

The Loyalists in the Revolution.

Second Paper.

BY FRANK R. DIFFENDERFFER, Litt.D.

Nowhere was there more timidity and indecision than in our own state. The very best men were to be found on both sides when the final rupture came. While Franklin may be regarded as the head and front of the Whig element, some of his warmest personal and political friends were Loyalists. For a long time, the cause in Pennsylvania was in great doubt. In addition to the fact that the ruling element of the population was almost exclusively British, the further fact that almost two thirds of the population were, from conscientious scruples, opposed to a resort to the arbitrament of arms for a solution of the existing troubles, is to be considered. The Quakers were men of peace and consequently Loyalists almost to a man, although of course there were some prominent exceptions. Joseph Galloway, an excellent witness, when examined by a committee of the House of Commons, declared that, had General Howe issued a proclamation when he entered Philadelphia, 3,500 men from Philadelphia and New Jersey would have rallied to his standards, and that more than fifty prominent gentlemen went to him and proffered their services in disarming the disaffected, but could not get even so much as an interview from him. Even John Dickinson did not seem to know his own mind. Between 1765 and 1775, he wrote much and ably as a Whig, but in 1776, he opposed the Declaration of Independence and was an uncompromising antagonist of the scheme of independence; and there were many more like him.

On October 16, 1775, while the Congress of the Colonies was sitting in Philadelphia, sluggish and irresolute, hardly knowing its own mind, the newly elected Legislature of Pennsylvania was organized. Chosen under a dread of independence, all of its members who were present subscribed the usual engagements of allegiance to the king. A few days later the Quakers presented an address in favor of "the most conciliatory measures," and deprecating everything "likely to widen or perpetuate the breach with the parent state."¹

Could any facts show more completely the prevailing diversity of public sentiment, or the chaotic condition of affairs generally?

It is a notable fact that in July, 1777, the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania instructed Col. William Henry of Lancaster Borough to disarm all those citizens of this county who had not taken the oath of allegiance to the cause of the Colonies. Col. Henry was the father of that patriotic son of Lancaster, who ran away to Boston to join Arnold's expedition against Canada and who later became Judge of our County Court.

¹ Ban., Vol. 8, p. 119.

In Virginia, everything was doubt and uncertainty. As late as March 15, 1776, Joseph Reed, of Pennsylvania, wrote to Washington as follows: "It is said the Virginians are so alarmed with the idea of independence, that they have sent Mr. Braxton on purpose to turn the vote of that colony, if any question on that subject should come before Congress." In reply, Washington wrote of the Virginians that "from their form of government and steady attachment heretofore to royalty, they will come reluctantly into the idea of independence." All this was within three months of the period when Congress actually pronounced the independence of the colonies.

In North Carolina, the two parties were pretty evenly divided. She was monarchially inclined from the beginning, and received large accessions to her native Loyalists from Scotland when the Stuarts were overthrown. Ignorance prevailed. According to Josiah Martin, her last royal governor, there were only two schools in the colony in 1775. Even the Whigs were unstable,—sometimes on the right side, and, when the King's troops came along, on his side. Thomas Jefferson, in his later years, directly accused William Hooper, a North Carolina delegate to Congress in 1776, of being a rank Tory. There are good reasons to doubt the truth of the accusation. That there were many men of the genuine stamp in the state, the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, written a year before Jefferson's fully attests.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

