different individuals, it necessarily happens that the same answers in substance are given to different questions; in such cases the questions and answers are both left out, as are other parts which seemed unimportant. This was done with the view of compressing the matter into moderate compass, and of making the whole more interesting.

EVIDENCE
ON THE
STATE OF IRELAND,
&c.

Thomas Spring Rice, Esq. in the Chair.

The Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D. examined.

18TH MAY, 1830.

HAVE you had occasion to turn your attention to the state of the poor in the different parts of the empire?—More particularly in Scotland: and I have paid some attention to the state of pauperism in England.

Was the attention you have paid to the state of pauperism in England grounded upon any personal observations and visits to this country?—Yes; it was grounded upon personal observation.

Has that attention been pursued by you with reference to the state of the poor in Scotland for many years?—From the time of my entering into the ministry of the Church of Scotland.

Are the Scotch laws, with respect to the relief of the poor, found in practice to create a right in the poor to demand relief?—I conceive that a sound interpreter of law would deduce as valid a right to relief from the statute book of Scotland as from that of England. In this respect there is a great similitude between them; and the chief difference seems to lie in the habit and practice of the two countries.

Does it appear that the relief of the able-bodied poor is practically contemplated or enforced under the law of Scotland, if such able-bodied poor are out of employment?—There was a material

decision upon this question so recent as the year 1806. Two persons having objected to an assessment imposed by the unanimous determination of the heritors and kirk session, for the relief of a number of able-bodied paupers, who in ordinary times supported themselves, but had been reduced to want by the failure of two successive crops; the court sustained the assessment.

In the Third Report of a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Poor Laws, in 1818, it is stated, that in 700 reported cases there appear only three instances of assessment prior to 1700; that from 1700 to 1800 there were 93 cases of assessment, and from 1800 to 1817 there were 49 new cases of assessment. Now, though that may not be precisely accurate, do you consider that it affords sufficient approximation to the truth, to give an index to the origin and progress of assessment in Scotland?—I feel myself authorised to say, that there were very few parishes indeed that had adopted the method of assessment prior to 1740.

To what cause do you attribute the nonapplication of the principle of assessment prior to that year?—There is an Act which permits the alternative of begging under certain regulations, and the preference of all parties for this seems to have made the progress of assessment amongst the Scottish parishes a very slow one.

Were there any circumstances in the internal state of Scotland, and in the state of society, which, in your opinion, impeded the introduction or the progress of assessment at that time?—It appears to me that the progress of assessments, instead of being impeded, was superseded or anticipated by the progress of education and good habits among the people.

In what condition does Scotland appear to have been about the beginning of the last century, and the close of the century preceding, prior to the introduction of the principle of assessment?—In the middle of the sixteenth century there was a very efficient system of christian instruction in the parishes of Scotland, and it is understood that the country at that time was in a very healthful, moral condition; immediately after the Restoration, the Act for the establishment of parochial schools was repealed, and there was an attempt to enforce episcopacy upon the Scottish population, which gave rise to what may be termed religious wars, that lasted for nearly thirty years; from the disorder and turbulence of that period, along with the suspension of parochial education, the population seems to have deteriorated very rapidly. There is a most frightful picture given of the state of Scotland in 1698, by Fletcher of Saltoun, as appears from the following extract:

“There are at this day in Scotland (besides a great number of families very meanly provided for by the church boxes, with others who, with living upon bad food, fall into various diseases,) 200,000

people begging from door to door. These are not only nowadays advantageous, but a very grievous burden to so poor a country; and though the number of them be perhaps double to what it was formerly, by reason of the present great distress, yet in all times there have been about 100,000 of these vagabonds, who have lived without any regard or submission either to the laws of the land, or even of those of God and nature; fathers incestuously accompanying their own daughters, the son with the mother, and the brother with the sister. No magistrate could ever discover or be informed which way any of these wretches died, or that ever they were baptised. Many murders have been discovered among them; and they are not only a most unspeakable oppression to poor tenants, (who, if they give not bread or some sort of provision to perhaps 40 such villains in one day, are sure to be insulted by them,) but they rob many poor people, who live in houses distant from any neighbourhood. In years of plenty many thousands of them meet together in the mountains, where they feast and riot for many days; and at country weddings, markets, burials, and other the like public occasions, they are to be seen, both men and women, perpetually drunk, cursing, blaspheming, and fighting together."

Does it appear, from historical records, that that state of things continued long after the date of the work of Fletcher of Saltoun?—It appears from very distinct historical documents, that that state of things subsided almost *per saltum*, very suddenly indeed, when the population had leave to repose from the religious persecutions, and the parochial system of education was again general. They were besides plied from sabbath to sabbath, by an efficient and acceptable clergy; in consequence of which, the transformation appears to have been quite marvellous. The extract I have now read, refers to the year 1698. The extract I am about to read, refers to a period of time only 19 years distant, 1717. It is taken from Defoe, the author of Robinson Crusoe. "The people" says he, "are restrained in the ordinary practice of common immoralities, such as swearing, drunkenness, slander, fornication, and the like. As to theft, murder, and other capital crimes, they come under the cognizance of the civil magistrate, as in other countries; but in those things which the church has power to punish, the people being constantly and impartially prosecuted, they are thereby the more restrained, kept sober, and under government; and you may pass through twenty towns in Scotland without seeing any broil, or hearing one oath sworn in the streets; whereas, if a blind man was to come from there into England, he shall know the first town he sets his foot in within the English border, by hearing the name of God blasphemed and profanely used, even by the very little children in the street."

In what particular part of Scotland was the principle of assessment first applied?—Those parts which were contiguous to England; and when it did proceed northwards, it began generally with the large towns.

Can you state the entire number of parishes in Scotland at the present moment, and in what number the principle of assessment is applied?—By the appendix that is subjoined to the third report, the number of parishes where assessments are now introduced is 152. The total number of parishes in Scotland is between 900 and 1000.

Do you consider the system of assessment in Scotland to be on the increase, or otherwise?—It is making progress both in the number of parishes and in the amount of the assessment.

To what causes do you attribute the advance of the principle of assessment; is it not the natural inference that the principle has been found a beneficial one?—In the first place I think it is a very natural imagination, that should there be a vacancy or a deficit in respect of means, the patent way of supplying that vacancy is just to pour relief into it, and it is very natural to proceed upon that imagination when urged by a sense of the short coming in of the supplies which are provided in a voluntary way; it is a very natural and frequent, though I think mistaken imagination, that an assessment will make good the deficiency. It is not from the impulse, however, which led to the assessment, that I would draw instruction upon this subject, but from the experience which ascertains the result of it. And here I would state another cause which, in many cases, has been the moving force that led to the introduction of assessments; there are many non-resident heritors in our parishes, and from a desire that the burthen should be equalized between the resident and not resident, the principle of assessment has been introduced, very much afterwards to the regret and repentance of all, when they have found that it would have been far easier to have borne the whole burthen of a gratuitous economy than the share only which fell to them of a compulsory system.

Will you describe the mode of proceeding on the subject of the poor in an unassessed parish in Scotland?—The chief fund for the relief of the poor is derived from voluntary collections at the church door; and, in some instances, the collection is made more effective by its being received within doors, the elders carrying about what they call a ladle, and making pointed and personal application with it to each individual before the dismissal of the congregation. That method obtains, however, in comparatively a small number of Scotch parishes; the collection being generally held at the church door, where the people give their offerings into a plate as they pass. The produce of the collection is the chief

fund out of which the poor are relieved in the unassessed parishes; there are occasionally other funds, however, as interest from small sums of money left to the kirk sessions. In regard to administration, the heritors or landed proprietors have a right, along with the minister and elders, to the conjunct management of one-half of the collection, though in point of fact they seldom avail themselves of it. Practically, there are a few instances of a conjunct administration, excepting where the parishes are assessed; so that in the great majority of these parishes, the administration may be said to be solely with the minister and elders.

Is the administration under any settled principle, limiting the objects upon which it can be expended, or is it at the discretion of the parties administering?—Almost entirely at the discretion of the minister and kirk session.

In the assessed parishes, what is the mode of procedure with respect to the relief of the poor?—After the method of assessment was introduced, the collections fell off very rapidly, and the heritors have stated meetings along with the kirk session, so that the fund may be said to be under the conjunct administration of the heritors and the kirk session.

Where there is an assessment, is the administration of that assessment carried on upon the admission of a principle of right on the part of the poor to demand relief, or is the expenditure discretionary on the part of the heritors and the kirk session?—There is a rapid growth, on the part of the population, of the feeling that they have a right to relief; and in regard to the discretionary administration by the kirk session and heritors, this was very much restrained by a practice that obtained till recently, of appealing from their decision to the sheriff of the county, or to a neighbouring justice. However, by a recent decision, it has been found that an appeal is not competent save to the court of session, and this may be said practically to have rendered the parochial courts of administration ultimate, the method of prosecuting the appeal being now so very operose and expensive that it is seldom resorted to.

Is not the rate apportioned between the tenants and the heritors?—It is apportioned between the tenant and the heritors, but the tenant has no voice in it. The sum to be raised is determined by the heritors and the kirk session, which last are not payers.

Have you any means of comparing the difference of expence under the assessed and the unassessed system in Scotland?—When I received my summons to attend this committee, I was very anxious to look into the original communications from the Scottish clergy, which form the basis of those numerical abstracts that are appended to the Supplementary Report, which has been

already referred to. I have thus been able to collect a few instances, taken at random, and which I think make that matter clear. I have noted a few parishes from the Synod of Merse and Teviotdale, where there is an assessment, and compared them with parishes of about an equal population in the Synod of Argyle which is not assessed. In Dunse the population is 3082, the fund for the poor £615 13s. 6d.; in Kilnicheal and Glassary the population is 3400 unassessed, fund £30 0s. 6d., less by a twentieth part than the former, although with a larger population; Eccles, population 1820, fund £327; South Knapdale, in Argyleshire, population 1720, fund £33; Coldstream, population 2384, fund £615; North Knapdale, population 2184, fund £15 10s.; Coldingham, population 2424, fund £316 2s. 9d.; Inverary, population 2061, fund £124; Jedburgh, population 4454, fund £631 17s. 4d.; Kilninian, population 4064, fund £20; Hawick, population 3688, fund £899 14s.; Lismore and Appin, population 3407, fund £34; Wilton, population 1500, fund £309 17s. 11d.; Kilmartin, population 1453, fund £15; Kelso, population 4408, fund 306; Kilninver, population 983, fund £22. These statements are given from the Appendix of the Supplementary Report.

Are there any circumstances connected with the different state of the population, in the districts you have contrasted, which could account for the smallness of relief given in the one case, and the amount of the rate in the other; is the one an agricultural district and the other a manufacturing one, or are there any other contrarieties which would account for the great disproportion?—There is no other circumstance I can assign than the mere existence in the one set of parishes, and non-existence in the other, of a compulsory provision. The counties where the method of assessment is most general are among the most agricultural in Scotland; on the other hand Campbeltown is the most populous in Argyleshire, its population being 7807, and the fund only £141 10s.; the employment of many of the people too is fishing, which is very precarious.

Have you had any means of comparing the actual condition of the poor in those separate classes of parishes, or any of them, so as to enable you to state to the committee in which of the two descriptions of parishes there is the greatest industry and wealth, and in which the physical and moral condition of the poor is the better?—I can say little on this subject from my own personal observation: I have a very vague recollection of Roxburghshire, where I was assistant for some months to a minister, about 29 years ago; my impression certainly is, that in the unassessed county of Fife, where I was afterwards a clergyman for 12 years, the standard of enjoyment is fully as high as in Roxburghshire, and the relative affections seem to be in much more powerful

exercise in the unassessed than in the assessed parishes, as also the kindness of neighbours to each other, and the spontaneous generosity of the rich to the poor: there is a great deal of relief going on in the unassessed parishes, perhaps as much in point of *materiel* as in the assessed, though not so much needed, from the unbroken habits of economy and industry among the people; the *morale* which accompanies the voluntary mode of relief, tends to sweeten and cement the parochial society in the unassessed parishes. On the subject of the relative condition and character of the two sets of parishes, I shall, with the permission of the committee, give a few extracts taken from the original communications of the Scottish clergy, upon which the Third Report of the Select Committee of 1818, and also the Supplementary Report of the General Assembly, are founded. The first are a few instances from the county of Sutherland. In Wick the population is 5080, the fund £48 6s. The minister says, "There is no one of any description in this parish, or indeed in this county, supported wholly from the public fund; a little help is all that is given; for the rest, they must depend upon their own industry, the kindness of relations, or the liberality of the generous; entire support is unknown." In Criech the population is 1969, the fund £10 19s. "None supported wholly from the poor fund; the pittance they receive from the fund would not support them one month in the year; but they are supported by their friends and neighbours. In admitting a pauper on the poor-roll, his moral character is minutely examined and considered in bestowing charity." In Tongue the population is 1493, the fund £12 12s. "None are wholly supported from the poor's fund in this parish, owing to the smallness of our fund; on the poor's roll the number at present is 40, to whom are given from 3s. to 5s. or 6s. from the poor's fund in a year, according to the urgency of their claims, and chiefly to buy shoes, or assist to buy them; the great majority of the above do a little for their own maintenance, but are principally supported by the kindness of their relations, and the bounty of charitable neighbours often sent to their relief." In Killarnan the population is 1390, the fund £46 10s. "None on the poor's roll of my parish are supported wholly from the poor's fund, but live partly by their own industry, and, when unable to work, are aided by their friends. There is one blind person in this parish: there are four persons deaf and dumb; the above objects are aided a little by the kirk session, but supported chiefly by their own relatives." In Kincardine the population is 1666, the fund £9 10s. "Character is always considered, and the amount of his allowance fixed in proportion; and this is seriously impressed on the mind of a bad man."*

* Many more extracts of a similar character are given in the Report of the Committee.

In the assessed parishes generally, has the disposition been to extend the amount of assessment?—I think very much so; at the same time it is but fair to state that there are some remarkable instances of moderate expenditure even in assessed parishes; and if the committee will allow me, I can give a few instances. In Longformacus the population is 444, the fund £40 3s. 7½*d.*; Eyermouth, population 962, fund £71 19s. 11½*d.*; Edwin, population 1360, fund £132 11s. 9*d.*; Selkirk, population 2466, fund £231; Melrose, population 3132, fund £270; Nenthorne, population 398, fund £24 5s. 4*d.*; Legerwood, population 560, fund £43 3s. 9*d.*; Stair, population 1454, fund £99 4s.; Martin, population 614, fund £42 15s. 10*d.*; Abbey St. Bathans, population 154, fund £5 15s.; Cranshaws, population 186, fund £10 18s. 5½*d.*; Preston and Buncle, population 766, fund £40 18s. 11½*d.*

Can you inform the committee what have been the causes which in those parishes have led to the moderation of the assessment, and prevented the increase of such assessment?—They are quite intermingled with and contiguous to other parishes, where the amount of the assessment is out of all proportion greater than theirs. Perhaps it may proceed from a later introduction of the assessment, though a more strenuous management could produce the whole difference. These instances, however, comprehend so very small a fraction of the parishes, that, if due to superior management, we are entitled to infer it is such a system as in the average will not be realised; whereas in the unassessed parishes, where we have an equally moderate expenditure, we need no strenuousness of management. It appears to me that the assessment has operated as an artificial stimulant, and given a movement to the people in one direction, and that the strenuous management operates as a counteractive, which, when strenuous enough, brings the people to a right medium state, as if by a compensation of errors. The ground upon which I prefer the system in unassessed to that in assessed parishes, is, that freed from both these errors, we remain in the same moderate state, without the putting forth of any skill or any strenuousness whatever on the part of the administrative body. Granting that there is no natural necessity for a compulsory provision to the poor, the anomaly of a moderate expenditure in some parishes might be accounted for. The want of this necessity will generally be discoverable by strict investigation, so that even after a compulsory fund is established, by means of a very vigilant guardianship and scrutiny, the great majority of applications might be warded off, or a great number of the already admitted paupers may have their allowances either reduced or withdrawn. I do not wonder that when a strenuous administration is set up in any parish,

we should hear of such marvellous abridgements as have been effected on the expenditure: but I do regret when I hear these instances appealed to as examples of the innocence of the system. Such instances among the assessed parishes of Scotland do not amount to one-tenth of the whole. They form too but an inconsiderable fraction among the parishes of England, proving that under the *average* management of parishes, or such management as is generally and ordinarily to be had, the system contains in it the mischievous principle of its own acceleration. It is not to be denied, that if we set up an unnatural stimulant on the one hand, and give a movement thereby in one direction, we may do much to neutralise the impulse by a counteraction of unnatural strength and violence in the other direction. But I should prefer a natural state of things, where the impulse had not been given, and so the counteraction has not been called for.

It is stated in the Third Report of the General Assembly, that in almost all the country parishes which have come under their notice, where a regular assessment has been established, the wants of the poor, and the extent of the assessments, have gradually and progressively increased from their commencement; speaking generally, would your experience, and the facts that have come within your observation, confirm that remark?—Completely so.

You officiated as minister in a country parish in the county of Fife?—I did; I was 12 years a minister of Kilmany in that county.

What was the state of the fund for the relief of the poor in your parish in Fife?—Our annual expenditure, speaking of the average of those 12 years, was about £24, and the population 787. I might also mention, that I have a recollection of about £12 being given for some years to one remarkable case of distress, so that we had only for some time £12 a year for the expences of the general pauperism of the parish.

Was there any effort made at any time during your ministry in that parish, to introduce the principle of assessment?—Not in the least; the heritors sometimes offered me a supplemental voluntary sum, but I always disliked it: I said that the effect of this, if known to the parish, would be to excite a great deal more expectation than it could gratify, and I found the parish kept in a more wholesome state by the rich giving what they gave privately, and without coming ostensibly through the known and public organization of the kirk session, so that I always discountenanced the tendency on the part of the heritors, who were abundantly liberal, to augment our regular session fund by any extraordinary contributions.

The funds for the relief of the poor in that parish were then provided exclusively by the kirk session?—They were; we had

a small capital of about £200, which afforded us so much interest, then we had our collection. A considerable part of the fund is expended upon small ecclesiastical matters, such as the payment of the session clerk, and the synod and presbytery clerks.

Were those charged upon the small annual fund?—They were.

Was the condition of the poor progressive or retrograding during those 12 years?—I was sensible of no great difference in that respect; the people, generally speaking, were in decent comfort; but I beg it to be understood, that I do not ascribe this to any positive virtue in our public charity. I think the excellence of our system, when compared with that of England, is altogether of a negative kind. Our parochial charity, from the extreme moderation of its allowances, does not seduce our people from a due dependance on themselves, or to a neglect of their relative obligations. It is not the relief then administered by our kirk session which keeps them comfortable. This is mainly owing to the operation of those principles which Nature hath instituted for the prevention and alleviation of poverty. I might here mention, that I had occasion to publish my Kilmany expenditure about 15 or 16 years ago, when Mr. Rose honoured me with a letter of inquiry, and begged to know by what excellent management it was that I had contrived to keep all the poor comfortable on so trifling a sum. I wrote back to him that I really was not conscious of putting forth any skill or any strenuousness in the matter, and that the excellence of our system did not consist in the excellence of our management, but wholly in the manageable nature of the subject, which was a population whose habits and whose expectations were accommodated to a state of things where a compulsory provision was altogether unknown.

During those 12 years, were there any peculiar visitations of distress or sickness, or any commercial vicissitudes, which affected the population of this parish?—There was one instance of low wages, and I remember the heritors then came forth with an offer, which I gave way to for once, of about £50, which was distributed over and above the sessional income. I had a feeling that it was not necessary; I did not think the parish by any means required it, that is to say, I would much rather have preferred that they would, without the excitement of any great expectation in the parish, have distributed the sum of £50 in a private and unseen way.

Then do you consider that the ill effect produced by any system of assessment, or even by any extent of increased charity, is to be measured rather by the expectation excited on the part of the parishioners, than by the actual amount of money given?—By the expectation decidedly; and I think it is one evil of public charity,

that the poor, who are not very accurate arithmeticians, are apt to overrate the power of a public charity, so that the real relaxation of their habits not being proportional to the amount given, but being proportional to the amount expected, leaves them in greater misery than if no such public charity were instituted. I would state, as a kind of characteristic specimen of our Scottish peasantry, that I have at times offered a poor person 5s. as from the session, and that it has been firmly yet gratefully refused; they said they were very much obliged to me, but they had not just come to that yet, and that they could make a fend, by which they meant they could make a shift. The feeling of reluctance to public charity is very strong, and forms one of our greatest moral defences against the extension of pauperism in Scotland. I may mention that there is not a more familiar spectacle in our cottages, than the grandfather harboured for life by his own married children, and remaining with them for years the honoured inmate of the family. In fact, I have no recollection of a single instance, and I am sure it would have been branded as the most monstrous and unnatural of all things, of the desertion of relatives by relatives.

During your experience in that parish, have you the means of knowing whether there was a good deal of private charity, independently of the mere charity and performance of duty by kindred, which relieved distress where such distress existed?—Generally speaking, the people, save in a few instances, were in a remarkably good economical condition, arising, in the first place, from their own industry and economy, in the second place, from the affection of relatives, which went very far to supersede any ulterior resource; but, in the third place, there was never wanting, to the full amount of the existing necessity, a third resource in the mutual kindness of neighbours; insomuch, that I hold the fourth and last resource, or the kindness of rich to poor, to be the least important of them all. It should be recollected in estimating the product of the kindness which obtains between neighbours, that they make up, by the number of their contributions, for the smallness of each individual offering. Still there were occasional calls upon the rich; and on the whole, I found that on the strength of these four principles, matters went on quite rightly and prosperously in the parish.

In the assessed parishes now, is the condition of the peasantry as good or better than it was 30 years ago?—I am not able, from any personal observations of my own, to reply to that question.

In the unassessed parishes do you think it is?—I do not think there has been any deterioration in the unassessed parishes.

Do you think they are better or worse off in their clothing, and the possession of the comforts of life, during the last 30 years?—

I think there has been a rise in the standard of enjoyment amongst the Scotch peasantry in the last 30 years.

Is that the case also in the manufacturing population of the parishes to which you have alluded, where there are manufactures?—I should think they, notwithstanding the greater fluctuations to which they are exposed, participate, on the average, with the general population.

With respect to some of the parishes to which you have alluded, what are the habits of the working classes in those parishes, for instance, taking some of the parishes in which there are scarcely any assessments, is there much forethought and frugality among them?—I think a very great deal.

Are there any institutions for the purpose of aiding those habits there?—None in that particular parish.

For instance, in case of sickness, is there any thing similar to the benefit societies in England?—I am not aware of any; it is likely there are some in the neighbouring towns. I may mention one institution to which I attached a great deal of importance; it may look like rather a subtle influence, but I hold it to be of substantial operation. I instituted a society, which was supported by the general population, at the expence of 1*d.* a week each, for the support of religious and philanthropic objects. I conceive that this had a most wholesome influence upon their economic condition; because it raised them all to the high state and character of givers, and in that way it widened their moral distance from the condition of receivers. I think that by the institution of that society, I raised and strengthened the barrier in the way of their descent to a state of pauperism. I may also here mention, that in the generality of unassessed parishes, where the collections are kept entire, and have not been diminished by the influence of assessment, there is what I would call a most beautiful operation running along the whole margin of pauperism. It is nearly the universal practice of the peasantry in Scotland to contribute a little to the collection on Sundays; the consequence of which is, that they are insensibly formed to the habit, and they feel themselves raised to the high condition of givers, having the same effect with that which I just now ascribed to the circumstance of their being associated with the support of a philanthropic society.

Are there any institutions, such as what are called Savings' Banks, in any of those parishes?—Had I been as much acquainted with Savings' Banks then as I am now, I should certainly have instituted one in the parish of Kilmany. They are on the whole multiplying in Scotland.

Are you aware that the sum you have mentioned as paid for the assessments in those parishes which are the worst managed

in Scotland, and where the abuses you have described have made the most advance, are about the same as the sums paid in the very best managed in the northern parts of England?—I think it is very likely they may be about equal with those in contiguous parishes in the north of England.

Are the agricultural labourers, in the unassessed parishes in general, in the possession or occupation of land?—Not generally. The produce of a cow is often allowed to them; which cow belongs to the farmer, and is maintained upon the farm.

Had they gardens to their cottages?—Very small gardens.

You have stated that in your experience of that parish, there was rather a tendency to consolidate small farms into large ones; had that system the effect of lowering the condition of the poor?—I am not sensible of its having had such effect. I have no doubt they would experience the inconvenience of a transition state. It has given rise to the erection of a great many country hamlets, which have swollen into villages, and which are chiefly occupied by country artificers.

Were there any cases of illegitimacy which rendered parochial relief necessary?—The cases of illegitimacy were very infrequent, and, when they do occur, no relief is given.

You have stated that the habits of the people in those parishes were those of forethought and consideration; does that apply itself to the article of marriage as well as to other engagements into which the poor enter?—There is a remarkable contrast in this respect between one part of Scotland and another. I remember a habit that used to be in full operation, which may have declined a little, though far from being wholly extinct, that after the virtuous attachment was formed, and an engagement was entered into, there was often the delay of years occupied with the labour of collecting what they used to call a providing, which was a most enormous mass of bed and table linen, generally a great deal more than was at all needful. It was a point of distinction, in fact, amongst our Scottish peasantry, to amass a preparation of this sort, which, on the day previous to the marriage, was exhibited to all the neighbours. This produced a very wholesome delay. I have been informed that this providential sort of anticipation was carried so far that, in many instances, the grave clothes formed one article of this preparation.

Do the same habits of providing, and of forethought against expence, still continue to actuate the peasantry?—I think in country parishes that are unassessed, the habit is in a great measure unbroken; it has now taken a different direction, partly from this circumstance, that the practice of preparing what they call home-made cloth has been exchanged for the practice of purchasing

from dealers. They find this cheaper, and there has been a gradual disappearance of the household manufacture.

Do you think that the habit of forethought so exercised will have considerable effect on their subsequent conduct in after life?—Decidedly so. I consider it as a guarantee for their subsequent good conduct.

In what year did your connection with Glasgow commence?—In 1815.

To what parish in Glasgow were you appointed?—To the Tron Church parish, where I remained 4 years; I was afterwards transferred to the newly-erected parish of St. John, where I remained other 4 years, from 1819 to 1823.

Will you state the number of parishes in Glasgow, and the general system of the town management of the poor at the time you went there?—When I went there, there were eight parishes; there are now ten. The collections at the different church doors were thrown into one fund, under the administration of a body denominated the General Session. This General Session consisted of all the clergy and all the elders of the separate parishes of Glasgow. There was a distinction made between sessional poor and town hospital poor. The way in which the sessional poor were provided was, that out of the fund constituted by the separate collections from all the parishes, the general session sent back again to each parish the sum they thought right, according to their judgment of the state and necessities of each parish. With that sum each separate session supported that class of poor called the sessional. If there was felt a pressure upon the sessional fund in any parish, then so many of its sessional paupers were transferred to the compulsory fund that was under the administration of the town hospital; and the peculiarly aggravated cases were, without passing through the intermediate state of sessional pauperism, passed immediately to that institution for the more liberal or the entire support, which the kirk session could not afford them. The town hospital fund is a fund raised by assessment.

Does the town hospital imply an establishment in which the poor were received, and relief given to them?—Yes. The more helpless and aggravated cases were admitted into the house, and were called inmates; the others not admitted were called out-pensioners on the town hospital.

Was the expence of maintaining the poor in Glasgow matter of increase during the period of your residence there, taking the whole town together?—In 1803 the poor rate of Glasgow was £3940; in 1818, £11,864; in 1820 it was £13,120.

Can you state what the population was in these two years?— I have no other account to give of the population than is afforded by the parliamentary table. In the year 1811 the population was 58,343; in the year 1821 the population was 73,665; I am speaking of Glasgow within the precincts of the city, exclusive of the two great suburbs that formed the parishes of the Gorbals and the Barony.

Was the system of administering relief, at the time of your first settlement in Glasgow, the same in all the parishes of the town, or did it differ?—It was the same in all the parishes.

Have you any observations to make to the committee with respect to the condition of the first parish to which you were appointed, the Tron Church, at the time of your appointment, and during the period of your ministry?—I disliked very much the condition of the parish at the outset of my connection with it, and withdrew altogether from any share in the management of its pauperism; I felt it my duty to do so. In the eyes of the population the minister stood connected, not merely with the administration of this compulsory fund, but with the administration of a great many such charities as we call mortifications in Scotland, which are endowments for indigence, left by benevolent citizens, and who generally constitute the clergy their trustees. Among the earliest movements I made through the families, I was very much surprised at the unexpected cordiality of my welcome, the people thronging about me, and requesting me to enter their houses. I remember I could scarcely make my way to the bottom of a close in the Salt-market, I was so exceedingly thronged by the people; but I soon perceived that this was in consequence of my imagined influence in the distribution of these charities; and I certainly did feel a very great recoil, for it was so different from the principle upon which I had been received with cordiality in my country parish, where the topic of their temporal necessities was scarcely ever mentioned: I therefore resolved to dis sever myself from the administration of these charities altogether. I soon made the people understand that I only dealt in one article, that of christian instruction; and that if they chose to receive me upon this footing, I should be glad to visit them occasionally. I can vouch for it that the cordiality of the people was not only enhanced, but very much refined in its principle after this became the general understanding; that of the 10,000 entries which I have made at different times into the houses of the poor in Glasgow, I cannot recollect half-a-dozen instances in which I was not received with welcome. I thus stood aloof during those four years from the administration of all those charities, yet very desirous all the while of a parish where I should be suffered to proceed in my own way, and to manage

them upon that system which I thought most conducive both to the morality and to the economic well-being of their families; this I could not accomplish in my first situation, from the way in which we stood implicated with a general system of management; and I had no great heart to lend my aid to modifications and improvements upon a system which I felt to be radically and essentially evil. I believed that unless there was an utter change of principle, it was impossible to proceed with any degree of comfort and prosperity, and therefore it was that I kept aloof altogether from the management of the Glasgow pauperism during the first four years.