No state perhaps was more torn by political dissensions than South Carolina. Many of her citizens were immigrants from various parts of Europe, and opposed independence. After Charleston was taken, the people flocked by hundreds to the royal banner. Sir Henry Clinton reported to his home government that the entire State had submitted to the English government and was again a part of the British Empire. It was owing to the gallantry of a few men like Marion, Pickens and Sumpter, that the Loyalists did not overrun the country. The fact is, the political condition of the State was deplorable. With the two sides so evenly divided, and the country overrun in turn by both the Whig and the Loyalist troops, the people were embittered by their sufferings and were led to commit all manner of outrages on each other. The rules and courtesies of civilized warfare were often ignored, and murder and rapine took the place of honorable warfare. General Green, a most competent witness, described the condition of things as follows: "The animosities between the Whigs and Tories render their situation truly deplorable. The Whigs seem determined to extirpate the Tories, and the Tories the Whigs. Some thousands have fallen in this way in this quarter, and the evil rages with more violence than ever. If a stop cannot be put to these massacres, the country will be depopulated in a few months, as neither Whig nor Tory can live." That eminent jurist, John Marshall, says in his "Life of Washington" that "the people of the South felt all the miseries which are inflicted by war in its most savage form. Being almost equally divided between the two contending parties, reciprocal injuries had gradually sharpened their resentments against each other, and had armed neighbor against neighbor, until it had become a war of extermination. As the parties alternately triumphed, opportunities

were alternately given for the exercise of their vindictive passions." In conclusion, it can truthfully be stated that the Loyalists were in the ascendant in South Carolina until the close of the war. It also deserves to be mentioned that, when the British forces, under General Prevost, invested Charleston, there was a day's negotiation to adjust the terms of surrender, after which "the correspondence closed with the proposal on our part of neutrality to the town and state during the war, the peace to fix its ultimate condition."² This proposed action was a clear proposal to desert the cause of the colonies with a probable return of the royal government.

In Georgia, the cause of independence was more favorably regarded, but it was far from being good. That colony sent no delegates to the first Continental Congress, but was represented in the second. It was at first found difficult to found a liberty party, although in the end Georgia sent 2,679 troops into the Continental service,—the smallest number contributed by any state, Delaware alone excepted. But her loyal governor, Sir James Wright, was an able man and raised a considerable force of Loyalists for the King's service, and many Whigs were compelled to seek refuge in the adjoining states.

On the whole, it may safely be said that the Loyalists were more numerous in the south, in Pennsylvania and New York, than in the New England colonies.

When we come to examine the attitude of the newspaper press at the outbreak of the war, we find that a very considerable portion was arrayed against independence. There were thirty-seven papers published in the colonies in 1775, of which seven or eight espoused the cause of the crown.

TREATMENT OF THE LOYALISTS.

As the contest proceeded and the Whigs got the upper hand, sterner measures were adopted. They were compelled to give up their arms, to take the oath of allegiance, to undergo imprisonment, to confinement in irons and to labor on the construction of barracks. Later, banishment was resorted to. Pennsylvania sent some of her Loyalists to Virginia and New York. New York transported some of her own to Pennsylvania, to New Hampshire, Connecticut and Massachusetts. The most dangerous were placed in jail after transportation, but others were allowed some privileges on parole. Generally, the treatment was all the circumstances would allow. Medical attendance was given the sick. Frequently their families were allowed to join them in their exile. Sometimes the starving were fed. But at times the treatment was more severe, varying often with the fortunes of the war.³

Later, trials for treason were ordered. Confiscations of property were begun, and the gallows was called upon to do its ignoble work. Agents were appointed to keep watch on suspected or open Loyalists, to ascertain their possessions and to report and suggest the course of action to be taken. The State of New York realized from confiscations of personal property nearly \$400,000—Spanish dollars. The total loss to the Loyalists was no doubt fully double; including all kinds of property, the amount was estimated at \$3,600,000.

² Lee's History of the War in the South.

³ Flick's Loyalism in New York, pp. 121-122.

One result followed this confiscation of lands that was beneficial to the State at large. The Patroons, the holders of vast landed estates, were nearly all Loyalists. When their lands were confiscated they were sold in small parcels. The land of James De Lancey was sold to 275 individuals, and the 50,000 acres of Roger Morris to 250 persons. All this served to weaken the feudal element which prevailed in that State, and unquestionably resulted beneficially to the general welfare.