In attending to the condition of your parish during the first four years of your ministry, had you the means of observing whether those bequests and charities to which you have alluded, produced in their distribution any real or permanent good in the condition of the poor?—I have no doubt that, in as far as those charities were applicable to the relief of general indigence, they did mischief.

To what parish were you removed after you quitted the Tron parish?—There was a new parish erected by the magistrates, under the name of St. John's parish, in Glasgow, and they did me the honour of presenting me to that parish. I think it right to state, that my great inducement to the acceptance of that parish was my hope thereby to obtain a separate and independent management of the poor, which I felt it extremely difficult to obtain in my former parish from the way in which we were dovetailed and implicated with a number of distinct bodies: there was, in the first place, the general session, which resisted the separation of my parish from the general system; then I had to negotiate the matter with the magistrates; thirdly, I was resisted by the town hospital; lastly, I was complained of to the general presbytery of Glasgow; by them the matter was referred to the general assembly; so that the legal and political difficulties that stood in the way of the arrangement, were not to be told; they formed, in truth, all the difficulties of the problem, for after these were overcome, the natural difficulties turned out to be so many bugbears, and quite disappeared.

Can you state what the population of this parish was, and what was the amount of the assessment at the time of your appointment?—The population was upwards of 10,000, and was afterwards reduced to about 8000 by the erection of another parish in its neighbourhood, which other parish took a slice off mine, but the population of St. John has risen to upwards of 10,000 again, being in the eastern extremity of Glasgow, where there happens to be a great deal of vacant ground, and a great many new buildings of late.

What was the character of the population?—Exclusively manufacturing, with the exception of shopkeepers, and a few of the upper classes, amounting to about a dozen families.

What was the amount of money levied for the support of the poor in the parish of St. John, at the time of your appointment?—There is no distinct sum raised for each separate parish in Glasgow; I speak at present as to the amount of the sessional poor, who at the time of my appointment cost £225 a year. With regard to the town hospital poor, it was very difficult to ascertain the precise expenditure, consisting as it did of outlay both for inmates and out-pensioners, the latter of whom were perpetually changing their residence from one parish of Glasgow to another. I consider the most important circumstance to be, that St. John's, by certain *criteria*, could be demonstrated to be naturally the poorest parish in Glasgow, and with more than one-tenth of the population.

What system did you adopt upon your appointment for the future management of the poor of the parish of St. John?—The collection, at the time that I passed from the Tron Church parish to the parish of St. John's, was about £400 a year, and the expence of the sessional poor was £225 a year, so that the collection exceeded the expence. What I gave in return for this excess was an obligation to send no more poor to the town hospital of Glasgow, so that with the dying out of the cases that were upon the compulsory fund, this portion of Glasgow would be completely cleared of its compulsory pauperism. I did not and could not foresee what future necessities might arise for which I could now obtain no relief from the town hospital; I thought it therefore a very moderate and fair bargain, when for the surplus of £175 which I withdrew from the general fund, I undertook to send no more cases to the town hospital, so as eventually to relieve that institution of the burden of St. John's, with the disappearance of the old cases. I felt, however, that the sum of £400 in the hands of my elders, with an expenditure at the time of only £225, might induce a relaxation in the management of the poor, in which case the cost of the sessional pauperism might very soon have mounted up to £400 a year. To avoid this hazard, I succeeded in forming another body, a body of deacons, recognized in old time by the constitution of the church of Scotland, though since fallen very much into disuetude. Beside my day congregation, which consisted chiefly of the higher classes from all the different parts of the city, to whom I looked for the higher collection, I instituted an evening congregation, and gave a preference for the seats to my parishioners, who thus formed a parochial congregation. Their collection amounted only to £80 in the year, consisting chiefly of halfpennies, contributed by many, at least of the evening hearers,

though not all of them, because the practice of giving in the collection had fallen very much into disuetude among the lower classes in Glasgow. The elders were put in charge of the day collection, and out of it they relieved the existing sessional poor; that is, the sessional poor who were in being at the commencement of the scheme. The deacons were put in charge of the evening collection, and with it it was their peculiar business to entertain all the new applications, to treat them with kindness yet firmness, inquiring thoroughly into the circumstances and claims of every applicant. There never was more patient and persevering inquiry exercised by any set of men, than was exercised at the outset by my deacons. At first the result was quite uncertain, but I did anticipate that the deacons would be enabled on the £80 a year to meet the new applicants for a considerable time, during which the old pauperism, both hospital and sessional, would be dying away, after which we would get the parish of St. John translated into the moderate economy of an unassessed Scottish parish, where the poor were maintained by voluntary collections without assessment.

What was the result of the system you have described, and how far were the objects you had in view realised?—The success of the system greatly outstripped my own anticipations. I continued with them four years: the whole number of paupers admitted during those four years were 20; of which number, those admitted on the ground of general indigence were 13, and their annual expence was £32; the number admitted on the ground of extraordinary and hopeless disease was 2, and their annual expence was £14 16s.; the number admitted on the ground of that necessity which springs from crime was 5, there being two illegitimate children, and three families of runaway husbands, whose annual expence amounted to £19 10s. So that, when I left St. John's, the annual expenditure of the new pauperism that had been formed was £66 6s.

Can you state what the decrease of the whole pauperism was in that interval, and how your relation stood with the town hospital funds at the close of your proceedings?—The decrease was so great that I felt myself warranted to do what I could not have ventured upon at the outset: I made an offer to the town hospital of relieving them of all their pauperism that they could fairly trace to the parish of St. John at any former period; I took the whole of that pauperism upon the sessional fund, leaving the deacons to the exclusive management, as before, of the new cases, and leaving the elders to the management of the old pauperism, now augmented; because, in the first instance, they had only to do with the sessional, but now they also undertook the town hospital pauperism connected with St. John's. After all, I found that was

not enough for the absorption of the sum raised by the day collection, and I confess that I had a twofold object in devising for it an additional topic of expenditure: I wished, in the first instance, to give such a direction to it as might conduce to the moral good of the population; and therefore I took away £500 from the accumulated sum now in the hands of the elders, and succeeded therewith in endowing a parish school; besides that the session charged themselves with £75 a year for salaries to three other teachers. My other object was to prevent too great an accumulation of money, and for this purpose to provide a safe and salutary absorbent. The truth is, that a large capital in the hands of a kirk session, might produce, to a certain degree, the same mischief that the regular and ample ministrations of compulsory pauperism do.

Did you contemplate, amongst the benefits connected with the alteration of system, a different and improved system of management, derived from the local nature of parochial arrangements, as compared with the central management of the general session and the town hospital?—In one respect, the old and the new managements are alike. It is the practice to divide each parish into districts, which districts are called proportions. I divided my own parish into 25 proportions, and assigned a proportion to each deacon. When I had the full number of deacons, which was not always the case, each had the management of a population of about 400.

Was not the principle of that management local management; whereas the principle of the former system was rather general superintendence, as connected with the entire town?—Yes, in as far as the administration of the town hospital fund was concerned. And, even under the old sessional management, they had not the full benefit of the local principle; which can only be secured by a local distribution, emanating not from a general fund but out of the local means.

Do you attach great importance to that distinction of principle between a local administration and a more central and general administration?—I attach the greatest importance to it.

Did you find it difficult to obtain the co-operation of your parishioners in filling the office of deacons?—The deacons, generally speaking, were not parishioners; I would have preferred their being so, but ours was the most plebeian parish in Glasgow, and there were very few of that class to whom I could have confided the administration of the poor's fund; but I found no difficulty in obtaining the requisite agency from other parts of the city.

What effect did you find to be produced by your alteration of system upon the habits of the poor within the parish?—They were certainly not in a worse economic condition in consequence of the

change of system, than the other parishes of Glasgow; and seeing that the expenditure was so much more moderate, the only inference is that there must have been a compensation for the smallness of the parochial allowance from some other quarters; and I can think of no other sources out of which that compensation could come, than such as would contribute very much both to the comfort and character of the population. - In the first instance, there must have been a certain stimulus to their own industry and economy, when loosened from their dependence upon the large compulsory fund. In the second instance, there must have been an increased aid and support from relatives to each other. In the third, there must have been an increased kindness amongst the poor in the contiguous families of that neighbourhood; that I consider a very important resource; and the last, which I consider as comparatively unimportant, and of which I did not avail myself, during all the four years of my connection with St. John's, in more than twelve instances that I can recollect, must have been a stimulated benevolence on the part of the more wealthy to the poorer classes.

Are you then of opinion that there was not more of unrelieved distress under your improved system at St. John's, than there had been when the expenditure for the poor had been so much larger?—I am quite of opinion that there was much less, because, in the four sources of relief just mentioned, there must have been greatly more than an over-passing compensation for all that had been withdrawn from them in the shape of public charity.

Were you able to trace, in any instances, the action of this principle of compensation in the private relief given, as compared with what would have been the relief given under a system of parochial assessment?—I never, during my whole experience in Glasgow, knew a single instance of distress which was not followed up by the most timely forthgoings of aid and of sympathy from the neighbours; I could state a number of instances to that effect. I remember going into one of the deepest and most wretched recesses in all Glasgow, where a very appalling case of distress met my observation: that of a widow, whose two grown-up children had died within a day or two of each other. I remember distinctly seeing both their corpses on the same table; it was my own parish. I was quite sure that such a case could not escape the observation of neighbours; I always liked to see what amount of kindness came spontaneously forth upon such occasions, and I was very much gratified to learn, a few days after, that the immediate neighbours occupying that little alley or court, laid together their little contributions, and got her completely over her Martinmas difficulties. I never found it otherwise, though I have often distinctly observed, that whenever there

was ostensible relief obtruded upon the eyes of the population, they did feel themselves discharged from a responsibility for each other's wants, and released from the duty of being one another's keepers; and this particular case of distress met the observation of the Female Society at Glasgow, which society bears upon the general population, and with a revenue of some hundreds a year, from which it can afford very little in each individual instance, besides the impossibility of having that minute and thorough acquaintance with the cases that obtains under a local management. I remember having heard that a lady, an agent of that society, went up stairs to relieve this widow, and gave all that the Female Society empowered her to give, which was just 5s. The people, observing this movement, felt that the poor woman was in sufficient hands, and that they were now discharged from all further responsibility. So that the opening of this ostensible source of relief closed up far more effectual sources, that I am sure would never have failed her.

Was this a solitary instance, or were there others that would lead to the support of the general conclusion that might be derivable from the case you have stated?—There are several such instances which I put upon record, and I think I could do more justice perhaps to the subject, if I may be permitted to read one or two of them. “The first case that occurs to us is that of a weaver, who, though he had 6*d.* a day as a pension, was certainly put into circumstances of difficulty, when two winters ago, in a season of great depression, the typhus fever made its daily inroads upon his household. His distress was in the highest degree striking and noticeable; and it may therefore look strange that no sessional movement was made towards the relief of so afflicted a family. Our confidence was in the sympathies and kind offices of the immediate neighbourhood; and we felt quite assured that any interference of ours might have checked or superseded these to such a degree as would have intercepted more of aid than is ever granted by the most liberal and wealthiest of all our public institutions. An outcry, however, was raised against us, and we felt compelled, for our own vindication, to investigate as far as we could the amount of supplies that had been rendered, and actually found that it exceeded at least ten times the whole sum that would have been allowed, in the given circumstances, out of the fund raised by assessment. It reconciled us the more to our new system, when given to understand that the most liberal of all the benefactions was called forth by the simple information, that nothing had been done by any of the legal or parochial charities.” There was a case that comes vividly home to my recollection, that of a mother and daughter, both of whom were afflicted with cancer; I said to one of my agents that we really must interfere in this. The agent, who was a very enlightened and sensible

person, and taught a sabbath-school in the place, replied, "I would certainly have asked the session to have interfered, but I do not like to arrest a very beautiful process that is now going on, and by which the most timely supplies of aid and service are now pouring into the household." I did not want to deprive the neighbours of the opportunity of exercising their kind affections when they were so willing to do it; I was in the habit of visiting them occasionally, but the topic of their temporal distress was never obtruded by them upon me, and never once introduced by me to them; and I was perfectly assured that everything was going on rightly, through the mere workings of the natural process, left undisturbed by the operation of a public and proclaimed charity. The case was this: "A mother and daughter, the sole occupiers of a single apartment, were both afflicted with cancer, for which the one had to undergo an operation, while the other was so far gone as to be irrecoverable. A case so impressive as this required only to be known that it might be met and provided for; and on the first warning of its necessity, a subscription could easily have been raised out of the unforced liberalities of those who had been attracted from a distance, by the mere report of the circumstance having made its natural progress to their ears; and what then was it that superseded the necessity of such a measure? the exuberant and as yet untired kindness of those who were near, and whose willing contributions both of food, and of service, and of cordials, had lighted up a moral sunshine in this habitation of distress. Were it right that any legal charity whatever should arrest a process so beautiful? Were it even right that the interference of the wealthier at a distance should lay a freezing interdict on the play of those lesser streams, which circulate around the abode of penury and pain? We want not to exonerate the rich from their full share in the burden of this world's philanthropy; but it is delightful to think that while, with their mightier gifts, an educational apparatus could be reared for good christian tuition to the people, and good scholarship to their families, and so a barrier be set up against the profligacy of cities, there is meanwhile a spirit and a capability among the poor wherewith it is easy to ward off the scarcely inferior mischief of a corrupt and degrading pauperism." The history of this case is, that the mother died first, and the daughter died in about a year and a half after the commencement of my acquaintance with them, and I told the person who stood on as a kind of observer, not to allow these people to suffer from want, and she said she would certainly make a communication the moment she found it necessary; but the conduct of the immediate neighbourhood superseded the necessity of any exertion whatever in behalf of those people during those eighteen months, at the end of which we were called upon to take part in an easy subscription for the expences of the funeral.

That was a case which, had it been brought before the town hospital, would have superseded and arrested this process of kindness among the immediate neighbours. "A very fine example of the natural sufficiency that there is among the people, under even the most trying of domestic reverses, took place a few years anterior to our connection with St. John's. A family of six lost both parents by death: there were three children unable to provide for themselves, and the other three were earning wages. On an impression that they were not able to maintain themselves, application was made by them to their elder for the admittance of the three youngest into the town hospital, where, at the average of indoor pensioners, their maintenance at least would have cost £20 a year. He remonstrated with them on the evil of thus breaking up the family; on the duty of the older to see after the education and subsistence of the younger branches; and on the disgrace it would bring to them, by consigning their younger brothers and sisters to pauperism. He assured them that they would find comparatively little difference in the sum which it required to maintain them when they all remained together, and offered them a small quarterly allowance as long as they should feel it necessary, would they try the experiment of keeping together, and helping on each other to the best of their ability. They gave way to this right moral suasion, and application for the stipulated quarterly sum was only made twice. Thus, by a trifling expenditure, a sum at least fifty-fold was saved to the town hospital. But the worth of such management to the habit and condition of the family cannot be estimated in gold. Who is there that does not applaud the advice, and rejoice in the ultimate effect of it? We could hold no sympathy either with the heart or understanding of him who should censure such a style of proceeding; and our conceptions lie in an inverse proportion from his altogether of the good, and the better, and the best, in the treatment of human nature."

Were there any Irish families among your parishioners in St. John's?—A good many.

Did you find them, under that kind treatment you have described, as amicable in their conduct, and as orderly as the Scotch families?—As amicable, certainly; but, in respect of order and sobriety, there is a marked distinction between the Scotch and the Irish families. At the same time, although there was a great deal said about the burthen of the Irish poor, I think that, under a purely gratuitous system, that and every other burthen might be made indefinitely small.

Was there a very great degree of labour on your part, or on the part of your deacons, required for carrying this system of

management into effect?—I think I can give the committee complete information upon that question, and I am glad it has been put, because it is a question relative to which there exists a very great degree of misconception, as if the plan was not imitable in other parishes, from the immense agency required. In point of fact, we laboured under a very inconvenient press of applications at the outset of our proceedings, because the understanding of the population was, that we had found out a new method of supplying the poor, which they conceived of course was just some extraordinary contrivance for pouring abundance into the lap of every family. This produced rather an inconvenient re-action at the outset, and there was a great and almost menacing press of applications; the deacons were therefore a good deal burdened with the business of inquiry at the first, but when the poor found that the object of that enquiry was to ascertain what their natural resources were, and that no public relief was given unless they could demonstrate that their case was worse than the case of a pauper relieved and supplied in other parishes, then they simply ceased to apply; they were thrown back upon their own natural resources, and felt the sufficiency of them in the way which I have already mentioned; and so our deacons, instead of being oppressed by the burthen and the strenuousness of their management, wrought themselves, in a very few months, into the condition of so many sinecurists, who at length had little or nothing to do; the people ceased to apply, and, in the course of a few weeks or months, we fell down to one-fifth of the applications to which we were exposed under the old system. I consider as particularly valuable the answers of these practical and experimental men to certain queries which I circulated amongst them before I left Glasgow; I wished to know particularly the local and intimate experience of each of the deacons relative to the families committed to his charge, and I thought that in that way, more effectually than in any other, I could fully expose the interior mechanism, as it were, of the operations that went on under the new system of pauperism. With the permission of the committee, I will first read the questions contained in the circulars which I addressed to them; they were as follow:

1. "Of what proportion is it in St. John's parish that you are deacon?"
2. "What is its population, as nearly as you can infer from your latest survey?"
3. "How many paupers belong to it that are upon the deacon's fund?"
4. "How many applications may you have for parochial relief, monthly or quarterly, as near as you can remember?"

5. "What time may the business of attending to these applications, and necessary inquiries that you had to make in consequence of them, have cost you upon the whole?"

6. "Are the applications more or less frequent since you entered upon your office?"

7. "Could you state how much time you are required to sacrifice, per week or per month, in making the requisite investigations that you are actually called to?"

8. "Do you think that a man in ordinary business would find the task of meeting the pauperism of such a district as yours so laborious as to put him to any sensible inconvenience?"

9. "Will you have the goodness to state any circumstances connected with your management that you think might elucidate the nature of the duties or attentions that you have had to discharge."

One of the deacons says, "The latest survey was taken about a month ago, and from it I observe that this proportion contains 335 inhabitants. There is not at present a single pauper in this proportion upon the deacon's fund: nor has there occurred either an occasional or permanent case, requiring assistance from this fund, since I received the charge of it in the month of May, 1822. The number of applications for relief in this proportion has been very few during the last twelve months, not amounting, to the best of my recollection, to more than seven, or about an average one every two months. Upon a review of these cases, I compute that I may have bestowed upon them about sixteen hours in the whole, or about a quarter of an hour per week at the utmost. All those applications for relief to which I have alluded, occurred during the first six months after accepting office; which leaves nine months, during which I have not had a single application for parish relief. Before I could be prevailed upon to take charge of this proportion, I imagined that, in consequence of my professional avocations, it would be quite impossible for me to accomplish such an object; but I was very much astonished to find, after a few months' trial, how simple a matter it was, and how easily managed; indeed, so light and pleasant did the duty seem, that I thought if all the other proportions were equally manageable, I could take upon me to manage the whole parish, and attend to my business besides. I am of opinion, that the first thing necessary to the proper discharge of the office which I hold, is to get immediately acquainted with every house and family in the proportion, in order to check any imposition which may otherwise be practised, and also to facilitate the investigation of every case which may occur."

Another deacon says, "Population 466: not one pauper at present: have one application every five months nearly, and have had none for six months and a half past. If the question as to the time necessary for doing the work of a deacon, refer merely to the time requisite to investigate the cases, I would say an hour in five months; but if to attendance at the examination of schools, making up a list of population, attending at the church for the evening collection, going to the several houses about the church seats, &c., then the time must be very considerably greater; probably, from the calculation made in a general way from memory, about one hour and a quarter per month. There would be no sensible inconvenience incurred by any man from being a deacon, if his duties are solely confined to the pauperism. Although I have acted as a deacon for about twenty-seven months, yet the cases have been so very few, that my experience has been very limited, and consequently I am not able I think to suggest anything which is likely to be useful; I may, however, just remark, that I think the two most requisite qualities in a deacon are kindness and firmness; kindness, that the people may be perfectly persuaded he is endeavouring to do everything for their good: firmness, that he may be able to resist pathetic but ill-grounded applications for relief. If he also possess some knowledge of the habits and character of the poor, he will be more likely to be able to be of service to them, and will run less risk of being imposed upon."*

What was the condition of Glasgow, and more particularly in your parish of St. John, during the years to which your experience more particularly refers?—The condition of Glasgow was perhaps the worst that had ever occurred; it was at the time that radicalism was at its height, and this radicalism had taken the unfortunate and alarming direction of insisting upon the English law of parochial aid being introduced and acted upon all over the city. I was waited upon by deputies from a very large associated body of operatives, and they presented a petition for the establishment of parochial aid all over Glasgow. I was enabled to meet it in this way: I observed that I had extricated myself from the general management of Glasgow, and that rather than give an answer therefore to the representatives of a general associated body representing the whole town, I would confer with representatives from those members of the body who belonged to the

* Several other extracts are given by Dr. Chalmers, but as they are of very similar character to the preceding, it is not necessary to repeat them here. One deacon states that the population of his proportion is 284; and that there were no paupers on either the deacon's fund or on the session; although the proportion is one of the poorest in all St. John's parish. One states that the readiness of the deacons to procure employment for such as may find any difficulty in doing it, serves as a check against the lazy and indolent from applying for aid.

parish of St. John, and that I had no doubt I would be enabled to give a satisfactory answer to their application; the only answer I gave was, that I was quite sure that our deacons met every specific application in a kind and patient manner, and that if there was any specific case of distress amongst them, I was quite sure that it would be so met. The truth is, that it was the mere working of a legal or political spirit which actuated this movement; and, when met by a challenge that each should expose his personal wants, there was felt the good wholesome Scotch aversion to come under any thing like the cognizance or surveillance of the kirk session, and so I heard no more of it.

Was there considerable distress prevailing amongst the manufacturers, and a reduction in the rate of wages, and the demand for labour?—A very considerable distress; in consequence of which there was a general subscription raised, of which subscription our people shared.

Can you state what proportion the parish of St. John received of that general subscription?—I can confidently say that it was a much smaller proportion than the rest of Glasgow received.

Was the smallness of that proportion owing to the less necessity there was for extraordinary relief in your parish?—I think it was owing very much to the business of requisite inquiry being confided to our deacons, who were so very expert in it that all cases of unworthy application were intercepted.

20TH MAY, 1830.

Can you state whether, under the operation of the system which you have described to have been introduced and practised in the parish of St. John, any considerable reduction took place in the amount of assessment, and in the number of persons receiving relief?—The whole of the assessment for St. John's was cleared away. In as far as the general assessment for the city was concerned, there was a considerable reduction at first, and which reduction was explained by those who were not friendly to the system on principles altogether different from any relief that had been rendered, in consequence of the withdrawal of all new pauperism from the parish of St. John.

Do you suppose that the system pursued at St. John's might have had the effect of banishing paupers from that parish, and throwing them upon other parts of the city of Glasgow?—That was certainly the imagination at one time; but we produced quite satisfactory evidence of the interchange of paupers between

St. John's and the other parishes of Glasgow being quite against our parish. I can state in numbers what importation of paupers we received from the other parishes, and what number of paupers left us during the time of my connection with St. John's. The egress of our poor to other parishes amounted to 15: the ingress from other parishes amounted to 29 in four years.

Can you state whether there has been any reduction in the expence of assessment in the other parts of Glasgow, which was concurrent with the entire extinction of the assessment in the parish of St. John?—There was first a reduction, and then after that an increase. I do not ascribe much influence, either in the one way or the other, to the success of the experiment in St. John's, because, along with the relief that our parish gave to the general assessment, there might be insensibly, and without reflection on any body of men, a slight relaxation on the part of the management of the town hospital; and it is very easy, from that cause alone, to account for the creation of as much additional pauperism in the other parishes as would compensate the extinction of pauperism in the parish of St. John. In point of fact, however, I believe the management by the directors of the town hospital to be as good as under the system is at all possible. I have never reflected against their management, but against that principle of a compulsory provision, the mischief of which no management can neutralise.

Have you been able to trace the condition of the parish of St. John subsequently to your removal from thence?—I have had correspondence with the present managers of St. John's parish within these few weeks, from which I am enabled to give the committee a precise statement of the condition of the pauperism there at this moment. The whole annual expence of St. John's pauperism in September, 1829, which is the time at which they make up their accounts, was £384 17s. 7d.*

Can you state what is the average number of those who have derived assistance from this fund, in the parish of St. John?—When we commenced our operations we had 117 sessional poor, and, as far as they could be traced, 49 hospital poor; the sessional poor we ourselves undertook, the others we left to the town hospital. This number of 117 was reduced to 98, by the abstraction of a slice from the parish; and, during my incumbency in St. John's, it was further reduced to 77. The achievement would have been equal to my own expectation, although that number had remained stationary, because the whole promise of the

* In another answer he states that of this £384 17s. 7d. the expence for lunatics is £34 17s. 9d., and the expence for orphans and deserted children £117 8s. 0d. He states that the only benefit St. John's derived from the town hospital, was a little occasional aid from the hospital surgeons.

achievement was, that no new cases were to be sent to the town hospital, but, in point of fact, the sessional poor were reduced in number.

The last letter to which you have adverted was in 1826; have you any subsequent accounts of the parish of St. John?—I have a very satisfactory letter from Mr. M'Farlane, my first successor, who has been transferred to another parish in Glasgow, dated 20th of April, 1830.

“My dear Sir,

“You cannot be more fully satisfied of the excellence of the St. John's system of pauperism than I am, nor can I imagine how any man who approves of our country parish system can object to it, for it has always appeared to me to be neither more nor less than the Scottish country parish system applied by means of a peculiar agency or machinery to our city parishes. I hope to be able, at no distant period, to shew that if there is in our large towns a greater number of poor, there is also a much greater amount of wealth to supply the wants of the poor, and no want of a disposition to apply it to that purpose. The St. John's system appears to me to create the link which connects the rich and the beneficent with the poor, it being the office of the deacons not only to prevent imposture by their rigid examination of all the cases which come before them, but also to bring the real and deserving poor under the eye of those who may have it in their power to provide work for their children, or to contribute otherwise to their relief. As the friend of the poor, I am an advocate for the system; I am convinced that if it universally prevailed in our large towns, it would greatly alleviate much of the misery which now exists, and, by creating and strengthening habits of industry and economy, would promote materially the moral improvement, and consequently the happiness of the poor.

“The experience of sixteen months, during which I was minister of St. John's, confirmed the favourable opinion which I previously entertained of the system; it worked well in all respects; with an income from collections not much exceeding £300 we kept down the pauperism of a parish containing a population of 10,000, and I know from actual observation that the poor were in better condition, and, excepting the worthless and the profligate who applied, and were refused assistance, were more contented and happy than the poor in the other parishes of Glasgow; I was also agreeably disappointed at finding that Dr. Chalmers was not the only person having sufficient influence to obtain the aid of the respectable members of his congregation in administering the affairs of the poor. I had not the smallest difficulty in procuring a sufficient number of deacons for that purpose.

“You are aware, that in the month of November, 1825, I was appointed to another parish in this city, at that time under the old system; and although that system was better administered in St. Enoch's parish than it was perhaps in any other in similar circumstances, I could not fail to perceive its defects, and therefore, with the concurrence of the kirk session, a system in all essential points similar to that of St. John's has been established. It has now been in operation for eight or nine months, and has hitherto succeeded to my utmost wishes. The assessment is the only thing that stands in my way; it chills both public and private charity; many of the wealthy members of my congregation do not hesitate to assign it as an apology for contributing sparingly to our church-door collections; and I fear it has a pernicious influence on their habits of private charity; notwithstanding, we are confident of success.

“Wishing all success to those who would ward off from the *poor* of Ireland the dreadful influence of poor rates,

“I am, my dear Sir,

“Your's always sincerely,

“PATRICK M'FARLANE.”

I have to state that we are under very peculiar disadvantages in these parishes, St Enoch's and St. John's; because it has a paralyzing influence on the liberalities of the wealthy to our poor, that those wealthy are also brought in to support the expenditure of the general system in Glasgow, and it is extremely discouraging, that although we have cleared away the burden of a compulsory provision from the parish of St. John, yet the householders and the proprietors in that parish are just as much subject as before to assessment for the general expences of the poor in the city.

Having brought your evidence on the subject of the parish of St. John up to the date of your last letter in 1830, will you describe the district which is called the Barony of Glasgow, and the system which there prevails for the relief of the poor?—I believe the population of the Barony is now upwards of 60,000, it was about 50,000 when I left Glasgow. The principle of a legal assessment was introduced into that parish so late as 1810, and I have reason to know, very much against the opinion of the minister. Before that time the whole expence of maintaining the poor seldom exceeded £600 a year; about the year 1810, or to speak precisely, according to the census of 1811 the population was 37,216, an exclusively manufacturing population, with the exception of a country district belonging to it. I have lost sight of the Barony since 1817, which was seven years after the adoption of the method of assessment, but the burden increased nearly six times in the short space of seven years, the expenditure rising considerably above £3000.

During those seven years were you able to estimate the effects of this increased expence upon the condition of the poor themselves?—I could say in the general that, abstracting from those fluctuations that proceed from other causes, such as the state of trade, there was no sensible improvement produced by the increase of this expenditure.

Is there not another district in Glasgow which is called the Gorbals?—That is the southern suburb of Glasgow.

What is the population?—I believe now between 20,000 and 30,000; but, at the time I took an account of its expenditure, its population was upwards of 20,000.

Is that a manufacturing population?—Exclusively a manufacturing population.

Are there any causes in the actual condition of the population themselves, that would, under similar circumstances, make the condition of the population in the Gorbals better than that of the population of the Barony?—No; I should think rather worse; because there are no agricultural resources, whereas the Barony has a large country parish.

Is the assessment principle introduced into the Gorbals?—Not that I am aware of; it was not introduced there very recently.

Can you state what is the voluntary contribution applied in the unassessed district of the Gorbals for the relief of the poor?—The whole expenditure was £350.

Can you compare the state of the poor in the unassessed district of the Gorbals, with an expenditure of £350, with the state of the assessed district of the Barony, when the assessment had reached £3000?—There is one very palpable test of the relative condition of the three districts, one of them being Glasgow proper, which occurred in 1817, there was an extraordinary expenditure of about £10,000, raised by subscription, in order to meet the distress of the population, incurred by a very extraordinary depression that had taken place in the trade. This subscription applied to all the three districts, and was distributed by a committee of management which sat in judgment on all the individual applications. The whole sum required for the extraordinary wants of 1817, in the Gorbals, was £835.

What was the amount of extraordinary relief required for the Barony?—I have not the numerical statement by me, but the Barony required somewhat more than three times the money, whereas its population is only somewhat more than double but not nearly three times the population of the Gorbals.

Can you state the entire amount of relief required for the poor of Glasgow, and the proportion of that relief which was taken for

the Gorbals?—There was about £10,000 expended on all the three districts, and only £835 on the Gorbals. I cannot state with numerical precision the sum expended on Glasgow proper. Its population was very little more than one-third of the population of the Gorbals, and the amount of relief which it required was somewhat more than seven times the sum which the Gorbals required, so that the disproportion between Glasgow and the Gorbals is much greater than the disproportion between the Barony and the Gorbals, that is, the district longest under assessment required the largest proportion, and the least proportion was required in the district that had not been under assessment at all.

Therefore the measure of assessment would seem almost a measure of the distress which remained to be relieved by extraordinary means?—Precisely so. I think it right to say, in regard to the present state of St. John's, as justifying a reliance upon the result of our experiment, that there is in one respect a very great precariousness; for let two or three only of the agents relax their management by a very little, such is the inherent power of increase in all systems of public charity which are carelessly conducted, that it would be in the power even of these few to upset the experiment. The true doctrinal inference which may be drawn out of the past history of St. John's, ought not to be affected by anything future in the history of that parish, particularly when one adverts to the very great discouragements by which the parish is surrounded, as well as the great mischief which it is in the power even of a small fraction of the agency to bring upon the parish, by letting down the strictness of their administration. The discouragements are great indeed; the establishment of a new system always makes slow progress among practical men, inasmuch that I have found it far easier practically to do the thing, than to convince men that the thing is practicable. There is a considerable feeling of hostility to this gratuitous method of relieving the poor. In reference to a question which was put two days ago, regarding the expenditure in the northern parishes of England under their best management, as being equal to the expenditure of the Scottish border parishes, where assessments have been introduced under their worst management, the reason of that I apprehend to be, the system of assessment has not had the same time to work in the border parishes that it has had in England. It appears to me a very prevalent delusion on the subject of our Scottish pauperism, that people are always looking for its benefits to our method of dispensation, or to the construction of our courts of supply; whereas I hold the benefit of the Scottish system to lie altogether in the reflex influence which a gratuitous economy of relief, with its moderate allowances, will always have upon the habits and expectations of a people. The

English principle of a compulsory provision grafted on our Scottish machinery, may do as much mischief in the one country as it has done in the other.

Are there any other instances in Scotland of parishes that have been liable to compulsory assessment, where that compulsory assessment, as in St. John's, has been abandoned, and gone to the system you adopted there?—There are several parishes under what I call the retracing process: there is the parish of Dirlton, in the county of East Lothian; there has been an exceedingly good book written upon the subject by the clergyman, Mr. Stark, of Dirlton. The parish of Dumblane, a good many years ago, adopted the retracing system, and fully succeeded in it. There is another parish in Berwickshire, but the name has escaped me. We cannot expect, however, that the attempt will often be made in the present state of the law.

Would you be of opinion that the retracing system might generally be adopted in Scotland?—I think with certainty of success; but that it ought to be commenced in a particular way, and if that be not attended to, the enterprise may be spoiled or put off for a considerable time. There are two distinct processes, both of which should be observed, when the object is to work a whole country out of its pauperism; there is the parochial process, and what I should be inclined to call the parliamentary process or the legal one. In as far as the parochial process is concerned, I would provide for the old cases that were actually upon the compulsory fund out of that fund until they had died out, so that it would require several years before we got quit of the compulsory provision; I would meet in the meanwhile all the new applications with the money raised by collections, just as they do in any Scottish parish; what I should anticipate is, that before the collection is overtaken by the new cases, the old cases will have died out, and have disengaged the compulsory fund altogether, so as to bring the parish back again to the gratuitous economy that obtains generally in Scotland; but it appears to me that before this can be carried into effect, there must be an interposition on the part of Parliament, because it is at all times competent for a dissatisfied claimant, more especially if backed by any powerful enemies to the system in his neighbourhood, to bring the administrators to the bar of the court of session, and it is very unpleasant to be overhung by any possibility of that sort, so that there would be a necessity for such a law as would protect every retracing parish from an appeal to the court of session, by making its kirk session an ultimate court. Now, in going about to frame such a law, there is a most material distinction that I think should be proceeded on between the effect of a compulsory and that of a permissive law. Suppose that a bill were brought into Parliament, making it imperative on all

the assessed parishes to adopt this system; those parishes are not yet prepared for the measure, they have not information or conviction upon the subject, the consequence of which is, that there behoved to be a very strong and general opposition to such a law wherever the compulsory assessment prevailed. Accordingly, we did experience this opposition in a recent attempt to reform Scottish pauperism; Glasgow and Edinburgh petitioned, and almost all the great towns, with many of the counties, petitioned against such a measure passing into a law; they would have had no interest in thus resisting it, if it had been merely permissive; and the effect of such permission, I feel persuaded, would have been that we should have had so many trial parishes at this moment working themselves out of their compulsory pauperism, while the more unmanageable and difficult parishes would have been standing by and waiting the result of the experiment. The success of those would awaken the attention of other parishes, and thus piecemeal, and by a successive process, the country may at length have been wholly delivered from its pauperism.

It has sometimes been suggested, that however expedient or possible it may be without a compulsory provision of assessment in agricultural parishes, that such a system is absolutely necessary to meet the fluctuations which arise in manufacturing districts, and the alterations in the amount of wages; what is your opinion upon the subject?—It does not at all accord with my experience that a compulsory provision is more necessary in a manufacturing than in an agricultural parish; and I perceive one very great disadvantage arising from it in the former class of parishes: in a season of great depression, when wages fall as low as 5s. or 6s. a week, those wages are supplemented by some small additional allowance of 1s. 6d. perhaps or 2s. a week. This keeps the people at their professional work, which has the effect of keeping up the glut in the market, and so lengthening out those seasons of depression to which every manufacturing population is liable.

Does not the compulsory system also act upon the habits of the poor during those periods when, in the fluctuation of wages, by increased demand and increased employment, wages become very high?—It acts, I think, by a very mischievous influence upon the habits of the poor during those periods, because it gives the feeling that they may be as reckless and extravagant as they like in good times, from having this to resort to in bad times.

Is that opinion supported by your observation of facts, as well as by your reasoning upon general principles?—I think it is supported by the observation of a good many facts. I remember in a season of great depression in Glasgow, the question was, whether the unemployed people, or the people who alleged themselves to be unemployed, should be supported by an additional allowance,

or whether work at low wages should be held out to them, that would detach them from their professional employment; I strongly advocated the latter method, because I said the former method just kept them at their looms, and kept up the glut in the market, and so perpetuated and aggravated the very evil that it was intended to remedy; whereas, if they withdrew so many of them from their professional work, and gave them any other, such as ground work upon the green of Glasgow, or the breaking of stones, it would be found much less expensive to defray the entire maintenance of all who offered themselves for this extra professional work, than to keep them all at their professional work at a fraction of the cost of their maintenance in the shape of a supplementary allowance; I think it is the uniform experience of manufacturing towns, that with the former method it is much easier to get over a season of depression than with the latter method. Now, with a poor rate in a manufacturing town, we have the whole disadvantage of the latter method, because we just supplement the defective wages, whereas, in a natural state of things, we have the advantage of the former method, by the people dispersing themselves, and quitting for a season their professional work. Many of them, in these excursions, abandon the town and find out for themselves some employment in the country, which detaches them from their looms for a period. There was a very instructive survey, and pregnant with weightiest inference upon this subject, made by Mr. McClelland, of Glasgow, at a season of great depression; he took account of all the looms in Glasgow and its neighbourhood, for the purpose of ascertaining how many were unoccupied; the number of looms in operation in ordinary times was 18,537, but at this season he found only 13,231 at work, leaving 5256 looms idle. This must have been a very wholesome cessation, the benefit of which is greatly impaired under a system of poor rate. In a natural state of things, there is a freer dispersion of people away from their professional employment; whereas there is an adhesive virtue in the poor rate, which keeps the people together, and so lengthens out every season of over-laden markets and low wages.

Do you consider that the compulsory system of relief has a tendency of raising or of lowering the rate of wages?—Decidedly to lower the rate of wages. When wages are helped by the allowance system, they may be resolved into two ingredients: the one consisting of wages, and the other the sum given from the poor rate. I have no doubt that the whole recompense for labour, as made up of both ingredients, is lower than the whole recompense would have been in a natural state of things.

Comparing two countries in which the rate of wages is higher in the one than in the other, and a free intercourse of labour subsisting between them; if in one of those countries no compulsory

system of wages prevails, and labour is cheap, and there is in consequence an emigration from that country to the other where labour is dear, do you consider that the introduction of a poor's rate in the country where labour is cheap would have a tendency to increase the emigration or diminish it?—I think it would tend to increase the emigration.

That would result upon the principles you have described of lowering the rate of wages, and thereby increasing the difference in the rate of wages in the two countries?—Yes.

Would it not have this additional inducement to seek labour in the other country, that by the poor law there would be a provision made for the females and the children of the labourer who came to seek employment elsewhere?—Yes, and in that way discharge him from the necessity of staying at home. It strikes me, that if it be proposed to establish the compulsory system in a country contiguous to our own, it may be done in different ways: if it be meant that it shall be divested of what has often been called the worst feature of the English pauperism, the allowance system, then I do not see how the emigration can be at all lessened, because if the poor's fund is only to be applied to the impotent and the aged, those are not the people to whom we are exposed, we have still as large a body as ever of able and healthy men coming over, who are discharged, in fact, from the necessity of remaining at home, and who will therefore come over in greater numbers: if, on the other hand, it be proposed to establish in the country the English system in all its entireness, granting an allowance to able-bodied labourers as well as to the others, then if this extends only to a part of the able-bodied labourers of the land, the sure effect will be the general reduction of wages throughout the whole body, so that the part not having the benefit of those allowances will be under a much stronger necessity than before to come to this country; or, lastly, if in order to meet this, it be proposed to extend allowances to able-bodied labourers to the population *en masse*, this, without after all accomplishing the object of lessening emigration, would lead the country into such an expence as would be tantamount to a sentence of extinction upon its landed property.

Do you consider that the questions you have answered in the abstract would apply to the condition of things existing between England and Ireland?—I certainly do; I think it descriptive of the relative condition of the two countries.

Supposing relief in distress to be given by employment, what effect do you conceive it would produce upon the free industry of persons not receiving that relief, and upon the natural application of capital?—I think it must be injurious, if it be proposed to give relief through the medium of work, and if this be a work that a certain population are already engaged in, then by bringing down

the price of their commodity, it must operate to the prejudice of the free labourers.

Supposing in a population of 10,000 weavers, 2000 of those weavers being thrown out of employment, are employed in weaving in a public establishment for the relief of distress, does not that produce, in addition to the general lowering of prices, a principle of competition not founded upon the principles of profit, but founded upon the hope of benefit and charity, which must derange the ordinary operations of industry on the part of the 8000 weavers, who would be otherwise employed?—I certainly think so; it must lessen their wages, and also lessen, if not destroy, the profits of the capitalist.

If relief be given in proportion to the number of children, what would be the consequences that you would calculate upon?—I think it is quite clear that that must operate as a bounty upon population, and so aggravate the general distress of the country.

Do you consider that any correction of the administration of the principle of assessment can correct the evils you have described as being incident to the system itself?—I do not think that any improvement in the method of administration can make head against the essential and inherent evil of the principle.

Should you apply the same observation with respect to the evils of assessment to a country not in a high state of civilization, that you would apply to a country in the condition of Great Britain?—I think that if the principle of assessment for the relief of poverty be introduced, it will deteriorate the condition of any country.

You think that if it were applied to the condition of the least improved of the European countries, it would have a tendency to lower the condition of that country?—I certainly think that it would.

Supposing the retracing system which you have described followed, do you conceive there would be a danger of increased suffering, if, after due preparation by that retracing process, the power of compulsory assessment were altogether withdrawn?—I am quite satisfied that, upon the abolition of the compulsory system, there would ensue a full compensation to the people for the whole amount that had been withdrawn from them in consequence of that abolition. I feel convinced that the augmented industry and economy of the people would prevent more than one half of the poverty that is now relieved under the compulsory system; then that the relative affections, restored to natural and proper strength, would do more than provide for the half of what remained; then that the kindness of the poor one for another, no longer diverted from its natural exercise by the prospect of relief *ab extra*, would set agoing a busy process of internal charity, that would nearly

overtake the last remainder, and leave the rich less of unrelieved distress to contend with under a natural system than they have at present under the compulsory.

Are you of opinion that that could be accomplished in England, where the population is supposed to be so redundant?—Yes, I think it is capable of being accomplished in England, provided the two processes are strictly attended to, that I have already adverted to.

Taking into consideration the present state of the poor laws in England, under which the people have been so long accustomed to receive relief, are you still of that opinion?—Yes; because the first process, or the parochial one, supposes that all the existing cases are to be provided for as they are at present, and thus makes the work a very gradual one in reference to the families of a parish; and the second process makes it a gradual work in reference to the parishes of the country, because each parish is left to adopt it under certain specified conditions, just as each parish incloses its own commons under certain specified conditions, so going on, not simultaneously but successively.

Do you consider that the distress of any given number of labourers may be resolved into the proportion existing between the number of those labourers, and the power of employing capital productively in the employment of those labourers?—Yes; I think that upon these two elements the state of the labourer depends.

Do you consider that a compulsory assessment has a tendency either to increase the capital, or the means of employing it productively, or to diminish the supply of labour?—I think it has no tendency either to increase the capital or to decrease the supply of labour; on the contrary, to increase the supply of labour, and therefore to aggravate the distress.

In those states of transition which occur in the passing from one mode of life to another, as for example in early times, from hunting to pastoral life, or from agricultural to manufacturing, or from the hand manufacture to manufacture carried on by machinery, do you conceive that compulsory assessment may be necessary to carry the bulk of the population through the peculiar pressure of distress in the transition state?—I should think that any temporary distress consequent upon such a transition, if necessary to be met at all, should be met by temporary expedients, and that, if met by the establishment of a poor law, it would only tend to perpetuate evils which might otherwise have soon passed away.

Have you turned your attention to the existing state of things in Ireland?—In a general way, I have; I must profess my ignorance of Ireland, in as far as a very minute and statistical acquaintance with the condition of its people is concerned.

Have you been in Ireland?—I have been in Ireland, but not in that part of it which is peculiarly or characteristically Irish. I have only been in the north of Ireland, and that only for a week.

From the attention you have been able to give to the condition of Ireland, in the course of your observation and study, do you conceive that there exist, in that country, any difficulties to prevent the application of your general principles to Ireland?—Though not minutely or statistically acquainted with Ireland, I have great faith in the identity of human nature all the world over, and certainly my general convictions on the subject of pauperism refer as much to Ireland as to any other country.

It would appear from the evidence taken before this committee, that many of the agricultural districts of Ireland are now in what may be called a transition state, and that there is a tendency in altering the system of managing lands, to consolidate farms, and to unite together small farms of five or ten acres into large farms of thirty and forty acres, the small cottagers passing into the state of labourers, which change seems to be productive of pressure upon the population; do you consider that those circumstances would render the introduction of any principle of assessment advisable or necessary?—The introduction of the principle of assessment would just have the same effect upon the population now about to leave their farms, that it has upon operative manufacturers in a season of depression; it would keep them together, and subject the parishes permanently to the evil resulting from a redundant population, and prevent that natural distribution of the people which is best adapted to the new state of things.

The population of Ireland being chiefly potatoe fed, which is a crop attended with great fluctuations and casualties, do you consider that those fluctuations and casualties would render a system of compulsory relief advisable?—Quite the reverse.

In what respects do you consider the assessment principle would be productive of evil under such circumstances?—I think it would just add to the recklessness and improvidence of the people, and so land the country in a still greater population without increased means of maintaining them. If I may be permitted, I will advert to a principle which I think may be called the pervading fallacy in the speculations of those who advocate the establishment of a poor rate in Ireland, and it is founded on the observation of a connection between a high state of character and a high state of economic comfort; it is quite palpable that so it is in fact, but there seems to be an important mistake in the order of causation. It is often conceived that comfort is the cause, and character is the effect: now I hold that character is the cause, and that comfort is the effect. It does not appear that if you lay hold of a man, thirty or forty years old, with his inveterate habits, and improve his econo-

mic condition by giving him, through a poor rate or otherwise, £3 or £4 a year more, it does not appear to me that this man will be translated thereby into other habits, or higher tastes, but he will dissipate it generally in the same reckless and sordid kind of indulgence to which he had been previously accustomed; whereas, if instead of taking hold of the man, and attempting to elevate him by means of his economic condition, you take hold of the boy, and attempt to infuse into him the other element, which I conceive to be the casual one, by means of education, then you will, through the medium of character, work out an improvement in his economic condition. What I should advise is, that education be made universal in Ireland, and that you should weather for a season the annoyance of Ireland's mendicancy, and the annoyance of that pressure which I conceive to be altogether temporary. This appears to me the only principle upon which Ireland can be securely and effectually brought to a higher standard of enjoyment, and into the state of a well-habited and well-conditioned peasantry. I think that, if patiently waited for, very great results might be looked for ere another generation pass away; but then the establishment of a poor law would throw a very heavy obstruction indeed on that educational process, to which alone I look for a permanent improvement on the state of Ireland.

You have stated that you conceive the tendency of the principle of assessment would be to increase population, and to create or increase habits of improvidence, and inconsiderate marriages; now, if it is shewn that in Ireland the population has increased more rapidly, and that greater improvidence exists than in Britain, how would you reconcile those two statements, your statement of principle and this statement of fact?—I am quite sensible of the effect which this complication of the problem has had in casting what may be called a general obscurity over it. If the only element upon which the standard of enjoyment depended was a poor rate, and if, in point of fact, we saw in a country where a poor rate was established, a much higher standard of enjoyment than in a country where there was no poor rate, the inference would be a very fair one; establish the poor rate there, and we shall bring the people up to a higher standard. But the whole matter is mixed and complicated with other influences; there are other elements than the poor rate which enter into the question of a nation's prosperity, and have a deciding influence on the taste and condition of the people. The low standard of enjoyment in Ireland is attributable not to the want of a poor rate, but to other causes—to misgovernment, and to imperfect education. On the other hand, there has been a gradual elevation of the people of England keeping pace with its commerce, its growth in general opulence, its pure administration of justice. The better condition of its people is no more due to its poor rate than it is to its national

debt. Its high standard of enjoyment is not in consequence of its poor rate, but in spite of its poor rate. I believe that had there been no poor rate in England, there would have been a higher standard of enjoyment than there is now; and, on the other hand, that if there had been a poor rate in Ireland, there would have been a lower standard of enjoyment there than there is at present. In a word, had the condition of the two countries, with reference to the single circumstance of the poor rate, been reversed, there would have been a still wider difference between them in favour of England, and against Ireland, than there is at this moment.

Are you not of opinion that religious instruction and religious habits are mainly conducive to the contentment of the peasantry with their lot?—They form, I think, the highway to a people's economic prosperity in every respect.

When you speak of the standard of enjoyment, do you mean the enjoyment of something like a degree of luxury, or do you mix with it the principle of happiness?—No; in any economical reasonings I would not speak of happiness, because I can understand that from the mere natural advantages of a country, a peasant may have greater happiness, although he has less of means over and above the mere absolute necessities of life. I would estimate the standard of enjoyment by that which remains to the peasant over and above the absolute necessities of life for the purchase of other things. Now, an English traveller coming into Scotland will have an unfair idea of our standard of enjoyment, from a mere cursory glance he casts upon the people. He finds them walking barefooted, and perhaps not so respectably clothed as the English peasantry are; and that the general aspect of his house, as to furniture, is more slovenly than in England. But, on examining the items of his expenditure, it will be found not only that decent sabbath attire, but the education of children, and often the seat rent of church or chapel, enter into his system of family economics. Taking those circumstances into account, it will be found that the standard of enjoyment is much higher among the Scottish peasantry than at first sight it appears to be.

In those particular instances which have come within your observation, where the compulsory assessment has been withdrawn, and the poor have been supported by voluntary contribution, was the standard of enjoyment reduced by that change?—Certainly not reduced.

You have stated, in a former part of your evidence, that the effect of the assessment principle is not to be measured by the money raised and expended, but by the hope excited in the minds of those who apply for relief; now if there be a principle of assessment which is indefinite, and which creates a right in any applicant to receive relief, must not the mischief also be indefinite and un-

bounded?—Quite so; it makes the expectation indefinite, and will sink indefinitely the standard of enjoyment. On the subject of different standards among different people, I beg to state an anecdote which is somewhat illustrative of the different habits of our populations, the Irish and Scotch. A Scotchman and an Irishman in Glasgow had got into converse, and were comparing notes with each other about their modes of living:—the Scotchman, with a curiosity characteristic of his nation, asked the Irishman what he took to breakfast,—the answer was, potatoes; he next asked what he took to dinner,—it was the same answer, potatoes; he finally asked him what he took to supper,—there was still the same unvarying answer, potatoes. The Scotchman could not altogether comprehend the mystery of such diet and regimen, and, to be further resolved, asked if he took kitchen to his potatoes. Perhaps it may be necessary to explain that term. With our Scottish peasantry, the substratum of the meal is either potatoes or bread; and if there be anything wherewith to season it in the shape of butter or cheese, or any coarse preparation of animal food, this, in the humble nomenclature of our poor, is called kitchen. Now the hero of our narrative had none of all these things, and so, when questioned by the Scotchman whether he had any kitchen to his potatoes, he, at no loss for a reply, and determined not to be outdone, said, that he made the big potatoes kitchen to the little ones.—Now, to meet the question in the terms of this anecdote, whether the people will be raised to a higher condition by improving their moral character through the medium of their comfort, or improving their comfort through the medium of character; my own opinion is, that it is not by giving kitchen to the potatoes that you will moralise the men; but that if you educate and enlighten the boys, another generation will not pass away ere the universal habit of Ireland be the use of kitchen to their potatoes.

Laying out of sight the objections you have stated to any general principle of compulsory assessment, do you not conceive that there are certain classes of misery and distress for which relief may be safely afforded, and which, if safely to be afforded, ought to be afforded?—I think there is a very great distinction between cases of general indigence and certain other cases of distress, which may be relieved with all safety.

What would be the distinction in general principle that you would lay down between the two classes of cases?—I would say that all those cases of hopeless and irrecoverable disease, or even those cases of disease which are better managed in public institutions than in private families, ought to be provided for with the utmost liberality.

Do you not conceive that all cases of misery, the relief of which has no tendency to increase the number of cases requiring relief,

may be safely provided for?—I think they may be provided for with all safety.

Would not cases of insanity, and cases of loss of sight and loss of limb, come under the latter description?—Decidedly. Deaf and dumb asylums, lunatic asylums, institutions for the blind, infirmaries, and even fever hospitals, might be supported to the uttermost on public funds. It is the more desirable a right direction should be given to public charity, and in particular to the charities of the rich; that, generally speaking, the upper classes have a great desire to do good if they knew but how to do it. There is one way in which *ostensible* relief, whether through the medium of an assessment or through the hands of the wealthy, might scatter on every side the elements of moral deterioration, and that is when the object is general indigence. There is another way in which public and visible charity might prove of permanent benefit to society, both for the relief of suffering and the increase of virtue among men; such as the support of institutions for the cure or alleviation of disease, and for education.

Would you include under that class of human misery which may be safely provided for, those cases of extreme weakness and destitution of old age which may be equally afflicting with bodily disease?—I think that old age is so much the general lot of human nature that it would strike too much into the providential habits of the poor to make anything like a regular and systematic provision for it.

If any such provision were made, might it not also operate injuriously upon the filial habits and duties of the young?—Yes; I think it would tend to undermine the virtue of filial piety.

Amongst the establishments for which a safe provision might be made, would you include foundling hospitals, or any asylums for deserted children?—I consider that that would be just a direct encouragement to immorality; I know not a single instance of a deserted family in an unassessed parish in Scotland. There were three or four such circumstances occurred in my own parish in Glasgow, when I was there; whereas I have often seen whole columns in the English newspapers, for example, at Manchester, filled up with advertisements of runaway husbands.

Have you known any instances of it in assessed parishes in Scotland?—Yes, in towns.

Do you not consider that to be very much peculiar to the manufacturing districts?—I think it is altogether owing to the feeling that the family will be provided for.

Is the reputed father in Scotland called upon to maintain his illegitimate child?—He is; and there is a very remarkable testimony from one of our border parishes upon this subject. The

Rev. Mr. Morgan, minister of Graitney, a parish contiguous to England, and separated from it only by a small stream, wrote me some years ago, that "to females, who bring illegitimate children into the world, we give nothing. They are left entirely to their own resources. It is, however, a remarkable fact, that children of this description with us are more tenderly brought up, better educated, and, of course, more respectable, and more useful members of society than illegitimates on the other side of the Sark, who, in a great many instances, are brought up solely at the expence of the parishes."

May the cases which do prevail of infanticide, and the more numerous cases of convictions of females for the concealment of the birth of their children, afford a sufficient justification for the establishment of foundling hospitals, or a provision by law for deserted children?—It is certainly painful to contemplate even one case of infanticide; but I have no doubt that the wretchedness and the vices of society would be greatly augmented by the institution of a regular provision for illegitimate or deserted children.

With respect to asylums for orphans, do you think they would come under the class of institutions for which you conceive a provision might be made?—I would hesitate more about an institution for orphans than the other institutions that have been mentioned; but still I am persuaded that orphans fare better on the whole in virtue of being left to the sympathy of their more distant relatives, and afterwards from the spontaneous patronage which their situation procures for them in society. This is perhaps the most ambiguous of the cases that have been proposed; but on the whole, I should feel inclined to decide against such an institution. There is a very delightful piece of information that I got upon this subject no earlier than yesterday, an experience with regard to Spitalfields. "At the time of the severe distress in Spitalfields, in 1816, they obtained, by application to Government, a quantity of stores, blankets, great coats, &c. &c.; among the rest a quantity of children's shoes; it was determined to give these to the most distressed children in the various schools, and upon examination it was found that, in the schools of Spitalfields and its vicinity, there were more than 70 orphans who, upon the death of their parents, had been taken into their houses by the poor, and had been supported by them." Upon the whole of this subject I would say, that I think there is a great deal of sound political economy in the New Testament, and that a lesson upon this very matter may be derived from the example of our Saviour. On two occasions, when the multitude were overtaken by hunger, He brought down food by a miracle. It is quite evident that, had this been His system, it would have disorganized the whole of Judea, and the population would have run in multitudes after Him for the purpose of being

fed; and accordingly the third time He was applied to, He detected the sordid principle upon which they ran after him, and said, "You come to me, not to see the miracles, but to eat of the loaves, and be filled;" and, instead of performing the miracle again, He put them off with a moral and spiritual advice. Now this stands remarkably contrasted with His example in reference to cases of disease. We do not read a single instance of His having sent a diseased petitioner uncured or disappointed away from Him; and we read often when they brought the lame and the lunatic, and the impotent folk, to be cured by Him, of His looking at them, and having compassion on them, and healing them all. Now His doings had all the eclat in them of a public charity, so that had He brought down food indefinitely by miracle, it would have disorganised and put into disorder the whole population; but no such effect would arise though He brought down health indefinitely by miracle. Every cure diminishes the amount of disease, whereas every individual act of relief does not diminish the amount of poverty. The will is upon the side of that indolence and dissipation which leads to poverty, so that the poverty will be indefinitely multiplied with the public provision that is made for it. But we shall never enlist the human will on the side of disease by all we can do for its relief. No man will break a limb for the benefit of a skilful amputation in an infirmary. We have a guarantee in the feelings of our sentient economy, against any mischief being done, by providing indefinitely for the cure of disease; whereas we have no such guarantee, but the opposite, in devising anything like public measures for the relief of general indigence.