Out of a population of 185,000 in the State of New York at the outbreak of the Revolution 90,000 were Loyalists. Of these 35,000 are believed to have left and 55,000 accepted the inevitable and remained, becoming valuable members of the young state.⁴

Complete separation only became the final issue early in 1776. When this new issue did come, the Loyalists denounced it as revolution and anarchy. Parties then divided on stricter lines. Every man had now to choose the master he would serve; whether he would remain a subject of Great Britain, or by declaring himself a citizen of the newly born nation become a traitor to the crown. There could be no middle ground. Those who tried to remain neutral received no consideration from either party. It was a forced issue. The Loyalists found their cause a hard one to accept. Most of them were Americans, as were the Whigs, and proud of it into the bargain. They felt the action of the crown as keenly as the latter and also desired justice and relief, but had hoped to secure both from the King and his ministers.

Town and district committees were appointed with authority to arrest and examine the disaffected persons and deal with them according to the degree of their disaffection. I will cite the result of the first examinations held in New York as a fair example of the views of the persons investigated everywhere.

The first person of prominence examined was Whitehead Hicks. He said he held crown offices and had sworn allegiance to the king, and hence would not take up arms against him. He was not willing to be taxed by Parliament, yet he had refused to sign the association. He believed arms should be used only as a last resort, and he was not prepared to say that all other measures had been exhausted. The committee decided that he was not friendly to the American cause and put him on parole.

William Axtell did not believe Parliament had a right to bind the Colonies in all cases, nor did he approve of the program of the opposition. He wished to remain neutral for the sake of his property, and objected to being paroled. He was turned over to the Provincial Congress.

Captain Archibald Hamilton said he loved America, that he had fought, bled, and been in irons for her, that he wished her free and happy, and would not draw his sword against her; neither would he unsheath it against his brothers on the King's side. He was dismissed on his parole of honor.

John Wildt denied the right of Parliament to levy internal taxes in America, but would not take up arms against the King. His other answers were so equivocal that he was released under a £2,000 bond. These are fair samples of the sentiments of the extreme type of Loyalists in 1776.⁵

⁴ Flick's *Loyalism in New York*, p. 159 and 182.

⁵ Flick's *Loyalism in New York*, 69-72-73.

The sentiment in favor of "political liberty" was strong, but at the same time it was crude and not consistent. Those who were loudest in proclaiming it were often found denying it to their Loyalist neighbors. Every Tory of prominence was likely to feel the vengeance of his Whig neighbors when opportunity offered. The latter learned it in the wanton destruction of their printing presses and types; it was manifested in the burning of individuals in effigy, continually in tarrings and featherings, ridings on rails through the streets, the breaking of windows, the stealing of live stock and personal effects, and the destruction of property generally. To refuse to accept the violent views of the Whigs was to be "disaffected," and even a suspicion of that was sufficient to cause arrest and imprisonment, all at the victim's own expense. When necessary the property of the victim was confiscated and used to meet the expenses.

WHAT DID LOYALISM MEAN?

One of the most interesting phases of the entire Loyalism question presented itself when the contest for independence was over. What was to be done with these people who had lost fortune as well as country in trying to serve their King? It was not an easy problem to solve. It could hardly be expected that the nation which they attempted to destroy should care for them. This fact was recognized at the very outset of the peace negotiations. Great Britain insisted on compensation to the Loyalists whose estates had been seized and forfeited. Her Commissioners tried hard to persuade Franklin, Adams and Jay to do justice to these unfortunate people. Days were spent in discussing this point; the English Commissioners insisting and ours as persistently refusing to make reparation.

There were various reasons for this attitude on the part of our Commissioners. That the Loyalists by their advice, falsehoods and misrepresentations had not only done much to bring on the war, but were also largely instrumental in prolonging it, there is no room to question; they were therefore in some measure the authors of their own misfortune. Many had taken up arms and aided in plundering and murdering their loyal fellow citizens. The property which had been confiscated had more than once changed owners and its return to its original owners was almost an impossibility in many cases. Besides, the country was in no condition to recompense its own citizens who had lost their property, much less to settle the demands of its enemies. Congress had instructed the Commissioners to enter into no negotiations respecting the claims of the Loyalists unless Great Britain agreed to make compensation for the property of American citizens destroyed by her.

Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the Treaty as finally concluded, deal with this vexed question. Article 5 provided that "Congress should recommend to the several States to provide for the restitution of certain of the confiscated estates; that certain persons should be allowed a year to endeavor to recover their estates; that persons having rights in confiscated lands should have the privilege of pursuing all lawful means to regain them; and that Congress should use its recommendatory powers to cause the States to revoke or reconsider their confiscation laws. Congress unanimously assented to this arrangement, and issued the recommendation to the States which the treaty contemplated."

In the House of Lords as well as in the House of Commons this partial abandonment of the Loyalist created a violent discussion. Mr. Wilberforce said he saw his country humiliated thereby. Lord Mulgrave regarded it as a lasting national disgrace. Edmund Burke declared these people had risked their all and the nation owed them protection. Mr. Sheridan execrated the treatment the nation was giving these unfortunates, and he denounced as a crime, the giving of them into the hands of their enemies, the victims of confiscation, tyranny, resentment and oppression. Lord Walsingham declared he could scarce speak of the dishonor with patience. Lord Townsend said it was a circumstance of such cruelty as had never been heard of. Lord Stormond asserted that Britain was bound by justice, honor, affection and gratitude to provide for and protect them. Lord Loughborough believed that neither in ancient nor modern history had there been such a shameful desertion of men who had sacrificed all to duty and to their reliance upon British faith.

Of course the Ministry defended their treaty. The Prime Minister said "I have but one answer to give the House; it is the answer I gave my own bleeding heart. A part must be wounded that the whole of the empire may not perish. If better terms could be had, think you that I would not have embraced them? I had but the alternative either to accept the terms proposed, or continue the war." There appear to be good reasons for believing that the Commissioners on both sides were of the opinion that little of benefit would flow out of the articles in the treaty, to the Loyalists, and that the parties on either side who had suffered by the war, would have to look each to his own country for reparation, and so indeed the sequel proved. In some instances Loyalists succeeded in getting back part or all of their landed estate but these were exceptional cases rather than the rule. Most of them never recovered anything and were compelled to end their lives in exile and poverty.

WHAT DID LOYALISM REPRESENT?

What, it may be asked, did Loyalism represent? It stood up for law against all forms of rebellion. It stood for the established order of things. It was first, last, and all the time for the unity of the British Empire. At the same time it did not uphold the colonial system of the mother country in its entirety. Far from it. Before the actual breaking out of hostilities, as well as for some time after, the Loyalists were quite as anxious as the Whigs to have existing abuses corrected. But they proceeded through legally organized forms to bring these ends about. It must be remembered they were Americans as well as the Whigs, and as truly attached to their native country as the latter. But they believed and hoped that justice could be better secured by mild measures than by force and that the better sense of the English nation would in the end right their wrongs.

The views of a few prominent Loyalists may here be given. Dr. Myles Cooper, the President of King's College, now Columbia University, and the recognized Loyalist leader among the clergy, while he held and said "God established the laws of government, ordained the British power and commanded all to obey authority"; open disrespect to government was "an un-

pardonable crime"; "the principles of submission and obedience to lawful authority are inseparable from a sound, genuine member of the Church of England as any religious principle";⁶ yet Dr. Cooper thought the duty on imported tea "dangerous to constitutional liberty," and declared the Stamp Act to be contrary to American rights, and favored the opposition to the duties on paper, glass and other articles.⁷