Are you aware that the parishes in Scotland have ever endeavoured to prevent a settlement being gained by three years' residence, by turning them out?—That can be done, I understand, by a form of legal warning, without removal; and even when the paupers of another parish reside with us, we do not incur the expense of removing them, but treat them as we should our own poor, and, by drawing upon the kirk session of the parish where they have their settlement, we get compensation for all our outgoings.

Must not the residence be an industrious one in order to entitle the person to a settlement?—Yes, an industrious residence of three years.

21st MAY, 1830.

The committee inferring from your evidence that you place no reliance upon the system of compulsory assessment for the improvement of the condition of the poor; are there any other causes, or any other agencies which can be employed, which, in your mind, are calculated to raise and improve their condition?—I think the main cause for bringing the people into a better economical state is their christian education; and, by the establishment of schools well conducted, I should look hopefully to the establishment of a better state of things in Ireland: I am led to this by the experience of Scotland. All the other causes of amelioration which I have ever heard of, I esteem to be of such subordinate importance that they are nearly absorbed in what I conceive to be the main cause, that of bringing the people into a better moral state.

In considering the state of a population, at any given time, or in any given place, do you see any connection between the numbers and the area upon which those numbers stand, without reference to other circumstances that can determine their physical condition?—The only connection between numbers and areas which I can perceive is, that if two countries were of equal average fertility, and neither of them derived their supplies from abroad, the larger country would of course have the larger population. But the proximate cause of this is just the augmented means of existence; and to quit this obvious principle for any new category on the relation between numbers and area, appears to be no great improvement in political science.

Assuming the fertility of the soil or the capital to vary, has area, taken *per se*, any possible connection with the question?—I do not conceive that area can have any possible connection with the question. I see no influence in mere area, unless it come to there being too little room for the people to stand in, or to move about in with facility and convenience.

Has it ever occurred to you that by a removal of numbers, when the numbers are disproportioned to the capital, and the means of employing it, relief could be given in the shape of emigration?—There is no doubt that temporary relief would be given, it being of no consequence whether the proportion be altered by increasing the supply of food to the same population, or by diminishing the population to the same supply of food.

Assuming that the wages of labour in Britain are considerably higher than the rate of wages in Ireland, and that the difference of the rate measures the inducement which brings the Irish labourer into Britain; were emigration applied upon a large scale to this

part of the empire, would it not have a tendency, in raising wages here, to increase the inducement to Irish paupers to flock over?—It certainly would have that tendency; that is to say, were it applied to England, and not applied in the same proportion to Ireland.

If it were applied to Ireland, would it not have a tendency to raise the rate of wages in Ireland, and to diminish the inducement to Irish emigration to this country?—As far as it went, it would certainly have that tendency. I do not think it would be at all unsafe to propose it, on pretty liberal terms, even to the Irish population. I would not anticipate a very great amount of applications for emigration from the Irish people; but, as far as it went, it would certainly have the effect stated in the question. I may here be permitted to state what I have very often considered a very important principle in this matter: a very small variation in the numbers of the people is followed up by a much larger than a proportional variation in their wages, just as a very small change in the supply of necessaries is followed up by a much larger than a proportional variation in their price. The fluctuation in the price of necessaries oscillates more widely in proportion to the variation in their supply than the fluctuation in the price of luxuries. Now the same thing, I apprehend, applies by a kind of reverse process to the price of labour. Employment being the medium through which people find their way to the necessaries of life, it observes the same law in the tendency of its price to vary with the supply of labour, that the necessaries of life themselves do; or, in other words, a very small excess in the population is enough to account for a very great and general depression in the economic condition of the people; and, on the other hand, a very small abstraction of that excess has a great power in the way of raising the people to a fair and right level. This, among other things, is an argument upon the side of emigration, because, though I do not believe it would be availed of to any great extent, yet if we can get quit, in the mean time, of a small fractional proportion of the population, this would tell very much beyond the proportion of that fraction on the wages of labour in the country; I must at the same time say, however, that I have an utter want of faith in the efficacy of emigration as a permanent scheme. As a temporary expedient for meeting that kind of temporary pressure to which a country is exposed when describing certain transitions, it might with all safety and advantage be resorted to, and that without an oppressive expense to the public, because, though set up on a large and national scale, much fewer would avail themselves of it than we are disposed to anticipate.

It is in evidence before this committee that, at the present moment, a very considerable change is in progress in the ma-

nagement of land in Ireland, leading to the dispossession of many tenants, and to a difficulty on their part of finding places of settlement elsewhere; does not that constitute one of those transition cases to which emigration might be made safely applicable?—I think it might help very essentially to smooth and facilitate that transition.

Do you not consider that recklessness and degradation, the consequences of poverty, involve a state of existence under which the prudential check is less liable to operate than in a community where the labouring classes are more enabled to maintain their own independence?—I am inclined to think that recklessness and degradation are more the causes than the consequences of poverty, and that the restoration of the prudential check is more directly arrived at by the operation of a moral influence than by any economical arrangement.

When it is asserted or implied that the natural remedy for a redundant population is that diminution in their numbers which poverty and disease will ultimately effect, do you not think that, although this may be true as a general law, it has its exceptions in every country where civilization is too far advanced to allow of the alternative of permitting persons to perish from want?—I think that every effort should be made for averting so dreadful an alternative, and that the perishing even of so much as one individual by want, is not a thing that should be coolly acquiesced in, in any christian land.

Are you of opinion that a measure of colonization upon an extended scale, applied as a national effort to the pauperism of the United Kingdom, especially of Ireland, would be a beneficial measure, facilitating the introduction of amended laws, and of a more judicious management of the poor, and if blended with a judicious education, would produce habits of thinking on the part of the lower classes, especially the younger portion of them?—I think it would be beneficial; but I do not think that the application of the general cure should wait for the scheme of colonization, though I think that such a scheme might operate as an auxiliary to the cure. In this view, a scheme of colonization might be very useful.

Do you not think that in England the knowledge which an able-bodied pauper has of his right to claim relief under the poor laws, necessarily indisposes him to take any efficient measures for sustaining an independent existence?—Most certainly; and on that very ground I could have no faith in the efficacy of emigration as a scheme of relief for England, so long as the present system of its pauperism remains. I think that it is a very profitless kind of legislation first to do, and then to undo, or first to stimulate population by a compulsory provision on the one hand, and then to

draw them off by an artificial mechanism on the other. It is playing fast and loose in the business of managing a people, and can be productive of no good effect whatever. But if tacked to a scheme for bringing England under a retracing process, by which to conduct the country back again from a compulsory to a gratuitous system of relief, then this were a transition process, which might be very much facilitated by emigration, and particularly by empowering parochial vestries to offer to able-bodied labourers emigration as an alternative, an alternative which I think would not be accepted in one instance out of ten. The people would go back upon their own resources, and find a sufficiency in these resources far beyond what even themselves had calculated upon.

Is not the tendency of the system of poor laws to produce pauperism, and the tendency of a system of extended charitable relief to produce mendicancy?—I think that it depends altogether upon the state of the population as to character and morals. It is a most important question for Ireland, whether you will submit for a time to its mendicity, or exchange that mendicity for a regular and compulsory pauperism. Now, on many accounts, I would prefer the former to the latter alternative; and one of my reasons is, that education will at length quell the one but not the other. It may be difficult to furnish the committee with a satisfactory analysis of this matter: I feel assured that so it is, however much I may fail in expounding how it is. One thing is abundantly obvious, that the act of becoming a mendicant is one of unmixed degradation, and the self-respect inspired by education stands directly and diametrically opposed to it. It is not so with the act of becoming a pauper; a state sanctioned by law, and in entering upon which, the consciousness of right, and the resolute assertion of it, awaken feelings that serve to temper the humiliation of charity. I think that this admits of historical illustration. The mendicity of Scotland gave way in a few years to its education. The pauperism and education of England have for many years advanced contemporaneously. I do not believe that the most efficient system of education which can be possibly devised, will ever make head against the pauperism of England; at the very most it would but give rise to two populations, distinguished from each other by opposite extremes of character. I should therefore be exceedingly sorry if Irish mendicity were exchanged for English pauperism. I think that the floating mendicity of Ireland will fall under the operation of those moral causes which might be brought to bear upon it; but if, in order to escape from this, you establish a law of pauperism, you will in fact establish so many parochial fixtures, a nucleus in every parish, around which your worst population will gather, and from which you will find it impossible to dislodge them. I should exceedingly regret that, under the influence of an impatience to be delivered from this evil of

mendicity, you should, in getting quit of that which is conquerable by education, precipitate yourselves into that which is unconquerable by education.

You said, in a former part of your examination, that you had no doubt that the compulsory system might be got rid of in England, and that the population of this country might be eventually brought to the operation of the system that prevails in Scotland; how do you reconcile that opinion with that which you have just now stated—that you consider the people of this country, having a right to the relief which they receive by law, are so fixed in the assertion and the claim of that right, that you do not think they could be induced to relinquish it?—Not unless the right be abolished. The retracing system supposes that all the new applicants shall be treated on the system of voluntary charity, and not on the compulsory system.

Do you contemplate, in the present artificial state of England, that there would be any hope, within any reasonable time, of accomplishing that?—I think that, with the disappearance of the existing generation of paupers, it might be accomplished. I should like to make one observation here on the great incredulity which prevails with regard to the possibility of the retracing process taking effect in England. People reason on the want of natural affection, and the want of mutual kindness between poor and poor: now I think that these affections exist in as great strength in England as they do in any other country, and that the reason why they are not exercised is, because they are accompanied with a persuasion in the minds of the people, that the objects of those affections are otherwise provided for, and that when so, there is no call for their exercise. The poor look towards something *ab extra*. It is not that they want mutual sympathy, nor is it that the system of compulsory assessment has extinguished this principle, but it has lulled it as it were to sleep, by taking away the occasion for its exercise. Therefore, instead of saying that the system of pauperism has extinguished those good feelings in the breasts of Englishmen, I should rather say it has operated as a check upon the exercise of their feelings; but the moment the check is removed, they will, by instant elasticity, break forth again, and be as vigorously exercised on their appropriate objects in England as in any other country of the world. There is one striking anecdote on this subject, pregnant, I think, with instruction, and for which I would refer to the very interesting work of Mr. Buxton on Prisons: he states that in Bristol the constitution of the prison is different from the constitution of most of the prisons in England. The criminals have a very scanty allowance, rather inferior to the average of human subsistence for their food. The debtors have no allowance at all, so that they are wholly

dependent either upon their own relations or upon the random charity of the public. It has so happened that both those resources have failed them; but the knowledge of a human creature in the agonies of hunger, and in the immediate neighbourhood, was so intolerable to the other inmates that no instance of starvation has ever occurred in that prison, because the criminals were drawn forth to the exercise of compassion, and shared their own scanty pittance along with the debtors. Now, carry this back from prisons to parishes; carry it back to a population who have not undergone the depraving process that conducts them to a prison, and *a fortiori* we may be perfectly confident that there will be no such thing as starvation permitted in any neighbourhood, provided that the circumstances of the suffering individuals are known. Insomuch, that if any case of distress ever broke out in the parish over which I presided in Glasgow, it was enough to quiet all my apprehensions, that I knew it to be surrounded with human eyes and human ears. I never distrusted the promptitude of human feelings, and I always felt that every such case was followed up by the most timely forthgoings of aid and of sympathy from all the neighbours.

Do you object to a compulsory provision in Ireland for the employment of the people?—Yes, I certainly would for the permanent employment of the poor.

If it appears that there are multitudes of able-bodied people out of employment in Ireland, and that there are many objects to which their labour could be profitably and advantageously applied, and which objects are nevertheless altogether neglected; do you not think that it might be desirable by law to collect funds for the sake of this at present unemployed and suffering population?—It strikes me, that whatever employment is profitable and advantageous, will be found out by the capitalists of the land, and its not being undertaken, save by Government, is a presumption against the employment being profitable and advantageous.

If the fact is otherwise: if it appears from the Reports of many Committees of Parliament, that there are those undertakings in which capitalists might engage with profit, would you still, under those circumstances, retain your opinion against that employment?—Against employment at the public expense, if calculated on as a permanent resource; I should have no objection to it as a temporary expedient for relieving those inconveniences which are also temporary, and which attach to a transition state. The change which is now taking place in the agriculture of Ireland, is a change producing inconvenience that will be but temporary, because it is a change I should imagine favourable to the increase of agricultural produce, and therefore securing a larger amount of the means of subsistence than under the present system, so that there are in

Ireland capabilities in reserve which have not yet been entered upon, large in proportion to the distance between the actual limit of its agriculture, and the limit to which it may be carried; and in the developement of these capabilities, there will at length be abundant room not merely for the absorption of all the present surplus population, but for the comfortable maintenance, at length, of a larger population than is now in Ireland.

Do you not consider that if there existed means of employment, such as those suggested by the few last questions, that more benefit would be communicated to the poor by the employment of private capital seeking a profitable return, than by the compulsory employment of capital raised by taxation for the purposes of labour and charitable relief?—I should feel disposed to confide all employments from which a profit is expected, to private capital.

If a system of employment derived from taxation were introduced, do you not think that it would impede the employment of private capital for the same purpose?—I should certainly be apprehensive of that result.

There is an observation made by Defoe upon this subject, in which he says, that “to set poor people at work on the same thing that other poor people were employed on before, and at the same time not to increase the consumption, is giving to one what you take away from another, enriching one poor man to starve another, putting a vagabond in an honest man’s employment, and putting his diligence on the tenters to find out some other work to maintain his family.” Are those opinions in which you concur?—I think there is great truth and justice in the observation.

What numerical proportion of the population do you think ought to be in the course of education at school?—I think somewhat more than a tenth; the proportion, however, is affected by the length of the attendance in school; and I can imagine such improvement in the business of education, and the education thereby to be so much expedited, as to render a less proportion necessary than one-tenth for the complete education of a people.

Have you compared the effects of education carried on through the agency, and under the superintendence of central and charitable associations, with a system of education which is more located in its character, and which is administered by those who have a direct interest in its success?—I certainly think that it is not in the power of charitable associations so thoroughly to pervade the land with education as might be done with what I would call the stationary apparatus of Scotland, consisting of schools erected in little vicinities all over the country; at the same time, I think that those societies might be of great advantage in the way of giving the first impulse to education, and creating an appetite for

it; but that societies never can thoroughly overtake the whole length and breadth of a land, and that we shall not reach a full and entire system of education but by means of permanently established schools.

Do you consider that however unfit such charitable associations may be to carry on and conduct schools over the face of the land, they might be made available for the purpose of printing and publishing books, and communicating instruction in that way?—They certainly might be of very great use in that way. There is another use to which I think they might be turned to: if there be anything defective in the mode of established education, I think they might be useful in supplementing and stimulating the system by keeping up a wholesome reaction upon the established teachers.

Might they not also act usefully in establishing model schools for the instruction and training of masters?—Yes, I think they might be very beneficial in that way.

There appear to be three different species of education for the poor of a country: the endowed system, in which the whole expense of the school is maintained by the public; the unendowed system, in which every thing is left to private effort, without any aid or direction; and the combined system, between these two. In the first place, what do you conceive may be the advantages and the defects of a system of education wholly unendowed?—A system wholly unendowed will never originate education in a country; it does not call out the people sufficiently. There is on this subject a very important principle, and which forms one of the strongest arguments, in my apprehension, that can be alleged, both for a scholastic and ecclesiastical establishment. I fear that Dr. Adam Smith has done great mischief by an unfortunate generalization he has fallen into upon this matter: he seems to think that the articles of christian and common instruction should be left to the mere operation of demand and supply, in the same way as articles of ordinary merchandise are, not adverting to the great distinction between the two. The sentient appetites and feelings of our nature secure a sufficient intensity of demand for the articles of mere physical gratification; and to be sure, he did well in exposing the whole system of bounties and artificial encouragement, as what should be put away from the business of ordinary trade; but he unfortunately extended the same principles to the articles of common and christian instruction, and seemed to think that it partook very much of the odiousness and the mischief of a bounty to have endowed and privileged men whose business it was to meet the people with education, whether that education be considered as general scholarship or as christian education. The distinction between that and an article of ordinary merchandise is, in proportion to our want of the one is our appetite for it, in proportion to

our want of food is the intensity of the feeling of hunger; but in regard to our appetite for knowledge, in proportion to our want of the article is our unconcern about it; and the consequence is, that unless the people are operated upon aggressively by a body of philanthropists from without, or by the government from without, we never shall arouse them out either of the state of ignorance or of the state of irreligion which they are found in naturally.

Would the application of this principle lead you to adopt, as the proper system of education, free schools, in which the whole expence is paid either by local taxation or by the State, namely, a system contrasted to that to which your last answer applied, that being an unendowed system, and this being a free system, or wholly endowed?—I think the wholly endowed system may be applicable to a country, in the first instance; and thus it is that I rejoice in the efforts of those philanthropic societies, who have gone about with the offer of gratuitous education both in England and in Ireland; but it strikes me that a wholly endowed system is highly inexpedient as a permanent system in a land. I would just read a single paragraph from a paper that I published on the subject in Glasgow, anterior to the erection of my parish schools in St. John's; I wished to interest the liberality of my friends in the support of those parish schools, and the way in which I argue against a wholly endowed system is as follows:—"What is gotten for no value, is rated at no value; what may be obtained without cost in money, is often counted unworthy of any cost in pains; what parents do not pay for the acquirement of, children will not be urged to toil for the acquirement of; to be away from school, or to be idle at school, when not a matter of pecuniary loss, will far more readily be a matter of connivance. There is no doubt a loss of other advantages, but these, under a loose and gratuitous system of education, will be held but in capricious demand, and in slender estimation. The only way of thoroughly incorporating the education of the young with the habit of families, is to make it form part of the family expenditure; and thus to make the interest, and the watchfulness, and the jealousy of parents, so many guarantees for the diligence of their children. And for these reasons do we hold the establishment of free schools in a country to be a frail and impolitic expedient for the object of either upholding a high tone of scholarship among our labouring classes, or of rendering the habit at all general, or of perpetuating that habit from generation to generation. And such a system has not a more adverse influence upon the scholars than it has upon the teachers; let a man deal in any article whatever, and there is not a more effective security for the good quality of what he deals in than the control and the guardianship of his own customers; the teacher of a free school is under no such dependence; it is true that he may be paid according to the proficiency of the learners,

but the parent who can instantly withdraw his children is a far more jealous inquisitor into this matter than the official examiner, on whose personal interest at least there is no such powerful or effectual hold. And we repeat it, therefore, that carelessness on the part of the teacher, as well as a remiss and partial attendance on the part of the taught, is the likely fruit of that gratuitous system of education, the aspect and the tendency of which we are now employed in contemplating." I may here add, that I think there were five wholly endowed schools in Glasgow when I first became connected with that place, and it quite accorded with our experience, that by far the most remiss and unprosperous style of education went on there, in so much that the authorities of the place, with great propriety, abolished those schools, and applied the funds to various parishes, for the purpose of erecting schools in accordance with the general system that obtains in Scotland.

Is that general system to which you have last adverted, a system combined of a certain portion of endowment, and a certain portion of contribution on the part of the scholars?—Yes; so as to form a halfway meeting, as it were, between Government and the population.

Are the schools, under the Scotch parochial system, built at the public expense?—Not directly at the expense of Government; the law is that the heritors of the parish shall erect a school and a school-house, and keep them in repair; and that the schoolmaster, over and above, shall be provided with a certain quantity of ground for a garden, and have a salary; and the maximum and minimum of that salary are defined, I think, by the act of 1803.

Is that duty generally executed?—Universally, I am sure, in the Lowland parishes; and I believe universally all over Scotland.

Is the system pursued in Scotland this, that each parish or district is bound to keep up, according to its extent, a school, or number of schools; and that those schools are supported by local assessment upon the inhabitants of those parishes or districts?—The number of schools is not according to the extent of the parish; the law only provides that there shall be one school in each parish; the expense, as far as the school is endowed, lies exclusively upon the landed proprietor. I call it an instance of partial endowment, because the income of the teacher is made up of a salary and fees, with the advantages of a school, school-house, and garden.

Can you inform the committee what is the fixed amount of salary generally given to the master?—The maximum and minimum are from £25 to £30 a year; but it depends upon the price of grain. There was some sort of provision that, at the end of twenty-five years, there should be a new estimate formed according to this price.

Are the committee to understand that the expense of providing a house for the residence of a master, and the land attached to that house, is also supported by local assessment paid by the heritors?—Quite so.

In what mode are the fees fixed, upon the ordinary principles of supply and demand, or are they fixed by any regulation of the heritors?—They are fixed by the heritors, in conjunction with the minister.

Do you know what the average amount of the entire emoluments of the schoolmaster may be taken at, comprehending the salary, the value of the house and garden, and the fees?—That varies in different parishes according to the population. I fear that the average income of a schoolmaster, taking Scotland all over, is not more than £50 a year; and I consider that a great deal too little. I do not know a more important functionary than the parochial schoolmaster, and I should like exceedingly to see that, by an increase of salary, and a proportional increase of fees, he was elevated to a far more respectable condition of independence than he at present enjoys.

Do you know what is the average amount of the quarterly fees?—That varies much too: but taking the general run of country parishes, about 2s. a quarter for reading, 3s. for reading and writing, and 4s. for reading, writing, and arithmetic. I give this answer, because in framing my own schools in St. John's, I fixed upon those fees, and also provided a salary of £25 a year to each of the schoolmasters, and I did it in the wish to assimilate the economy of a town parish as much as possible to that of a country parish, to give the children the same advantages in regard to the cheapness of education; that rate was fixed upon a deliberate survey of the state of the matter all over Scotland.

Is not the course of education in some instances carried much further than mere reading, writing, and arithmetic, in the parochial schools?—Most of our parish schoolmasters can teach Latin, and generally when they are advertised for, Latin is stated as one of the qualifications that will be required.

Do those parochial schools then, in the case of a boy of superior ability and energy of character, afford him the means of acquiring knowledge that may lead him to the university?—The transition is immediate from most of the country schools to the university.

Have you found that, among ignorant and vicious parents, a low estimation of education for their children is very prevalent?—There are not many instances of that in country parishes in Scotland. The great good of the parochial system is, that it created an appetite which extended even beyond its own means of

supplying it. In many instances, where there is a parish of 5000, 6000, or 8000 people, the established parochial school cannot dispense education to the children of so great a number, but a taste and a demand for education have now been so infused by the parochial system into the general mass, that the demand of the people alone is adequate, in country parishes, to make good the deficiency of the established means, and accordingly, beside the established parish school, there are, in many of our populous parishes, three, four, or five schools that are carried on purely on the strength of the principle of demand and supply; but then this demand has been previously created by the operation of the parochial system.

Is education as cheaply supplied by those additional schools as in the parochial schools?—I believe in general not so cheaply; or if so cheaply, it is education of an inferior quality.

At what age are the children generally taken into the parochial schools?—It depends very much upon the parents, and perhaps upon the modes of industry that prevail in particular parts of the country; I would say they enter generally at five years of age.

At what age are they generally transferred to the university?—I think that the students now do not go to the university so early as they used to do, though they still go a great deal too early. I suppose the average may be fourteen or fifteen.

Do you consider that the Scottish parochial system has had any considerable effect in forming the character of the people, and in giving them the prudential habits you describe?—There is a charm annexed by many to the mere education of letters; I do not hold that this of itself can achieve much for a people: in Scotland it has been made the vehicle of education of a higher description, even that of religious principle.

Is the introduction of religious principle into the schools of Scotland connected with any authority or superintendence exercised by the clergy, or does it depend upon the parochial system itself, independently of such clerical interposition?—I should think that, even apart from clerical interposition, a school might be productive of salutary effects, provided it were well constituted, and that the school books were well ordered; but, in point of fact, there is a very close affinity between the parish minister and the parish school; and, besides, there is an annual examination of all the schools within the bounds of the presbytery, conducted by a committee of their number, and made the subject of an annual report.

Does religious instruction form part of the education?—I would scarcely say that religious instruction, in a formal or separate way, formed part of our school education, but that a religious

influence is secured in schools, because the bible is generally a class book, and the national catechism is also taught.

Is that part of the education carried on through the agency of the schoolmaster, or under the control and superintendence of the minister of the parish?—It is carried on under the immediate agency of the schoolmaster. The minister may exercise an habitual inspection as he chooses, and when he does so, he, generally speaking, is very much welcomed by the schoolmaster; and, besides that, there is the annual examination I just now adverted to.

Is the schoolmaster, in any degree, under the authority of the parochial minister?—Not properly under the authority of the parochial minister; but were there anything exceptionable, either in the mode of education, or in the character of the schoolmaster, he could be brought before the presbytery, and certainly might have complaints preferred against him there, which, if substantiated, would infer his deposition from his office.

Do you connect any important consequences with the locality of those schools, their being fixed in the parishes, and the school-houses being provided, and thus, by external signs, the subject of education being constantly presented to the eyes of the people?—I think that is of very great consequence, in as far as the amount of the education is concerned. With the permission of the committee, I will read a short paragraph on the subject from the paper adverted to already. Some may think it a fine and shadowy, but I consider the principle there noticed as having quite a substantial and practical influence. “The universality of the habit of education in our Lowland parishes, is certainly a very striking fact, nor do we think that the mere lowness of the price forms the whole explanation of it. There is more than may appear at first sight in the very circumstance of a marked and separate edifice standing visibly out to the eye of the people, with its familiar and oft repeated designation. There is also much in the constant residence of a teacher, moving through the people of his locality, and of recognised office and distinction amongst them; and perhaps there is most of all in the tie which binds the locality itself to the parochial seminary, that has long stood as the place of repair for the successive young belonging to the parish; for it is thus that one family borrows its practice from another, and the example spreads from house to house, till it embrace the whole of the assigned neighbourhood, and the act of sending their children to school passes at length into one of the tacit but well understood proprieties of the vicinage, and new families just fall, as if by infection, into the habit of the old ones, so as in fact to give a kind of firm mechanical certainty to the operation of a habit from which it were violence and singularity to depart; and, in virtue of which, education has

acquired a universality in Scotland which is unknown in the other countries of the world."

How are the masters chosen, and how are their qualifications decided upon?—There is an advertisement of the vacancy, and there is a day for the examination of candidates, who are required to bring their testimonials, and who are subjected to an examination at the sight of the heritors and minister.

By whom is the examination conducted?—In general, I think, by the clergymen; but they may call in the aid of examiners; it is an examination which is held in presence of the electors, who consist of the heritors along with the minister.

Is the modern system of instruction, which is called Bell's or Lancaster's, much practised in the large schools of Scotland?—In the larger schools it is introduced; but it has not, excepting in a very few instances, superseded the personal inspection of each scholar by the schoolmaster. The monitorial system has been introduced to a certain degree, but not so far as it has been carried in England.

Where the population is not very large, do you conceive that in the older system of education there are moral advantages from the more immediate superintendence of the master, which form a compensation for the loss of time in the one system as compared with the other?—I think that both might be combined; and that great mischief is done to the cause of education, when a school is of such extent, that the monitors stand completely between the head teachers and the scholars.

Has it not, in some instances, a tendency to replace the moral influence by a process merely mechanical?—Yes; and I do not think that any mechanical process can make up for the loss of the moral influence; at the same time, much use might be made of the systems of Bell and Lancaster. I have known some able and skilful teachers avail themselves of the system to such an extent, as to enable them to do justice to a school of 150.

From the general rapidity of instruction which is connected with the system of Bell and Lancaster, do you not think there is a facility given, and necessity created, for the enlargement of the circle of education?—I certainly do think that now, in consequence of the improvements which have taken place in education, the old course of it will not suffice to fill up the number of years that used to be devoted to education; and that, in the same time, a much greater amount of knowledge may be acquired now than formerly.

Do you conceive that in schools, such as the parochial schools of Scotland, there might be instruction introduced bearing upon the practical interests of the people, such as works upon the evils of

combination, or explaining familiarly the principles upon which the wages of labour depend, or the effects of machinery in its immediate and in its ultimate consequences, and other subjects of that description?—It is a great improvement upon the old practice to have books that come down to the understandings of the young people; but I am not aware that those subjects could be thus brought down to the understandings of children so young as those that repair to what I may call the primary schools. I think that those subjects may be addressed to even the lowest of the people; but in a more advanced state with respect to age. I know that in the mechanics' school of Edinburgh, some of the more interesting topics of political economy have been introduced with very great advantage, and in such a way as to have a tranquillizing effect upon the minds of the people.

Had you at Glasgow any portion of your parishioners in St. John's, of a religion differing from the established church of Scotland?—A good many; it was one of those parishes in which, from the population having outstripped the established means for their instruction, there were very few indeed who belonged to the established church of Scotland.

Were there any Roman Catholics?—A good many Roman Catholics.

Were there any of those Roman Catholics in the progress of education within your view?—There happened to be one school very numerous attended, to the extent of 300 scholars, within the limits of the parish of St. John; it was a school which, along with two others, was supported by the Catholic School Association that was formed in Glasgow, and we made what we considered a very good compromise with the Catholic clergyman: he consented to the use of the bible, according to the authorised version, as a school book, we consenting to have Catholic teachers; and upon that footing the education went on, and went on, I believe, most prosperously, and with very good effect. From the mere delight I had in witnessing the display and the exercise of native talent among the young Irish, I frequently visited that school, and I was uniformly received with the utmost welcome and respect by the schoolmaster. I remember, upon one occasion, when I took some ladies with me, and we were present at the examination of the school for about two hours, he requested, at the end of the examination, that I would address the children, and accordingly I did address them for a quarter or nearly half-an-hour, urging upon them that scripture was the alone rule of faith and manners, and other wholesome Protestant principles. The schoolmaster, so far from taking the slightest offence, turned round and thanked me most cordially for the address I had given.

That schoolmaster being a Roman Catholic?—That schoolmaster being a Roman Catholic; it really convinced me that a vast deal might be done by kindness, and by discreet and friendly personal intercourse with the Roman Catholics. I may also observe, that whereas it has been alleged that, under the superintendence of a Catholic teacher, there might be a danger of only certain passages of scripture being read, to the exclusion of others; as far as my observations extended, he read quite indiscriminately and impartially over scripture; I recollect, that day in particular, I found him engaged with the first chapter of John.

Did you meet with any contradiction on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy of Glasgow?—Not in the least, for the clergyman was a party in the negotiation; he attended our meetings, and there was a mutual understanding between the clergyman and the members of the committee; nay, a good many members of the committee were themselves Roman Catholics, and I remember, when I was asked to preach for the Roman Catholic School Society, the committee came and thanked me for my exertions, and more particularly the Roman Catholic members of that committee, who were present at the sermon.

Do you consider that the success of that experiment was owing wholly or in any degree to their reliance upon the absence of any indirect object on your part, or any attempt to interfere with the religious faith of the Roman Catholic children in the way of proselytism?—Had they suspected any sort of attempt that was obnoxious to their feelings, they of course would not have sent their children to the school.

Was not the system of education which you represent as having so very much raised the character of the Scotch people, a very decidedly religious education?—Decidedly; and there is no doubt that it was with a view to the religion of the people that those schools were originally instituted; I have no doubt that it was a desire for their religious instruction that formed the great moving force on the part of the clergy and the fathers of the Scottish reformation, which led to the establishment of those schools.

Was it not in fact a system which produced a people whose instruction in christianity was of a much more perfect kind than their instruction in other matters?—I ascribe the religious influence of our schools to the circumstance of the scriptures being a school book. When I spoke of direct religious instruction, I meant to say that there was not, to the best of my recollection, any separate day or any separate meeting for the exclusive object of religious instruction, but that, in point of fact, the reading of the bible, and also a daily examination of the children upon the catechism, stand incorporated with the general system of the school.

Do they not form the major part of it?—I will scarcely say they form the major part, because the catechism does not occupy more perhaps to each individual than a very few minutes; and with regard to the reading, it is, in my opinion, a bad plan to make the bible so very elementary a book, that scholars have to spell and misspell, and hammer their way to the words of it; the bible, therefore, should be chiefly read by the higher classes. The general course of our country schools consists of the alphabet, two spelling books, the easier and more difficult; the New Testament read at a distinct class, and earlier than the bible class, which has lessons from the whole scripture: besides these there is a lesson book, called the Collection, consisting of miscellaneous pieces from various authors; I have also seen abridged histories used as school books.

Have you read a Report of a Select Committee of this House, upon the subject of the education of the lower classes?—I have.

What observations would you make to the committee upon the principles laid down in that Report, which, whilst it connects religious instruction essentially with the principles of national education, in order to meet the difficulties of a mixed community, leaves that religious instruction which is rendered absolutely necessary under the supervision of the respective ministers of the various denominations?—My approbation of the leading principle in that Report depends upon the construction which is given to it. “Resolved, That this committee, with reference to the opinions above recorded, consider that no system of education can be expedient, which may be calculated to influence or disturb the peculiar tenets of any sect or denomination of christians.” If it be meant by this clause that there shall be no compulsion on Catholics to attend the scriptural class, I quite agree with it; but if it be meant by this clause, that in deference to any principle or inclination of theirs, there shall be no scriptural class open to the demand of every parent who may choose that his children may attend it; to that I would not agree, and on this matter I would hold no negotiation with any party whatever; but instituting a school on what I judge to be the best constitution for one, I would hold it forth to the free choice of all the parochial families, and I think that a scriptural class should be the integrant and indispensable part of every such school.

Are the committee then to understand that you consider the system of education would be incomplete without the establishment of a scriptural class in each school, but that you would consider it would be inexpedient to render the attendance upon such scriptural class compulsory upon the parties?—I would not have any part of the education given at the parish school compulsory; they should no more be compelled to attend the bible class

than to attend the reading or arithmetic class, and the bible would of course fall to be read by the more advanced scholars. I cannot answer for what the Catholics will do, though I have a very strong opinion upon what they ought to do. If they do not attend the scripture reading that is going on in a school so constituted, then I think the districts which they occupy should be laid open to the influence of all that general religious activity that is now expatiating freely over the length and breadth of Ireland. My idea of the perfection of an established system lies in this: that, in the first instance, there should be an establishment, but that establishment constantly operated upon, stimulated and kept on the alert by the zeal and activity of an energetic, active, and unconstrained dissenterism; and I have a parallel idea to this in reference to a scholastic system, that there should be an apparatus of stationary schools, but if those stationary schools are not working that effect which is desirable, and which effect is, that the whole young population of the country should be leavened with scriptural knowledge, then I say that, with reference to those districts of country where this deficiency prevails, there should be free scope and encouragement given to the same sort of active and zealous exertion on the part of religious philanthropists, whether acting individually or in societies, and that in all such places there should be full and free encouragement given to the talents, and energy, and the competition of private adventurers.

Do you not consider that the principle of compulsion must, in a divided religious community, where part of the population are Roman Catholics, indispose persons who might otherwise be induced to read the scriptures from such a study?—I think it is the likeliest of all methods for limiting and preventing the spread of scriptural education to attach anything like compulsion to it. As I have been questioned generally with respect to the Report of the Committee, I will beg leave to say that in regard to the authorised and Donay version, the difference between them is not so great as to make it a thing of practical importance which of them should be used, though that, in point of decorum and good taste, it were better that the school bible should be our authorised version, and that the Catholic priest would evince his wisdom and liberality by making no objection to it.

If an objection is made upon the ground of difference of version, do you not think that the permission of reading the Donay version is a greater gain than the gain that might be derived from an attempt to enforce the reading of the established version?—Were I the Protestant minister of an Irish parish, and were the alternative set before me whether it shall be the Donay version or no scriptural reading at all, I should certainly prefer the Donay version. There is one part of this Report which perhaps I do not

well understand, where it is said, "That it is the opinion of the committee that it be the invariable rule in such schools of general instruction that the scholars shall attend on Sunday at their respective places of worship, unless prevented by some sufficient excuse;" and this regulation is enforced by a subsequent one: "That it is the business of the Board of Education to receive returns duly certified of the attendance of children at school, and of their attendance at divine worship, and at the times appropriated to separate religious instruction." I am doubtful of the soundness of such a regulation. It is not necessary for my argument to define in what direction the proselytism is going on, whether from Protestantism to Catholicism, or reversely; but it appears to me that the Board of Education is, upon the principles of this Report, charging itself with the duty of constraining the attendance of children at school, at their respective places of divine worship. Now I can conceive that in the progress of light and of conviction, there may be a sort of intermediate state on the part of the population who are making the transition, and in virtue of which they perhaps cease their attendance from that which was formerly their place of worship, and have not yet begun a regular attendance upon that which may be eventually their place of worship. I think therefore the Board of Education would stand charged with a duty which may operate as a barrier in the way of free circulation of light and of sentiment through the land.

Are you then of opinion that the whole matter of religious instruction should be limited to providing a scriptural class in all the schools, and then leaving the course of events, the progress of knowledge, and the anxiety for religious information, to work out their own consequences?—I at present think so; although for the sake of a more full and distinct explanation on this subject, I will, with the permission of the committee, offer a supplementary paper in addition to my oral evidence. There is another part of the Report which I feel doubtful of, where it speaks of those schools being supported by parliamentary aid. I would certainly prefer an establishment for the support of those schools in the way in which they are provided for in Scotland, by parochial assessment; and if I may be allowed to state, in connexion with this, a way in which you might meet, and satisfactorily meet, a very general feeling in the public mind, on account of which feeling I am a little apprehensive that government may precipitate itself into a scheme of poor laws; I am inclined to think that there is something radically wrong in the attempt to force beneficence by law, and that it should never be made, save for such objects as might publicly and fully be provided for without detriment to society. General indigence I hold not to be an object of that kind, though I should have no objection to a compulsory tax both for the relief

of what may be called institutional disease, and for the establishment of a religious education. Now I would not object to absentees being taxed in a certain proportion above the resident gentry for the objects now specified, for hospitals, churches, and schools; I should be happy if such a tax would satiate the public indignation against them, for I feel strongly apprehensive lest that indignation should prompt a tax upon them for the expense of general pauperism; I feel no tenderness for them, but if such shall be the application of a tax on absenteeism, I should dread a very sore mischief to the population at large; whereas it strikes me that there would be a peculiar propriety that as they withdraw from the population of Ireland the moral influence of a residing gentry, they should pay it back in kind by contributing more largely than other householders of Ireland to the moral influence of a vigorous and good scholastic system. I hold that the essential principles of such a question may be as effectually studied on a small scale as on a large, just as we can study mechanics better by the inspection of a small model than by the survey of a large machine, or as the results of an experimental farm might be turned into universal principles in the science of agriculture. Now I have noticed so often in the separate parishes of Scotland, that it was the desire to punish absentees which has been the moving force that has led to the establishment of compulsory assessment, that I should be apprehensive for Ireland of the same consequences in the country at large.

Then the objection you have taken is rather to the evil consequences of the expenditure of the tax when raised, than any objection to the imposition of a peculiar tax upon absentees?—I have no objection to a peculiar tax on absentees; any objection I have to a compulsory provision for pauperism is not to save the pockets of the wealthy, but to save the principles and the character of the poor. May I be permitted to say on this subject, with reference to the difficulties between Catholics and Protestants, I have felt those difficulties so very conquerable by friendship and kindness, that I feel more and more impressed with the importance of a good Protestant clergy in Ireland. I think that with good sense and correct principle on the part of the established ministers, a right accomodation on this subject would not be difficult in any parish. I hold the established church of Ireland, in spite of all that has been alleged against it, to be our very best machinery for the moral and political regeneration of that country. Were it to be overthrown, I should hold it a death-blow to the best hopes of Ireland. Only it must be well manned; the machine must be rightly wrought, ere it can answer its purpose; and the more I reflect on the subject, the more I feel that the highest and dearest interests of the land are linked with the support of the established

church, always provided that church is well patronised. I know not what the amount of the government patronage is in the church of Ireland, but as far as in the exercise of that patronage, they, instead of consulting for the moral and religious good of the people, do, in the low game of party and common-place ambition, turn the church livings into the bribes of political subserviency; they, in fact, are the deadliest enemies of the Irish people, and the most deeply responsible for Ireland's miseries and Ireland's crimes.

Do you think you would have more scriptural readers under a permissive than under a compulsory system, and that those who did read under the permissive system would be more likely to read with profit and spiritual advantage?—From the very outset I reckon upon a much greater number of scriptural readers under the permissive system, and much greater results from it.

Do you consider that the interposition of authority to compel scripture reading, as a matter of direct obligation, has not only the tendency you have described, of indisposing persons to that course of study, but also to lower and degrade the scriptures themselves in the minds of men?—I certainly do think so; it leads to the establishment, in the minds of the people, of a most hurtful association with the scriptures.

The Right Rev. James Doyle, D.D. examined.

3RD JUNE, 1830.

Is there any considerable proportion of the labouring classes in your neighbourhood out of employment?—I think, at the present moment, nearly all our labouring people find employment, but then the present is a season of the year when more employment is found than at other seasons; and, in the town where I live, there are some public works going forward, on which account the demand for labour is greater than usual.

Can you state what the wages of labour are in the neighbourhood of Carlow?—I have had occasion myself, for the last two or three years, to keep employed a considerable number of labouring people, to one class of whom I pay 1*s.* and to another 10*d.* a day; not less than 10*d.* to any one.

Are your payments above or below the general average of wages?—They are not below, nor could I say that they are above the general average. Perhaps when I say 1*s.* I should add, that I give that to only a select number of working people; it would be right therefore to observe that 1*s.* is above the general average, but 10*d.* is not.

To what district of Ireland would you confine your own peculiar knowledge and observation?—I am somewhat acquainted with the county of Wexford; I am intimately acquainted with the county of Carlow, Queen's County, and the county of Kildare; partially with the county of Kilkenny, King's County, and the county of Wicklow; perhaps I might add some others.

Do you consider the condition of the labouring classes to have varied in any respect within the last four or five years?—I think, at certain periods within that time, great numbers were unemployed. In that answer I do not, however, refer to Carlow, which, owing to the particular circumstances before mentioned, is better circumstanced than other places; but I think, within the period specified, the number of people seeking employment, and not finding it, was greater than theretofore.

Is that marked by any falling off in the wages for those descriptions of works to which reference can be made for actual payments in money: the question refers to the grand jury payments?—I think it is not; but that would not be a safe criterion whereby to judge of the number of persons out of employment, because those

who are employed generally get the same rate of wages; for the farmer or person employing workmen leaves many unemployed, but those whom he actually engages receive very nearly the usual rate of wages.

Have there been any peculiar circumstances that in your opinion have led to the increased mass of unemployed labour?—Yes, very many causes indeed; I think, after the peace, the fall in the price of agricultural produce was amongst the chief of those causes. The failure of several banks, and a consequent contraction of the circulating medium, occurred shortly afterwards: then arose a disposition, prevailing generally amongst proprietors of land, to consolidate their farms, and eject the poor tenantry; this disposition was encouraged and aided by several legal enactments, among which I may specify Sir John Newport's Act, which enables the landlord, by a short process, to eject the tenant; next, the Subletting Act, and afterwards the Act annexed to the late Relief Bill, which disfranchised the forty-shilling freeholders. All those causes combined to throw a great many persons out of their homes, and ordinary modes of life, persons to whom no resource was left, but that of seeking employment. Thus the stock of labour being increased, and the demand lessened, there must of course be a great quantity of it unemployed.

At what time did the system of consolidating farms to which you have referred begin?—I think in Queen's County it began at an early period; I could find it in operation in some portions of that country so early as 1815; but in other parts of the large tract of Ireland before mentioned, I think that system of clearing away lands, and consolidating farms, was not put into operation until within the last four or five years.

To what causes would you trace this system?—I think the anxiety on the part of the proprietors to improve the value of their grounds, and the general feeling produced in the minds of all persons that a pauper population spread over the country would go on increasing, and the value of the land at the same time diminishing, till the produce of it would become insufficient to maintain the resident population. That evil became so obvious to proprietors generally, that they thought some remedy should be applied; and they did accordingly apply remedies, of the principle of which remedies I highly approve; but I thought and think that the enactment of those laws, which gave effect to the views of landlords, ought to have been accompanied by some enactment, making a provision for the poor.

Have you been acquainted with the condition of the people upon any of those districts or estates for a number of years?—No doubt I have.

What was the condition of the occupying tenantry in those cases?—I think at no time has the condition of that description of tenantry been good, but I think it was every day growing worse and worse.

What was the description of farming?—Farms were divided and subdivided, till at length you would find half-a-dozen families, with small habitations, living upon half-a-dozen acres. The land originally let to the father or grandfather, was portioned among his children, whose habitations were most wretched; the land itself was subdivided by ditches into very small compartments, and those small compartments very badly tilled.

Do you think that, under that system, the quantity of produce was diminished, and the quality of the produce deteriorated?—The quality of the produce certainly was deteriorated, and the quantity, I should think, also considerably lessened; for ground which is in good heart will give better corn or better potatoes than that which is very much impoverished; besides, the poorest sort of people can rarely find good seed to put into the ground, and the land being tilled by them year after year, and not let to rest at all, must become a mere *caput mortuum*.

Was not the occasional failure of the potatoe crop, and the vicissitudes to which it is subject, peculiarly fatal under that system of cultivation?—No doubt it was; but should such a failure of the potatoe crop occur now, we should have disease and famine as prevalent as it was in the year 1822.

So that you trace a contagious fever very much to the failure of the potatoe crop?—In almost all cases I trace it to the want or to the insufficiency of wholesome food.

Has there been any alteration in the species of potatoe cultivated, by a less nutritious potatoe being introduced?—I think, in the last thirty years, a regular series of change has occurred in the quality of seed potatoes; so that at present the sorts of them are numberless, whereas, when I was a boy, I recollect but three or four. I think, however, farmers generally put into a certain quality of soil a certain description of seed, so that in land well manured and well prepared, they plant apple potatoes; in mountain land, or where it is low, and where the crop cannot be planted till a late season, they put in another kind of large potatoes, which is soft, and good only for cattle or seed, but not fit for eating.

Is not that grown upon the worst description of soil cultivated, with less manure, and consequently is it not more cultivated by the small cottier than it is by the farmer who possesses more capital?—Yes, that is truly the case; the poor tenant, whether he be cottier or of whatever description, if he has no land of his own, is obliged to hire a con-acre, or to take such piece of land as his

landlord assigns to him, which will not naturally be the best; it will generally be such as requires to be reclaimed. Then, if a poor man take a con-acre, he takes it at a high rent, so high as £6, or £8, or £10 a year.

Do you mean that becomes an annual rent, or that it is paid for the use of the land for a particular season, with the manure?—For one year only; the land to be manured by the owner.

Supposing this system of subdivision of land to have gone on without check, what do you conceive would have been the tendency and ultimate effect of it upon the condition of the mass of the people?—Evils, when they come to a certain height, always cure themselves; and the evil was so great in Ireland, that it could not have gone much further, for, at the point at which it was arrested, it was producing vast suffering and misery among the people. Had it gone on further, that misery would of necessity have increased. It was indeed essentially necessary to the good of the country, that that system should be corrected, and every wise man applauds those measures which have been taken for the correction of it; but I believe there are very few people who now witness the sufferings of the poor in Ireland, who would not be inclined to say with me, that along with those Acts to which I before referred, there ought to have been an Act passed, making some provision for the ejected people. It would be impossible for language to convey an idea of the state of distress to which the ejected tenantry have been reduced, or of the disease and misery, and even vice, which they have propagated in the towns wherein they have settled, so that not only they who have been ejected have been rendered miserable, but they have carried with them and propagated that misery. They have increased the stock of labour, they have rendered the habitations of those who received them more crowded, they have given occasion to the dissemination of disease, they have been obliged to resort to theft, and to all manner of vice and iniquity, to procure subsistence; but what is perhaps the most painful of all, a vast number of them have perished from want.

You have stated that you apprehend the necessity of altering the system of managing land was considerable, and that the ultimate benefit will possibly be great, but that in making the change great misery and suffering is produced to the occupying tenantry?—Misery and suffering which I think no language can possibly describe; it would be necessary to witness it to form a just notion of it.

What is the change that takes place with respect to these ejected tenants; where do they seek for an asylum when they quit their farms?—An example is very often the best explanation of a subject, and I will take one, not to exaggerate the matter, but to

illustrate it: it occurred near me the other day. A gentleman ejected a few tenants (eight or ten families), some of whom sought an asylum with the neighbouring tenantry upon the estate, and it was stated to me, upon unquestionable authority, that the landlord prevented those other tenants from affording to the ejected people that asylum. They then wandered about for some days or weeks, till another gentleman in the neighbourhood, of a very humane disposition, afforded them some temporary accommodation, and gave them patches of land upon which to build huts. In other cases, they wander about without a fixed residence; the young people, in some instances, endeavour to emigrate to America. If the family have a little furniture, or a cow, or a horse, they sell the latter, and come into the small towns, where very often they get a licence to sell beer and whiskey. After a short time their little capital is expended, and they become dependent upon the charities of the town; they next give up their house, and take a room, but at present many of them are obliged to take, not a room, but what they call a *corner* in some house. It may be necessary to state to the committee, that in all the suburbs of our towns there are cabins, having no loft, of suppose 20 feet long by 12 feet wide, with a partition in the centre. Now four of these wretched families are sometimes accommodated in one small apartment of that cabin, and three families in the other, or little kitchen where the food is cooked, and into which the door leads from the street. I have not seen myself so many as seven families in one of those cabins, but I have been assured by one of the officiating clergymen in the town, that there are many instances of it; I myself found three families in a little compass not larger than what is within the circuit of these tables. Then their beds are merely a little straw strewed at night upon the floor, and by day wrapped up in, or covered with a quilt or blanket. They are obliged to do it up in that manner by day, in order to leave some vacant space. In these abodes of misery disease is often produced by extreme want, disease wastes the people, for they have no food or comforts to restore them: they die in a little time. I have known a lane, with a small district, adjoining in the town in which I live, to have been peopled by about 30 or 40 families who came from the country, and I think that, in the course of twelve months, there were not 10 families of the 30 surviving: the bulk of them had died.

Are the committee then to understand, that, although there are other modes in which the ejected tenantry may seek an asylum, a more general one is to throw this distressed population upon the town?—That is the most general mode, but I have known some proprietors, and I could say, of the district which I mention, not a few who have made considerable exertions to provide, in some manner, for the tenantry whom they ejected. In some instances, they gave them a consideration in money for the little holdings;

in others, they gave them aid to go to America. Some proprietors, who had previously opened communications through their lands, gave patches of mountain to the tenantry, and thus provided for them; so that many landlords endeavour to assist those whom they cast out, but a good many also have entirely abandoned them. I should add that, during the last year, the outcry raised against landlords for ejecting the poor, was felt so sensibly that the system has been arrested, and I have heard of a very extensive proprietor, in the county of Kildare, to have made an offer of an acre or two of bog to each of his tenantry who had been ejected; however they have disappeared from the country, or they were without the means wherewith to build a dwelling, so that I do not know the offer has been accepted of by any one; however, it was made, and made in the best spirit.

Have you been able to trace the condition of any of those ejected tenants who have been placed upon mountain land in the way you have described?—I have; I travelled not long since through a considerable portion of the Queen's County, I had occasion to pass through some of the most wild and mountainous tracts of that county, and found that communications generally were opening, very good roads made, and several of the people, who had been removed from the low lands, to have built dwelling-houses, were building out-offices, and preparing land for sowing crops. Upon inquiry I was told that their crops of oats and of some other kinds of grain were very good; that they had limestone of the best quality in the neighbourhood, and culm not far off; so that, upon the whole, the condition of that class of tenantry was rather improving.

Do you think it was better than it was likely to have been, had they remained forming part of the superabundant population in the low lands?—That description of tenantry consisted more of persons who had been comfortable upon the low lands, upon farms of thirty or forty acres; therefore I could not say that their condition had been bettered by the removal: but if there were amongst them any whose holding in the low lands consisted of an acre or two acres, I am satisfied the condition of that portion was improved.

Have you been able to ascertain whether this accumulation of pauper population which has led to the ejections you have described, had taken place, generally speaking, under the immediate tenancy of the proprietor of the land, or where the system of middlemen has prevailed?—I think more generally under the proprietor.

Do you think that where land has been immediately under the proprietor, there has been more of a disposition to subdivide land, and to create a pauper population?—My answer does not refer to the disposition but to the fact; and it is not owing so much to the nature of the thing as this, that, in the country to which I have

referred, we have a considerable number of resident proprietors, and not many middlemen.

Confining your observation to those cases, in which of the two do you consider that the population is most augmented?—I would not like that the judgment of the committee should be influenced by my answer, but I think I might say, under the middlemen.

You have spoken of cases in which some of the ejected tenantry have emigrated to America, and have been assisted by their landlords in that change; is there a disposition among them to seek an asylum in America?—I would say a very great disposition; and I am particularly well acquainted with it, because the people generally, of the diocese in which I live, when going to America, think that a testimony of good conduct, signed by me, would be of use to them in travelling; hence numbers of them come to procure it, so that scarcely any one emigrates to America, from the neighbourhood in which I live, who does not come to me previously. Owing to this, I have an opportunity of conversing with them upon the subject of emigration, and I find a disposition to emigrate prevailing very generally amongst the unemployed poor, if they had only the means of doing so. A considerable number of able-bodied men have gone within the last year to Newfoundland or to the Canadas, but I think more frequently to the United States, several of whom told me that they were leaving their families behind them, but from the accounts they had received from America, they hoped in a short time to be able to send home money to enable their friends to join them.

Are the accounts which those emigrants give of their position in America such as to encourage this disposition on the part of the Irish peasantry?—The letters written by them are often read by me, and I have not known a single instance wherein the writers have not given the most flattering view of their situation in America, and expressed the most anxious wish that their friends in Ireland, who are in distress, should be removed to that country.

Do you not consider that the clearances of the estates are carried into effect by the landlords of the country with a view to their own advantage, and the improved value of their property?—Yes.

In instances in which the landlord takes that view of his interest, but finds it difficult to carry it into effect, from the misery it produces to the tenantry, might it not be worth his while to contribute to emigration?—Very well worth his while; and I think there are many landlords in Ireland who would not think it a grievance to be burdened with some assessment for the purpose of aiding their own tenantry to emigrate.

You have described the state of misery in which those ejected tenants are placed; can you describe what is the condition of the

remaining population who are allowed to occupy large farms, and to remain upon the land?—I think I could give a pretty just view, though perhaps it would be made much more plain by a comparison than by a direct statement. I recollect the condition of farmers, thirty or forty years ago. At that time, I know that the farmers themselves, and their working people, were better fed than they are now; I know they were as well or better clothed; the farmers were not as comfortably lodged, but I know that, at that period, they were able to put together and save considerable sums of money, whereby they settled their sons and daughters in life. On the other hand, I know that, at present, the food of the farmer is very little better than the food of the workmen: both live chiefly upon potatoes and milk; their clothing is not better; the house of the farmer has a greater appearance of decency, but not so much solid comfort. They eat less bread, and drink less beer, and I know very well that they are not able to put by almost any saving for their children.

Comparing the condition of the tenantry who may be left on the farms, upon the farms being consolidated, with their condition previous to that consolidation, when the same land was overburdened with people, is there an improvement in the condition of those that are left?—There is generally an improvement in the condition of the farmers so left. However, a general answer will scarcely convey to the committee the precise state of things in that respect. The farmers, of whose condition forty years ago I was speaking, held farms from suppose 100 to 300 acres of land, and oftentimes less than 100. Now, when a farm is given to a tenant, he gets 100 to 300 acres, and therefore his circumstances in general appear better than those of the lesser farmer at a remote period, and I believe are better. It may also happen, in the course of a little time, from the additional knowledge of tillage which farmers have acquired, and the more economical modes of living now in use, that they will become a better class in appearance than the like description of farmers had been some years ago; but the rent of land, even where farms are consolidated, is very high, and generally so much above the value, that I do not think any class of farmers will be very comfortable.

What are the peculiar circumstances in Ireland which appear to you to lead to this excess of rent, over what you consider to be the value of the land?—I think, when prices were very high, before the peace, landlords saw that the tenants could pay almost anything for land, and hence they let their lands very high, so much so that many gentlemen in Ireland who, thirty or forty years ago, were not worth £1000 a year, became worth £5000 a year. Then, when the peace came, and the value of lands fell, those gentlemen had establishments which could not easily be reduced, for we all know how painful it is to descend from a certain

rank to another below it. They endeavoured to keep up those establishments. Many of them also entered into marriage settlements, or borrowed money, and so created incumbrances upon their property, that they could not lower rents, or let their land for its value. These I take to be among the causes why rents are over high, and the tenant overcharged.

Rent being a contract between the two parties, and those causes only acting upon one of the contracting parties, to what do you attribute the assent of the other contracting party to an agreement to pay for land more than the value of the land?—I am sure the answer to that question must be very well known to most of the gentlemen upon this committee. There is a competition for land in Ireland to such a degree that a landlord may almost name his price for any farm he has to let.

Can you inform the committee what is the average annual rent of land, per Irish acre, in your neighbourhood?—The soils differ very much in the country to which my evidence refers. In some places £4 an acre is the average rent, in others £2; and I know a very considerable portion of the county of Kildare let for about 10s.

If the Ejectment Act and the Subletting Act had been passed thirty years ago, would not that have tended very much to prevent the misery that now prevails?—I think, had these Acts been passed thirty years ago, we would not probably now be under the necessity of discussing the subject at all.

You stated that an excessive population was one of the greatest evils of the principle of subdivision; will you have the goodness to state in what way that evil was brought about by the subdivision of land?—When a small farmer took 20 or 40 acres of land and was permitted to subdivide among his children, he did so when they grew up, and hence the subdivision immediately resulted. Those children in their turn subdivided it again among their children, until the farm of 40 acres was subdivided into pieces not exceeding an acre each. Now, if the tenant taking the 40 acres had not been permitted to subdivide his land, he would have provided for his children by sending them, one into the army, another into the navy, and then left his holding to a third: thus the farm would have been continued in its first state; but the tenant, being at liberty to subdivide it, availed himself of that privilege, and the landlord encouraged him in so doing, because, instead of having one freeholder, he had by the subdivision four upon that portion of his estate.