Dr. Samuel Seabury, another prominent Loyalist, declared "My ancestors were among the first Englishmen who settled in America. I have no interests but in America. I have not a relative out of it that I know of. Yet, let me die! but I had rather be reduced to the last shilling, than that the imperial dignity of Great Britain should sink, or be controlled by any people or power on earth."⁸ Still another used this language: "My most earnest wish is for the happiness of America. I consider Great Britain and her colonies as but one body, which must be affected throughout by the sufferings of any one member. I consider them as constituting one great and illustrious family, to which I have the honor to belong; and I pray that its tranquility may be speedily restored, and that peace and harmony may forever reign through every part of it."⁹

There can be no question about the sincerity and honesty of these men. They were of the highest character. Immediately prior to the Revolution, the main distinction between the Whigs and Loyalists was what shape opposition to the acts of the English Parliament should take. Both sides held that injustice was being done to America. It was only a few ultra Tories who upheld the acts of the British government in their entirety.

Such were the views of the Loyalists up to the Declaration of Independence. After that they were reluctantly compelled to believe that the hour for argument and persuasion was past, and that the integrity and security of the British Empire could be secured only by pulling down the rising revolutionary spirit by force of arms.

DEMANDING RECOMPENSE FOR THEIR LOSSES.

The efforts of the Loyalists to secure recognition in the Treaty of Paris compelled them to enter upon a campaign for recompense from the British Government direct. As all parties agreed they had been ruined through their adherence to the King, public sentiment in Britain leaned toward compensation. They went to work with a will. They sought to bring the case before the people to arouse public sentiment in their favor. An agency was established to take charge of affairs, and a committee appointed consisting of one delegate from each of the Thirteen American States. By their direction a pamphlet was prepared and published in 1783 called "The Case and Claim of the American Loyalists, impartially stated and considered." The great authorities on international law of that day, Vattel and Puffendorf, were quoted and the arguments were in reality very strong. They had taken up arms at

⁶ A Friendly Address, etc., p. 5.

⁷ Ibid., p. 43.

⁸ A View of the Controversy, etc., p. 23.

⁹ Chandler, What think ye of Congress now? pp. 44-48.

the request of the King, and the latter was in honor bound to consider their claims. In fact, at the opening of Parliament, the King in the speech from the throne made reference to the "American sufferers," who, from motives of loyalty to him, had relinquished their properties or professions, and trusted that "generous attention would be shown to them." An act was passed creating a Board of Commissioners to examine and pass upon the claims of all such persons; they were also directed that in case any of these persons claimed greater amounts than they had lost, they were to receive no compensation whatever.

To get at the loyalty and conduct of these Loyalists, the Commission classified them under six heads. First: Those who had rendered services to Great Britain. Second: Those who had borne arms for Great Britain. Third: Uniform Loyalists. Fourth: Loyal British subjects resident in Great Britain. Fifth: Loyalists who had taken oaths to the American States, but afterwards joined the British. And, lastly, such Loyalists who had borne arms for the American States, but who afterwards joined the British army or navy.

The claimants set forth the character of the losses they had sustained. In adjusting these losses, there was often a great discrepancy between the amounts claimed and those allowed. In some cases the full claim was allowed, but in others only fractional sums, while still others got nothing at all, chiefly owing to their inability to prove their claims. This naturally gave rise to much complaint. The time limit in which claims could be presented was March 26, 1784. By that time 2,063 claims were handed in, and the aggregate of the amounts claimed was \$35,231,390. A second, third, fourth and fifth report was submitted, each representing additional claims and allowances that had been passed upon. By April 5, 1788, the Commissioners had passed upon and examined one thousand six hundred and eighty claims, and had liquidated the same for \$9,437,740. That the long delay in adjusting these claims should call out loud complaints was to be expected. A petition had been presented to Parliament in which it was said, "It is impossible to describe the poignant distress under which many of these persons now labor, and which must daily increase, should the justice of Parliament be delayed until all the claims are liquidated. Ten years have elapsed since many of them have been deprived of their fortunes, and, with their helpless families, reduced from independent affluence to poverty and want; some of them now languishing in British jails, others indebted to their creditors, who have lent them money barely sufficient to support their existence, and who, unless speedily relieved, must sink more than the value of their claims when received, and be in a worse condition than if they had never made them; others have already sunk under the pressure and severity of their misfortunes."