Do you think that the principle of subdivision gave rise to many more marriages than would otherwise have taken place?—Undoubtedly; because if those three or four sons or daughters could

not remain upon that piece of land, but were obliged to provide a livelihood by going into the army or colonies, or learning a trade, they might have married at some future period, but they would not have married upon that spot, and at that precise time.

In the cases you have mentioned, where a considerable number of tenants were ejected, did they go about in quest of work?—Certainly; as soon as they get a resting place they offer themselves for work. When settled in towns they always go to the market-place at six in the morning, and such of them as are wanted are taken; the others, after standing till seven or half-past seven, go home to their cabins unemployed.

You stated that the average rate of wages is about 10*d.* a day; does it not seem extraordinary that when there are so many persons out of employment they do not offer to work at a less sum?—I think they offer themselves; but it would appear that the employer thinks it useless to give less than 10*d.* to a man; for if you give less the man cannot be fed, and consequently he cannot work; so that a person who employs a man gives him what is sufficient to provide him with sustenance. I recollect some time ago I employed a poor man to do some thing about my house; I had three or four others with him, and when these others went to breakfast I saw this man still labouring, and asked him why he did not go to breakfast; he said, I have nothing to eat at home, and I cannot procure it till I am paid in the evening; a person knowing this, when he does employ a man, gives him as much as will provide food for him.

Have you turned your attention to any remedies for the distress and misery that you have described as existing in certain parts of Ireland?—I must say, but with a great deal of diffidence, that I have. With diffidence, because the subject is one of great difficulty; and a person with a limited capacity, and not extensive means of information, such as I am, cannot be very confident that his own notions upon so complicated a subject are correct.

Do you consider that any alterations of law could be made that would have a tendency to lessen or to terminate the distress among the poor in Ireland?—I believe no legal enactment could terminate the distress of the poor, for the providence of God is, that there will always be poor in the land; but I think legal enactments might diminish very much the stock of misery which now exists, and provide, in a reasonable manner, for the wants of the destitute who may be hereafter.

Will you have the goodness to describe to the committee what species of enactment you refer to?—I think I might say, after all the consideration I have given the matter, comparing the state, as far as I am acquainted with it, of the poor laws in England with the state of the law in Scotland, with reference to the condition of

the poor in Ireland, and the probable results of some measure for their relief, that I would apply the 43rd of Eliz. to Ireland, leaving out only that clause which obliges parishes to find employment for able-bodied persons. That is the conclusion to which I have come after deliberating upon the subject, and viewing it in various lights, for the last two or three years; at the same time being fully convinced of my inadequacy to form a judgment not liable to many exceptions upon a subject so difficult.

Do you consider that that part of the English law to which you refer, providing support for the able-bodied poor, would not be applicable without injurious consequences to Ireland?—That is my opinion. But to explain more fully, I would class among the poor, the impotent poor and the poor who are not impotent, but able to provide for themselves. I would give to the body to be entrusted with the management of the pauper fund, a power to relieve all the impotent poor in such a manner as they thought fit and reasonable, and also to assist the able-bodied poor, in such manner as they pleased, in times especially of great distress.

Would you then, in times of pecuniary exigency, contemplate the giving relief to the able-bodied poor?—I would; but only a temporary relief. I think that would be fully as necessary as the other.

In either case would you recommend such a law as would constitute a right on the part of the poor to obtain that relief?—No; my opinion on that subject is quite decided. I think that if there were a body so constituted in each parish or district, as the law would determine, entitled and enabled to levy an assessment for the support of the poor, that their feelings of consideration for the distress in the midst of which they are supposed to live, would be quite a sufficient stimulus to their charity, so that it would be quite unnecessary to give to the poor of any description a strict right to claim relief from that body.

Do you conceive that such an establishment of right could be given advantageously to the interests of society in Ireland?—I think not.

Would you propose that such assessments should be conducted upon the parochial principle, or with reference to any other districts?—That is a matter also that I have thought of very much; and I differ almost entirely from a great number of persons who think that a body could not be found generally in country places in Ireland capable of managing, providentially and wisely, a fund to be raised. I think in those parts of Ireland with which I am acquainted, there is not one district in which a body sufficiently numerous of active, intelligent, honest, and prudent persons could not be found to administer a system of relief. Then as to a

parish. Under that name I presume the committee will understand either the ancient division of parishes, or the unions of parishes as they now exist, whether in the established church, or in that church of which I am a minister. In the diocese of Lochlin and Kildare, in which I live, the number of parishes originally was about 200; they are now in the established church, and in ours, reduced to a lesser number than 50. I am quite sure that each of the parishes as they now exist would furnish a body fully competent to manage the assessment; but I would not say that if the ancient division of the parishes were adhered to that that would be the case. I have not, however, the smallest doubt, that taking the arrangement of parishes as it exists now, that you could find in every one of them practical, honest, prudent men, who feel an interest in the poor, and who would be fully competent to administer the funds to be entrusted to them.

How would you propose that such persons should be selected?—I would propose that in each parish every householder, not a pauper, should be assembled in vestry; that they should select six persons resident in the parish to administer the poor laws; that to those six persons should be joined the clergy of whatever denomination, residing in the parish, and the magistrate, or the senior magistrate, if there was more than one magistrate in the parish; that this body should hold their office for a year, and be enabled to appoint applotters to value the different properties in the parish; that the committee, upon the return made by those applotters, would levy an assessment by a poundage upon that property; the assessment to be paid in the first instance by the occupant of the property, or the tenant in possession, who would be entitled to make a deduction, when paying his rent, or tithe charge, or whatever other burden he might be subject to, of three-fourths of the sum total paid by him. The committee thus appointed, and thus empowered, should be obliged to meet from time to time, and to appoint a treasurer, secretary and collectors, with power to levy by distress the assessment: that the committee should be entitled to receive all applications for relief; to ascertain the justice of such applications, and to give relief in such quantities, and in such manner to the distressed persons as they might think proper; that at the end of the year they should account at a public meeting for the administration of the funds entrusted to them; that the accounts should at all times be accessible to every parishioner, and at the end of the year be exhibited to the public at large. A system of that kind, I think, could be worked in Ireland with great advantage to all classes.

Would you propose the power of assessment to be unlimited, or to be restrained within any defined limits?—I should not say that it ought not to be restrained, but I would not undertake to fix

either a minimum or maximum; I would leave that to the discretion of the committee, for I am quite convinced that the parishioners would select, for the exercise of that discretion, men of great integrity, prudence, and skill, well acquainted with the circumstances of the parish, and the character of the claimants; and that these persons so selected, being always rate-payers, would be careful to limit the assessment as much as would be necessary, and, at the same time, not to stint the poor beyond what was just.

You have spoken of the persons administering those duties being themselves rate-payers; do you think that it is essential to the success of the scheme, and to the existence of an economical check upon the amount of money raised?—I would make that condition essential to a man being elected to a place on the committee; because when it would be required that the clergy of all descriptions should be members of the committee, and as they might be inclined more than others to extend relief to the poor, I would make it indispensable that the other portion of the committee would be rate-payers, in order that their self-interest might act as a check upon the clergy, if the charitable feelings of the latter should lead them to be too indulgent to the poor, or too willing to impose a heavy assessment upon the owners of property.

Do you not think that the householders electing six vestrymen, would have a disposition to elect such persons as would carry the system of relief furthest?—No; in my former answer I referred to the disposition which I always saw manifested at public meetings; whenever there was a question of appointing a committee to manage funds, I found that uniformly the minds of the people were directed to that better class of persons whom I before mentioned. It is in the nature of the lower classes to put into prominent situations those of a higher rank; and though they would be ready to put forward zealous, active, and charitable men, still I know the uniform tendency of every meeting of that kind would be to select the heads of the parish.

Will not the condition of the poor, upon a given spot in Ireland, be either greatly improved or deteriorated, according to the amount of rent imposed upon them by the landlord?—Certainly, I should think so.

Then, under the system you describe, in proportion as the landlord augments the rent, will he not augment the claim of his own tenant to relief from the parochial fund?—He will augment the charge also upon his own property, it being supposed to be within the parish. But are there not a thousand resources in the administration of a public fund, for the correction of a disposition so vicious as that alluded to in the question.

In what way could the administration of the fund produce such a result?—If there be a landlord, as is supposed, who suffers a

pauper population to accumulate upon his estate, and who are to be supported at the expense of the inheritors whose lands adjoin his, I should think that, in the committee and throughout the parish, there would be an outcry raised against him, and that such outcry would operate even upon him; besides, as I would give to the committee a discretionary power to give aid in any quantity they thought just, they, by limiting to the minimum of relief the aid to the tenantry placed upon that man's estate, would thereby urge them to remove, and either go to America or to settle elsewhere. The evil alluded to could, I think, be controlled, as I would give to the committee a power, not only to give a modified relief to those in distress, but also out of the fund raised by them to assist families to emigrate, particularly families of the description now spoken of; so that, although I have no doubt the apprehended evil would exist to a considerable extent, I am satisfied that, in the working of a wise system of this kind, it would be corrected so far as human institutions admit of correction, for in all of them we find defects and evils.

In proportion as you limited the amount of relief given to the tenants of such a landlord as has been described, making their condition, as far as relief went, worse than that of other persons in distress in the parish; would not that, in fact, be punishing those who are innocent for the selfishness of those who may be assumed to be guilty?—That is true; but I should only do that which Providence frequently does. It punishes in many instances the children for the crimes of their fathers. The visitations of Providence are of that very kind, and we cannot expect to manage a limited system of government in a wiser manner than the Supreme Being governs the whole universe.

To what classes of individuals do you consider this relief ought to be confined, if any direct classification can be described?—First to the impotent poor. A poor person is impotent, sometimes through extreme old age, sometimes through infirmity, sometimes through accident, sometimes through the desertion of friends. That is the description of poor to whom, in the first instance, I would extend relief. Next I would have the committee enabled to assist persons to emigrate; and, lastly, I would empower them to give relief, in cases of extraordinary distress, to such able-bodied persons as could not find employment, and were in extreme want, but always in such manner and in such degree as the committee thought proper. Then I should add that, in my notion of the thing, it would be necessary that the committee should be restrained to giving relief to those paupers who had a domicile in the parish. So that a kind of law of settlement would still be required to accompany the legal provision of which I am speaking. Then as to domicile or settlement, I would take the principle of the old Roman

civil law, which required three years' industrious habitation to entitle an individual to a domicile in any place. The pauper then should shew that he had a domicile within the parish, and the committee could relieve him when he had established this title, in such manner as they would prescribe by some fixed rule. Then such paupers as could not shew this title on their part, should be sent to find a parish elsewhere, and if they did not go, or if, after going, they returned, the committee should be entitled to call upon the magistrates to punish them by some light and temporary penalty. I would beg to add that, amongst the means of relief in ordinary years, I think the committee should be enabled to give to the impotent poor, having a domicile, the privilege of begging within the parish. If this were done, the relief to be given to that class would, in ordinary years, be limited to paying for their lodgings, (a mere trifle), and providing them with shoes and stockings, a little clothing, or bedding. Now, that arrangement alone, if it were made by law, would cure an immensity of evil in Ireland, for at present, amongst our common beggars, we have a great number of able-bodied persons who are of the most vicious character, and the more vicious they are, the more effrontery they have, and the more they extort by that effrontery from the charitable and humane. Now if you created this committee with a right to investigate the claims of the paupers, and if you required the title of domicile on the part of the paupers themselves, such a regulation would expel those bad characters, and secure to the really deserving poor that relief which is now often given to the worst class in society. Then another advantage is, that by fixing the domicile of the poor, you could free the country from those gypsies, and fortune-tellers, and strumpets, and thieves, who go about, from parish to parish, vending all manner of lies, disseminating vice, and troubling the minds of the people with false prophecies and stories. But, without a measure of the kind referred to, you never can have a moral police in the country, whilst, if you adopt it, you may establish such a police in every part of it. The next advantage would be, that the poor people being looked after by the committee, and their extreme wants provided for, they will conceive an attachment to the government and to the law, which has thus provided for them, such as never before has been felt in Ireland. I look to a measure of this kind as the only effectual remedy whereby the evils, in which I myself have been immersed for years past, can be removed: namely, nocturnal outrages, combinations amongst the working people thrown out of employment, nightly meetings at ale-houses, excessive drinking, and plunder of the property of honest people, with all the other evils which do and must necessarily result from the state of society in Ireland, where the population is now hanging unbinged, without any principle of fixedness or cohesion.

Would you propose that the relief should be given in money, or through the means of employment?—I think it should be optional with the committee to employ the able-bodied, in times of distress, on public works—such as making roads and sewers; but I would not make it imperative on them to provide work. I would give them a discretion to relieve the poor in any way they thought proper. I would leave to them a great discretion, for I am sure that every parochial committee would be much better judges of what would be beneficial to the parish than the gentlemen here can be.

Would it be proposed that they should be relieved in workhouses?—I abominate workhouses; they would be totally unfit for Ireland, and I am sure they are very prejudicial in this country. The expenses of such establishments alone would be sufficient to support the poor in Ireland for years; for, as our mendicity associations prove, you can support a pauper in Ireland for 2*d.* or 2½*d.* a day; and a committee of the kind, I propose, would be enabled to provide for the whole of our paupers at a tithe of the expense which would be incurred by the establishment of workhouses. I have had myself to provide for a few destitute children, and it could hardly be conceived for how very small a sum of money it is done.

Would you allow the householders at large to regulate the amount of assessment?—I would leave it entirely discretionary with the committee, because they are elected for the year, and at the commencement of the year, the constituents could not possibly foresee the exigencies which might arise within the year; and the committee need not be so controlled, as it would consist of a considerable number of persons in whom unlimited confidence might, for one year, be reposed. If I know anything of Ireland, and of the dispositions of the people, I think you would not find, in committees of that kind, any disposition to expend profusely. If abuses arose, they would be small and of short duration; but to expect there could be a body of men doing any work into which no human imperfection will creep, is to suppose that men are more than human.

If a disposition to emigrate should be found amongst able-bodied persons, how would the emigration of that class of people tend to relieve the pauperism?—I carefully abstained from saying that the committee should assist able-bodied persons to emigrate. Whenever I mentioned the subject, I said that it should aid *families* to emigrate; if, therefore, you remove an able-bodied man, you remove along with him his incumbrances, his wife and children; so that, by assisting emigration, you do not send away the cream of the people, but you send away some good, and some not so good, and so relieve the parochial funds of a portion of the burden upon them.

From your experience of the habits of the Irish people, do you think you can rely upon the existence of such a charitable feeling amongst them as would prompt them to act efficiently in the parochial committees you have described?—If I were not convinced that you would find in every parish the number I have mentioned of persons able and willing to discharge the trust I have proposed vesting in them, I could not, consistently with my sense of duty to the committee, have suggested the plan which I have had the honour of submitting.

Do the charitable feelings of the Irish people, and of that class from whence you suppose these vestrymen to be chosen, shew themselves, at the present moment, by acts of kindness and relief one towards another?—They do; the feelings of that class of people are of the finest description. The farmers of the country, to my knowledge, though paying high rents, plant sometimes one, sometimes two, sometimes three acres of potatoes, which, from the time of planting, they destine for the support of the poor; and I have seen farmers, holding from 200 to 300 acres of land, distributing on a morning, with their own hands, assisted by a servant maid, stirabout to upwards of 40 or 50 paupers, and doing so not for one or two, but regularly during a whole season of distress. I have known a farmer, in the county of Kildare, not only to continue that practice, and to distribute the milk of 20 or 30 cows almost every day to relieve mendicants, but to have at Christmas a bullock killed, and boiled in two or three large boilers, and distributed amongst the people. I could not, if I were to speak till the sun went down, convey a just picture of the benevolence prevailing in the minds and hearts of the middling class in Ireland; but it is sufficiently proved by this, that the poor are now supported almost exclusively by them, although they form a class not over numerous, and a class subject to great pressure; still, of the million and a half, or two millions now expended to support the Irish poor, nearly the entire falls upon the farmers and other industrious classes.

Do the same feelings manifest themselves in the class below the description of farmers?—Indeed they do, to the very lowest grade of society; but, when you ascend to a higher class, you find many individuals of great goodness, of singular beneficence and charity; but you find a much greater number who seem to be very anxious to throw the whole burden upon the industrious people, and who seem indifferent to all the wants of the poor.

Are there cases in which the benevolent feeling you have described is exhibited even by the charity of the poor towards the poor?—You cannot be amongst the poor for a single day, particularly if you discharge the office of a clergyman in visiting the sick, without witnessing the exercise of it in the most touching manner.

In visiting a poor creature in a hovel, where sickness and misery prevail, we find this creature surrounded by poor neighbours, one of whom brings him a little bread or meal, another brings a little meat, or prepares a little broth or soup, and they all comfort him with their conversation and society. If the clergyman be expected, they put the little place in order, and seek to make it clean, and their expressions of sympathy for the poor creature in disease are such as console one's heart in the midst of that distress.

Does the affection of the people shew itself in the care of the parents by their children, and in the care of the young by their parents?—It does; I do not think that anything can be greater than the attention shewn by the children generally to their parents. I have known some instances of children having been neglected by parents, but the instances of children wanting in affection to their parents, have been very rare indeed.

How do you conceive that these kindly feelings, and the good works consequent upon them, would be acted upon by a system of parochial relief?—By the system I have had the honour of submitting to the committee, I do not think these feelings would be in any sensible degree diminished.

Do you think there would be the same necessity for their exercise?—I do not think the same necessity would exist, but I think the poor are prompted by a kindly feeling, which is not so much the fruit of reflection as the impulse of nature. When the Irish, who are a warm-hearted people, find distress near them, they approach to it and seek to relieve it.

Do you think the same impulse would act under a lesser necessity for its exercise?—There might be some drawback upon it, but then the proposed relief would only afford assistance to the people.

Supposing aid were provided by parochial assessment, would there be the same necessity for aged persons being maintained by their children as at present?—Not the same necessity, particularly if you contemplate the erection of workhouses or poorhouses; but, in my view of parochial assessment, you would only give to the relatives of the aged and infirm some aid; for, in ordinary seasons, and in a great number of parishes, the relief to be given by the committee will, in my opinion, consist of paying for the lodging of the pauper, giving to each of them a pair of shoes and stockings annually, perhaps some linen, or a cloak. I think that is all, generally speaking, which will be required; but even that aid, however small, will be of the greatest possible use; for now the poor people, hundreds of them in my town, are obliged to pay 6*d.* a week, and sometimes 10*d.* for a corner of a house to lodge in. These paupers can subsist merely by begging from door to

door, but then when Saturday night comes, they have no resource for the rent, and the consequence is, they go to the pawn office and pledge their coat, or their cloak, and come home naked. They are thus disabled to go abroad the following week to beg; but no man, not conversant with the state of the poor, can speculate justly upon the advantages which would result from forming a legal body in every parish to look after the interests of those poor, to classify them, to exclude vagrants, and to give a proper direction to the benevolence of the people.

Do you think that funds provided by assessment would be administered with the same moral discrimination, and with the same benevolent intent that prevails in the charitable relief you have described?—Perhaps it would be better to state a fact which may throw some light upon the notion I have formed upon that subject. In the town of Rosse, which is my native place, there was an hospital founded by a gentleman of the name of Houghton, who charged his estate with £300 a year for the maintenance of it; there is a dispensary annexed to it, and the act of foundation requires that the committee managing this fever hospital and dispensary, consist of 12 Catholics and 12 Protestants, including the clergymen of both persuasions at all times to come. I acted as a member of that committee the whole time I resided in that town, and I found, with regard to those 24 persons who had to distribute funds not raised upon themselves, but issuing out of the Houghton estate, and monies voted by the grand jury, that in the expenditure of those funds, there was more economy used than any individual of the twenty-four would probably have used in the expenditure of his own private income.

Do you think there was the same moral discrimination exercised?—There was more. I have been in the habit of giving charity in Ireland, as every person is, and I never used the same discrimination, and never took the same pains to ascertain the merits of a claim: I never informed myself so well about the good or evil that might result from what I gave, as I did when acting as a member of that committee, and as all the other members in my opinion did. Then there is another advantage which it would be proper to notice as resulting from the composition of that committee. There were, as I observed before, 12 Catholics and 12 Protestants who governed it. They agreed by a bye-law to breakfast together every Monday morning; they met and discussed their proceedings, and the consequence was, that at all times, and even when Ireland was exceedingly disturbed, great harmony prevailed among the different sorts of religionists in that town, and I think it was mainly owing to the Protestants and Catholics meeting every week, and acting together for a charitable purpose. Now though the late Relief Bill has in a great degree taken away

dissension from Ireland, yet, in order to harmonize still more the feelings of men there, and to blend and mix together the dispositions of the people, the forming of those committees which I have mentioned, and which would consist of both Catholics and Protestants, would be, under God, a most effectual means for the attainment of that most desirable end. I mention this at length to the committee, because I think it is better to state an example of providential expenditure and economical management of a public fund, which had not been raised upon the managers themselves, than to give opinions founded only upon theory.

Did you find that the effect of the charitable establishment at New Rosse, to which you have referred, was to remove the causes of distress, and sensibly to improve the condition of the poor?—It certainly improved most sensibly the condition of the poor. Besides giving medicine to the poor, that institution, on the recommendation of the physicians, sometimes gave a little flannel or other aid, to assist poor patients at the time of their convalescence.

What were the annual funds of that hospital?—The private subscriptions might amount to about £100, the grants from the grand jury were latterly, I think, £250, and the donation by the Houghton family was £300 a year.

4TH JUNE, 1830.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the two elements, the combination of which would measure the condition of the poor, would be the amount of capital capable of being actively and profitably employed, compared with the number of people, would the imposition of a compulsory assessment have a tendency either to raise and increase the amount of capital, or to lessen the number of people, so as to make the wages of labour higher, and the condition of the people better?—That a compulsory rate would have the effect of increasing the capital to be usefully employed in Ireland I have no doubt; that it would tend to lessen the number of people I am not prepared to say. That is a question to which I have not turned my mind much; but the opinion expressed upon the first part of my answer is founded upon this, that capital in Ireland consists of a very fertile soil, and an immense quantity of labour, which is prepared to be employed upon it, and that the instrument of application, which is money, and moral exertion by the elevated ranks, is alone wanted to put those elements of capital into active employment, and thereby to make them productive of infinite good to the country. Further, I have no doubt whatever that a legal assessment, which would take a certain quantity of

money from those who now spend it in luxuries, or in distant countries, and which would employ that money in the application of labour to land in Ireland, would be productive of the utmost benefit to the country at large; and I think that that benefit, so far from being confined to the poor themselves, or to the class of labourers immediately above the destitute, would ultimately, and at no distant day, redound to the advantage of those proprietors out of whose present income I would suppose the chief portion of that money to be taken. The reason of my opinion is, that when the proprietors of the soil in Ireland would be assessed for the relief of the poor, they would be impelled by a consideration of self-interest, to watch over the levies to be made off their property, and over the application of those levies; and that the necessity of doing so would induce many of them now absent, and particularly those of moderate income, to reside in Ireland. Then with regard to the money thus levied, and with which the committee would be enabled to give employment to able-bodied men in times of want and distress, if that money were employed, whether in public works, or by the owners of land in useful improvements, I have no doubt but lands, which are now inclosed, would rise very much in value, the quality of the tillage be considerably improved, and that of agricultural produce greatly altered for the better; so that, in fact, every thing which constitutes property in Ireland, would gradually become better and more valuable than it now is, or than it ever will be under the present system.

Do you think there is the means of employing additional capital upon land, or in other improvements in Ireland, at the present moment, yielding profit not less than the average rate of profit?—I can have no doubt upon that subject; and I am very decidedly of opinion, that a quantity of capital, which I would hesitate to name, might be usefully expended both in the improvement of the lands now enclosed, and in the reclaiming lands now waste.

If capital can be so employed with a profit, what are the circumstances which, in your opinion, prevent it from being so employed, for, if it were to be so employed naturally, it is presumed you would prefer such a system to any forced application of capital whatever?—Undoubtedly I would; but it is not employed at present because there are, or there have been rather, in Ireland many causes which deterred men from embarking capital in the country which could be employed with more safety, if not with more profit, in another. Many of those causes have ceased, and therefore there is, at present, an opening for the employment of capital which did not exist before; but notwithstanding that, I think there are still very many obstacles to the employment of it in the improvement of lands, or the establishment of manufactures in Ireland, the chief of which are the unsettled state of the population in that country, the nightly combinations and outrages which

result from that state, as well as the want of character in the common people themselves. All those things operate very much to prevent the investment of capital in land in Ireland by men who, if society were better arranged, would not hesitate so to vest it. I think, therefore, that though there may be at present a prospect that capital could be employed usefully in Ireland, it would be the duty of the legislature to open that prospect wider, and to give greater facilities and encouragements to the investment of capital, to hold out inducements to men to settle in that country by preparing for them a quiet and well ordered population. But those preparations, as I conceive, cannot be made by the natural force of things, but to produce them it is necessary that the legislature should interpose. Again, there are a great many persons, some of whom I know personally, and many by character, who are at present absent from Ireland, men of limited fortunes, who are invited by the luxuries and ease, and the improved state of society in foreign countries, to be absent. If those persons were threatened with an assessment upon their property, such threat would urge them upon one side, whilst a better system of society existing at home would invite them upon the other, and those two causes thus operating would, no doubt, produce the effect of leading those men both to dwell at home, and to invest capital in that country which they now desert.

Have you turned your attention to the operation of the poor laws in England?—I should fear to say that I have, lest the committee would expect of me opinions, which in my own mind are not sufficiently accurate.

Do you consider that the state of society in Ireland presents the same gradation, and above all, the same mass of information in the middle classes, and such an independent yeomanry, as is to be found in England?—No; I have no hesitation in saying that Ireland, in that respect, could not stand a comparison with England; but, with reference to the great question now under consideration, I formed an opinion with relation to England, which is this: that we are now pretty much in the same state in Ireland as they were in England in the time of Elizabeth. At that period the change of religion, and the suppression of the monasteries, and the turning away the ecclesiastical property from the purposes to which it had theretofore been applied, threw upon society a heavy mass of paupers and vagrants, who became a great incumbrance, and presented a picture of society here pretty much the same as that which is now exhibited in Ireland. In England at that time, many Acts of Parliament were passed for the purpose of correcting those evils, but it was found that none of these Acts were effectual till a poor rate was established. In Ireland, you took away at the same period from the poor their resource, and you

have left them up to this period without any substitute for it. They now cover the land, and produce the same disorganization of society that prevailed in England at the period I mention; and I think that Ireland at the present day is fully as well able to bear the pressure and administer the burden of a poor law system, as England was at the time of Elizabeth, when this system was first imposed; and if there be in Ireland that capacity, and that capability, I have no doubt that our poor have now fully as good a claim to a legal provision as those of England had at the period referred to.

When you say that the persons charged with the management of the poor in England are too much removed from the middle classes of society, do you refer to the class of overseers and parish officers?—The authority of administering the poor laws in England is divided, as I conceive, between the overseers and magistrates; and it generally happens that both of these are removed from the mass of rate-payers; besides which the rate-payers have no share, or very little, I believe, in appointing the one or the other. Those gentlemen, moreover, are not obliged to discharge their trust before the face of the public in the same manner that I would make the committees in Ireland accountable to their constituents. I think the whole frame of the system in England differs from that which I would submit for adoption in Ireland.

If it should be the fact that those officers are elected and chosen by the rate-payers, that there is a responsibility of account, and that there are in England many of those checks to which you have alluded as being the protections that you suggest in Ireland, and if, notwithstanding all this, there be abuse frequently existing in England, what circumstances would you rely upon in Ireland as a protection from that abuse?—I cannot adduce any circumstances of this nature, and it is better not to pretend to what is not in my power. However, I think that our system would be a very long time in operation before so many abuses could accumulate about it as have accumulated about the system prevailing in England. The watchfulness of men at present, and the generally prevailing disposition to check and correct abuse applying itself to a system just put into operation in Ireland, would prevent the formation of those habits which are the causes of abuse in England. But, admitting the whole evil that exists in England, and supposing the English system, with all its evils, to be transferred to Ireland, I think that would be a less evil to Ireland than the continuation of the state of society which now exists there; for in that state the burden of supporting an immense pauper population is thrown exclusively upon the industrious classes; the owner of property is entirely exempt from that burden. We have in short a disorganised population becoming by their poverty more and more

immoral, and less and less capable of providing for themselves; and we have, besides that, the frightful, and awful, and terrific exhibition of human life wasted with a rapidity and to a degree such as is not witnessed in any civilized country upon the face of the earth.

If human life be wasting with that rapidity, how do you account for the circumstance of the population being augmenting with a greater rapidity than that of Great Britain?—I do not think that the wasting of population in the manner described is a very considerable check to the multiplication of the species; because, when a child is taken away, or an old or young man dies, there is room, as it were, made for another; and as we find that in countries sending their children to found colonies, that such drain for the purpose of colonization, if there be no other check, instead of diminishing, augments the population of the mother country, so in like manner that waste of human life in the manner that it takes place in Ireland, does not retard the multiplication of the people. However, the children begotten by the poor in that state of society to which the question refers, become of an inferior caste; the whole character of the people becomes gradually worse and worse; they diminish in stature, they are enervated in mind; the whole energy and character of the population is gradually deteriorated, till at length you have the inhabitants of one of the finest countries in the world reduced to a state of effeminacy which makes them little better than the Lazzaroni of Naples, or the Hindoos on the coast of Malabar.

Do you think there are any facts in the state of the labouring poor of Ireland, that would seem to mark that they were falling into the state of weakness or effeminacy you have described?—Beyond all doubt; I think, within my own recollection, the labouring men in Ireland appeared to be and were much more manly, much more strong, much more animated, and altogether a better race of people than they are now. I recollect, when a boy, to see them assemble at public sports in thousands, and to witness on such occasions exhibitions of strength and activity which I have not witnessed for some years past, for at present they have not either the power or the disposition to practise those athletic sports and games which were frequent in our country even when I was a youth. Moreover, I now see persons who get married, suppose between twenty and thirty years of age, to become poor, weakly, and emaciated in their appearance; and very often if you question a man who appears decrepid and old, and ask him what his age is, you will find he has not passed fifty. I think that there is no man, who has lived in Ireland during my time, who will not say that in that respect the character of the peasantry is very much altered for the worse; and how can it be otherwise. Whereas, in the farmers'

houses, when I was a boy, (I could refer to individual cases if it were proper to do so), but I know that, when I was a boy, farmers employed their men, and fed them at their own table, for the greater part of the year on stirabout made of oatmeal, or on bread; they gave them flesh meat two, or three, or four times in the week, and potatoes were not in general use, except from the beginning of September till about Christmas; that was about the year 1793, or before, for it was even then going into disuse. The men at that period were brought up in the houses of the farmers, fed upon that species of food, their labour was less constant and less intense than since rents were very highly raised, and they must of necessity therefore have been a better and an abler race of men than now, when their work is long continued and severe, and their diet very poor if compared with that in use at the time to which I refer.

What effect do you think would be produced by the compulsory system of assessment you have described, upon the general rate of wages throughout the country?—That is a very nice point to determine, and I would hesitate about risking an opinion upon it; I think for some time to come it would make very little difference, because the system of relief which I propose for adoption is one that, in country parts, and even in towns, would be in ordinary years extremely light, as it would be employed in helping the present disposition to relieve, rather than in taking the burden of relief exclusively, and placing it on the public fund. I think, on that account, the variation in the wages of labour would not, for a considerable time, be very material; but if this system produced an organised state of society, and led men to the improvement of land in Ireland, when that result came about, as it gradually would, I have no doubt that the price of labour in Ireland would rise.

Taking the extreme cases in which you suppose that relief ought to be given to the able-bodied poor, if it were given in money, gratuitously, or in food, what effect do you think it would produce upon the industry of that class?—I do not see that it would differ much as to the result, whether it was given in money or in food; because I suppose that the distress is temporary, arising from the failure of the potatoe crop, or from some other such cause; and therefore if the people be idle, they are so only because they cannot get employment; but, when the want ceases, they will go to work, and the relief will also be withdrawn from them.

Then you would see no danger incidental to giving gratuitous relief to able bodied poor in those cases of extreme exigency to which you have referred?—I can see none whatever; because I have myself been often engaged in distributing relief to able-bodied persons in seasons of distress. We employ them sometimes in making roads, sometimes in clearing drains, or in doing other works of that kind; and the moment the distress ceases, we

discontinue the aid to them, they are thrown upon their own resources to look for employment as before, and we find no change made in their habits and dispositions.

The answer supposes relief given by employment, the question assumes relief given without employment; would there be the same impulse to exertion were gratuitous relief, under any circumstances, to be given to the able-bodied poor?—I am convinced that when the able-bodied poor had passed through this ordeal of temporary distress, they would be as disposed as they had ever been to look for employment, and to work.

At the approach of the failure of the potatoe crop, is there not great economy used at the present moment by the poor in the use of potatoes?—Undoubtedly there is.

Does not the apprehension of the failure of the potatoe crop induce them at once to limit the number of pigs they rear, and to check all extraordinary consumption of potatoes, so as to enable their store to go as far as possible?—There is precisely that disposition; but it is confined principally to the farmer, large and small, who have some stock; but the paupers generally have scarcely anything to save, for in the best seasons their stock of potatoes (if they have any) seldom extends beyond Christmas; so that this provident care, which is exercised in a year of that kind, is exercised by the very class of people who give relief, rather than by those who require that relief; for the latter have no property to watch, no potatoes scarcely to take care of, and no resources to manage well.

Do not the cottiers of Ireland grow potatoes; and is not the bulk of their support derived from potatoes grown by themselves?—They do no doubt; but with regard to the greater number of those cottiers, their potatoe store seldom extends beyond Christmas.

As far as it exists, does not the apprehension of a failure of crop, or of high prices, at once induce them to be provident in the use of those potatoes?—Undoubtedly so.

How would that be acted on by a compulsory system of relief; would there be either more potatoes grown, or would the same providence be applied in the use of those that were produced?—In giving my answer to all these queries, I ever bear in mind, nor can I remove from it the impression, that the committee selected to administer relief are not obliged to give relief but as they think proper, and as such relief is really wanted and merited. Therefore, I think that the people who cannot look to this committee for certain support, and who cannot claim relief from it, will take good care to make themselves as independent as possible of that relief, and that they will watch their little store with nearly

the same care that they do now. There is, moreover, a matter worthy of consideration, which is, that there always has been, and always will be, an aversion in the minds of the poorer classes to seek relief, and that such a disposition will urge them to husband their little resources, and put off the evil day of claiming parish alms as long as they can.

Are there many of the poor in your own neighbourhood who pass over to England for the purposes of labour?—Very few, except tradespeople, weavers particularly, who go to Manchester and the north of England occasionally; but from the county of Wexford, the county of Carlow, the county of Wicklow, and the county of Kildare, few or none of our poor labourers go to England at all.

Has it occurred to you to consider the effect that would be produced upon the emigration of the Irish paupers to this country by the introduction of a poor's rate into Ireland?—I have considered it; I think that at first there would be little or no variation in the number of emigrants of that description who come to England, because the same causes that now exist would continue to exist for a certain time; but I am sure that, as soon as society in Ireland becomes well organised, and when more employment is found at home, when a prospect arises of somewhat more of comfort and less of suffering, the emigration to England of labourers would cease to a great degree, notwithstanding that there might be a higher price for labour in England than at home. This is not only theory derived from a consideration of the natural attachment which men have to their own homes, and the reluctance which they feel to quit their wives and children, and go into a foreign land, but it is founded upon this, that the coast of Ireland which is opposite to this country, because it is more advanced in civilization, and the habits of the people more domestic, sends forth very few comparatively to seek for employment in England, whereas the west of Ireland, the mountainous districts of Kerry, and the barren tracts of Cork, send over swarms to this country. Like the wandering Arabs who go into the desert to seek for prey, and then come home and devour it amongst their kinsfolk, so those people, who have scarcely a home, and scarcely a country, do not hesitate to traverse the whole extent of Ireland, and come here to seek for work; but if their country could be brought to a degree of civilization, and that these wandering people had a home and something like comfort, I think they would be attached to that home, and that we should find as few of them come to England from the poorest parts, as now come from the more cultivated and civilised parts of Ireland.

Among those cultivated and civilised parts of Ireland, in which the state of society has checked that emigration, do you include

the district of Carlow and Wexford?—Indeed I do; and notwithstanding the great distress prevailing there, few or none of our labourers think of coming to England.

You have stated that one of the important benefits which you expect will result from the introduction of a compulsory system of provision for the poor in Ireland is this, that it will lead to the return of the absentee proprietors, who will be obliged to watch over their estates with more care than they hitherto have done, in order to prevent the abuse of law from absorbing a large portion of their income; are you aware that at present in Scotland, a compulsory system of provision for the poor is making its way in different parishes, and in parishes where there is a want of resident proprietors, and, that being the case, are you aware whether the effect that you anticipate from the introduction of a compulsory provision for the poor in Ireland, has in fact resulted in Scotland?—I am not prepared to reason as to what is good in Ireland, from what may have happened in Scotland; for Scotland is a peculiar country, peculiarly situated, and the habits of its people very different from those of the people in Ireland and England; and I should hesitate long before I would draw any inference as to what would happen, or what would not happen in Ireland from any state of things which may be supposed to exist in Scotland.

Will you have the goodness to state to the committee the particular circumstances which you conceive make that marked distinction between the situation of the parishes in Ireland and Scotland, and what would prevent a similar result from recurring in Ireland to what has already taken place in Scotland?—I am not well acquainted with Scotland, but I am under an impression that there are in it a great many more small inheritors of land than there are in Ireland, and that in general those inheritors dwell within their own parishes and upon their own properties. Moreover, the Scotch people, since they have become civilised, have a great attachment to their own country, and a kind of pride in promoting its interests in every kind of way, in speaking of it better than others speak of it or think of it. Altogether, I am little acquainted with Scotland; I do not admire that country so much as I admire England or Ireland, and I would not draw from their institutions any rule whereby to regulate my own country.

Reverting to the principle itself, do you conceive it likely that an absentee proprietor will find it necessary to return to his estate for the purpose of performing all those manifold duties and little attentions which, even if he was resident, he must necessarily devolve upon inferior agents?—I think there is no law which can possibly be enacted, and no system which can possibly be introduced into Ireland, that will ever lead back to us great numbers of those who are now absentees, for our relation with England is

such as to make us a province, and, in the nature of things, men of large property will always congregate in the capital, and seek for the luxuries and pleasures, the improvements and employments of life in those places where they can best be found. Ireland is not that country, nor can it become that country. Therefore I think you must have at all times a great number of absentees; but I do think there are a great many persons of moderate income who are now away because they can live cheap, and who would return if there was a well organised system of poor laws in Ireland, in order that their presence at home might save their property from being burdened with assessment, or if the poor rate would tend of itself to the improvement of their property. So far, I think that measure would bring back a certain class of absentees. Then with regard to gentlemen of large fortune, who are habitually absentees, and whom I would not blame for being so, (for if I was one of that class I would be an absentee myself), they will not return. However they will be careful to appoint better agents than they now do, and will visit their estates oftener than they now do, and be more anxious than they now are that these estates are providently managed. If, therefore, we cannot have their constant residence, we shall have some portion of that superintendence which ought to be exercised by the great over their own properties, and over the poor who inhabit upon these properties.

Do you think that the introduction of capital into Ireland, invested in the purchase of land, and which would probably lead to a further investment in the improvement of waste lands, would lead to the employment of those persons who at present are destitute of work?—No doubt it would tend very much to produce that result; but I think if you wish to hasten the investment of capital, you must produce a better organization of society than exists now, which organization cannot, in my opinion, be introduced without some system of the kind I have submitted to the committee. If large quantities of capital were invested, no doubt it would create employment; but in order that men may be encouraged to invest capital, it is necessary you should regulate the state of society, and produce more social order than exists now, or than is likely to exist if the present system should continue. My lights to be sure are very dim, and I cannot see very far into futurity, but if I had a capital of £100,000 to invest in lands, and was sure that an arrangement would be made for maintaining the poor, and putting an end to the present system, I would forthwith purchase. If I thought, on the other hand, that arrangement was not to be made, unquestionably I would not purchase land in Ireland.

You have stated that you look to the knowledge that has been acquired by experience as one of the principal safeguards against

the system of poor laws degenerating into a state of abuse which has been experienced in this country; are you aware that the system of poor laws is making its way in Scotland, and in some of the southern parishes it is burdened with a great part of the abuses which are experienced elsewhere?—I am aware that it is making its way into Scotland; but I am not aware that it is making its way accompanied by the abuses which are complained of in England; besides which the system proposed to be adopted in Ireland would have in itself many safeguards against those abuses. Then as to the operation of public opinion, such is the force of it that it is able, in many cases, to correct old and established abuses, and to render men engaged in public trusts more honest than heretofore. If such then be the force of public opinion, as to correct inveterate habits, reform old abuses, and prevent the establishment of new ones, as well in governments as among individuals, should we not expect that the force of that opinion would, in a new establishment of this kind, prevent or retard very much the introduction of whatever may be abused.

You have stated that the reason why the subdivision of land has led to such an enormous increase in the population is, that a certain provision, though a very small one, was afforded, and that that led to early marriages; then why would not a pecuniary provision, if it were also certain, lead to the same results?—I think there is very little if any analogy between the cases. In the first place, the relief that I propose to be given is not by the hypothesis to be certain; it is to depend upon the discretion and good will of the body administering the parish fund; that therefore is one very great difference between the one case and the other. In the next place, the person who had the power of increasing the population and extending pauperism, was the father, who, through ignorance, thought that in subdividing his land he was doing a service to his children, and therefore was led by the impulse of his feelings to act in a manner prejudicial to his family, and injurious to society at large. But here you have a state of things the very converse of that: you have, in place of the father, a committee of men who are supposed to assist, out of their own means, the multiplication of paupers, who are to do so with a full view of the evil which they would be producing, and to have in their own hands, at the same time, the power, by withholding the means, to check that evil. I therefore think there is scarcely any analogy between the cases; and that if there be causes operating in both cases, these causes are altogether different.

Then you think that a pecuniary provision, although certain, would not produce the same effect, with respect to the increase of population, that a certain provision made out of land would do?—I did not admit that the provision to be made for the relief of the

poor was certain; I removed that condition from the question, because I thought it was better to argue upon a state of things which may possibly occur, than upon a state of things which no one contemplates making the relief certain, why should we argue upon that supposition, and not upon the supposition which is generally admitted, that the relief, if given at all, should depend upon the good will and discretion of the parochial committee.

Are marriages very early in your diocese?—So early that I have had occasion to use every means within my power to check them; they sometimes take place when the parties have not arrived at the age of twenty, and I think much the greater number of marriages are contracted by persons who have not exceeded thirty.

Do you conceive that there is any tendency among the peasantry in Ireland to be more provident, and to marry at a later period than was formerly the case?—I believe it is true, and universally known, that amongst people who have acquired a little property and some degree of comfort in the world, marriages do not occur so early as among the poor people who have no means of subsistence. These latter are thrown together in the same huts, form intimacies that are often very criminal, and then seek to escape from that state of criminality by entering into marriage. This sort of people are, from ignorance and other causes, incapable almost of estimating the consequences of their own acts.

Do you think that those causes have led to any alteration of habits in the people of Ireland, and that the habits of the poor are either more provident or less so than they used to be?—If by the poor is understood the lowest class of people, that is, labouring people, and mechanics, and paupers, who live by begging, I cannot say that I have noticed any material change, certainly amongst that class there has been no check, if there has not been an augmentation of marriages. It is unnecessary to add, that I am particularly well-informed on the subject of marriages taking place amongst all classes of people who are subject to my jurisdiction within the diocese over which I preside.

You have stated that you felt it your duty in many cases to use your influence against those improvident and premature matches; on what grounds?—On account of the misery that resulted from the excessive number of paupers in the country, and the want and hardships which I always observe to follow upon those improvident marriages.

Have you known many cases of deserted children, or cases of infanticide?—I have known a good many. I cannot say very many cases of deserted children. Upon the subject of infanticide I would greatly prefer that the committee would seek for infor-

mation from a person not a clergyman. I know more than an ordinary person upon that subject, but my ministry is such that I think it would be prejudicial to its interests if I were to give the evidence sought for, and, if the committee would indulge me, I should rather not give it.

Do you think it desirable that a provision should be made and continued by law for deserted children?—That is a subject which formed part of a Bill lately introduced by the Right Honourable the noble Secretary of State for our country. I received a copy of that Bill, and my opinion of it was sought for. I hesitated before I gave that opinion, but the result was that I would prefer the Bill, with very little alteration from its original state, rather than to have no Bill; for though I saw it would be an encouragement for vice and immorality upon the part of females, I saw that it would also be a check upon the part of young men, and I thought it would prevent infanticide.

Do you conceive that the benefit of the check upon infanticide, to which you have alluded, would be commensurate to the mischief that might be created by holding out a premium on desertion?—I believe a politician would be more competent than I am to form a just notion upon the subject. I have such a horror of infanticide, I look upon that crime as so great, so unnatural, tending to harden the heart of the mother, as well as to destroy an infant, and send its soul away from the sight of its Redeemer, that I would leave society open to many evils in order to prevent the committal of such crime, though it were to be committed in only a few cases. I think, therefore, that something of my feelings and peculiar opinions may bias my judgment on this subject, I would not, on this matter, confide in my opinions, still less would I wish that others should adopt them.

Would those principles lead to the establishment of foundling hospitals?—By no means; I think the congregation of children or of paupers in one house, is most destructive. Whilst nothing is easier than to provide for children in the manner I have described, leaving them when deserted to the care of an overseer, and obliging him to provide a nurse. Then the child is brought up in a cabin in the same manner as other children; it is accustomed from its birth to the habits and companions among whom it will afterwards live, so that when it is grown up it is like one of the other poor; but when you put it into a foundling hospital, or bring it up in a charter school, if it escape disease which prevails so much among children so cooped up, it is like a tender plant reared in a hot-house, and liable to danger upon the first exposure. Hence the females become corrupt, as is known to be the case almost without any exception, and the boys are unnatural and vicious.

You were understood to state in the developement of your plan, that a domicile of three years in the parish would be required before a pauper would be entitled to relief; as the cess is to be divided between the landholder and the landowner, would it not be the interest of each to get rid of such paupers on his estate as are not entitled to such relief by three years' residence?—Undoubtedly he would so consider it. And besides other advantages resulting from a proof of a domicile being required, I think one great advantage would be, that it would relieve the towns now of a great proportion of the population which press upon them, and throw back the population upon the parishes from which they were expelled, for many of those have been expelled within the three last years.

Allowing that there is a wish, under existing circumstances, on the part of landlords, to get rid of the pauper population upon their estates, would not the circumstance of their being subject to assessment for the relief of the poor enhance their objection to the residence of the paupers on their properties?—Undoubtedly it would; and that would be one of the great advantages that would result from this measure; because then proprietors would take care that the number of paupers upon their estates should not be unduly multiplied, and the parochial committee having the power of assisting families to emigrate, would combine with them in seeking to preserve a due proportion between the numbers of the labouring poor and the employment to be found for them.

Have you turned your attention to the state of education of the poor in Ireland?—Very much so for several years.

Is there, on the part of the Irish poor, a great anxiety for education, and, on the part of the parents, a great anxiety to procure it for their children?—A great anxiety on the part of both parents and children.

Does this manifest itself by sacrifices made even out of the property of the parents to obtain education for their children?—It does; of which at present, in my mind, there are countless instances.

Are the schools in the parishes which are under your care as bishop, numerous?—The number of the schools in the diocese of Lochlin and Kildare are very numerous; some of them are not of the best description, but since I have been bishop I have directed my own attention, and the attention of the clergy and people, very much to the advancement of education, and by our joint efforts we have succeeded in building very good school-houses in every parish of my diocese; when I say in every parish, I do not mean the unions as they are held now by one incumbent, but I mean each parish composing the union. For instance, one parish priest

often holds three or four parishes united, but within that district he has two or three chapels, and as many chapels as there are, so many school-houses have we succeeded in building; but from our limited means, and from the many other charges upon the people, we have not been able to make those houses of the best description, and in general we have been unable to furnish them in a proper manner. We find some difficulty also in supplying masters capable of instructing the children upon an improved system; and the expenses attendant upon those schools are such that we cannot well bear them with our other burdens. They require very much to be aided in some way by Government.

Are the committee then to understand that in the several parishes which are under your care schools have been built at your suggestion, and through the agency of the Roman Catholic clergy?—Precisely so.

From what funds were those schools built?—From voluntary contributions by the clergy and people, aided sometimes by donations from proprietors resident within the parish, or having properties within the parish.

What description of persons have been appointed the masters of those schools?—I have selected three schools within the diocese, and I have appointed these as model schools; the persons conducting these schools have been well educated, and conduct them in an excellent manner. Every master whom I recommend to take charge of schools in the other parts of the diocese, shall spend three months at least under one of these approved masters, and bring a certificate of competency from him.

Do you know where those masters, who are employed by you as instructors and masters of the model schools, were educated?—They were educated at Kildare-place.

What system of instruction is given in those schools; the question alludes particularly to the literary instruction?—The children are taught to spell and read upon the system of Lancaster, with the improvements that have lately been introduced into the system by Pestalozzi and others; they are taught also book-keeping, mensuration, geometry, and a portion of algebra; some of them learn various branches of mathematics. In most instances the masters are capable of teaching what I have now mentioned.

Is there a great disposition amongst the Irish peasantry to apply themselves to exact science?—It is very remarkable how great a portion of them seem delighted with mathematical knowledge, and to have a particular turn of mind and fondness for it.

Are the children who are in these schools received gratuitously, or do they pay anything towards the expense of their education?—In each of the towns there is a free school. In the country

parishes the children generally pay, but paupers are sent to the school by the priest who pays privately to the master a certain sum for them, and they pass among the other scholars, not as paupers, but as persons paying, so we seek to screen from the children the wants of their fellows, lest one class should look down upon the other with something like disregard.

Do you conceive that, as far as the system can be made applicable, the pay system is a better one than the system of mere charity?—Vastly better, where it can be made available; but in towns where the population is considerable, and the number of the poor great, you must have a free school.

Is there any system of religious instruction connected with the literary instruction of the children?—Always. It is a rule with me, and with all the bishops of the Catholic church, that literary instruction ought always to be united with religious instruction: in fact, we make the teaching of religion the first consideration in the education of youth.

Is there any regulation in those schools that excludes the children of Protestants wholly from the benefit of education?—None whatever; from the commencement of my sharing in the management in schools, I have been very careful to exclude all rules that would make a distinction between children on account of their religion, and to encourage the union of children of different religious opinions as much as I could in the same schools, but unfortunately my views have not been the views of men of influence.

Then, if a system of common education for children of the different religious persuasions could be adopted with the assent of the different sects, do you consider that that would be more advantageous than a separate system of education for each?—I do not see how any man, wishing well to the public peace, and who looks to Ireland as his country, can think that that peace can ever be permanently established, or the prosperity of the country ever well secured, if children are separated at the commencement of life on account of their religious opinions. I do not know any measure which would prepare the way for a better feeling in Ireland than uniting children at an early age, and bringing them up in the same school, leading them to commune with one another, and to form those little intimacies and friendships which often subsist through life. Children thus united know and love each other, as children brought up together always will; and to separate them is, I think, to destroy some of the finest feelings in the breasts of men.

Have you seen any experiment of united education of Protestants and Roman Catholics, which led you to think the system is

practicable as well as desirable?—I do not know any difficulty attending it. I recollect, when making a return to the Commissioners of Education Enquiry from Carlow of all the schools in it, I do not recollect there was one found wherein there were not Catholics and Protestants educating together, although the majority of teachers and scholars were Catholics.

Did that apply to the schools under your own superintendence?—Certainly.

Will you have the goodness to state to the committee what is the description of religious instruction which is given in the schools under your superintendence?—I drew up, and caused to be printed and circulated amongst the clergy, I believe in 1822, a year or two after I became bishop, and as soon as I had time to turn my attention to the subject, a number of rules, which are, I believe, observed generally. These rules require that the school commence with prayer, unless where Protestants and Catholics are united, as objections are taken to their joining in prayer. Next, that the Catholic children be instructed in their catechism, which is an abridgement of christian doctrine whereby they learn the gospel morality and truth, in the way of question and answer. Then the literary instruction of the children proceeds. In the afternoon prayer is said, and a lecture read by the master, or by one of the scholars, out of the Old or New Testament, and an exposition of that passage also read from some approved religious book, one or two of which books I named as fit to be used in the school for that purpose.

Is there anything in your system which renders it imperative upon the Protestant children to attend this religious instruction if it should be considered inexpedient?—No, if the parent or child objects.

Are there any lending libraries connected with any of those schools?—I cannot say connected with any of those schools; but I have had in each chapel throughout the diocese, from the same period, a parochial library, as it is called, and this consists of a great number of volumes of religious works. After divine service on Sundays, a person appointed to that office by the parish priest, opens his bookcase and distributes to such parishioners as apply for them, one or more of those books; he takes down the name of the borrower and leaves the book with him a fortnight or a month, and then receives it back and lends another. They who can afford to do so, pay 1*d.* per month for the use of each book, and this forms a fund for the purchase of additional books. They are lent to the poor, gratis.

At whose expense were those libraries formed?—At the expense of the parish. On my first visitation, I explained to the

people at considerable length, in every chapel, the great advantages of a library of this kind, how necessary it was to diffuse widely religious knowledge, and that the establishment of libraries was among the best means of doing so. I then desired, that upon the Sunday after my visitation, the priest would make a collection of money from the parishioners, and from the sums so collected purchase a stock of books; thus the libraries were originally formed; they have since received additions in consequence of monthly contributions, and I do not know any institution which has produced so much moral good in the country.

Have you ever made use of any of the books that are printed by the Kildare-place institution?—Until latterly when another institution was formed, with which I am personally connected, and which supplies books at a cheaper rate, I often recommended that purchases of school books should be made at Kildare-place; such purchases have been frequently made, so that their books are found everywhere throughout my diocese.

Do you not conceive that the books for the use of schools in Ireland might be advantageously extended to instruction in matters of domestic economy and improved agriculture, and a knowledge of the practical arts of life, which are calculated to raise and excite the industrious habits of the people?—There is nothing I am more desirous of, at the present moment, than to see such books put into the hands of children at school. I once took the liberty of applying to the Honourable Chairman of this Committee, begging to know whether there could be in Ireland a reprint of some of the tracts proposed to be published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, which might be used in our schools. I found that was not practicable. I did myself intend to compile some small works of that kind for the use of schools, but finding that they were likely to be published by persons much more competent, I gave up that notion. I refer to this only to shew my great anxiety to see such books in use in Ireland. I think small treatises which would explain to children the principles of agriculture, the mode of planting trees, of cleaning land and corn, the keeping and cure of cattle, the management of bees, and the internal economy of a house, but particularly containing exhortations to sobriety and incessant labour, illustrated by domestic examples. Tracts compiled with these views, and for these objects, and used in schools, would be of exceeding great value to the rising generation.

Do you not think that one of the desirable objects that would also be obtained by those means, would be that of illustrating to the labouring classes, and particularly to artizans, the evil effects of those combinations which have so much retarded and checked industry in Ireland?—If artizans particularly could be so con-

vinced, very great advantages would result both to themselves and to the community at large, for their combinations are most injurious to the public interest. The week before I left home, I spent a few days in Kilkenny, on a visit with the Catholic bishop of Ossory. They were at that time disposing in that city of a fund of £300 or £400 raised for the relief of the poor. There was a question of setting to work the unemployed weavers, which led to my inquiry into some particulars with regard to them. It was the opinion, however, of these gentlemen then conversing, that the combinations amongst that description of tradespeople were the chief cause of the almost extinction of the blanket manufacture in Kilkenny, and though the citizens were then obliged to relieve them out of the public funds, these weavers themselves were the cause of their own misfortunes; for as soon as they discovered that a manufacturer had a contract for making blankets, or that there was a demand for goods, they immediately struck, and would not work unless for very high prices: hence the manufacturers were unable to enter into contracts lest they should be disappointed, or that too high wages would be extorted from them, and the consequence was that the manufacture went down altogether.

Do you consider those combinations amongst the artizans and manufacturers one of the most serious difficulties to the extension of manufacturing industry in Ireland?—It is one of the great obstacles to it; and I am very confident that the diffusion of knowledge before mentioned would tend very much to remedy the evil; I say this from some experience, because at one time, in the county of Kildare, there was a number of weavers who had struck, and were at variance with their employers. I, who felt a great interest in their welfare, went to the place, and a deputation from those weavers waited upon me. They submitted to me their rules and regulations; I reasoned with them for a long time, and explained to them their own interest, they entered into my views, and from that time (four or five years ago) to this, there has been no combination in that district. There was also a colliery in a remote and mountainous district of the county of Kilkenny, where a like disagreement recurred. I went to it and reasoned with the labouring people, endeavouring to shew what their real interests were, and both they and their employer immediately acceded to my proposal, and from that time to this there has been no interruption to the works in that place. The result in both these cases was not owing to any personal influence I had with these people, half so much as to my making them understand what their true interests were; and if the people had been well educated, I am sure my interposition would have been quite unnecessary, as the evil which that interposition removed would never have existed.

Are you acquainted with the system on which the Kildare-place society carry on their schools?—Yes, tolerably well; I witness it as it is exemplified in my own schools every day.

In the schools which are managed under your superintendance, and conducted upon your rules, do you consider their system to be applicable to the education of both Protestants and Catholics equally?—Their system of course is not; because their rule excludes religious instruction, which we require as an essential part of education. Then, as a substitute for that religious instruction, their system requires the reading of the sacred scriptures by children who have acquired suitable proficiency, without note or comment. There are in that system two inconveniences, as they regard us: the first is, that it excludes religious instruction in that shape and manner in which we think it necessary to have it given to young and tender minds, namely, catechetical instruction by way of question and answer; and, in the second place, it is inconsistent with our notions of conveying scriptural knowledge, to give the scriptures to a child to read, leaving him to form upon the sacred text what notion he pleases. Therefore, as their rule excludes all comment, whether oral or written, upon the scriptures, we, who maintain that the Divine Revelation is to be interpreted by the church, cannot at any time agree with them. Whilst those rules therefore exist, the one excluding catechetical instruction, and the other prescribing the reading of the scriptures without note or comment, their system can never make any progress in Ireland; but if it were freed from those inconveniences, it would be hard to devise a system better calculated to effect good.