Whether that picture is overdrawn it is, of course, impossible for us at this time to say. Certain it is, however, there must have been a great amount of distress among these unfortunate people. In 1778 a tract supposed to have been written by the most pronounced of all Pennsylvania Loyalists, Joseph Gallaway, reiterates all the above statements. He says, "It is well known that this delay of justice has produced the most melancholy and shocking events. A number of the sufferers have been driven by it into insanity and become their own destroyers, leaving behind them their helpless widows and orphans

to subsist upon the cold charity of strangers. Others have been sent to cultivate a wilderness for their subsistence, without having the means, and compelled through want to throw themselves on the mercy of the American States and the charity of their former friends, to support the life which might have been made comfortable by the money long since due from the British Government; and many others, with their families, are barely subsisting upon a temporary allowance from Government—a mere pittance when compared with the sum due them.”

Still later the eleventh report was made, at which time the entire number of claimants is restated, including those in England, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Canada, at 5,072, of whom 952 either withdrew or did not prosecute their claim to a conclusion. The losses submitted in this last amended schedule were \$40,130,225, and the sum allowed was \$16,462,260, or about 40 per cent. of the amounts claimed. And yet it must be conceded that these people fared perhaps as well as many of the Whigs, whose property was often seized by raiding parties of the contending armies, often without compensation, but more frequently paid for in a currency so depreciated that they got only a fraction of its actual value.

FURTHER MEASURES FOR RELIEF.

It is impossible to regard without feelings of pity the conditions and fate of the Loyalists after the treaty of peace made in 1783. Their all had been staked on the results of the conflict, and they had lost. Their future prosperity was dependent upon the success of the British arms. The treaty of peace sounded the death knell of their hopes. They were aware that their victorious countrymen hated them even more than they hated the English, and that they had nothing to expect from them. It is true that the British ministry made a long and honest effort to protect them in their property. The fourth article in the treaty stipulated that the creditors on either side should “meet with no lawful impediment” in endeavoring to recover their good debts. The fifth article stipulated that the Congress of the United States should “earnestly recommend” to the several states the restoration of the rights and possessions of “real British subjects,” and of Loyalists who had not borne arms against their countrymen. All other Loyalists were to be allowed to go into any state within twelve months to settle their affairs and recover their confiscated properties upon paying the purchasers the sale price. The sixth article was to the effect that no further confiscation should be made, that all imprisoned Loyalists should be released, and that further persecutions should not be permitted.

But in many localities these stipulations were disregarded. It was contended that no forfeited property should be restored, inasmuch as Great Britain refused compensation to Whigs whose property had been destroyed. In New York, many who returned under the terms of the treaty of peace were “insulted, tarred, feathered, and whipped, and even hamstrung.”

Many of them, however, expatriated themselves forever, and these composed the very flower of the Loyalist party. They had sought refuge in various parts of the British Empire, in England, Scotland, Ireland, Nova Scotia and

various parts of Canada. But the real exodus began only after the treaty of peace had been made. Companies were formed by the well to do, which chartered ships to transport themselves to chosen asylums, while the poorer ones were carried away by the British government. On April 26, 1783, twenty vessels carried 7,000 to Nova Scotia. By August of the same year, 18,000 had arrived at St. Johns, and 10,000 more were expected. By December 16, about 30,000 had arrived, and among them were 3,000 negroes.¹⁰

For several years this stream of emigration continued to flow northward. "Within the period of one year, Shelburn grew into a city of 1,400 houses and 12,000 people. At the mouth of the St. John River, a town of more than 2,000 had sprung up in a year."¹¹ And still they continued to flow in from all directions. The estimates of the whole number of Loyalists who settled in Nova Scotia vary from 28,347 to 40,000. England supplied as many as 33,682 rations, and as late as 1785 was still feeding 26,317 refugees. Counting all the Loyalists who had sought refuge in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Cape Breton and Prince Edward's Island, there were 35,000 who found new homes in those regions.¹² Besides, 20,000 had taken refuge in Canada proper. The entire period occupied by the dispersion of the Loyalists reached twelve years subsequent to 1775, and perhaps included in all as many as 60,000 souls.¹³

But sending them to her outlying provinces was not all Great Britain did for these unfortunate people. Before the crowning stroke came, she had many of them claiming her assistance. Home and lands had been sacrificed through their loyalty to the mother country, and they claimed her assistance in their hour of need. Many prominent men from New York and Boston early fled to London, where they were either given positions or temporary annuities. The many who went to Canada and Nova Scotia were given food and shelter. Houses and barracks were built for them. The plan was to make them self-supporting as far as possible. The men were employed on farms or given lands as tenants. Fuel, beds and household utensils were supplied them.

HOW SOME WERE COMPENSATED.

It is to England's credit that she fairly accepted the responsibility thus thrown upon her. Not only did she lose her most valuable colonies and incur a great war debt, but now this new burden also came along. The masses of the Loyalists were given lands, seeds, tools and provisions in British North America. "To the better classes, the churchmen, army officers and public officials, were given either larger land grants, lucrative positions in the army and navy, state or church, or pensions. Losses were made good in proportion to the services rendered."¹⁴

Surveying lands in Nova Scotia for the settlement of Loyalists began as early as 1782. By 1784, 1,000,000 acres had been surveyed at a cost of \$24,175,

¹⁰ Jones' History of New York, Vol. 11, p. 494.

Canadian Archives, 1894.

¹¹ Canadian Archives, 1894, p. 417.

¹² Canadian Archives, 1894, pp. 413-23.

¹³ Flick, pp. 179-180.

¹⁴ Flick, pp. 189-190.

and divided into lots; but the demand exceeded the supply, and still more lands were surveyed. Loyalists were exempted from the payment of fees and quit-rents for ten years. Boards to the value of \$27,500 were given them. Nails, glass, shingles, bricks and carpenters' tools were also supplied them. The King ordered ironwork for grist and saw-mills and other things to be sent them. For surveys, tools, lumber and seeds, fully \$100,000 were spent in two years and a half, and about \$4,500,000 in transportation, provisions, clothing, etc., during the first two and a half years.¹⁵

In Canada proper things proceeded much along the same lines. Land surveys began in 1783, and eight townships were at once surveyed. There was no absolute uniformity in size of the land grants. The rule was to give every adult male and every widow 200 acres. By an Act of the Provincial Council, 200 acres were also granted to every son and daughter of Loyalists when they attained their majority. In upper Canada, 3,200,000 acres were given to Loyalists who had settled there prior to 1787. Huts were at once built, as the grantees were required to settle on their lands at once; but a few years later, these were replaced with comfortable houses. In every way, the government lent its assistance. All their requests for tools were granted. An axe, a hoe, a plow and a spade were allotted to every two families until all were supplied; a whip and cross-cut saw to every fourth family; to every fifth family, a set of carpenter's tools, pick-axes, sickles, grindstones, corn-mills, grist-mills; and one cow to every two families. At first, firearms were denied them, but later were also furnished, that the people might provide themselves with game and wild fowl. About \$4,000,000 were spent in supplying these Canadian Loyalists. In the end, they became a prosperous and loyal people, and their descendants are to-day her best and most loyal colonial citizens.

THOSE WHO CROSSED THE OCEAN.