Then your objection to that system is not to the reading of the scriptures as such, but to the mode in which, and the discipline under which, scripture reading is given?—Most certainly not to the reading of the scriptures themselves, for I prescribe that they be read in all our schools; and the various memorials presented by Catholic bishops in Ireland to successive Lords Lieutenant there, and the various petitions presented on their behalf to Parliament, shew that they have at all times wished for religious instruction as the basis of education in schools, which religious instruction, in their opinion, should consist in part of reading the sacred scriptures; so that, upon that subject, there can be no doubt what our doctrine and discipline is. We have laboured very much to have it known to every one, and to remove the impression which unfortunately prevailed generally in England, that the Catholic priesthood and prelacy were opposed to scriptural education, than which no greater calumny was ever sought to be affixed on the character of men.

Have there been any late editions of the scriptures published in Ireland, under the superintendance of the Roman Catholic

hierarchy?—Yes, one very lately, a stereotype edition, which has enabled booksellers to vend a very excellent edition of the bible at so low a price as 16s. bound.

Has the sale of this edition of the scriptures extended?—Very much extended, certainly.

You are aware that in the Roman Catholic editions of the scriptures there were many notes, some of which were considered to be objectionable and offensive to persons of another persuasion; in the late edition, to which you have referred, have any of those notes, to which objection was taken, been expunged?—All the notes, to which objections were at any time taken, have been expunged, not only from this last edition, but from several previous editions, from the time when those notes were first brought under the observation of the Catholic bishops; they were expunged before I was a bishop. I heard of an unauthorised edition of the New Testament being published by some person, wherein some of those notes were preserved, and which caused a great outcry; but, however, we were no more responsible for that edition than if it had been printed in Calcutta. The discipline of our church requires that no printer shall publish the sacred scriptures unless with the approbation of the ordinary of the place; and no ordinary of ours in Ireland has granted a licence for the publication of the scriptures with these objectionable notes for a long time previous to my being of that body.

Has the present system under which the Parliamentary grants are administered, in your opinion, tended to promote the cause of education generally in Ireland?—I believe it is well known to every Member of Parliament, that the public funds that are now, and have been for years past, given to a certain society in Dublin to promote the education of the poor in Ireland, are applied to the building, and supporting, and improving of schools which are frequented by few or none of the Roman Catholic population. Then, no doubt, those funds have contributed to the advancement of the cause of education amongst people who are not of our church, but to us they have been useless; indeed, if they had been merely useless, I do not think we should have complained; but they have been sources of numberless jealousies and conflicts between inferiors and superiors, sometimes of persecution by landlords of their tenants, and of ill-will on the part of the tenants towards the landlord; altogether, they have been productive of so much evil and discord, as I think it would be most desirable to put an end to.

Would it be impossible to allow all the children to read the scriptures together in some early part of the day's instruction, leaving the respective teachers to enforce it afterwards according to their respective rules?—I fear, if that rule were adopted, it would give occasion to much inconvenience and perhaps disputes;

for this reason, that the authorised version of the scriptures in England is not admitted by us as correct, and our version of the scriptures differs from it in some things, and therefore we might not agree. Protestants might not be satisfied to have our version used, and we might be unwilling to have the Protestant version used; therefore, I think the better way would be to separate the children at the time of giving religious instruction.

Is not the Protestant version used in many schools now where Catholic children attend?—As far as my knowledge goes, no Catholic children attend at that part of the instruction where the scriptures are read in schools conducted by Protestants. At present the Catholics and Protestants of my diocese are mixed very much in the day schools, scarcely at all in the schools under the Kildare-place society; but whenever they are united, Catholic children are exempted from reading the Protestant version of the scriptures, and, *vice versa*, the Protestant children are exempted from reading the Catholic version where the master happens to be a Catholic.

In those cases in which the Roman Catholics and Protestants are united under the Kildare-place system, is not the tendency rather to leave the Roman Catholic, who withdraws from the scripture lesson without any religious instruction at all?—Certainly; and as catechetical instruction is excluded, if he withdraw from the reading of the scriptures, he receives no religious instruction.

As you would have no school without religious instruction, and as you would wish that the Roman Catholic and Protestant children should be educated together, and neither to interfere with the faith of the other, how can spiritual instruction in such schools be given?—It could be given; because the children might be separated for the religious instruction, and to so separate them would be very feasible. If it could not be done otherwise, the Catholic children could receive religious instruction three days in the week, and the Protestant the three other days. There would be always means found to obviate inconveniences of that sort.

5TH JUNE, 1830.

You stated yesterday that it is your opinion and that of other prelates of your church, that no system of education should be supported generally in Ireland from which religious instruction is excluded?—Yes, it is my opinion, and the opinion of every prelate in the Catholic church in Ireland, that religious instruction should be joined with literary instruction, and made the basis of education.

But where the funds are sufficient only for the support of one master, the religious instruction of those children who differed from that master as to the creed they professed should be entrusted to monitors?—To a person appointed by the clergyman, the children who differed in religion from the master, to be instructed by such person, who would generally, I think, be of the class of monitors.

Do you suppose that among the children generally in a school, such a person as you describe could be found competent to give such religious instruction?—I cannot at present charge my recollection with the circumstances of any school known to me, in which a person of that description could not be found; but it may be that where a school is newly formed, no one of the scholars is competent to preside over the others, or convey to them religious instruction; but in every school established for some time, and in which even a few of the pupils have made some considerable proficiency, and are somewhat advanced in age, I could scarcely suppose that there would not be found a boy amongst the many children in attendance capable of giving that kind of instruction which is now under consideration.

In case no such pupils could be found, and supposing the funds of the school were insufficient to support a second master, how would you provide for that exigency?—The supposition that the funds of the school would not be sufficient is, I think, one that would not be verified in most cases; for the religious instruction of children is of so much importance, that in the founding of a school, or the establishment of it, persons should calculate upon the expense of providing that instruction as an indispensable portion of the general charge. If, however, a boy competent to impart it in the manner stated, could not be found in the school, I think the priest or minister of the parish, as the case might be, would find some pious and well disposed person residing in the neighbourhood of the school, who would come there on stated occasions either without consideration, or for some small sum of money, to impart to the children that instruction which it is indispensable they should receive.

For the spiritual instruction of those children who differed in religious faith from the master appointed over the school, you must either appoint one of the children as monitor to give them instruction, or you must depend upon the voluntary attendance of some charitable individual, or else you must pay a second person as assistant in that school?—To simplify the matter I would state it thus: where the funds of the school would not allow a second master to be employed, then the pastor of the children differing in religion from the master, should be commissioned by the patron of the school, or by those presiding over education generally in the country, to appoint some competent person to give, at stated

times, religious instruction to the children of his own communion; and the patron of the school, or other persons presiding over education in Ireland, to be charged to make some compensation, if required, to the person so appointed.

Then, in point of fact, with regard to the system of education you have proposed, you must be prepared, in every instance, to supply a second master for the sake of religious instruction?—Not in every case, because in very many parishes in Ireland the children resorting to a parochial school will be Roman Catholics exclusively. I should think in more than one-half of the schools throughout Ireland, all the children will be of one belief, because Catholics chiefly form the agricultural population. Moreover, persons of the best condition in the parish will prefer having select teachers rather than send their children to a parochial school, to which all descriptions of persons have access; and I believe, in the rural population of Ireland, the few Protestants mingled with the Catholics are generally of the highest class of inhabitants. Their children will therefore be sent generally to a higher description of school, and not to the parochial school, so that, in two cases out of three in the country parts of Ireland, the children will be only of one faith, and hence the necessity of providing two masters for each school will not be so general as might at first be supposed.

The effect of this system would appear to be, that though professedly those schools were open to all, the few Protestants in the country districts to which you have alluded would be virtually excluded?—I was only mentioning a state of things that now exists. I do not assent at all to the supposition included in the question, and I do not think any thing I stated would justify an induction of that sort. I mentioned, that though it might be necessary to appoint two masters for every school wherein Protestants and Catholics would be educated; still that necessity would not be a universal necessity in Ireland, because it so happens that there are very many districts in that country, particularly in the rural parts, wherein the population is exclusively of one creed, or nearly so, as the exceptions are scarcely deserving of notice. On the estate of Earl Fitzwilliam there is a large population, a greater proportion of which is Protestant than in most parts of the country with which I am acquainted; his lordship, always zealous in doing good, was very anxious to establish upon his estates a system of education that would afford equal benefits to all, and he and Lord Milton, his son, being in the country, drew up certain regulations for the conducting of schools upon those estates, which regulations he had the condescension of submitting for my approval. In those regulations there was one which specified that where Catholics and Protestants assisted in

the same school, they always should receive religious instruction in the manner prescribed, and at the time approved of by their respective pastors; and that where the master happened to be a Protestant, the Catholic pastor would be entitled to appoint a person to instruct the Catholic children in their religion, at such time and in such place as might be found convenient by the managers of the school; and if it was found that the master, being a Protestant, interfered in any way with the religion of the Catholic children, that then Lord Fitzwilliam's representatives would, on the representation of the priest, appoint a Catholic or, as the case might require, a Protestant assistant to remedy the evil referred to; but that in case no such necessity was found to exist, no second master should be appointed. Schools were established upon that principle by Lord Fitzwilliam. I have approved of them. The Catholic Bishop of Ferns, who was equally interested as I was, also approved of them; and from that time till the present I have heard no complaint of the manner in which those schools proceeded, nor have I found it necessary, in any instance, to apply for the appointment of a Catholic master in a school presided over by a Protestant master; nor do I suppose there is any want or neglect as to the religious education of children in any of those schools. In stating the rules prescribed by Lord Fitzwilliam, I may have varied the terms of it, as I recite it from recollection; but I am quite certain that I have stated correctly the substance of the arrangement.

The arrangement you recommend is founded upon your own system which you have established in your own diocese?—It is conformable to it.

You stated yesterday that that system does not work the exclusion of the Protestants from the schools, but that on the contrary Protestant children are included in one or more of those schools?—I have never found it tend to the exclusion of any one.

Do the Protestant children of those schools receive religious instruction?—If their parents or their pastors object to the instruction given in the schools, they are not required to attend it; and if they are pleased to adopt any measure to provide the children with religious instruction in the school-house, either after or before the classes open, every facility would be afforded as far as was compatible with the arrangements of the school.

Supposing the religious pastor of the Protestant children made any application to attend for the religious instruction of the children attending those schools, would there be any obstacle to it?—Certainly not; but I would go out of my way to accommodate him, and would induce the priest and the master, being Catholics, to facilitate the instruction of such children in their own faith.

Then if they are without any instruction in their own faith, it does not arise from any part of your system, but arises from other causes?—Certainly.

Do you think it probable, that unless a master of each religious persuasion were appointed, there would, in point of fact, be any religious instruction for those children who differed in faith with the master of the school?—I think it very clear that a master being of a certain religious belief, the parents of those children who differ from him will prefer charging themselves with the religious instruction of their own children, rather than confide it to a person of a different belief; and that therefore those children would be instructed not in the school but at home, or elsewhere.

Therefore those schools would not be generally efficient for the conveyance of religious instruction to the children of both persuasions?—That inference is one that I could not at all admit; because if there were parochial schools established in Ireland, in which a system of education, approved of by the public authorities, was established, and those schools placed under public superintendence, and assisted from the public funds, and all the people equally entitled to the advantages to be derived from such schools, Government would provide that the children, of whatever religious persuasion resorting to them, should receive all the benefit to which children attending school are justly entitled; but now the schools which exist in Ireland have not that character. Our schools are supported exclusively by our own funds, limited in amount; they are very numerous; there is no joint effort of the whole people to maintain them; the Government does not interest itself about them, they are left in a great degree to chance; and though some of them, as in my diocese, may be better ordered than others, still they have not that regular system of arrangement which they would have if a national plan of education were adopted by Government, and established in the country agreeably to the general wish. It is not therefore, in my opinion, altogether just to reason from the actual state of any school or set of schools, now in existence in Ireland, as to what would be the practice of schools established upon a more improved and general plan; and I cannot therefore admit the inference which is implied in the question, because I do not think it could be justly drawn from any answer that has been given, or from any supposition founded upon the present state of schools in Ireland.

Have you read the documents connected with the late Education Enquiry in Ireland?—I have read them all I believe, and with all the attention matters of such moment require.

Are you aware that the highest authorities in the established church have therein stated their opinion that it was the duty of the ministers of the established church to attend upon the schools

within their respective parishes, and to administer religious instruction to the children of those schools who were of their own faith?—I do recollect that that opinion was given to the commissioners by the highest dignitaries of the established church in Ireland.

Would there be any difficulty in uniting the performance of those duties which were so recommended to the parochial clergy of the established church upon the highest authority of the bishops and archbishops of the establishment, with the systems of school instruction that you have devised?—None whatever.

On the contrary, when you state it would be expedient to provide every facility for the separate religious instruction of the Roman Catholic and Protestant children, would not the very principle you have laid down afford the means of carrying the recommendation of the bishops into full effect, without creating any religious jealousy or heart-burning?—Certainly, I think it would, and should, for this reason, that in principle, so far as the necessity of imparting religious instruction to youthful minds, there is no difference whatever between the prelates of the established church and myself.

Are the committee to understand, as a general view of your entire system, that it provides for the combined literary instruction of the Protestants and Roman Catholics, that it makes religious instruction indispensably necessary to literary instruction, that it affords the same facilities for religious instruction of both parties, free from any danger of proselytism, or interference with their peculiar tenets?—I conceive it has all those qualities which have been so distinctly set forth in the question. I was about to add one remark, that the clergy of the established church can, with peculiar ease and convenience to themselves, watch over and even communicate religious instruction to the children of their communion, on account of the comparatively small number of souls entrusted to the care of each of them; whereas the Catholic clergyman whose congregation is generally much more numerous, and whose professional duty towards each of his parishioners is much more heavy, even he can find time to attend to the religious instruction of the Catholic children.

Have any complaints been made to you on the part of the parents or friends of Protestant children who have attended your schools, of any interference in their religious faith?—No such complaint has reached me, nor I believe any such complaint was ever made. I know that Protestant children coming to Catholic schools are in the habit of saying to the master or mistress, "My father or mother desires that I be not obliged to attend catechism, or any religious instruction." The master or mistress having

received this intimation, permits these children to go home, while the others receive religious instruction.

Do you consider that any inconvenience arises from the frequent recurrence of holidays, as observed by the Roman Catholics, where such observance is not regulated merely by the canons of your church, but by the will and appointment of the parish priest in various districts?—That question implies what is not founded upon fact, for no parish priest either in Ireland or elsewhere, has any discretion whatever as to the institution of a holiday, or to the abrogation of a holiday.

Have you any objection to state how many, and what, holidays are necessarily observed in your church?—I believe I could enumerate them. The Nativity, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Ascension of our Lord, the Annunciation and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, All Saints' Day, St. Patrick's Day, Corpus Christi, and the Festival of St. Peter and St. Paul. I do not recollect that there is any other. On those days the Catholics of Ireland are obliged to abstain from servile works, and to attend divine service, and keep the day holy so far as is consistent with their ability to do so; they are bound to this observance, not by the will of any bishop or priest in Ireland or of all of them, but in virtue of a church usage growing up through the fourth, fifth, and sixth, and up to the twelfth century; for holidays were not all instituted at the same time, but from time to time. This obligation of abstaining from servile works, or keeping certain holidays, is derived from the church law or usage, precisely like that which prescribes abstinence from flesh meat on certain days, when such abstinence can be observed without great inconvenience. We are thus bound to observe them, but all jurists and divines hold that these laws cease to bind when the observance of them would be productive of immorality, or great loss; hence it happens that in certain seasons, for instance, when a crop of corn is to be saved, and the weather bad, Catholics are permitted to gather it in, or to save hay upon Sundays or upon holidays, because it is believed to be the will of God and the will of the church that you should rather violate the sabbath than suffer the fruits of the earth to be destroyed when they can be saved; but as to the parish priest or the bishop having any power to abrogate an holiday, or to give licence to violate it, that is what cannot be; what we are entitled to do is this, and simply this, to interpret the law, and to tell the people when, in our opinion, there exists a sufficient necessity to justify them in working. This right of declaring when the church law ceases to bind is given to the clergy, because it is improper to let any one be a judge in his own cause; and it is always better to have recourse to a judge to decide as to the meaning of the law, than to decide upon it by private authority. So we the bishops,

who are judges in the church, are entitled to explain to the people when the ecclesiastical law would bind, and when it would not, but as to the enacting a church law such as would abrogate holidays, that is entirely beyond our competency.

Is it not within the competence of the Pope so to abrogate?—The Pope can abrogate the holidays in the church, all of them, except Sunday, the Lord's Day.

According to your observations of society in Ireland, what is your opinion with reference to the interests of society, both in a religious and civil contemplation of the question, of the effect produced by continuing to require Roman Catholics to observe those holidays?—I have lately been under the necessity of publishing in print my opinion upon that subject, and it is, that the observance of holidays in Ireland, particularly at certain seasons of the year, is injurious to good morals, and to all the interests of the people.

Would not so influential an individual as yourself, together with other clergmen of your church, be doing a great service to Ireland by taking measures to impress upon his Holiness the Pope the propriety and the necessity of abrogating that injunction upon the Roman Catholic population?—So perfectly am I satisfied of that being a duty upon my part, and the part of my colleagues in Ireland, that about two years ago I drew up as strong a statement as I was capable of framing, of the evils resulting from the observance, or rather the violation of those holidays, and of the advantages which would result from the abrogation of them. I sent this representation to the Pope, who sent it back to be considered by the prelates in Ireland; and on its being referred to them, and their opinion required, they agreed substantially with me. We therefore conjointly petitioned the Pope that he would abrogate the law requiring certain days to be kept holy. In reply, we received a rescript, abrogating the observance of Easter Monday and Whit Monday. The Festival of St. John the Baptist was also so mentioned, but the rescript, as to that day, only removed the obligation of abstaining from servile works, but left untouched that of hearing mass; and we thought it better not to publish that portion of the decree until we represented anew the necessity of abrogating the obligation of hearing mass, as well as that of abstaining from servile works. Since then it was moved, in an assemblage of our bishops to pray the Pope to abrogate most of the remaining holidays; this was supported by a majority of the bishops, but as they were not unanimous, it was thought better to defer the application until the matter should be reconsidered, when perhaps unanimity could be procured. I state these particulars in order to shew that the propriety of reducing the number of holidays is not with me a novel, or a merely theo-

retical opinion, but one on which I have acted and exerted all my influence.

Is not the holiday of St. Patrick a day which is kept by the lower class of Protestants, to as great a degree as the Catholics, as far as abstaining from working?—Yes; and a very curious occurrence took place on Easter Monday in Carlow. I am carrying on there a very extensive work. I told the men they should work on that day. There was a work at the other end of the town conducted by a Protestant; and he said to his men, as I was informed, “You shall not work; it is an old holiday and you shall keep it.”

It has been supposed that a compulsory tax would defeat and diminish those charitable feelings on the part of the benevolent part of the community in Ireland, which you have in glowing terms described as existing to a remarkable extent there; do you not consider that there will always exist in the minds of such people a charitable disposition, in the proportion with the exigencies of their poor neighbours?—I have no doubt such disposition will continue.

Do you not consider that it would be desirable that part of the burden should be removed from those more charitably inclined, and apportioned on those who, if not forced to do so, would not bear a part?—Next to the great object of affording relief to those in extreme want, or so great want as to approach to the last degree, my object in the proposition I had the honour of submitting was to equalise the burden now borne almost exclusively by the industrious classes, and to place a due proportion of it on those who have the greatest portion of property in Ireland, and who are now almost entirely exempted from the charge of maintaining the poor.

Do they not expend a portion of their capital for charitable purposes, which they would otherwise employ upon their land?—Undoubtedly.

Is not such a system equally injurious to landlord and tenant?—Every system not founded on justice as its basis, operates evil, and the unequal distribution of the public burdens must, in my opinion, always produce evil; and that the burden of maintaining the poor in Ireland now presses most unequally is, I think, so clear, as not to escape the observation of any one.

Do you assume in your examination that it is an obligatory duty upon the State to provide a system of relief for those who are in distress?—Upon that subject I have as clear a conviction upon my mind as I have of any moral or political truth whatever; which is, that the State is bound by the law of nature, by the positive law of the gospel, and by its own constitution, whatever the form of

government may be, to provide for the preservation of life to all its subjects.

Then if it be the duty of the State to make such provision, must there not be a correlative right on the other hand to claim a maintenance?—That there is the substance of that right on the part of the poor I am quite certain; but I am equally certain that the Commonwealth may regulate that right, and subject it to such rules as I proposed in the plan submitted to the committee; because though the poor have a right to support, and in my opinion a right founded upon natural justice, and upon the evangelical law, still I think that for the public good that right may be regulated so as to withhold from each individual a legal claim to a maintenance from this or that person, if the State only made a prudent provision for them by such an organization of public contribution as I submitted.

Do you think that it would be possible to try your plan as an experiment, and that in case it failed, or were found objectionable, it could be afterwards withdrawn?—The principle of it, if once introduced, should certainly always be continued in some shape or form.

You are aware that, in certain districts of England, the wages of labour are assisted out of the poor rate, and support is given to the able-bodied poor in cases of distress?—Yes.

What would be, in your opinion, the effect of at once altering that law, and withdrawing that mode of relief to which the able-bodied poor have been so long accustomed?—I think the alteration of it in England, where it is now mixed up with the habits of the people, would be a very dangerous experiment indeed. I think the repeal or even the material modification of any law which bears upon the habits of life of a great portion of any community, cannot be touched without a great deal of risk; and as that law, or that practice of the law rather, prevails to so great an extent in England, I think that if it were to be altered it should be done very gradually, very slowly, and with exceeding great caution.

Are you sufficiently acquainted with the abuse of the law which has been alluded to, to know in what way it is administered in different parts of England?—No, I am not.

Then it is only with reference to the general mode in which it has been stated, namely, the wages being made up out of the poor's rates, that you allude to it?—Not alone; I have heard and know of that practice having extended in England to prevail now in a great many places, and to be complained of as a great evil; however, my knowledge of it is not so precise as to enable me to answer satisfactorily any question relative to it.

You have stated that you thought it would be dangerous to withdraw such a system suddenly?—I have stated that; but it was upon this principle; that when any law has taken root, as it were, in a country, if it be a law which affects not a few individuals, but a great portion of the community, that the touching of such a law, but above all the repealing of it suddenly, must ever be attended with great and marked inconvenience. Law is a rule of conduct, and there is a maxim in the civil law of the ancient Romans, "*Leges feruntur cum promulgantur firmantur verò cum moribus utentium comprobantur.*" It implies the abstract maxim of reason, that the mere enacting and promulgating of laws is of itself of little force; but that laws acquire validity only when they are mixed up and confirmed by the practice of the people. If, therefore, a great number of men in any community have followed a certain rule practically for years and years, to take them out of that course by a new rule, and force them to abandon their old habits, is an experiment which, in the nature of things, must be productive of great evil; therefore, whenever abuses do arise from old laws, it is better to seek to correct those abuses gradually and slowly, and to open as it were new channels for the habits of the people wherein to flow, than to cut short any practice which has prevailed for a length of time amongst a great portion of any people.

If five former Committees of this House, sitting laboriously year after year, investigating these abuses and hearing evidence upon them, have, after due deliberation, and receiving from the different classes of persons different opinions, recommended that that practice should be gradually discontinued, should you not think that some respect was due to that opinion so formed, and that they probably had considered the circumstances sufficiently to induce them to form a plan whereby each gradual alteration might be made without evil?—I can answer that in the affirmative, without in the slightest degree infringing upon the answer that I gave.

If Committees of this House, for a much longer series of years, have been continually endeavouring to devise means for correcting abuses of the English poor laws, without having, as yet, brought their labours to any termination which has given satisfaction, should you not in like manner view, in the labours and opinions of those committees, some reason to distrust the practice or the application of the principles of the English poor laws?—That is a question to which I would give this answer: I am quite certain if the abuses prevailing in England, or arising in England, out of the system of poor laws, as now in operation, were as great in reality as they are represented in words, that they would have produced evils which have never existed, and that the Legislature

would ere now, instead of reasoning about these abuses, have actually applied a remedy to them. But I do think, notwithstanding what are called the great, and pressing, and crying abuses of the poor laws in England, that they are amongst the least of the many burdens which press upon society here; and that though they are evils, the community at large does not feel itself greatly aggrieved by them, or unquestionably those abuses would long since have been corrected; and therefore though these abuses were admitted to exist to the full extent that they are represented by those who amplify them most, I would think that, instead of excluding from Ireland a modified system of poor laws on account of the abuses prevailing in England, we should rather apply our minds to discover the sources from which those abuses arise; and, in framing a system of poor laws for Ireland, to seek to keep clear of those inconveniences inherent in the English system; I think, therefore, that the existence of those abuses in England, allowing them to exist, and the long and laborious investigations that have been made for the purpose of reforming them, and have failed; allowing all that, yet I do not think it is a sufficient reason for withholding from Ireland the benefit of some system which would preserve the lives of the people, and free the Legislature and Government of this country from, I was going to say the reproach, yet I will say the neglect of a duty which they owe to the community.

If it can be shewn that, in consequence of the reports of different committees upon abuses of the poor laws, efficient alterations have been made of the law correcting certain abuses, should you not have some greater faith than you would have upon the contrary supposition, in the advantage of such committees?—Certainly.

If it could be shewn, for instance, that within a few years an alteration has been made which has introduced what is called a Select Vestry, somewhat like the parochial committee you have recommended, and which has been embraced by 2000 parishes in England, and which the returns shew has worked well, should not you think the labour of such committees has not been cast away?—Undoubtedly.

It has been supposed that, for a long series of years back, committees have been sitting for the purpose of correcting abuses with respect to the payment of wages of labour out of the poor rate; if it can be shewn that the abuse itself only commenced to any amount within thirty-five years, that it commenced from a peculiar circumstance, namely, the great fluctuation in the price of the food upon which the labourer depended, causing him in one year to buy his food at a price perhaps three times over that which it was in the preceding year, so that he had no means of providing by any forethought against such fluctuation of food, and that that only arose within thirty-five years, should you not think that,

having arisen from such a cause within such a comparatively short period, the difficulty of abolishing that custom would be less than if, on the contrary, it had arisen from a much more indefinite period, and from much more indefinite causes?—Certainly, if it be an evil that arose from an accidental change in the price of provisions, and has prevailed only for the short period mentioned in the question, I cannot suppose it to be an evil incapable of cure.

If the reports of the committees sitting upon this subject, and taking evidence upon it, point out that as being the principle cause, and this as being the principal period over which it is extended, would you then consider it as an abuse of that indelible character, and ingrafted into the character of the people so deeply as that it may not be eradicated?—If it be an abuse of the kind that has been described, it may, I think, by wise legislation, be cured in the course of a fewer number of years than have passed since its introduction.

If it was the united opinion of all who had investigated the subject, that this particular abuse tended to depress the natural rate of wages, and to degrade the character of the labourer to whom it was given, and to give a temptation to a selfish person to get the wages paid out of the poor rate, which he ought to pay out of his own pocket; should you not think that that was an additional reason why we should strain every effort to try to eradicate such an abuse?—I am convinced that, if these be the characters of the abuse, it will be corrected in a short time, because they are such as must stimulate every man who has the power of remedying the evil, to apply his mind and his talents to the production of some remedy.

If those evils have never been remedied in England in any one parish, how is it to be expected that, in the introducing a new system into Ireland, the Legislature would be able to do that which, with the advantages they possessed in this country, they have never been able to accomplish?—The question seems to refer to an abuse specified in the late question, namely, the abuse of paying labour out of the poor rates. If the abuse be found incorrigible, (and I believe it is not), let it be carefully guarded against in any new system devised for Ireland; but, from the statement made, and the character assigned to that abuse, its origin, and its progress, I have no doubt whatever, though it has not been cured, that it will be cured very shortly.

If you allow your district committee in cases of a temporary nature to provide work for able-bodied men, would there be no reason to apprehend that that species of relief might grow into a habit as it has done in this country?—No, I do not think it would, because the relief to be given to able-bodied men in times of distress would not consist of the allocation of them upon this person

or that, for the purposes of labour. They would be employed in labour by the committee, but only in public works; and if such labour could not be found, the relief would be given in food, or in such other manner as the committee might think best. Indeed there has been no season of distress in Ireland wherein we have not had occasion to administer relief to able-bodied persons in times and circumstances like those now considered; we sometimes employed them upon public works, and gave them money payments, but when we had not such works to be executed, we purchased meal or potatoes, or other kinds of food, and distributed that food either gratis, or at very low prices, to all the poor whilst the temporary distress continued.

Supposing, from any cause, there was a great excess of population in a district above its means of employment, and that temporary relief were afforded to that population, what would be the point at which you expect your committee would suspend its relief, or in what manner would they be able to do it?—I mentioned before, that in cases of this kind, considering the class from which the committee would be taken, the clergy and magistrates, and a part of the industrious classes, I would confide entirely in their discretion. I have no doubt they would do that which would be best under all the circumstances.

Do you not propose to give them the power of applying their funds even to emigration?—I do.

Would not the success of that operation depend upon the willingness of the poor to emigrate?—It would; but however, at present, and as long as I have been acquainted with the peasantry of Ireland, there have been great numbers of them disposed to emigrate; and if that disposition abated, the committee, by narrowing the relief, could apply a stimulus to it.

Do you think that the district committee, having the power of taxing themselves entirely at their own discretion, would continue to afford that relief if the paupers refused to emigrate?—I am sure they would temper the administration of the relief so as to create in the pauper population almost any feeling they wished.



+