It still remains to tell how those Loyalists fared who had early in the struggle gone to England. They were for the most part the well-to-do class,—men who owned property but who could not carry it with them and were therefore wholly dependent upon the British government. There was, of course, a general exodus of the public officials, who from their positions had become specially obnoxious to the Whigs. The support it was thought would be only temporary, and began after 1775. There was no rule or uniformity in the payment either as to amount or time. At first, the payments were made quarterly, and later annually. By 1782, there were 315 recipients who received \$200,000 in the aggregate. The amounts ran from \$100 to \$2,500 each. The increasing number of pensioners resulted in an investigation, in consequence of which 81 names were dropped, reducing the aggregate yearly sum from \$200,000 to \$158,500; but 428 new claims were admitted in 1782, on which \$87,000 additional were allowed, making the grant for 1783, \$245,725. Only 25 applications were refused. The claims were on account of loyalty, actual losses and positive need. One, John Tabor Kempe, who took \$70,000 to England with him, applied for an annuity, but was refused. He had, however, lost \$98,000. All classes, from aristocratic landholders to emancipated

slaves, from college presidents, soldiers, sailors, brewers, lawyers, doctors, shopkeepers, and farmers, were represented in the applications.

In all, 5,072 Loyalists presented claims for losses. Even the King urged Parliament to treat the Loyalists with "a due and generous attention." As a result, a commission was appointed by Parliament in 1785 to classify the "losses and services of those who had suffered in their rights, properties and professions on account of their loyalty." The commission went to work at once, and soon discovered their task was no easy one. All claims were to be presented by March 25, 1784; but the time was later extended to 1790. On the first date, 2,053 claims had been presented, representing losses in real and personal property amounting to \$35,231,000, and \$11,770,000 in debts, and \$443,000 in incomes, or a total of nearly \$47,500,000. By 1788, 1,680 claims had been adjusted, on which \$9,448,000 were allowed.

STILL MORE CLAIMS.

It was soon found that justice could not be done to these Loyalists unless commissioners took evidence in America. Such were accordingly sent both to Halifax and New York. The claims passed upon were 1,408, asking for nearly \$7,000,000, on which \$2,745,000 were allowed. The commissioners in this country gave three years to the work. Every effort was made to deal fairly with claimants; but the claims were "padded" to the utmost extent. Altogether 5,072 claims were presented, amounting to \$50,411,000. Of that number, 3,184 were allowed, and over \$19,000,000 were awarded and paid. The total outlay on the part of England on account of the Loyalists, during and after the war, was not less than \$30,000,000. A few of the largest claims were the following:

	Allowed.
Frederick Philipse, Jr., claimed \$770,000.....	\$210,000
Sir John Johnson " 516,000.....	223,000
Oliver De Lancy " 390,000.....	125,000
Beverly Robinson " 344,000.....	148,000
James De Lancy " 284,000.....	160,000

NOTE.—I have not found any lists of Lancaster County Loyalists who were deported or sent elsewhere, although they were plentiful. An incident came under my personal notice that throws some light on the question may be given. Nearly fifty years ago, I stood at the foot of that "world's wonder" the Falls of Niagara gazing on the sublime sight. An elderly gentleman approached me and began a conversation. I at once thought I detected the well known *Pennsylvania German accent* in his talk, and the longer he talked the more surely it became evident to me that there was Pennsylvania-German blood in him, and I told him so, and told him besides there were scores of men of his name and lineage in Lancaster County, Penna. Then he told me his grandfather and a good many more from Pennsylvania—from what county he did not remember—had been deported to Canada where they founded a small hamlet and where their descendants are still living. He had these particulars from his father who was a boy at that time.

Author: Diffenderffer, Frank Ried, 1833-1921.

Title: The Loyalists in the Revolution : second paper / by Frank R. Diffenderffer, Litt. D.

Primary Material: Book

Subject(s): American loyalists.
United States--History--Revolution, 1775-1783.

Publisher: Lancaster, Pa. : Lancaster County Historical Society, 1919

Description: 155-166 p. ; 23 cm.

Series: Journal of the Lancaster County Historical Society ; v. 23,
no. 9

Call Number: 974.9 L245 v.23

Location: LCHSJL -- Journal Article (reading room)

=====

+++++

Institution Name
Institution Address
Institution Phone Number
Institution E-mail Address